

□ 1610

So do we really want to legalize 33 million people, or even 11 million people?

Do we want to give them access to all of the government benefits that we have?

Do we want to let them have access immediately to, I'd say, at least to and their children to the systems that we have, the health care system, the education system we have, the public security systems we have?

Do we want to put them in a place where their tax return makes them eligible for the Earned Income Tax Credit, so that all of their children that may not live in the United States even at the time, they get a check from the Federal Treasury for that?

Do we want to see this pour out to where the number that came from Robert Rector's study is that, on average, the people that would be included in this amnesty act in the Senate, over the course of the time they would live in the United States, the average comes in at 34 years old, and a 34-year old, by the time they reach that age, will live to the age of about 84. That's 50 years in the United States. That's a net cost to the taxpayer of \$580,000 per person.

Do we want to really write a check or borrow the money from the Chinese to fund that?

Do we need that many more people in the United States doing the work they say Americans won't do, for a price of \$580,000 per person?

Do we want to rent cheap labor for the price of \$12,000 a year? That's what the math works out to. I think it's \$11,600 a year.

Do we really want to—do the taxpayers care that much about having somebody to cut the grass and somebody to weed the garden and somebody to do all this work that they claim Americans won't do?

By the way, I don't think anybody in this Congress can find work that I haven't been willing to do, and I think my sons would certainly reinforce that statement. They remind me that they've been out in 126-degree heat index and poured concrete on these days, and they've been driving sheet piling across the swamp at 60 below wind chill. They tell me that's a 186 degrees temperature change, and no species on the planet could survive what they went through growing up in our family. And I say, well, no species other than my sons. And I remind them that, and me too, guys.

We did work like that in the heat, in the cold, in the rain and the snow. We did work underground. We do the sanitary sewer work. We do earth work. We do all kinds of things. We do demolition. All of the work that they say Americans won't do, we've done a whole lot of that and will do more.

No one's too proud to do work in this country. We're just sometimes not willing to do work for the price that's offered. And we know that free enter-

prise capitalism takes us to this. The value of anything, including labor, is determined by the supply and demand in the marketplace.

Corn prices go up and down, depending on how much there is, how much corn there is, the supply, and how many customers there are to buy it, the demand. That's true for gold and oil and platinum and soybeans and labor.

And because we have an oversupply of unskilled labor, and underskilled labor is why we have such low wages and benefits at low- and unskilled labor. The highest unemployment's in the lowest of skills.

And yet people in this Congress think you have to expand the low-skilled labor numbers, bring people in, low- and unskilled, Senate version of the bill, seven unskilled people and under-educated people, for every one that's going to be able to pay their going rate on what it costs to sustain them in society.

For every person that would come in under the Senate bill, that would pay as much or more in taxes as they draw down in government benefits, there are seven who will not be able to do that.

The universe of those in the 11 million people cannot sustain themselves in this society that we have, not in a single year of their projected existence in this culture, in this society, in this economy. So why would we do that?

Why, if we need more people to pull on the oars, would we allow 100 million Americans, that are of working age and simply not in the work force, to sit up there in steerage, while we bring people on board to pull the oars and wait on the people sitting in steerage?

That defies any kind of rational logic, Mr. Speaker.

So to destroy the rule of law, to, I'll say, subsidize a non-work ethic, and now it turns into three generations of Americans that are drawing down some of the 80 different means-tested welfare programs, it is foolish for us to consider such a proposal. And I'm hopeful that the good sense of the American people can do something about the spell that has been cast over too many Republicans in the House and the Senate.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I urge the American people to save this Congress from themselves and restore the rule of law.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, today the Speaker of the House, not the presiding officer at the moment, but the Speaker of the House, JOHN BOEHNER, made some irresponsible remarks about climate change. He was asked about the reports that the President is

prepared to act to protect the planet and future generations from climate change impacts.

And here's what the Speaker had to say:

I think this is absolutely crazy. Why would you want to increase the cost of energy and kill more American jobs at a time when the American people are still asking, where are the jobs? Clear enough.

Well, I could not disagree more strongly with Speaker BOEHNER. Presidential action to protect the climate and future generations is absolutely essential. The House is controlled by leaders who deny the science and are recklessly ignoring the risks of a rapidly changing climate.

The House has become the last refuge of the Flat Earth Society. That is why the President must act, using his existing authorities under the law.

The Speaker's assertion that acting to reduce emissions will hurt the economy is absolutely wrong. We need to act to lead the world in the clean energy economy of the future. If we don't act, initiative, leadership, and economic growth will go to countries that do.

Now, I've been in Congress for over three decades. I worked on the Clean Air Act reauthorization of 1990. I remember the testimony we received in the 1980s about how, if we tried to do more in the environmental area, we would lose our jobs and our economy would be set back. We would face another depression.

Well, on a bipartisan basis, we adopted the Clean Air Act. We had the bill sponsored and signed by President George H.W. Bush, and that legislation led to accomplishments of reducing air pollution in some of our heavily polluted urban areas, including my own home of Los Angeles.

We were able to stop the ravages of acid rain, which were causing destruction of our forests and rivers and ponds in the Northeast and in Canada. We were able to do something about toxic pollution, which was causing birth defects and cancer in large numbers of people who lived near industrial facilities. And we were able to get legislation passed and moved forward to stop the destruction of the upper ozone of our planet.

We accomplished these goals because we didn't pay attention to the naysayers who told us our economy would be ruined, we would lose jobs, we should forget about a healthy environment, we should forget about pristine air in our national parks.

Luckily, we had leadership, from Republicans and Democrats, to do something, and we can now talk about the great accomplishments that we achieved. And at the same time, we created more jobs. We created more industries. We created new technological developments.

But let me talk about why the President needs to act on this question of climate change. On Monday, the International Energy Agency, IEA, released

a report concluding that the world is not on track to meet the goal of limiting global average temperatures below 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit, or 2 degrees Celsius.

Now, that is a tremendous concern because the scientists are telling us that if we don't achieve the goal of reducing the temperature rise, we are going to see some very severe impacts: flooding of our coastal cities, increased risk to our food supply, unprecedented heat waves, exacerbated water scarcity in many regions, increased frequency of high-intensity tropical cyclones, irreversible loss of biodiversity, including coral reefs.

□ 1620

Recognizing this danger, our country and other countries around the world joined together in 2010 and said that we've got to do what we can to keep the temperature rise below 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit. The IEA concluded that the world is failing to meet this goal. Greenhouse gas emissions are driving climate change, and it's happening with increasing rapidity. So can we just deny this is happening? Can we say, oh, it will cost jobs and we shouldn't pay any attention to it?

On our committee, the Energy and Commerce Committee, which has jurisdiction over this whole question, the Democratic leaders on the committee have asked that we have hearings to bring in the scientists because some of our Republican members have said they don't believe in the science. We sent over 36 letters asking that the scientists be brought before the committee to tell us why they think these terrible things may happen, and we have never gotten a response from a single letter of request for hearings.

Can you imagine the people running the Congress denying the scientists and then refusing to hear from the scientists or claiming the science is uncertain and not resolved and then refusing to hear from scientists who can come in and talk about what they have learned?

Now, if we're facing a world where all the accumulated greenhouse gases stay in that atmosphere and to the point where our planet is heating up and we're facing terrible consequences, you don't have to buy everything they say, but what are the chances that they're right? Ten percent? Would we take the risk that we're going to face a 10 percent chance of all these catastrophic consequences and do nothing about it? Well, that seems to be what the Republican leaders are saying, including the primary leader of the House, the Speaker.

Now, let's look at some other more recent examples. When the President announced historic fuel economy standards, critics said cars would get smaller and more expensive, and it would hurt the sales of our automobiles. Well, they were completely wrong. Vehicle sales are booming. They are at high levels now. Consumers are

saving money because cars are more fuel efficient. This is an accomplishment—an accomplishment—despite all the naysayers. When the Obama administration issued mercury standards for power plants and other sources, House Republicans said it would cost jobs and raise electricity prices.

Well, that hasn't happened. Implementation has gone smoothly, and electricity prices have not gone up. In fact, wholesale prices actually went down, and there have been no rolling blackouts as predicted by the doomsday scenarios.

In 2011, the EPA issued a report on the benefits of the Clean Air Act over the period from 1990 to 2020. According to the study, the direct benefits of the Clean Air Act in the form of cleaner air and a healthier population, more productive Americans, are estimated to reach nearly \$2 trillion in the year 2020. We're talking about saving money by protecting our environment.

So when the Speaker says that we shouldn't pay attention and that it's crazy to pay attention to the concerns about climate change, he's absolutely wrong. When he says action to reduce carbon emissions would harm the economy, just the opposite will happen. We will create new clean energy businesses and more economic growth.

The President has said that if Congress won't act, he must act; and he is absolutely right. The President must act, and he has the authority to act under existing laws. Congress will not act because the leadership of the House of Representatives denies reality. They want to politicize science. They want to politicize science by ignoring it. Well, science is not another political opinion. Science is looking at the evidence. Turn on the television news any day of the week, and you will hear stories about droughts, superstorms, new hurricanes, new climate events, and new record levels of temperatures. Don't we think that something might be happening and that we have some responsibility in government to try to do something about this issue?

Addressing climate change will require actions over the long term, but the IEA report highlights four policies that can be implemented now and through 2020 at no economic cost, policies that will help reduce local air pollution and increase energy security.

First, that report recommended that countries adopt specific energy-efficiency measures. We don't have to build new power plants if we use our energy resources more efficiently. We can have more efficient heating and cooling systems in residential and commercial buildings, more efficient appliances and lighting in residential and commercial buildings. Energy-efficiency measures can account for half of the emissions reductions that the report proposes through the year 2020.

Secondly, the report said that if countries limit the construction and use of inefficient subcritical coal-fired power plants and switch instead to

cleaner and more efficient plants, we will see the air get cleaner and the threat from climate change be dramatically reduced.

Thirdly, the report recommended that countries reduce emissions of methane, a potent greenhouse gas from upstream oil and gas production, by installing readily available technologies in the short term and pursuing additional long-term reduction strategies.

And, fourth, the report proposed that countries accelerate the phase-out of fossil fuel subsidies which exacerbate climate change by encouraging consumption of carbon pollution emitting energy. Why are we subsidizing the oil companies with special tax breaks? Is a tax break for an oil company any different from appropriations of dollars for the oil companies? They're doing very well on their own.

What we need to do is to provide a level playing field for competition for renewable fuels, alternatives and efficiency. These are the things that we ought to be focusing on rather than keeping oil and coal the predominant sources of our energy for electricity and fueling our motor vehicles.

Things are changing. They're changing because investors don't want to buy into stranded investments because they know climate change is happening. The American people are getting a clear sense that something is happening in the climate, but they don't hear Congress even talking about it. And around the world, others are moving forward. Why should we allow others, whether it's the Chinese or the Europeans, to develop the technologies? We have always been the leader in developing technologies for the future. We developed the catalytic converter to control pollution from automobiles. We invented the scrubbers that could be used on power plants to reduce the emissions that come from these power plants. We have made all these advances over the years because we've given a clear incentive for anti-pollution control devices because we wanted to reduce pollution, and now we have a Congress where they want to deny at the highest levels of leadership in this Congress that climate change exists and the President shouldn't take any action.

Imagine the top leader of the House of Representatives saying:

I think it's absolutely crazy. Why would you want to increase the cost of energy and kill more American jobs at a time when the American people are still asking, where are the jobs?

□ 1630

Well, the jobs can come along with efforts to reduce pollution. We have always seen the economy and our protection of the environment go hand in hand. We shouldn't say that we have to choose. We can have both. We have a long history in this country of bipartisan support for the proposition and the reality that we can preserve the environment and protect our economy

and prosper, if we are willing to adopt policies and show some leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I remember when the compliance costs were being thought of, when we were trying to deal with the acid rain problem. Industry after industry on the record—and it's all available to review—claimed the costs would be enormous. Then when we passed the law, the actual costs were a small fraction of what was being predicted. When they were told that they had to accomplish the goal under a cap-and-trade program to reduce sulfur emissions that were causing acid rain, we accomplished the goal at a fraction of the original estimates—which I think were highly inflated for scare purposes—but we accomplished the goal because we said this is the goal, accomplish that goal. You can benefit from new technologies and new ways to accomplish our environmental objectives. And that's exactly what we did, we moved out with the acid rain pollution problem.

So my colleagues and Mr. Speaker, let's not have leaders who say we have to say that we're going to ignore the threat from climate change in order to protect jobs. We can protect and promote jobs and protect our environment at the same time.

And Mr. President, you were so right when you said if the Congress will not act, you must act, you must lead. We are looking to the President to show that leadership because we're not going to get it from this House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

**CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE DISPOSITION OF RUSSIAN HIGHLY ENRICHED URANIUM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-38)**

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the Federal Register for publication the enclosed notice stating that the emergency declared in Executive Order 13617 of June 25, 2012, with respect to the disposition of Russian highly enriched uranium is to continue in effect beyond June 25, 2013.

The risk of nuclear proliferation created by the accumulation of a large volume of weapons-usable fissile mate-

rial in the territory of the Russian Federation continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13617 with respect to the disposition of Russian highly enriched uranium.

BARACK OBAMA.  
THE WHITE HOUSE June 20, 2013.

**WEEK IN REVIEW**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, today we did vote on the farm bill, as it's been referred to, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act. But as some of us have pointed out—and I attempted to establish through an amendment—this was not a farm bill. Eighty percent was about food stamps.

It was a very brilliant move by Members of Congress back when the Democrats controlled the majority—the seventies, the eighties—in fact, after Vietnam, the post-Watergate era, the most liberal Congress until Speaker PELOSI took the gavel. They did a brilliant thing. They were able to take so much in the form of welfare, public assistance of all kinds, and put it into so many different budgets under the jurisdiction of different committees so that if at any one time someone went after one area that was multiplicitous, it was simply a duplication of other agencies' funds, then they could be marginalized and demeaned and have it said, you don't care about women or veterans or children or the poor, or whatever. It's worked well, in fact, to the point that we now obviously have about \$17 trillion in debt more than we've had revenue coming in. Basically, we would be, perhaps, Greece or Cyprus, other countries that are basically on the verge of bankruptcy except that we produce our own money. And the dollar is the international currency, so it's allowed all this reckless overspending.

So I think it's time—and I know there are many others that agree—that we reform Congress to the point where all public assistance comes in one single committee, one area where all public assistance can be located. It will be easy to see all the duplications, all the waste, so much easier to see areas where fraud is running rampant when you put all of those public assistance measures in the same bill.

I actually proposed an amendment that would strike title IV—which was the food stamp program, although it's been cleverly renamed the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP—has a real snap to it. But the goal was not to do away with that program. In fact, my friend across the aisle, Mr. MCGOVERN, asked me: Are you wanting to do away entirely with

the food stamp or the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program? And I replied before the Rules Committee, on the record, before a television camera, into a microphone, no, I didn't want to do away with that program. But I did feel it needed to have its own time, its own discussion, and not be 80 percent of a farm bill.

But what is really heartbreaking is not that children are not going to have food in America—because whether we bring a farm bill back that separates out the food stamp program so we can deal with that separately—not do away with it, but deal with it separately—or whether it comes back and we're into the rut of continuing to extend and extend, children will not be allowed to go hungry.

But I think back about the Presidential campaign last year and about how much the politics around here has degenerated, such that when a Republican like Mitt Romney—or JOHN MCCAIN, back in 2008—says I disagree with my friend, my opponent, but I know he's a good man and he has a good heart. He wants to do good things for the country, we just disagree with how to get there. And yet what we have coming back, as Mitt Romney saw, was Mitt Romney, after saying he's a good man, a good family man, but I think he's wrong on these issues, what came back from the drones—the human drones that were speaking on behalf of the President—was, gee, he wants to push people off a cliff; he wants people to die of cancer; he wants them to get cancer. He's obviously painted as a very evil man.

□ 1640

That came back to mind today during some of the discussions. I heard our friend from Maryland, minority whip here, talking about the farm bill, blaming Republicans for not being bipartisan when three-fourths of the Republicans had voted for the farm bill. Yet our friends across the aisle did make it a very partisan measure, and not only made it partisan in the rhetoric condemning Republicans for not reaching out, things were said in the subsequent discussions when my friend from Texas had been here on the House floor, but comments from friends across the aisle like children were crying out here for food and Republicans, in essence, not only voted down their help but wanted to slap them down.

I would never say that about a friend across the aisle. I think they're wrong in the way they want to spend so much more money than we have coming in it's bankrupting the country. I would never think for a moment that one of my friends from across the aisle wanted to slap down children. I just wouldn't bring myself to say that because I know it's not true. I think they're very wrongheaded on so many issues. But comments like taking not