

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

only food, but their utensils or table and just leave them with the floor, how could we do such a thing?

Yet, when we look at the food stamp bill that had 20 percent farm in it that did not pass today, it certainly wasn't for a lack of work by the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, FRANK LUCAS. Chairman LUCAS and I don't always agree on things, but I know that man and he is a good man, and I did appreciate hearing Mr. HOYER commenting as much. FRANK LUCAS worked very, very hard on this bill and he actually got reforms in here.

There were actually amendments passed that some didn't like, but it was a bipartisan bill. There were some Democrats that voted for this bill. That makes it bipartisan. Not like ObamaCare that was rammed down the throats of Americans and the Republicans, without having input, without having any opportunity for amendment really, just forced upon Republicans in the country.

In fact, there's never been a Congress that has been as closed to amendment, as closed to input from the other side, as we witnessed when the Democrats took the majority in January of 2007 until they lost the majority in November of 2010. Those years saw more closed rules, no amendments possible. It was unbelievable the way our friends across the aisle were so abusive with the process and preventing almost half of the country from having any voice in anything that went on.

When I hear our friends across the aisle talk about a lack of bipartisanship, it's a little difficult. What really is a bit heartbreaking is to hear people across the aisle speak so eloquently as I sat here listening today, hearing people speak with such incredibly persuasive words and expressions and with such venom and passion that, if I did not know the truth, I actually would be believing how horrible and evil and nasty and child hating Republicans really are.

However, I know people on this side of the aisle as well. There is not anybody that has been elected to Congress—there's no other way to get to the House. There is nobody that's been elected on either side of the aisle that wants to see a child suffer because of anything we do. It is very offensive to have people on one side of the aisle attribute those kinds of feelings that we wanted to hurt children. Really? It sounds so real and so true.

How can we ever have legitimate debate in this House of Representatives when anybody can stand and attribute such evil motivation on the side of the other and make it sound so real? Do we have any chance of saving this country when people can come to the floor and make such ridiculous allegations sound so persuasive and true? You can't have debate like that.

On the other hand, I have looked in the eyes of constituents of mine. As I go all over my district, down to a wonderful little community, it brought us

recently for a town hall. I go all over the district. One of the things that really makes me proud is to be introduced as having been to some community more than any other Member of Congress. They thought, Oh, well, he is from Tyler. He wouldn't care about us here. I care about the whole district. I know all of the people that are elected, they do care about their district.

But when I look into the eyes of constituents who want to provide for their children, they want them to have the best that they can provide for them, and they talk about standing in line—I've heard this story so many times from people who are brokenhearted about it and sometimes get angry just thinking about what they've seen and what they've heard.

But standing in line at a grocery store behind people with a food stamp card, and they look in their basket—as one individual said, I love crab legs, you know, the big king crab legs. I love those. But we haven't been able to have them in our house since who knows when. But I'm standing behind a guy who has those in his basket and I'm looking longingly, like, When can I ever make enough again where our family can have something like that, and then sees the food stamp card pulled out and provided. He looks at the king crab legs and looks at his ground meat and realizes, because he does pay income tax, he doesn't get more back than he pays in, he is actually helping pay for the king crab legs when he can't pay for them for himself.

People across the aisle want to condemn anyone who is working and scraping and can't save any money and is trying to decide how in the world do we ever get ahead, can we ever get ahead. They're cutting back my hours at work. We're doing the best we can, and yet I stand in line and see multiple people paying with food stamp cards for things I cannot afford.

How can you begrudge somebody who feels that way? How can you begrudge anyone who steps up on behalf of constituents who feel that way? We don't want anyone to go hungry. And from the amount of obesity in this country by people we are told do not have enough to eat, it does seem like we could have a debate about this issue without allegations about wanting to slap down or starve children.

Because when I think of children, I think about those also who are growing up right now. They have no say in the amount of money we're spending in this Chamber right here, billions and billions and billions, with so much waste, fraud, and abuse.

□ 1650

Yet those very little children who have no voice in what we're doing are going to have to pay for our extravagance and our waste and our fraud and abuse. What kind of parent would want that? I don't know of anybody on either side of the aisle who would want that, but it is what we are producing.

I didn't vote for the farm bill—because it's not a farm bill. I believe we need to have a debate where we bring all the public assistance into one place so we see what's there and so we can cut out as much waste, fraud and abuse as possible, where we can make those cuts, because when we're spending the billions and billions and billions we are for food supplement, whatever you want to call it, and when there is story after story of people who are caught selling interest in their food stamp cards or what they buy with their food stamp cards, can we really not come and have a discussion about how we can quit putting a heavier and heavier burden on children who have no voice in this Congress?

Can we not have a debate and a discussion without demonizing people who say, Look, I care about the children who are growing up and who are going to be born and who shouldn't have to pay for the extravagance and the narcissism within this generation? Can't we have that discussion without demonizing one another? I would hope that we could get to that point.

One comment about Tea Party extremism killing the farm bill. When a small reform is made to the food stamp program and when this additional requirement is added that, for those who are able to work, they will need to work, is that evil and mean and just so totally in disregard of those who are "getting" from everyone else?

We heard this when Congress wasn't a blip on my radar. We heard this over and over as Newt Gingrich and the new Republican majority after 40 years or so came into this body as the majority, and they said, We are going to reform welfare—and they did. President Clinton didn't want it. He fought it tooth and nail. Just like the balanced budgets, he fought it, he fought it—and he used his veto more than once—but finally, it's signed into law. When it's clear to President Clinton that there are votes here in a bipartisan way to override his veto, he might as well sign it. Now, today, how wonderful it is when he extols the virtues of his two terms as President—the virtues of what the Republican majority did when they finally reined things in.

Now, I was told as a freshman and as a very staunch conservative, don't even bother to go to the Harvard orientation for new Members of Congress because it's just so liberal. They vilify those of us who think like we do in that we need to be more conservative in our spending, but I went anyway as I enjoy a good debate, and we had several. I was struck, even at the liberal Harvard Law School, where they've totally forgotten the reason for their founding and of what was required of students in those early days as they prepared them to live a life in total submission to their savior Jesus Christ. It's amazing when you go back and read the things that the students were taught and what they had to take an oath to believe, but they're at Harvard.

We had a dean come in with charts, who explained, ever since the Great Society legislation in the sixties—I know some think maybe it was born out of less than noble ideas, but I believe it was born out of the best of intentions. They saw people needing help, so let's give them money, let's give them help. Gee, there were deadbeat dads around the country, so let's give the single moms a check for every child they have out of wedlock. Back then, when there was between 6 and 7 percent single moms who were struggling to get by, over the years, we have paid for more and more children out of wedlock. As philosophers have said, if you pay for some activity, you're going to get more of that activity. Now in this country we are getting what we've paid for.

We are past 40 percent single moms and are on our way to 50 percent, in large part, I think, because this Congress decided—well-intentioned—to try to help single moms instead of trying to help them reach their God-given potential. Maybe help them with daycare. Get back in high school. Finish high school. You can earn so much more if you finish high school than if you never do. Get a little college, and you'll make more. That's what the statistics tell us. If we care about the people, why wouldn't we want to push them?

These charts from this dean at Harvard showed that, since the Great Society legislation, a single mom's income when adjusted for inflation for about 30 years was a flat line. Single moms on average did not ever improve their situations.

Then along came what was portrayed as being these evil Republican Congressmen and Senators who said, We're going to reform welfare. We're going to require people to work who can. They pushed people out of being on the dole of the Federal Government, and they pushed them into starting to pursue their God-given potential and what they could do for themselves and to feel good about themselves because they're providing for themselves.

He pulled out a chart to show a single mother's income when adjusted for inflation and after welfare reform—when people were forced to work, they could—and wow. For the first time in about 30 years, a single mom's income went up when adjusted for inflation.

So who cared more—those who said, You Republicans are evil for trying to make people work who are getting child support from the government or are getting welfare? How evil you are. Are they in the more virtuous position? Or those who say, I know this will work. I know every human being has potential that God put there, and we want them to move toward that. We do not want to pay them to be a couch potato and to pay them to keep having children out of wedlock and to pay them for not pursuing what they're capable of pursuing for themselves and that wonderful feeling when you ac-

complish something for yourself? Who is more virtuous in that situation?

I can tell you, from the rhetoric, that my friends on the Democratic side were the virtuous ones and that the Republicans were the evil, mean-spirited, self-involved people because they wanted single moms to reach their potential and make more money—and it happened just like that. So then President Obama comes in, and what does he do? Right off the bat, he wants to eliminate the work requirement. I think he was motivated out of good intentions, but we're back to where we were.

We want for the people who have been getting food stamps, if they can work, to work. Let's push people toward reaching their potential. That's not evil. That's a good thing. People are also free to worship whoever, whatever or no one if they wish in America, but there are those who say, Well, gee, you're a Christian. The Christian thing is to give people money if they need it.

□ 1700

In Romans 13, it talks about the government is supposed to be an encourager of good conduct. An encourager, it would seem, to reach your potential, not to kill your potential. To encourage people to reach for the stars, not kill a NASA program and force people to teach to a test.

If we want to keep having a country that is worthy of so many places around the world trying any way they can to get into this country, then we must protect this country. That's what our oath involves: protect the country so it's not overwhelmed. Prevent this country from becoming one massive welfare state, but encourage the greatness in people.

We're not going to help that when we see a leader of a country like Syria, an Assad, who has killed so many people, who we would not want to support to stay in that position, but he's being challenged by people who we know are involved with al Qaeda and al Qaeda-type groups and who want to subjugate other Muslims and Christians or kill Coptic Christians, as we've seen in some places, kill others, Jews, Christians, with whom they disagree. Do we really want to help either one of those?

Back before they had to teach to the test, people learned a little bit about history, and they had to learn before World War I. You don't find enough people that can talk intelligently about World War I any more.

In fact, we see the polls that say there are more people that can name the Three Stooges than can name the three branches of government because the tests they've been teaching to have the same requirements for everyone. We were doing better when they were local requirements. The local people knew best. But back when people were learning history, they found out and we were tested on and taught that World War I came about because of what we were told were entangling alliances.

What do we see around Syria? Well, Iran is propping up Assad. Russia says

we are going to send in the best anti-aircraft defense if you start a no-fly zone there. Yet this President, without the support of Congress, just like he did not have when he went into Libya—and we know how that's turned out. At least four people are dead that wouldn't be otherwise. But giving money to Syria, really? A billion dollars is what I was reading today. How about taking that billion dollars that's going to cause all kinds of death and that will probably in some way, some day end up causing the deaths of Americans and Israelis, allies of ours, Coptic children, Jewish friends, they're going to kill people that were never intended because it's not well enough thought out of this administration rushing into Syria.

Well, we didn't rush in. That's for sure. Perhaps if the President had decided early on to go in, then it wouldn't have been so massive an al Qaeda movement within the rebels. But we know they're there.

This is not the thing to do, to get involved in a country where the United States national interests will not be served if Assad stays in power, and they will not be served if the al Qaeda rebels take over. So why are we sending a billion dollars? Why are we sending help to either side in that scenario?

Let's help people at home. Let's use that money to secure our borders. Because when it comes to immigration, if we really want to care, it's time to secure the borders so legal people coming in do so legally and then we'll get an immigration bill passed in no time flat.

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for June 19 and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for June 19 and today until 1 p.m.

Mr. HONDA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for June 19 and 20 on account of official business in the district.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 23. An act to designate as wilderness certain land and inland water within the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes; to the committee on Natural Resources.

S. 112. An act to expand the Alpine Lakes Wilderness in the State of Washington, to designate the Middle Fork Snoqualmie River and Pratt River as wild and scenic rivers, and for other purposes; to the committee on Natural Resources.

S. 130. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land