

## NAYS—208

Amash	Garcia	Napolitano
Andrews	Gingrey (GA)	Neal
Barber	Grayson	Nolan
Barrow (GA)	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Bass	Grijalva	Owens
Beatty	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Becerra	Hahn	Pascarell
Bera (CA)	Hanabusa	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Bishop (NY)	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Higgins	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Himes	Peters (CA)
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Peters (MI)
Braley (IA)	Holt	Peterson
Brown (FL)	Honda	Pingree (ME)
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Pocan
Bustos	Huelskamp	Polis
Butterfield	Huffman	Price (NC)
Capps	Israel	Quigley
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Rahall
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Rangel
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Jones	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Keating	Rush
Chu	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Cicilline	Kennedy	Salmon
Clarke	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda
Clay	Kilmer	T.
Cleaver	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Sanford
Cohen	Kuster	Sarbanes
Connolly	Langevin	Schakowsky
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Cook	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Schrader
Costa	Levin	Schwartz
Courtney	Lewis	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Lipinski	Scott, David
Cuellar	LoBiondo	Serrano
Cummings	Loebach	Sewell (AL)
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Shea-Porter
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Sherman
DeFazio	Lowey	Sinema
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Sires
Delaney	(NM)	Slaughter
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Speier
DeBene	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
DeSantis	Lynch	Takano
Deutch	Maffei	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Maloney	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	Carolyn	Tierney
Doyle	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Duckworth	Markey	Tonko
Duncan (TN)	Matheson	Tsongas
Edwards	Matsui	Van Hollen
Ellison	McClintock	Vargas
Engel	McCollum	Veasey
Enyart	McDermott	Vela
Eshoo	McGovern	Velázquez
Esty	McIntyre	Visclosky
Farr	McNerney	Walz
Fattah	Meeks	Wasserman
Foster	Meng	Schultz
Frankel (FL)	Michaud	Waters
Franks (AZ)	Miller, George	Watt
Fudge	Moore	Waxman
Gabbard	Moran	Welch
Galleo	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Nadler	Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—11

Broun (GA)	Hunter	Schweikert
Campbell	McCarthy (NY)	Shinkus
Green, Gene	Negrete McLeod	Smith (WA)
Horsford	Rogers (MI)	

□ 1539

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 353, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, on consideration H.R. 2609, I am not recorded because I was absent due to medically mandated recovery. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on final passage of the bill rollcall No.

345, "aye" on the Titus Amendment of the bill (rollcall No. 337), and "aye" on the Heck Amendment to the bill (rollcall No. 337), and "aye" on the Heck Amendment to the bill (rollcall No. 325).

On rollcall No. 353 on final passage H.R. 2642, I am not recorded because I was absent due to medically mandated recovery. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on final passage of this bill.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2300

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 2300.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILLIAMS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

□ 1545

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come, and I yield to my friend, the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House will meet in pro forma session at 10 a.m. No votes are expected.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few bills under suspension of the rules, a complete list of which will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

The House will also vote to delay, for a year, both the employer mandate and the individual mandate under ObamaCare. As the Speaker and the gentleman know, the administration declared last week that they would delay the enforcement of the mandate on businesses for a year, but not the mandate on working families and individuals. We will respond next week to correct this injustice.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the House may consider H.R. 5, the Student Success Act authored by Chairman JOHN KLINE. The bill represents a solid, commonsense approach to education to provide our next generation with the education they need to keep America competitive in the world economy.

Finally, the House may consider the Department of Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 2014 drafted by Representative BILL YOUNG for the resources necessary for our troops.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information on the schedule. As the gentleman knows, we just passed a farm bill and I'm wondering how soon he might expect to move to go to conference on that bill.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman, the chairman, the Speaker, and other members of leadership are in discussions about how to expedite an agreement on the farm bill. Certainly it is our intention to act with dispatch to bring to the floor a bill dealing with the SNAP program, that portion of what was traditionally the farm bill. We intend to be bringing that vehicle to the floor at some time in the near future. It is our intention to do so.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information, and I am glad to hear that we will go to conference as soon as possible so we can consider that important piece of legislation. As the gentleman knows, there are substantial differences between the House and the Senate, and the sooner we get that bill done and whole, I think the better we will be.

You mentioned the Defense appropriations bill is coming to the floor. Does the gentleman expect that to be coming to the floor with an open rule?

And I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I will respond to the gentleman, as he knows, this Congress, as was the last Congress, has been a Congress that is as committed to the open process as any in recent history. I would say to the gentleman that the Speaker continues to insist that we strive toward that open process to allow for as much debate and exchange of ideas as possible to benefit the American people as well as the outcome of legislation.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. Was that a "yes"?

Mr. CANTOR. I would tell the gentleman again that the Rules Committee, as the gentleman knows when he was in the position of majority leader, determines the structure of debate, and I would remind the gentleman that the discourse and debate on this floor has been a lot more open than in years past, and I would remind him of that.

Mr. HOYER. Well, the good news is I don't have time to discuss that today, but perhaps at some time we will.

Immigration. Obviously, the Senate, as the gentleman so well knows, has passed a major piece of legislation, passed it 68-32. That bill is, I believe,

now with us. Can the gentleman tell us when we might be expecting immigration legislation on the floor?

Mr. CANTOR. I'd say to the gentleman, it is not correct to say that we have that bill. There was a tax, I believe, that was added to the bill so we do not have that. I would say to the gentleman, though, as he knows, our conference members met yesterday to discuss the path forward so far as immigration reform is concerned. I would say to characterize the agreement on our side, we all believe we need to fix a broken system of immigration and we need to rebuild the trust of the American people and the operation of government in terms of securing our borders and enforcing the law, at the same time balancing that with the history and tradition of our country as one that is built on immigrants.

Mr. HOYER. I'm pleased to hear that. Of course, former President George Bush said, as the gentleman knows, just a few days ago, that we have a problem. The laws governing the immigration system aren't working, the system is broken, and he urged us to pass a bill. The chairman of the Budget Committee, PAUL RYAN, has said the same thing that I think the gentleman just said. We are very hopeful that we will bring a comprehensive, which we believe is absolutely essential, immigration bill to the floor and to realization so we can fix a broken system. And, yes, give a pathway to citizenship for those who meet the criteria that we would set forth.

But I thank the gentleman for his comments; and if he would like to respond further, I'd yield.

If not, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 15, 2013

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Monday, July 15, 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

#### DEPENDENCE ON THE GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today, despite all of the diatribe, all of the allegations, so many of which shocked me, this bill passed. There were things in the farm bill I was not crazy about, but what an extraordinary day for this reason: over the last 40-50 years, Members of the other party have increasingly made the United States a

welfare state where more and more American people are dependent upon this government for their livelihood. Having been at a Harvard orientation course, I was shocked to have a dean there with charts that showed that since welfare began, and assistance to single moms, a check actually for each child that any woman could have out of wedlock, they would get a check from the government. Now, it was well intentioned.

Back in the sixties, there were deadbeat dads that were not helping with their obligation to help their children, and so the government, people here in Congress thought, wow, why don't we help these poor single moms by giving them a check for every child they have out of wedlock. At that time we were around 6-7 percent of children being born to single-parent homes. And after 40 years—actually after 30 years, as economists will tell you, you will get more of what you pay for. And so we are to date now past 40 percent and moving toward 50 percent of children born in American to a single-mom home because we got what we paid for.

Now, it doesn't matter how well intentioned the program was. What I saw happening in the nineties as a judge was single moms coming before me for welfare fraud, and the stories were usually the same that they presented to me. So often they were bored with high school, and someone said, hey, you can just have a baby and the government will send you a check. And then you can live, and you don't have to work. You don't have to finish high school.

And those well-intentioned Members of Congress back in the sixties ended up in effect luring smart young women away from finishing high school into having a child out of wedlock and away from reaching their full potential.

Now, even for those of us who are Christians that believe God created heaven and Earth and that God created at one time a Garden of Eden from which man fell for disobedience, even in that scenario when the world was perfect, Adam was given a job. In a perfect world where everything was fantastic—before childbirth pains, before briars, before thistles, before all of the things that frustrate farmers, at that time he had a job: tend the garden.

□ 1600

In a perfect world, people will have a job to reach their God-given potential, and there is a good feeling from doing a good job in what we do.

That's one of the things I miss about working in the yard or working out on a farm or working with your hands. When you finish, you see you've done something good.

When we work here, we try to do the right thing, on both sides of the aisle, but we never know for some times decades whether we did more good than damage.

And I would humbly submit that the program that began to lure young women away from their potential,

away from finishing high school, away from time in college, was well intentioned, but this government should never be in the business of luring people away from their potential, from luring people into results from which they cannot seem to extricate themselves.

And they'd come before me for welfare fraud, felony welfare fraud, as a district judge. And normally the scenario was that they realized, after a number of children, they couldn't live on that little bit of government subsistence; and they would think, well, maybe if I get a job, and I don't report it to the Federal authorities, maybe I'll finally have enough income that, combined with what the government's giving me, then I can get ahead and I can get out of this hole, this rut.

And so when the Republicans took the majority, in 1995, one of the things that they wanted to do was welfare reform. And I was at that Harvard orientation seminar and was surprised when they brought out the big poster graph of single mothers' income over the 30-or-so years since that program had first begun.

Single moms' income, when adjusted for inflation over that 30-year period, was flat-lined. All those years, the average single mom never got ahead. She was flat-lined because she was lured into that government program.

I'm not sure what the right thing was, but I think it's time to have the debate about it.

So I know that those people that passed the bills in the sixties, they had the best of intentions, but those poor single moms were flat-lined for about 30 years of what they were bringing home. That's tragic. I know both sides of the aisle would want them to do better and do well and every year to do a little better. I know that feeling is on both sides of the aisle, but we disagree with how you get there.

But what really shocked me today, and I've got to say, in some cases broke my heart, is to hear friends talk about how Republicans wanted to take food out of the mouths of children. I would never insinuate or say such a motive on the part of friends across the aisle, even though I believe that that welfare program, back from the sixties, did exactly that.

I would never ascribe that motivation to friends across the aisle because I know that's not their heart. They really do want to help. They just went about it in the wrong way in the sixties.

And so, in 1995, when Newt Gingrich led the Republican Revolution, had the Contract With America, they put in a requirement for work. If you could work, you had to work. And it pushed people who had been subsisting on welfare, barely getting by, it pushed them into the workforce.

And this graph, about 9 years later, showed that single moms' income, when adjusted for inflation, after welfare reform, had single moms making