

the labor force should be determined by supply and demand. Why don't we let human migration follow where the jobs are? Well, Milton Friedman had the answer to that. He said that you cannot have open borders and a welfare system, especially one that is as generous as our welfare system is.

So which one can you fix? Can you fix the border problem? Can you fix the welfare problem? I'd like to fix them both, Madam Speaker. One of them is a little easier than the other. We can control the borders and shut off the jobs magnet easier than we can make the case that we should be tightening down the welfare system in this country. But we need to do both. We need to bring the country back within its means. The entitlement system that's out there that fits within those 80 different means-tested welfare programs needs to be completely reexamined.

I think Congressman LOUIS GOHMERT is correct when he said we need to put all of the welfare into a single committee so they're responsible for all of the programs that we have. It's the only way we can begin to get a handle on it. The committee jurisdiction is scattered out through multiple committees, and he knows that better than I.

The big picture that I started to talk about in the beginning, Madam Speaker, is that we need to identify the pillars of American exceptionalism and we need to refurbish those pillars. The identification of them become the things that we've inherited from far back in the origins of Western Civilization. Mosaic law flowed through Greek and Roman law, and the Magna Carta that was signed in 1215 established individual freedom from the monarch or the despot that no subject could be—let's say no one other than a serf at that time—could be punished arbitrarily. They had to have the right and the protection of the rule of law.

We have these guarantees in our Constitution, freedom of speech, and I'm exercising it now, Madam Speaker, and I encourage all to do so. If we stopped exercising freedom of speech, we would eventually lose it because it would be defined away from us. Freedom of religion fits the same category. If we don't exercise our freedom of religion, it becomes redefined away from us. How about freedom of the press? I would submit, Madam Speaker, that those who abuse freedom of the press, those who do not have journalistic integrity, are undermining our First Amendment right. If every newspaper out there printed things that they knew were dishonest, if they just drove purely a political agenda on the front page, on the side where they're held accountable for journalism, or in their commentary when they print falsehoods as fact, it undermines all of our freedom, because when someone abuses a freedom, they diminish that freedom for all of us.

Now, think in terms of this—if that's hard to understand for some folks, Madam Speaker, I'll put it this way: If

everybody went out there and abused the Second Amendment right, it wouldn't be long before we wouldn't have the right to keep and bear arms, regardless of what the Constitution says. We have to utilize those rights, and we have to exercise them in a responsible way. The abuse of God-given rights, the abuse of these rights, especially in the Bill of Rights, undermines the rights that we have.

But we do have freedom of speech, religion, and the press and assembly. If we stopped exercising them, we would lose them. We have the right to keep and bear arms, not for hunting, not for target, not for self-defense, and not for collection. All of those four reasons to keep and bear arms are—I'll say they are additional rights; it's just the bonus that comes along with it because our Founding Fathers understood that a well-armed populace was a protection against tyranny. I agree with that and defend the Second Amendment because that is what allows us to defend ourselves against tyrants.

You can go on up through the Bill of Rights, the right to property in the Fifth Amendment—nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation. The Kelo decision took that phrase out of there, “for public use.” I think one day, a Supreme Court, if we raise an adequate objection, will have to go back and revisit the Kelo decision. It was an unjust decision that didn't reflect the language in the Fifth Amendment. Property rights is another core of American exceptionalism.

Without these rights, freedom of speech, religion, and the press, and the Second Amendment rights to keep and bear arms, without property rights, without being tried by a jury of our peers and the right to face our accusers, without the concepts of federalism and these enumerated powers in the Constitution, that being reserved for the Congress and the balance of them that revert to the States or the people respectively, without those components, we would not have emerged as the country that we are. We can't sustain ourselves as a country that we are to be if we don't protect those pillars of American exceptionalism.

In the core of those pillars of American exceptionalism is, as I said earlier, the rule of law. When the rule of law is usurped by a king or a despot or a President of the United States, it diminishes us all, and it diminishes the potential destiny of the United States of America. We've seen, as the President of the United States has decided, that he will enforce the law that he sees fit, and he will not enforce the law that he doesn't agree with. And it's clear in a number of ways, Madam Speaker. The President suspended No Child Left Behind. He won't enforce that. He essentially has waived it off the books.

Now, he took an oath to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. That is in the Constitution, and it's a

requirement. He took the oath, he understands it, he taught constitutional law, but he simply set aside No Child Left Behind. It isn't the issue that I'm advocating here; it is that a President must take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

Behind that, he suspended welfare to work. In the middle 1990s, there were three times that President Clinton vetoed the welfare reform law. He finally signed it and took credit for it—okay, that's politics—but one component of that was welfare to work. And only one of all of our more than 80 different means-tested welfare programs that we have, or a minimum of 80 different means-tested welfare programs that we have, of all of them, there's only one, Madam Speaker, that requires work. That one is the TANF program, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. And it says in there that it specifically prohibits the President from suspending or waiving the work requirement. The President did so anyway.

Sticking with this rule of law that has been so damaged by our President, it's also true with immigration law. The immigration law requires that people who are in violation of it be put into the process for deportation. The President has decided he won't do that. Now, it's one thing to have prosecutorial discretion. I agree that the executive branch has to be able to decide which highest priorities are there for the resources of law enforcement. But when the executive branch—the prosecutorial discretion is always on an individual basis, not on a group basis, not on a clear-the-board basis. But look what the President has done. He has issued a memorandum, actually a memorandum that was written by Secretary Napolitano of the Department of Homeland Security, that said that we're not going to enforce immigration law. So I'm here to endorse the rule of law and stand up and defend the Constitution. I appreciate your attention.

I yield back the balance of my time.

SUFFERING UNDER SEQUESTRATION

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. Madam Speaker, the sequestration has taken place that we were told a year and a half ago would not. The President said during the debates last fall it would not, but it has taken place, as the President traveled around the country demonizing those of us back here that were hoping for a better way to cut, hoping that something could be reached in the way of an agreement that would have given more flexibility, but that didn't happen. People were too busy going off doing other things to be here in Washington with us and work out some kind of an agreement.

One bit of good news, though: We had heard from the Secretary of Homeland

Security that the lines would be long in the airport, there would be delays and there would be all kinds of problems. Initially, it was announced that FAA officials would be pulled from between 150 to 200 airports. They were going to make America feel as much pain as possible. But with all the tough news for travelers, we can all be comforted. This is dated March 5, a story by Elizabeth Harrington: The TSA was able to seal a \$50-million sequester-eve deal to buy new uniforms.

So the lines will be longer traveling. We are told by Homeland Security they are going to make America feel pain because we managed to cut less than 2 percent of government spending when it's increased over 20 percent over the last 4 years, when every American who works and pays taxes had their taxes go up 2 percent on January 1. This was merely taxes going up 2 percent, giving basically a tax on government for 2 percent, the same one America suffered.

□ 1620

That is the same amount basically, and yet we have officials in this administration who say, Oh, no. We can't stand a 2 percent cut. Heck, here at the House itself, our budgets have been cut 11½ percent over the last 2 years. We did it. And you've got TSA, you've got FAA, you've got Homeland Security, you've got people being released from custody that will put American citizens in jeopardy all to make the point that we can't live with a 2 percent cut like every hardworking American taxpayer has. At least we know that TSA will have new uniforms while the lines are getting longer.

It also is worth noting a story here by Terence Jeffrey March 4 of this year, that President Obama borrowed nearly six times as much in February as the sequester cuts all year. I recall in 2006, the last year Republicans were in the majority before Speaker PELOSI took the gavel, Democrats on this side of the aisle appropriately beat up Republicans because we had a budget, an appropriations that year that spent \$160 billion more than we brought in, and we should have gotten it balanced. They were right.

I would never have dreamed that within a few years and with a Democrat in the White House, with a Democratic majority in the House and a Democratic majority in the Senate, that they wouldn't spend \$160 billion more than we took in; they'd spend \$1.6 trillion more than we took in. And here, with all the gloom and doom and claims of how bad it's going to be—oh, it's going to be horrible—we find out that the President borrowed \$253.5 billion in one month, the shortest month of the year, February, six times more than the sequester was with all the complaints.

I have an interesting story here in Townhall.com by Heather Ginsberg: "President Obama's Golf Trip Could Have Saved 341 Furloughed Jobs." She

goes on to outline the millions of dollars it cost for the last golf outing. That's pretty tragic.

I think we have one of the most gracious and graceful First Ladies that we've ever had. She made a wonderful quote previously. She said:

This is really what the White House is all about. It's the people's house. It's a place that is steeped in history, but it's also a place where everyone should feel welcome. And that's why my husband and I have made it our mission to open up the house to as many people as we can.

That was our First Lady, and that was a wonderful position to take.

So I'm sure she was not consulted today when the White House in its frustration that all of us in Congress—heck, the cut we are having in Congress is going to put us around a 20 percent cut of our budget in the House. The Senate hadn't cut themselves 11½ percent like we have, but we will have cut our own budget in the House of Representatives in every office at least 20 percent in 3 years' time. The President, even though his government has grown about 20 percent in 4 years, could not live with just pulling back 2 percent of that 20 percent increase.

So, today, as the story indicates from today—this is from the Washington Examiner:

Never say the White House isn't affected by sequestration. The Visitors Office just notified Congress that tours of the White House are canceled until further notice.

Due to staffing reductions resulting from sequestration, we regret to inform you that White House Tours will be canceled effective Saturday, March 9, 2013 until further notice, the White House email to legislative offices explains. Unfortunately, we will not be able to reschedule affected tours. We very much regret having to take this action, particularly during the popular spring touring season.

Well, knowing that, as the story reports here, we could have had 341 Federal employees that could have kept their jobs and not been furloughed if the President had not taken his last golf outing. It seems to me that since there are so many people coming to Washington—it appears to me as many Democrats as Republicans, possibly more—they have wanted, they have counted on the quote from the first lady. They were so looking forward to touring the White House.

I filed an amendment with the Rules Committee this afternoon so that we can work together. The amendment to the continuing resolution of funds—and I'm hoping and begging and pleading that the Rules Committee will make this amendment in order. It's an amendment to H.R. 933 offered by Mr. GOHMERT of Texas:

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

None of the funds made available by a division of this act may be used to transport the President to or from a golf course until public tours of the White House resume.

That way we will both work together so the President will not be able to take a golf outing that causes 341 more Federal officials to be furloughed and

lose their job, at least temporarily. Then perhaps by avoiding furloughing all these Federal employees, we'll be able to get the Democrats and Republicans across America, people that didn't even have a party because they're just Americans, they'll be able to get their tour of the White House, and all it will cost is one or two golf trips less.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1736

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.

HOURLY MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 933, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-12) on the resolution (H. Res. 99) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 933) making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 307. An act to reauthorize certain programs under the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to public health security and all-hazards preparedness and response, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.