on a sweatshirt. And the sweatshirt was a remembrance of her going to the State volleyball finals. And so she had a bunch of names, all of her classmates wrote their names on there.

So we walked down to the Governor's Office, and he looked at her and grabbed her and, you know, wanted to know what all the names were, what happened, did they win the championship, I mean, all this sort of stuff, just, I guess, so typical of the type of individual that Governor Gardner was.

So I can't talk about the policies that my previous colleagues spoke about, but I can tell about that one particular issue. And it just turns out that my daughter is here in town this weekend with her three daughters, and we were talking about that last night. And she says, yeah, you know, I do remember that, where he kind of put his arm around me and made me feel very welcome.

So he was a Governor that was forward-looking. I know he's thought about very, very well. My part of the State is a whole lot different than the other part of the State politically; but there's no question that, at least in his second term, he did very, very well in my part of the State. I didn't necessarily like that, but that's part of politics.

So he will be missed; and the editorials around the State that spoke of him, I think, were very true. But just from a standpoint of personality, that's my association with him. And he certainly will be missed.

With that, I'd like to yield to one of the newest colleagues from the State of Washington, the gentleman from the Sixth District, Mr. KILMER.

Mr. KILMER. Thank you. And thank you to all of my colleagues from Washington State who spoke before me. I'm batting clean-up and have the unique position of having neither served with Booth Gardner nor having run against him.

But I actually met him when I was a kid. There's no doubt that Booth Gardner's legacy of accomplishments is impressive, and I could stand here and list them off, both from his role as Governor and for his involvement on trade issues at the Federal level.

But I think it says more about the kind of man Booth Gardner was when we don't just talk about what he accomplished, but we talk about what kind of man he was. As someone who met him as a kid, I was just very much struck by the fact that he was exceedingly civil and very, very kind and seemed to have interest in every person he represented.

Regardless of one's race or religion or orientation or gender or economic status, he seemed to care about every person he represented, including a little kid in Port Angeles, Washington, where I was born and raised.

I met Booth for the first time when I was a kid and he was a candidate and my mom was involved on his campaign.

□ 1320

I was struck by the fact that he seemed to be spending an inordinate amount of time talking to me, even though I wasn't old enough to vote. I met him again in his last year in office. As a high school senior, I received a scholarship to go off to college; and Booth, as Governor of our State at the time, was hosting a luncheon to honor all the scholarship recipients. And I remember he came over to talk to my mom and me and say hello. In that very brief interaction, I was just struck by the extent to which he seemed to care about my mom and about how much he cared about me. As an 18-year-old, I just thought it was really cool that a Governor expressed that level of interest.

Over the years, I'd run into him at political events or often at education-oriented events or events in Pierce County, where he was our first county executive. And our interactions always started in the exact same way. He'd start by saying, How's your mom? Many years later, just this last year when I decided to run for Congress, I was very touched that he came to my kickoff in Tacoma. Parkinson's, by that point, meant that he could not walk, and he struggled very deeply to express himself. I went over to thank him for coming. I kneeled down and thanked him, and I could tell he was struggling to say something. It struck me I knew he was going to ask, How's your mom? I thanked him for that, and I told him she was doing just fine.

The other thing I'll say about Booth and his legacy is the legacy he lives behind of his family. His grandson, Jack, actually interned with our campaign. He's an extraordinary young man who spoke very eloquently at the memorial service that was held in honor of Governor Gardner.

So you can look at his legacy of accomplishments when it comes to education or protecting our environment or extending health care services to folks who need it or his work to improve our economy or improve civil rights, or you can look at his extraordinary business legacy as someone who is a leader in our business community. But for me, his legacy is as a guy who truly cared about others. That's how I will remember Booth Gardner.

Today, I will tell all who are listening that my mom is doing well, but she misses Booth Gardner; I miss Booth Gardner; and the people of Washington State miss Booth Gardner.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

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. A lot has been going on this week and certainly worthy of discussion here at the end of the week. One of the important topics that has been discussed at both the Senate end and the House end is the issue of immigration—legal immigration and illegal immigration.

Back when my friend STEVE KING and I were meeting with people from the British Government about their handling of immigration, they were offended by the term that STEVE and I were using of ''illegal immigration.'' We were told that that's not appropriate in England. I asked what words they use, and I was told the appropriate terminology is ''irregular migrant.'' I was concerned that sounded too much like some kind of body function. I hated to use that term. Anyway, when people immigrate into a country illegally, it's illegal immigration. And it is a problem.

Anyone that goes down to the end of this Hall just outside these two doors here and heads onto the Senate floor, immediately what is seen above the President of the Senate's chair are the words ''e pluribus unum,'' Latin meaning out of many, one. I have heard a colleague before say it means out of one, many. But we all get mixed up at times. But e pluribus unum means out of many, one.

For those of us that attended public schools when and where I did, we were taught that it was immigration and the process of out of many people becoming one people, becoming Americans, is what made us strong. And the terminology for much of this country's history was that we were a ''melting pot.'' I believed it then, I believe it now, and I believe that that has been one of the great strengths that has made this country the greatest country in the history of mankind—greater than Solomon's Israel—with more liberties, more conveniences, more input into the government and into the way the government works.

My friends on this side of the aisle and everybody I know of agrees we want immigration to continue. Our country allows more immigrants into this country than any other country in the world. No other country comes close to allowing the number of people to immigrate into this country, to come with visas into this country. Nobody comes close. We are an extraordinarily generous country. And for those who have wondered about whether they should be proud of our country in the past, one of the greatest pieces of evidence would probably be the fact that people all over the world, those who hate us, those who admire us—at least a billion, maybe 1.5 billion in estimates have been made—want to come to America. There's no other country in the world that so many people would like to come to and enjoy the freedoms we have.

Unfortunately, there are many who want to come to this country to destroy the freedoms we have because they look at our country and they say, No, unless you have something like sharia law or a country in which you

have a powerful, benevolent dictator, be it religious leader or be it a benevolent secular dictator, they think we would not be nearly so decadent. I prefer our government—a government, as Lincoln said, that, under God, was of the people, by the people, and for the people. There's never been one like us.

Now, I have heard a guy call into the show of my friend, Sean Hannity, and he knew just enough history to be dangerous. He talked about our history being founded on the proposition e pluribus unum—out of many, one. He said there was never anything about God in our beginnings. This young man apparently showed his ignorance and the weakness of teachers in whatever school he grew up in. Because the fact is e pluribus unum was never our national motto, as this person thought.

From the beginning, from the 1700s, it was part of the Great Seal. The Great Seal had two sides—and still does. It's still the Great Seal of America. And on one side we have the eagle. I like the way the eagle has differed over the years. I like the way it is now better than the skinny little eagle that was there back in the 1700s. But the eagle has a ribbon through his beak and on that ribbon has always been the Latin phrase e pluribus unum—out of many, one. That's on one side of the Great Seal.

On the other side of the Great Seal is a pyramid. And that pyramid represents one of the greatest works of man. And there was a reason. Because if you read the Founders' writings, read their journals, read their letters, they believed they had within their grasp what philosophers like John Locke, Montesquieu, and so many philosophers had only dreamed about—that we might be able to govern ourselves.

□ 1330

They viewed it as a little experiment in democracy. They believed that if we did it right, that nations around the world would want to follow our example. So it was important. They recognized that this was a great achievement of man if it was done properly.

If you look on the back of a dollar bill, a one-dollar bill—if anybody still has one, Mr. Speaker—you note one side with the eagle and the e pluribus unum on the ribbon through the beak. In fact, the shield up here above the House floor doesn't have the ribbon through the beak—it's beneath the eagle—but it has those words there.

But on the other side, seeing the pyramid—you know, here's a great, well-done work of man. Above that pyramid is a triangle, and in that triangle is an eye. There is a glow around that eye to represent the all-seeing eye of God looking at the work of man. Above that is a Latin phrase that's above one of the exits down at the Senate, the Latin words ''annuit coeptis.'' Taken together, it means He, God, has smiled on our undertaking.

Beneath the pyramid are the Latin words ''novus ordo seclorum,'' meaning new order of things, new order of the ages—not new world order, as some tried to say. But the way the Founders looked at it, if we did this right, if we governed ourselves effectively and created the most free Nation in the history of the world, by the grace of God, God would smile on our undertaking and it would be a new order of things because of the other nations that may follow our example. And it is good.

I don't try to push my religious beliefs on anyone else, but it is a part of who I am. As a matter of fact, I believe it was 36, at least—most of the signers of the Declaration of Independence weren't just Christians, they were ordained Christian ministers. It's hard to imagine if over half of the Congress now, as the Continental Congress was in those days, was of made of ordained Christian ministers—and I'm not advocating that at all, I'm just historically making the note. That's where we came from. That's who was inspired to start this little experiment in democracy, not just Christians, but ordained Christian ministers. They knew if they did it right, this place would be blessed, and it would be a source of blessing for the world.

They did like the idea ''out of many, come one nation.'' That has continued today, as most of us strongly support the idea of allowing more immigration into this country than in any other country in the world. Mexico doesn't allow near the freedom for immigrants that the United States of America does. So at times it goes down a little tough to be criticized by the leaders in Mexico who demand more rights for immigrants into the United States than they would ever consider affording United States citizens who are going into Mexico. But it's true around the world.

Now, I'm told that some students are taught that we're not really a melting pot; we're more of a tossed salad, where people retain their individual natures and don't really become one people so much, we just retain individuality. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you, having studied history and continuing to study history, that is a recipe for the end of a nation. People need to come together as one people.

I find from data—and my Hispanic friends, some of them have pointed out—that actually in the Hispanic community a vast majority support the idea of having English as the official language. One of my dear friends in Tyler, whose parents immigrated from Mexico, started one of the most successful restaurant businesses there, and my friend has just branched off and started another restaurant, he said that his parents were adamant: you will speak only English in our home. Now, to be sure, his parents spoke Spanish between themselves, but his father told him: you can be anything in this country, but if you're going to be everything you can possibly be, you have to speak good English, and in doing so, you can be anything. He was right. Gus has been a city councilman, a county commissioner, he is a leader in the community—a good guy, a friend.

That's why it breaks my heart when I hear people—and it's normally of the liberal political persuasion—who say, no, no, no, we need to educate Hispanic immigrants in Spanish. Because when you study what happens in those cases, you are compelling children who could end up being President, if they're native-born Americans, President of the United States. They could be President of the country. But when you teach them in Spanish rather than English, you are relegating them to be manual laborers when they could be president of the company, not working out in the field for the company.

So that's what conservatives believe in. We want everyone to have the sky as the limit for what can be achieved. We even want, at the White House right now, we would prefer that women be compensated on an even par with men, which is not happening right now. We want everyone to be treated with equal opportunity, not to be treated equally, but with equal opportunity. Because when you take away the incentive to work hard and do well and achieve, you again are compelling a country down a path that leads to the dust bin of history.

I've related this numerous times, but in the Soviet Union, when I was an exchange student there one summer and visiting a collective farm, communist farm, a collective, socialist farm—a progressive farm, if you would prefer that, as some of my friends prefer not to be called socialists, but prefer to be called progressives—it was a progressive farm, where everyone was treated equally and everyone was paid the same number of rubles.

I was shocked, having worked on farms and ranches around east Texas growing up, because I had learned, heck, if you're going to work out like that—and back then, if you were lucky enough to get to drive a tractor instead of walking through the field hauling hay or working with cattle or horses, we didn't have cabins over the tractors. We thought it was pretty terrific if you got to drive the tractor instead of walk along and working. But here I was at this progressive farm—socialist farm, communist farm, whatever you want to call it—and most of the farmers were sitting in the shade. I had a couple of years of Russian at Texas A&M, and I spoke my best Russian at the time and asked the question, here was mid-morning, When do you work out in the field? I looked out in the field; I couldn't tell what they were working and what they hadn't. It didn't seem to be a whole lot of difference.

I couldn't really tell what they were even growing out there. It looked kind of greenish brown; none of it looked too good. This was the middle of the summer. I knew from my work that you want to start early and try to finish by three or four at the latest before

the sun gets its hottest, and here they were in the middle of this shady area, not working; didn't look like they'd worked all morning.

The people there laughed, and I thought, oops, maybe I didn't say it properly in Russian. And one of the guys responded for the group: I make the same number of rubles if I'm here in the shade or if I'm out there in the hot sun. And he said: So I'm here.

□ 1340

And there, in a nutshell, is why a progressive farm will not ever really work. Because when you give people the same amount of money to work and sweat and produce as you pay them to sit in the shade and not do anything but laugh and joke and cut up and have fun and eat snacks, then I don't care how dedicated you are, at some point you'll quit working out in the hot sun and you'll sit in the shade and no one will have food to eat. That's why socialists or progressive societies always fail.

So how does a free enterprise system fail? Free enterprise systems always fail when they become so progressive, so socialist, that they begin to reward completely the same amount for working as they do for doing nothing.

This administration has been at the head of destroying the welfare reform that was done in 1995–1996. And, yes, I'm pleased President Clinton takes credit for it now. He certainly didn't at the time. He fought the Republican majority over it over and over. He vetoed it. And when finally there were enough votes to override the veto, President Clinton signed it, and now he takes credit for it. But it was welfare reform.

And what you learn from that, if you go back and do the studies—and I was surprised, knowing the liberal bent of Harvard, to be at Harvard for a seminar and have a dean have charts that said, since the Great Society legislation started in the sixties, here is a chart of single mothers' income when adjusted for inflation; and the graph showed a flat line when adjusted for inflation. Single mothers, since the sixties when the Great Society and all the giveaway programs began, the welfare system, the welfare state began here in America, single moms flatlined. When adjusted for inflation, they never improved their situation, on average. Some did, but, on average, it was flatlined.

And then he said, since welfare reform where people were required to work who could work, here is what has happened to single mothers' income. That was since people were required to work who couldn't work. And then adjusted for inflation, there was a huge rise for those 10 years in the income for single moms.

Well, now, I know the people that passed the Great Society welfare legislation in the sixties, they wanted to help. I know they did. I know friends on the other side of the aisle, they want to help single moms. They want to help anybody who needs help.

But there is a question of how much do you help when you incentivize people to never reach their God-given potential, and how much do you help when you incentivize working and producing and becoming productive and participating in society; who helps more? I know the intentions are equal on both sides, but who actually helps more?

And it's never been more graphic than when you look at the income for single moms after welfare reform and for the 30 years before welfare reform. And now this administration has taken the best thing that Newt Gingrich did as he led to a Republican majority and led in balancing the budget, but even better, he helped single moms more than anything that any Democrat had done for the 30 years preceding that majority by elevating their income and beginning to have them feel some self-worth because they could do jobs and they had value and they had worth that they did not feel when they were flatlined and just taking the doles that the government provided.

The Romans learned the hard way: you provide bread and circuses, and eventually you kill off incentive. Once Caesar decided, gee, this is not good for the people not to work when they can work; let's cut off the bread and circuses, and he did. And there was so much massive rioting, like we've seen in Greece, like we've seen in other places in Europe that are broke.

Once you have degraded as a society to the point that more people have been convinced to sit back and just accept what the government gave them instead of using their God-given potential, then you are not likely going to ever get back to your greatest days again; you're done. It's just a matter of how long until you hit the dustbin of history.

The reason I'm still in Congress, the reason I've continued to run, is because I've still got hope. I've still got hope we can preserve, perpetuate for more generations the greatest gift that any group of people have ever been given as a secular nation, and that is the gift of this country, a country that saw its Founders coming over, Pilgrims. Right down the hall in the rotunda, there is the great painting, that massive painting, of the Pilgrims having a prayer meeting, praying for the land that they would come to.

That famous prayer meeting that they had on board the Speedwell—they had two ships, the Speedwell and the Mayflower. A lot of people don't know that. But that prayer meeting was in Holland, before they left from Holland to go to England, and then from England come to America. Some think it may have been a bit like Gideon's army being whittled down to just the strongest among them.

But the Speedwell, when they got ready to leave from England to come to America, began to take on water, so they had to cut their group. The Mayflower was smaller than the Speedwell. They had to cut their group down in size and get the hardiest and the most likely to be able to plant that settlement in America where Christians could have prayer meetings, where they could say what they believe, where they could say without fear of retribution that I believe marriage is between a man and a woman. They could say all of the things they had been taught in the Bible, all of those things they believed as Christians, and have a land where Christians would not be persecuted. Other groups came as Christians seeking that land that God would allow them to live in without persecution.

Now, Jesus said, ''You will suffer for My sake.'' I didn't suffer for Jesus' sake growing up as a Christian, because people who were Christians didn't suffer. But now we're persecuted. And now if you point out that Jesus sanctioned marriage, he intended a marriage between a man and a woman, if you point out that in Genesis God ordained marriage, he saw a man alone and said, that's not good, so I will give you a helpmate, a wife, you start talking about those things, then as a Christian you're about the only person, the only group in America that it's politically correct to actually persecute and condemn and discriminate against and say, as my friend, Rick Santorum, was told, Gee, oh, you believe what's been the history of great societies for thousands of years that a marriage is between a man and a woman. Because biologically by nature, even if you don't believe in God, by nature, that's how a species continues is by marriage between a man and a woman. And now we're persecuted for that.

We're persecuted because we say, you know, I believe a baby is a life deserving protection. ''Well, that's some Christian nonsense. You ought to be a criminal. You ought to be put behind bars, don't try to protect.'' And all the while where some of those folks are saying we need to protect the most innocent among us, is there any more innocent being in the world than a child ready to be born? They've done nothing wrong. They just want to live.

□ 1350

We want immigration. We need immigration in this country. I want Hispanics coming to America. I want people coming from any nation where they want to come together and become one people and be part of that e pluribus unum. But I also want them not to tear down my history and act as if it never was true. Or act as if when you look to the west and you see the Washington Monument, that when that was finished over 100 years ago, after the whole nation was contributing and they finally brought it to a conclusion and finished it off, they capped it with a capstone and on that capstone there's writing on three of the four sides of that capstone that's made out of what

was an extremely valuable and rare metal back at the time called aluminum. But on the side facing the Capitol, by design, they wanted two Latin words, ''laus Deo,'' meaning praise be to God.

Don't tell me that that's not the case. Don't tell me that's there by mistake. Because over a hundred years ago and back to the days of John Adams and his son John Quincy Adams, and Abraham Lincoln, or going back to George Washington when he resigned from the military and his prayer was that we would be following the divine author of our blessed religion, without an humble imitation in these things we can never hope to be a happy nation.

I understand things have changed, but don't tell me that is not our history. It is. Don't tell me those words are not up there. They are. And even though the Park Service for a time took the capstone that tourists could see and turned it to where you couldn't see ''laus Deo,'' it doesn't hide the fact that up there on the top of the Washington Monument, those words are there.

And why are they facing the Capitol? It's certainly not because we can look out from the Capitol and read ''praise be to God'' in Latin on the top of the Washington Monument. No, it's because they knew that would be the highest point man had constructed in our Capital City, and they wanted to ensure as the first rays of God's sun illuminated anything in this town, it would be the words, praise be to God. That's why it's there.

As a Christian, I'm supposed to turn the other cheek. I'm not always good at it, but that is what I'm supposed to try to do. But as a part of the government, we have an obligation to protect this country, to provide for the common defense, to make sure that whether enemies are foreign or domestic that we protect what has been entrusted to us as servants to protect, and that's not happening sufficiently right now, because there are people coming into this country that want to destroy what we have. They want to bring us down before a monarch that they want to set in place. There are some who simply want to come for benefits.

I'm so grateful that most of the people that come want to come to enjoy the freedoms and to get a job, and I'm so thankful we have so many immigrants, first generation immigrants, who come wanting to work. They are of an incredibly immense help to this country still being productive, especially after 50 million abortions. We're needing people to help. But I want them to have a chance to be president of their company and, if they're born here, to be President of the country. We need to be one people, and we need to have people come legally. Since we're allowing more immigrants to come in legally than any other country in the world, why not make sure the people that are coming are going to be helpful to America and not hurt America and not end this great experiment in democracy? That's part of our job.

And then we have this article from Friday, April 12, 2013. This is from radio WOAI:

> The debate in Washington on immigration reform has had no political impact, but the debate is having a major impact on south Texas.
>
> Officials say the number of people entering the U.S. illegally is way up and, tragically, the number of undocumented immigrants who have been found dead in the unforgiving Texas brush country is way up and is on path this year to best last year's record for the number of people found dead in the ranch country.

So why are more people dying in the harsh brush country of Texas?

The article goes on:

> Linda Vickers, who owns a branch in Brooks County which is ground zero for the immigration debate, pins the blame directly on talk of ''amnesty'' and a ''path to citizenship'' for people who entered the United States illegally.
>
> She recalls one man being arrested on her ranch not long ago.
>
> ''The Border Patrol agent was loading one man up, and he told the officer in Spanish, 'Obama's gonna let me go.' ''
>
> Border Patrol agents report that immigrants are crossing the border and in some cases surrendering while asking, ''Where do I go for my amnesty?''
>
> ''When you have amnesty waving in the wind, you're going to get an increase,'' Vickers says. ''And when you get an increase, especially with this heat, you're going to get an increase in deaths.''
>
> She says the current increase in illegal immigrant entries began last summer, at almost exactly the same time as President Obama unilaterally announced plans to no longer deport young people who came to the U.S. as children with their illegal immigrant parents.
>
> ''Washington is directly responsible for these deaths,'' she said.
>
> Brooks County routinely has the largest number of illegal immigrant deaths each year because smugglers come up U.S. 281 from the Rio Grande Valley but kick their human cargo out of the truck before reaching the Border Patrol checkpoint in Falfurrias.
>
> ''If that individual, illegal immigrant, can't keep up, they are left behind,'' she said. ''And you are going to die out in this heat if you can't find water.''

I know none of my friends on this side of the aisle want people to die like that. I know that. I deeply care about so many, just as the Democrats do. As a Christian, I'm supposed to love all people. I don't want them to die in the Texas brush country. And if the administration or people in Congress promising amnesty is luring people out as so many are indicating in that area who appear to have firsthand knowledge, then we should not be luring them to their deaths.

We need to talk about one thing right now: let's have a secured border, so when the report came out 2 or 3 weeks ago that there were over 500 people that entered illegally at one place and that not even 180 or so were actually picked up or seen by cameras by the Border Patrol, and fewer than that were picked up, and there were over 30 people bringing drugs into this Nation that would poison American children, American people, then we're not ready to talk about resolving the issue of the people who are here. Because until the border is secured—not closed, I don't want it closed, we need it open for people to come in legally—but until it's secured so we can control who comes in, we should not be talking about a pathway to anything but deportation.

□ 1400

Let's secure the border, and then people will be amazed at how fast we have an agreement on what to do about the people who have come into this country illegally.

I've got a lot of restaurants and hotels and people who have businesses who say, I need those immigrants to keep my business open.

Fine. Let's secure the border, and then we can work this out. We surely can—we absolutely can—but until that's done, we're luring people to their deaths. We're learning what one article says—and this is from townhall.com—that border crossings are up two to three times what they were because of all this talk.

Then there's the talk that the President has given about how we're not going to be able to secure our border because of the sequester. We're not going to cut golf trips, and we're not going to cut any of these other things, but by golly, we're not going to protect the border unless you give us amnesty for the people who are here. Well, let's secure the border. Oh, no. We're going to hold that hostage. We're not going to do our job that we took an oath to do until you grant amnesty to the people who are here.

People who are here in this Congress need to understand what it does to those who did everything lawfully to come into this country, who have followed every part of the law. It is absolutely demoralizing to most of those people to have the talk of amnesty of people who didn't follow the law as they did. Once we have a secured border—not held hostage, but just do the job that the oath was taken to do. Once that's done, let's talk about a pathway to a green card or a pathway to being here as a permanent legal resident. A pathway to citizenship needs to have people who believe in the rule of law because, if that is not the case, we will become like the nations those people left because they couldn't find jobs. They didn't have adequate freedom. There was graft and corruption because they did not believe in the rule of law as a nation, so they had to leave that nation and come to our Nation.

So don't destroy a Nation that, for the most part, believes in the rule of law and in following the law—and that includes me and other Members of Congress. We need to show respect for those who follow the law and for those who say, It's Christian to help all immigrants. Well, it's Christian to help all people and to love all people just as Christ did, but as a government we

need to make sure this country is going to be here, and we cannot do that unless we make sure that people here—immigrants who have come in, people who are Native Americans, those who are here in America—are protected against all enemies who may come in and want to destroy us. That's part of our job.

I want to make a point about gun control since cloture was voted on down the hall. I've not always been terribly complimentary of our friend Senator MCCONNELL down the hall, but he made some very, very important points that people need to understand about what is being proposed for gun control. Under what has been proposed in the Senate for gun control—and I'm quoting from Senator MCCONNELL—he has it right:

''An uncle giving his nephew a hunting rifle for Christmas.'' That's someone who, under the law being pushed in the Senate, will be a criminal. Someone else who would be a criminal under the law being pushed in the Senate is ''a niece giving her aunt—'' he says ''aunt,'' but it could be her grandmother even ''—a handgun for protection.'' Another criminal under the Senate proposal would be ''a cousin loaning another cousin his hunting rifle if the loan occurs just 1 day before the beginning of hunting season.'' Another criminal under the proposal would be ''one neighbor loaning another a firearm so his wife can protect herself while the husband is away.''

Senator MCCONNELL said, ''The people I am describing are not criminals—they are neighbors, friends and family—and the scenarios,'' he says, ''I am describing are not fanciful. They happen countless times in this country.'' As he says, ''The Schumer bill would outlaw these transfers, and it would make people like these, criminals.''

Any time a bill is rushed to the floor before people have a chance to read it, examine it, amend it, discuss it, it's not going to be good for the American people in all things.

Thomas Jefferson was not part of the Constitutional Convention. He was part of the Continental Congress. In fact, he did most of the drafting of the Declaration of Independence, but he wasn't there for the drafting of the Constitution, itself. He wrote this letter after the Constitution was promulgated—an incredible document.

He said:

> If I could add one thing to the Constitution, it would be a requirement that every law had to be on file for 1 year minimum so everyone could read it, everyone could make comments on it. You'd have plenty of chances to think of amendments that might make it better and a stronger, more effective law.

Have it on file for a year. That may not have been such a bad idea if it had been included. As incredibly and, I believe, divinely inspired as the Constitution was, so many of the Founders said they got their inspiration for provisions in the Constitution from the Old Testament, but as fantastic as it was, it was written down by men who make mistakes.

This Congress better not put into law a gun control bill or an immigration bill or any other important bill that has not had adequate scrutiny because, if that happens, Americans will suffer just as surely as they are beginning to as ObamaCare is being implemented around the country and as people are being turned away from treatment, though they were promised: if you like your doctor, you can keep him; if you like your health insurance, you can keep it. Now they've found that was completely untrue—and JOE WILSON was right. It's not true what was said about the Affordable Care Act. People have lost their doctors, and they've lost their insurance. That will continue to occur, and we're going to destroy the best health care in the history of man.

There are doctors, medical historians, who have indicated that they think it was just after the turn of 1900—maybe 1910 or so—when for the first time in human history a person had a better chance of getting well after seeing a doctor than he did of getting worse after seeing a doctor. You get your mind around that. For thousands of years of the existence of man, where we have recorded history of man, think about that: only in the last hundred years have you had a better chance of getting well after seeing a doctor than of getting worse. You think about how far we've come. Now we're radically going to change health care so people can't get the treatment they once did? We needed to reform health care—it needed reform—but it didn't need a government takeover, and it still doesn't. The reason for that is that life is important. Life has value.

I'm going to read a story—I won't read the whole thing—that was in the New York Daily News from Thursday, April 11.

□ 1420

> Ashley Baldwin said she saw the puppies moving on five occasions after their spines were snipped.
>
> The doctor is charged in the deaths of these puppies and in the death of the mother. The gruesome testimony at the ''House of Horrors'' trial of Dr. Kermit Gosnell continued on Thursday, with two former employees describing scenes that strained the imagination.
>
> Ashley Baldwin, who began working at the cash-only clinic in west Philadelphia when she was just 15, said that she routinely assisted Gosnell with these procedures, on five different occasions, saw puppies moving following the procedure.
>
> In one case Baldwin, who is now 22 and a dog owner, testified that she witnessed a puppy ''screeching'' after the procedure.
>
> She said, ''They looked like regular puppies.''
>
> When asked about a particular puppy described in court as ''puppy A,'' who the prosecution contends was nearing its birth date, Baldwin recalled how large the unborn puppy was following the procedure.
>
> ''The chest was moving,'' she testified Thursday.
>
> Gosnell trained his employees to cut the necks of the puppies to sever their spinal cords, both Baldwin and Lynda Williams, another former employee, testified on Wednesday.
>
> Williams testified that she saw her former boss snip the necks of more than 30 puppies.
>
> John McMahon, Gosnell's attorney, has argued that his client did not kill any puppies by snipping their spines and that they were already in the death throes because of the drugs he had given the mother dog.
>
> Gosnell is charged with first-degree murder in the deaths of seven puppies, as well as murder in the death of the mother undergoing its procedure.

Now, the reason the mainstream media has not reported this story and continues to refuse to report this story about little innocent puppies having their necks cut and killed after they're born alive is because they are not puppies; they're human beings. They're boys and girls, and it doesn't fit the agenda of the mainstream media to report on little boys and little girls whose spinal cords are cut by a doctor. They would be sure to report if these were puppies, but they're not; they're little boys and girls.

And as a father who held our first very premature child in my hands and heard her gasping for air, heard her efforts to live, and knowing that we did all we could to help her live and that she's 29 years old, I can't imagine anyone thinking not only is it not a big deal but it is not worth reporting when a doctor snips the neck of someone's little child.

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

WOMEN'S PAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADEL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 30 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rushed to get to the floor before the gavel went down this afternoon because this is the week which marks when women had to work as long as men work in order to get the pay that is equivalent to the pay of men during the 12 months of 2012. Notice what month we are in. This is April. So we're talking about four-plus months beyond the 12 months that a man had to work in order to have the same salary—it takes a woman 16 months plus.

But it was not that alone, Mr. Speaker. There are figures I discovered in doing some research. And, of course, there is the pressure, I think, all of us should feel if Congress has anything to add to this discussion that would move what appears to be a ''no-forward'' position for women's pay in the workforce in at least the last 10 years. There are pending before the Congress at least two bills. There is a petition, a discharge petition, that is already up to compel the House to vote on the Paycheck Fairness Act. That act has not moved forward in the House, although it has been filed for a number of