

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