

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 spending 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