

SELL AMERICAN NATURAL GAS  
TO UKRAINE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Napoleon of Siberia, Putin, controls Ukraine and other European countries by holding their energy needs hostage. Russia uses gas as a political and economic weapon to manipulate its neighbors.

This does not have to be, and the United States can change that.

By selling European countries our oil and gas, we can reduce their dependence on imperialist Russia. We have more gas than we can use here in the United States, and we could sell the gas we don't need to our allies in Europe. That would create jobs here in America and help our allies overseas.

The same goes for crude oil.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment that passed the House Foreign Affairs Committee today would require the State Department to submit a report to Congress within 90 days on the effect our increased natural gas and crude oil exports would have on Russia's economic and political influence over Ukraine and other European nations.

Ukraine has to get their oil and gas from someplace. Let's have them buy American and make the Russian bear Putin and his energy irrelevant.

And that's just the way it is.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE DAY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Agriculture Committee, I rise in support of the goals of National Agriculture Day, which is today, March 25.

Agriculture remains the number one industry in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, supporting upwards of 63,000 family farms, generating more than \$67 billion in economic impact, and one in seven residents of Pennsylvania works in the agriculture sector.

While a good portion of America's population does not see firsthand where our food supply comes from, a wise man once told me that we shake hands with a farmer at least three times a day. This saying truly illustrates the importance of supporting agriculture, but equally the importance of supporting the future of agriculture and our future food security.

I had the pleasure of meeting with two officers of the Pennsylvania chapter of the Future Farmers of America earlier this morning. I commend them for their outreach efforts here in Washington to promote the goals of National Agriculture Day. Their advocacy in engaging the next generation to become farmers is crucial to ensuring our country has the most affordable, the highest quality, abundant, and safest food supply in the world.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNI-  
VERSARY OF  
NORMAN  
BORLAUG'S BIRTH

(Mrs. BACHMANN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of National Agriculture Day. But also, today marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of a man who literally changed the world. His name is Norman Borlaug. He was born in an upstairs bedroom in northeast Iowa 100 years ago today. He went to the University of Minnesota, where he received a Ph.D. degree in plant biology.

While he was in a class dealing with plant genetics and the future options of increased food production, Norman Borlaug had that moment of divine genius. That is when he applied himself to work. And Norman Borlaug, because of 6,000 experiments in very difficult terrain, created a grain of wheat that literally changed the world.

Norman Borlaug is rightly credited with saving the lives of over 1 billion people, 1 billion people on this Earth because he dedicated his life and persevered to create strains of wheat which would grow in India, Pakistan, Africa, and places that never before could be able to uphold a grain of wheat. He did that in East Asia with rice.

Today we honor and recognize and celebrate the life of one American who did so much for 1 billion people across the world.

□ 1515

OUR FIRST FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DESANTIS). 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. Mr. Speaker, this is an important day right across the street at the U.S. Supreme Court Building. It has been interesting. In the past, most of the time that I am aware of, when there was a matter coming before the Supreme Court, they observed what is called reciprocity, just as if a U.S. Senator wants to come down here and observe—they can't speak on the floor—but they can come to the House floor. In the same way, we have reciprocity with the Senate. We can go down to the Senate and stand in the Chamber and be there in person, as I have done when RAND PAUL was doing what amounted to a filibuster and when TED CRUZ was doing what amounted to a filibuster.

With the Supreme Court, normally, if there are Members of Congress that are going to be coming, they will reserve a bench. There have been a couple of times that the bench was full and other Members of Congress filled those spaces before I got there; but it has

been an observation that, since this body is charged with funding the Supreme Court and providing what they need and determining what they don't really need, it is part of reciprocity that they provide those places to observe what is happening.

I have been rather ambivalent. I can see both sides of the issues of cameras in the courtroom, because as a judge, murder trials, other things of interest, networks would want to come film. I had one case that went for 10 weeks. We have very strict rules. We only allow one camera in the courtroom. It could never be worked on during anything that was going on, and it could never be a distraction at all. But I saw how cameras could work in the courtroom without being any problem at all.

Here in Congress, I have fairly much taken the position that if a camera is going to be in the courtroom, leave it up to the courts. But with the United States Supreme Court, as I have seen this week, there would be no harm in having a camera somewhere in the courtroom where people didn't notice so that Americans could see—since we moved the Supreme Court toward being an oligarchy—we could see what they are doing, whether they are sleeping, whether they are participating, or whether they are asking stupid questions.

I went over, and since I am sworn in as a member of the Supreme Court Bar, I was allowed to be in the overflow room and hear what was going on; so it was kind of difficult to really tell who was addressing what during the case that the Supreme Court was hearing this morning that I heard oral arguments on. This is an extremely critical case, and I couldn't tell which judge asked the questions, but when the Supreme Court is, in effect, expressing concern through their questions that a corporation, a for-profit corporation, could not possibly have firmly held religious beliefs, then it occurred to me, for Heaven's sake, this Justice Department doesn't seem to have a problem indicting corporations. So, if the Justice Department can indict a corporation and say they have an intent to violate the law, well, if that corporation can have intent with regard to violations of the law, it certainly ought to be able to form the intent to have firmly held religious beliefs.

It was shocking as I listened to questions from some of the Supreme Court Justices today, when that is compared with the history of the United States of America and Roger Williams, for example, whose statue has been moved last week, but how he formed Rhode Island because of his firmly held religious beliefs and his beliefs that there should be freedom of religion in America where the government does not interfere in any way.

You compare the beliefs of the Pilgrims who came from Holland to England and then here—they wanted religious freedom so they could serve the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob;