

Moreover, he taught me the critical role of the individual in a free republic if, indeed, the republic is to remain free, and how such a system is philosophically and practically superior to the elitist and collectivist systems that have been tried throughout history but which, of course, as we all should know, have failed. They collapsed, ultimately, under the weight of their own tyranny, a point Dr. McLean repeatedly made.

And at every turn, he taught young Wabash men that our rights are derived from our Creator—not Democrats, not Republicans, not any President or any Congressman, but they came from God himself. And as a result, our rights are inalienable, as our Declaration reminds us and as men like Cicero and St. Augustine discovered for us. In a secular sense, our rights are part of natural law, as McLean always taught.

Perhaps most importantly, he taught Wabash men, professors, and others all over the world about the worthy ideal of a society of free and responsible individuals and how it might practically be achieved.

Mr. Speaker, for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would submit the following facts:

A masterful scholar, teacher, and lawyer, McLean demonstrate his rigor for teaching and pursuing his own level of education by earning his juris doctorate from Indiana University in 1975. He managed to be an effective teacher, attorney, and deputy prosecuting attorney in Montgomery County. In 1972, he received the McLain—no relation—McTurnan-Arnold Excellence in Teaching Award. Since 1980, Dr. McLean was most closely associated in administering the Goodrich lecture series. He was active in local and State politics. He demanded that students think critically in his constitutional law and political philosophy classes.

Dr. McLean was both loved and feared as a man who challenged students to hone their critical thinking skills. He used the Socratic method to assist students in recognizing and correcting flaws in their arguments, and somewhere along the line, he earned the nickname “Fast Eddie.”

Dr. McLean was elected to the board of directors of Liberty Fund, an Indiana institution that has a global outreach. He served there until his death. Founded by Pierre Goodrich, the son of one of Indiana’s great Governors, the Liberty Fund is a private educational foundation with the mission of encouraging a deeper understanding of the requisites of restoring and preserving a society of free and responsible individuals.

Just this morning, Mr. Speaker, I pulled up a series of emails that Ed and I exchanged once. They spanned the time in which I was running for the seat I now hold until shortly after the election to this seat. You see, I was asking in the emails if there has “ever been a nation or civilization that re-

versed its slide into collectivism or socialism, thereby rescuing itself from the ultimate loss of economic and political liberty?”

Sadly, and months later, he replied, as he was in and out of hospitals at the time, that he could not identify historically the type of reversal that I had described and went on to remind me, perhaps obviously, that the “desire for more power motivates agents of the state.”

□ 1430

Many men today are responsible for individuals thriving in a free society because of Dr. Edward McLean. Unfortunately, it is now society that is stepping away from liberty due to the irresponsibility of the individual, aided by a nanny state willing to do things for the individual which are rightly his alone to do, and the endless quest, as he said, for expanded power by government and its agents.

So I use today not only to give this tribute to a great Hoosier, but also to, as part of that tribute, profess my continued and renewed commitment to reverse the current and hopefully temporary course of this great Nation, as it really is the last, best hope on Earth for man. For once, I want to prove Ed McLean wrong. We can reverse this course, and by so doing, show the world yet again how exceptional America is. We can and must halt the march of statism for our children and grandchildren and for the idea of liberty in the world. In this case, Ed himself would hope to be proved otherwise.

Everything Ed McLean did, he did for the men of Wabash College, his community, and his country. I would like to thank his wife, Marie, and son, Ian, for sharing Dr. McLean with us. For all he provided this world, he will be truly missed.

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

GREEN JOBS AND CRONY CAPITALISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There’s so much going on today, this week. We’ve been, for one thing, trying to take up trade agreements that should end up creating new jobs in America. I know there have been concerns by some—gee, don’t we give away sovereignty each time we enter a free trade agreement. Well, I read these free trade agreements. I wasn’t here when NAFTA passed. I’m not sure that I would have voted for it because it seems like we did give away too much of the autonomous nature of this country. But with regard to the Colombia free trade agreement, the free trade agreements with South Korea, and

Panama, it doesn’t appear from my reading that we are giving away any autonomy, we are giving away any of our powers to govern ourselves.

In fact, the U.N. is far more of a threat with the concessions, particularly this administration is giving to the U.N., as far as us controlling our own destiny. Since the U.N. has become so incredibly anti-Israel, I think it’s time to look seriously about getting out. We should not be accessories to the kind of anti-Semitism and the anti-Israeli feelings, the hostility from those members of the U.N. that have so much more control, it appears, than we do, who encourage, basically, the wiping out of Israel and of the Jewish population.

In the meantime, on the homefront, we have people still claiming that the President’s tried and failed methods of helping the economy should be tried yet again. There’s the old story about a guy beating his head with a hammer, and somebody came up and asked, “Why do you keep hitting yourself in the head with a hammer?”

He said, “Because it feels so good when I stop.”

For heaven’s sake, it is time to stop hitting ourselves and hurting our own country, hurting our own economy with the crony capitalism that has come to bear here in this country. And it does not serve as a defense that Paulson started it under George W. Bush. That’s not a defense. It was wrong for Paulson, and it’s wrong now, and especially, the longer this country struggles to get back on its economic feet. And any time you engage in crony capitalism where those closest to an administration reap the biggest benefits, you hurt the economy. So when you have a company like General Electric that is so close to this administration, the head of GE certainly has the President’s ear as the trusted adviser, and that adviser has caused thousands and thousands of jobs to be sent overseas, then you can anticipate that with him advising the President, we’re going to have more and more jobs sent overseas.

And then we keep being told yes, the true answer is in green jobs. Green jobs are our future. How long is it going to take for us to stop hurting this country in the name of green jobs? We have sent thousands and thousands of great union jobs overseas in the name of greenery. And yet it shouldn’t take anybody past an elementary education to realize when you send manufacturing jobs from this country to China, South America, Latin America, where they pollute so many more times doing the same job than what the output was here, that the world would be better off with those jobs here. Pure and simple.

And then, of course, we’ve been treated to the fiasco which is Solyndra. And as a former judge who saw cases where people acted against the interests that they were hired and sworn to protect, we call that fraud. And so it sure sounds like we’re having the beginning

of a fraud case emerge, potentially against people in our own government, because we know that the law said that these loans could be given to these so-called green companies, but there could not be another lender that had priority over the Federal Government in lending that money.

Well, that means that if someone within this administration, which appears to be what's coming out, actually advocated and actually made sure it happened that the United States taxpayers, the United States Government, that they were hired to protect, subverted the position as first lender to Solyndra to the detriment of hundreds of millions of dollars, somebody ought to be going to prison. I mean, I had people come before my court having committed felonies, pull a gun, rob somebody, maybe they didn't get \$100, and they went to prison. How about somebody that causes the theft of hundreds of millions of dollars? Well, we sure have to look at it.

And just when people thought it couldn't get any worse, then we get word this week about a new entity called SunPower, another one of these wonderful green companies that were going to set the world ablaze with power and light with their clean green energy. This article from biggovernment.com by Mike Flynn, says, The Department of Energy bragged about giving a \$1.2 billion loan guarantee to SunPower, a politically connected solar energy company to create "10-15 permanent jobs," raising critical questions as to whether California SunPower is the next Solyndra in the ongoing Cronygate scandal.

□ 1440

Unlike Solyndra, which went bankrupt receiving the loan from the government, leaving taxpayers on the hook, SunPower's deal is more complicated. Many questions are being raised about how the company was able to obtain the loan and what they did after they got the money. Questions include: How could the Department of Energy give a loan to a company that was under a shareholder suit alleging securities fraud and misrepresentations?

This says that the son of Representative GEORGE MILLER from California was paid \$178,000 to lobby on behalf of the company representing SunPower as a lobbyist. Why did Representative GEORGE MILLER tour the SunPower facility, which is outside his congressional district? And what other official action did Representative MILLER take on behalf of the company that is represented by his lobbyist son? Did the company's hefty political contributions to the Obama campaign and the DCCC play a role in the deal? Did U.S. taxpayers help pay for the company to open a facility in Mexico after the announcement of the loan? Was the U.S. Government aware that company executives were in the process of selling a portion of the company to a French

company, an action that was undertaken 2 weeks after the loan was awarded? Did the loan allow insiders to cash out, leaving other investors holding onto the stock that has dropped by more than 60 percent since the loan was awarded?

In 2009, a year before the DOE awarded the loan, investors in SunPower filed a class action lawsuit against the company alleging SunPower and certain of the company's executive officers were in violation of Federal securities laws. The lawsuit alleged the company knew or recklessly disregarded and failed to disclose or indicate the following:

One, that the company made unsubstantiated accounting entries during the class period;

Two, that, as a result, the company's financial results were overstated during the class period;

Three, that the company's financial results were not prepared in accordance with the generally accepted accounting principles;

Four, that the company lacked adequate internal and financial controls;

Five, as a result of the above, the company's financial statements were materially false and misleading at all relevant times.

Despite the questions about potential violations of Federal securities law, the Department of Energy approved the loan guarantee in 2010, all to create 10 to 15 permanent jobs. That's not only some silly estimate, it's what the Department itself thought would result from the billion-dollar loan. Our Department of Energy intentionally invested over \$1 billion in order to create 10 to 15 jobs. At best, that's around \$80 million from our government to create one job.

Now, there are a lot of folks in government that have never been in business, but I'm betting just about anybody in this body could do a better job of creating good-paying jobs if they were given \$80 million to create each job. I bet if we auctioned that off, we might even get as low as \$50 million to create one job.

For those in Washington I've found that don't understand sarcasm, I am prone to sarcasm.

Very tragic. At a time when this country can ill afford to be squandering vast amounts of money, that's what we're doing. It's also no comfort that in the President's so-called jobs bill there are numerous references to wanting to get more money to these green companies to help out our country.

And when you see that the President's so-called jobs bill is not about jobs at all—there's only a tiny fraction that goes for infrastructure, so forget about all your bridges being fixed. It's not about that at all. It's about more government control. In fact, as we have seen since this President took office, especially the first 2 years under the control of Speaker PELOSI and Leader REID, it seemed like most everything

we took up was all about the GRE. The GRE, the Government Running Everything. And you look at the President's so-called jobs bill and you find in there the American Infrastructure Financing Authority.

So, again, when are we going to stop beating ourselves death with the same tried-and-failed policies. So, Fannie and Freddie wasn't bad enough. Now we're getting into investing and guaranteeing billions of dollars for each financed operation instead of a hundred thousand dollars or so for homes. Yes, we've done such a great job with Fannie and Freddie nearly bringing us to the brink of ruin financially, wouldn't you next suspect that we should get into financing all the infrastructure needs of the country as a Federal Government?

But those who are suspicious and think, gee, maybe this is more about the government running everything than it actually is financing infrastructure, there would be evidence to support that idea, because the board of the American Infrastructure Financing Authority is appointed by the President. And since the current President has an affinity for people who have never been in business, never made a payroll—he actually put people on the auto task force that didn't own cars. Most of them never had anything to do with the auto industry. So we can anticipate that if he stays true to form, we'll have people on the American Infrastructure Financing Authority that will be spending billions and billions of dollars, just like they have on Solyndra, on SunPower, and who knows how many other companies like that, they'll be doing it for infrastructure. Crony capitalism to the max.

And I have struggled as we've seen these groups like Occupy Wall Street. There's a little group down the road here on Pennsylvania. Most of them are very young. I'm guessing perhaps many of them still rely on their parents for a living, making expenses. I know some of them have indicated that. It reminded me of the female comedian on television that said, Gee, there's a study out that says our generation may be the first generation that doesn't live as well as our parents. She said, That makes no sense, it can't be, because we're all still living with our parents. So that doesn't make sense.

Well, apparently it's given some people time on their hands, since they're not working, to go create public nuisances in New York City, here, and other places. And it really is intriguing to find out they don't really have a centralized, firm position on anything. They're just out there to protest. But as a history major trying to think through history, certainly I can never recall a time in this country's history when a President of the United States ever told people to take off their bedroom slippers, put on their marching shoes, let's get out there and then encourage them. Yes, it's wonderful.

They're getting out there. They're standing up. These are great rank-and-file grassroots folks. Encouraging protesters.

I can't find another time in this country's history—so the President can be proud of this—when the President of the United States encouraged protesting the country he was leading. Most Presidents would never have had the nerve to do that because they knew they were in charge. And to encourage people to go out and protest meant you're encouraging protesting the country that you're in charge of and you're leading. So if things aren't good, it must mean you're doing a rotten job of leading. So why in the world would you encourage people to go out and protest?

For those who say the President had a great jobs bill, and Congress ought to do something, you find out when you look at the real facts that this President and Leader REID never had any intention of passing the President's jobs bill. Never.

□ 1450

The President never anticipated this Congress would pass his jobs bill. He didn't anticipate it. He didn't help it happen. He has still not helped it happen. It's why it went for so many days before anybody bothered to file that bill.

And when HARRY REID filed it in the Senate, he knew the rules. He knew that under the Constitution, any revenue-raising bill—as the President's bill raises taxes—any revenue-raising bill must originate in the House. It's part of the Constitution. He knows that because in order to get ObamaCare through, when it didn't originate in the House, he took a House bill, designed and passed here in the House to give veterans a tax credit when they bought their first home, stripped out every word and put in ObamaCare. He knew the constitutional requirement, and yet he didn't do that.

I was shocked when I told my staff, after I heard he had filed, I said, go find out what House bill he stripped out because he's playing that game again like they did on ObamaCare. And yes, I know Republicans have done it. It doesn't make it right. It doesn't matter who does it. It isn't right. That was never what was intended, but it's the game that's been played.

And Leader REID, even when he filed his amended President's jobs bill that he himself amended, he didn't bother to strip out a House bill and go through the facade, the game that has to be played for a bill like that that raises revenue to become law. He didn't even bother. He just filed it as it was. I told my staff, no, he has to—he knows. He's done this before. He has to strip out a House bill, delete every word beginning at line one, page 1, deleting every word thereafter, substituting, therefore, the whole bill. He has to have done that. If he really wants it to pass, then that's

what he's got to do. Well, since he didn't do that, we know that the President and Leader REID never intended for the President's so-called jobs bill to pass.

Well, then, for what reason would the President have gone on the road after condemning us in here for not passing a bill that didn't exist, going on the road and demanding we pass a bill that didn't exist, and then when it did exist, not even bother to pick up the phone for days and ask somebody to actually file the bill? That's why I filed the American Jobs Act. You can go online at the Clerk's office, Mr. Speaker, and find out the American Jobs Act. It's mine. And it would create hundreds of thousands of jobs if mine were passed.

And as I've said here on the floor, I'm open to negotiation. I'm not married to zero as the corporate tax rate. I think it would be best. I think it would create more jobs. And then of course there are those left-wingers that enjoy seeing billions of dollars go to companies like Solyndra and SunPower, enjoy seeing their friends being enriched and engorged with taxpayer dollars and Chinese dollars we'll have to pay back with interest. They enjoy that.

They've also said, well, gee, I must be in the pocket of corporations. No, I'm in the pocket of the American people, and I want to see jobs. And I have seen the devastation from people from all walks of life, from the manual labors to the airline pilots to the engineers who have said, This is killing me. I never dreamed of losing my job and not being able to find one. And all this administration is doing, it puts forward a disingenuous bill. It isn't going to create more jobs.

And when you see the Public Safety Broadband Corporation, what job does that create? The board is going to be appointed mainly by the President, and then the board that he appoints will appoint some others. That's not a job creator, but it is about the government running everything, the GRE. The Public Safety Broadband Corporation will be able to protect every American citizen from what they may want to look up or see through broadband because we'll then have the President's own Public Safety Broadband Corporation that this President is pushing in his bill. That's not a jobs bill.

And he says on the one hand he wants to go after excessive profits of major oil, and then you look at page 151 through 154 of his bill and you find out this doesn't hurt major oil. The things in there will devastate and drive out of business the independent oil and gas producers. Those are the people that don't have their own company sections that go in and do everything necessary to drill a well. They go out and hire people to help with the mud that goes in the well, to help with the wireline stuff, the people that will do all the—even feeding the people that work there. They hire independent contractors all over the place. Many of those people stay in hotels. They eat at

restaurants. They drive the economy. And yet this President, as we've heard from people from the Gulf of Mexico area, this President's moratorium did more to cause people to lose jobs than the horrific Deepwater Horizon explosion. That was so tragic. It was so needless.

Why in the world would this administration have allowed British Petroleum to continue to operate in the Gulf of Mexico, putting this Nation at risk, when we find out after the fact, though, Exxon was found to have, I believe it was, one willful, egregious safety violation; Sunoco had two violations, willful and egregious. The President's friends at British Petroleum had 760 willful, egregious safety violations, when others had one and two, and the administration looked the other way.

We've had hearings on that, and I've brought it up to the Director of MMS before our Natural Resources Committee: What safeguards did you have to make sure that investigators were doing the proper job, the inspectors, the offshore rig inspectors? Because, see, to me, if you're an offshore rig inspector, you're a bit like the military. You stand between us here in the continental U.S. and devastation.

So I was surprised to find out that they didn't have any problem with having unionized offshore rig inspectors. Well, if you're comfortable having offshore rig inspectors being unionized, then next you'd be comfortable with the military unionizing. Why not? They're standing between this Nation and disaster. If the offshore rig inspectors can be unionized and negotiate their hours, or whatever is all in their union contract, then why wouldn't the military be next? The trouble is there are some professions that are so important to national security you can't have contracts that limit hours. A soldier can't have an agreement that he won't work more than 8 or 12 hours and get time and a half. It doesn't work that way. They stand between us and disaster. And they, God bless them, they serve as they're required to serve to protect this country.

I was quite concerned about our United States military in the 4 years I was in the Army after Vietnam. There were times I would see what some of our troops were doing—couldn't read, couldn't write effectively, smoking lots of dope—and I would think, if the Russkies ever attack, we're in big trouble. But I get around the fine men and women of our armed services now, they're the best that's ever existed in the history of the world. But we can't allow them to unionize. Well, the Interior Department has no problem.

And the Director of MMS replied, Well, we do have a means of making sure that our offshore rig inspectors are doing their job. We send them out in pairs, so they watch each other. And if one of the rig inspectors didn't properly do their job, we know the other would report them. Because there have been stories, rumors, things alleged

about some rig operators providing benefits of all kinds and services of all kinds to rig inspectors to have them look the other way.

So I was curious, What do you do to safeguard that that doesn't happen? And the one answer, the only answer the Director had was, We send them out in pairs, and that ensures they're doing their job. She apparently was not aware that I knew that the last pair of inspectors that were sent out to the Deepwater Horizon rig to inspect it were a father and son unionized team. Some have wondered, why in the world wouldn't the administration immediately move to force BP to close that thing up?

□ 1500

And we find out later that, actually, leaders of British Petroleum were meeting with key leaders of Congress at the Senate, figuring out when they would come out and have the great day over which the President and the Democratic leaders in the Senate would rejoice in which they announced that they're a major oil company and they were supporting President's cap-and-trade bill.

Well, of course, after it was realized just how serious Deepwater Horizon was, eventually, the White House and the Senate Democratic leaders had to finally accept the fact it wouldn't be very good for PR to have BP be the one major oil company that came in and embraced the cap-and-trade bill that was attempted to be shoved down America's throats, like ObamaCare.

And then we heard the President say there are more people protecting our southern border than ever before. This story, from Yahoo news, brand new story—well, it's Wednesday, October 12: Drug smugglers are endlessly creative when it comes to inventing ways to move marijuana, cocaine, and other contraband from Mexico into the United States.

In the latest innovation uncovered by law enforcement, smugglers in the border town of Nogales, Arizona, were bringing drugs into the United States for the cost of a quarter. The parking meters on International Street, which hugs the border fence in Nogales, cost 25 cents. Smugglers in Mexico tunneled under the fence and under the metered parking spaces and then carefully cut neat rectangles out of the pavement.

Their confederates on the U.S. side would park false bottom vehicles in the spaces above the holes, feed the meters, and then wait while the underground smugglers stuffed their cars full of drugs from below. When the exchange was finished the smugglers would use jacks to put the pavement plugs back into place. The car would drive away, and only those observers who were looking closely would notice the seams in the street.

In all, U.S. Border Patrol Agents found 16 tunnels leading to the 18 metered parking spaces on International Street. The pavement is now riddled with neat symmetrical patches.

It's unbelievable, Nogales Mayor Arturo Garino told Tucson, Arizona, ABC affiliate KGUN. Those are the strides these people take to get the drugs across the border.

Past methods of smuggling have included catapults that launched bales of drugs across the border fence. The smugglers have tried everything, said Garino, and this is one of the most ingenious methods of them all.

The city, advised by Homeland Security, has agreed to remove the parking meters. Nogales stands to lose \$3,500 annually in parking revenue, plus the cost of citations.

Well, the President, I know he wouldn't have said it if he didn't believe it was true. But it isn't the most people we've ever had on our southern border, not at all. In fact, you can find this at Wikipedia, regarding General Pershing, and there are other far more detailed accounts.

In January 1914, Pershing was assigned to command the Army 8th Brigade, United States, at Fort Bliss, Texas, responsible for security along the U.S.-Mexico border. In March, 1916, under the command of General Frederick Funston, Pershing led the 8th brigade on a failed 1916-17 punitive expedition into Mexico in search of the revolutionary leader, Pancho Villa. He had met him in 1913 when he invited him to Fort Bliss.

And that's about all it says, but if you do more digging you find out, actually, after Pancho Villa and his cutthroats had come into the United States proper and killed some Americans, Woodrow Wilson ordered American troops, led by Pershing, to go into Mexico to pursue these murderers and end their killing spree, and make it clear that there would be dire consequences for coming into the United States illegally.

One report I read said there may have been as many as 100,000 or more National Guard troops put on the U.S. southern border. Pershing went in, depending on the account you believe, 10,000, 14,000 troops into Mexico pursuing Pancho Villa, killed many of his lieutenants. Never got Pancho Villa. But it ended, for a long time, anybody coming in illegally to the United States to commit a crime on U.S. soil.

Woodrow Wilson was not really considered a warmonger, as a university president. But he understood, when the Nation is under attack, whether it's from Pancho Villa or drug smugglers today, we took an oath we must follow, and supporting and defending the Constitution means providing for the common defense. And if people are bent on the destruction of this country, we must take such steps as are necessary to defend ourselves.

Mexico is in deep trouble. We can help Mexico, we can help ourselves, simply by defending ourselves and reestablishing the rule of law along our southern border. It's critical.

In the time I have left today—this is the last day of this week, at least for

about 10 more days when we come back into session. I want to take up an issue. My late mother thought I should have been either a doctor or a college professor. I do enjoy history. I love teaching. I enjoy math.

So, despite my parents' disappointment, I did go to law school. And anyway, as I told my dad, who said, you know, there are just so many lawyers that are hurting the country, it really caused me to do some soul searching. And I explained, Dad, I've thought about it, prayed about it, wrestled with it. The fact is the law is a tool, like a hammer. You can use it to build up or you can use it to tear down. It's all in whose hands the hammer is hitting.

The law is a powerful tool, but as so many of our Founders laid out, unless we serve and govern a moral nation, this form of government is entirely inadequate to protect us.

And I know our fine President has said we're not a Christian nation, and I will not debate that issue. There's plenty of evidence on both sides of that issue currently. I don't think we are anymore. But for those that continue to persist and say we were never a Christian nation, who refuse to note that a third of the signers of the Declaration, over a third, weren't just Christians, they were ordained Christian ministers.

People like Peter Muhlenberg—ended up with a statue down the hall. He was a minister who Washington made a colonel, unbeknownst to his flock and his church. His statue depicts him taking off his ministerial robe to reveal a uniform underneath, even with a saber on. He was preaching from Ecclesiastes: There's a time for every purpose under heaven. When he got to verse 8, that there's a time for war and a time for peace, he took off his robe and said, now is the time for war. He recruited men from the church to join him. They recruited men from the town to support them. And he became a general by the end of the war, all of that while a Christian minister.

But I think it's helpful to go back and look at some of those who were intimately familiar with our founding and, of course, I've read so often from Washington here on the floor, from John Adams, I thought I would read from John Quincy Adams to start off with. John Quincy Adams, our youngest diplomat. Washington appointed him to serve briefly as a diplomat at 11 years of age. Smart guy.

At the age of 77, in 1844, John Quincy Adams was not only a U.S. Congressman, but he was also the chairman of the American Bible Society.

□ 1510

These are John Quincy Adams' words:

"I deem myself fortunate in having the opportunity, at this stage of a long life drawing rapidly to its close, to bear at this place, the Capital of our national union, in the Hall of Representatives of the North American people, in

the chair of the presiding officer of the assembly representing the whole people, the personification of the great and mighty Nation, to bear my solemn testimonial of reverence and gratitude to that book of books, the Holy Bible. The Bible carries with it the history of the creation, the fall and redemption of man, and discloses to him, in the infant born at Bethlehem, the legislator and Savior of the world."

On the occasion of his 80th birthday, John Quincy Adams' words were these:

"I enter upon my 80th year with Thanksgiving to God for all the blessings and mercies which His Providence has bestowed upon me throughout a life extended now to the longest term allotted to the life of man, with supplication for the continuance of those blessings and mercies to me and mine as long as it shall suit the dispensations of His wise Providence, and for resignation to His will when my appointed time shall come." John Quincy Adams.

One of the most powerful closing arguments of any case was given by John Quincy Adams in the Amistad case just downstairs in the old Supreme Court Chamber. And toward the end of his argument he was so concerned that he might be losing, and that if he lost the argument, he lost the case in which he was representing the Africans who had been captured and had chains put on them. They were able to get loose and take over the ship and ultimately ended up in the U.S. So the lawsuit was over. Were they free people who could go where they wanted? Or were they to remain slaves? He ended up in his closing arguments by asking about where were all the Justices? He now called every one of the Justices that had ever been on the Supreme Court by name and asked where they were. Where are they? Where was the Solicitor General that argued against me last when I was here? That was back in the early 1820s. And during the course of the arguments, about 3 days in the Amistad case, one of the judges died one night. That kind of throws a crimp in your closing argument. But when they resumed the case, he was asking, "Where are the judges?" Even the judge that started the case with him wasn't in there.

In essence, he concluded by asking, "Where have they gone? They've gone to meet their Judge." And the big question about their life, he quoted from Scripture when he said, "Did they hear these words, 'Well done, good and faithful servant?'" The message was clear. You are all going to die, and when you die, do you want to go meet your Maker after having a decision that allows these free Africans to be drug out of here in chains and bondage?

He won the case. The Africans, as they should have been, were free. And they should have been. And it is an embarrassment that slavery was ever allowed in this country. But if you look at the founding, they were led by Christian Founders. If you look at the

greatest developments in civil rights, Abraham Lincoln felt called by God to run for office and bring an end to slavery. John Quincy Adams was a mentor to him during the 2 brief years he was in the House of Representatives. Adams had a massive stroke during that term, but young Abraham Lincoln, despite their difference in ages, was one of the honorary pallbearers. Adams thought a lot of Lincoln.

After Lincoln was President, he said that the most memorable thing that occurred during his time in the House of Representatives, just down the Hall here, was John Quincy Adams' powerful sermons on the evils of slavery. John Quincy Adams, as a Christian, believed he was being called. After losing the election for a second term, he believed he was being called to come into Congress, as William Wilberforce had done. Adams had corresponded with Wilberforce in England and had come into Congress as Wilberforce had come into Parliament, to fight to end slavery. And each time he was recognized on one of his bills, he preached a hellfire and brimstone sermon about, in essence, how can we expect God to keep blessing America when we treat our brothers and sisters by putting them in chains and bondage? He thought God had called him to end slavery.

He served in the United States House. He was the only person to have ever done this: After being President, he lowered himself to run for Congress and serve in the House. Of course, he told some folks he was more proud of being elected representative after being President than he was being elected President. And that seems like such a strange thing until you realize what it meant was that after he was President, his neighbors still liked him. And that is not often the case.

We know that some of the greatest debates that occurred in the House of Representatives and in the Senate were participated in by Henry Clay. He and Daniel Webster had some powerful debates. Henry Clay said this in 1829. He said, "1,800 years have rolled away since the Son of God, our Blessed Redeemer, offered Himself on Mount Calvary for the salvation of our species, and more than half of mankind still continue to deny His divine mission and the truth of His sacred Word. When we shall, as soon as we must, be translated from this into another form of existence, is the hope presumptuous that we shall behold the common Father of the whites and blacks, the great Ruler of the Universe, cast His all-seeing eye upon civilized and regenerated Africa, its cultivated fields, its coasts studded with numerous cities, adorned with towering temples dedicated to the pure religion of His redeeming Son?"

I want to make clear that the reason that we have more religious freedom in this country than any other country in the world is because we were founded on Christian principles that Jesus taught. Any nation that is based on

sharia law and follows true sharia law will not have freedom of religion. So this is the freest country that any Muslim can ever worship in. You don't have to believe exactly as the radicals do about the Koran's teaching, because you have that freedom here in this country.

And we just read this week that after we have spent hundreds of billions of dollars and lost over 1,700 precious American lives to rid Afghanistan of the Taliban and, unfortunately, try to create a central government that won't work, we now find this week that there is no longer in Afghanistan a Christian church. Not one. We also find out this week there is a report that there is only one Jew left in Afghanistan. After 10 years of battle, hundreds of billions of dollars and precious American lives, we see what we've done come to this. There is not one Christian church, war declared upon Christians, Christians killed and imprisoned, and a jihad against Christians there in a country that we saved.

We're losing some of our freedoms here because some say we should have more law that follows sharia law. The only way sharia law will be completely and freely followed and worshiped, not by some radical Islamist view of it, but by all Muslims who freely can have different interpretations, unless they're in a radical Islamic society, they can only have that here, where we were founded on Christian principles. And thank God we were.

I was a history major. I didn't read this until after I was out of school. Christopher Columbus wrote this in his own words: "It was the Lord who put into my mind, I could feel His hand upon me, the fact that it would be possible to sail from here to the Indies. All who heard of my project rejected it with laughter, ridiculing me. There is no question that the inspiration was from the Holy Spirit, because He comforted me with rays of marvelous illuminations from the Holy Scriptures, a strong and clear testimony from the 44 books of the Old Testament, from the four Gospels, and from the 23 epistles of the blessed Apostles, encouraging me continually to press forward. And without ceasing for a moment, they now encourage me to make haste."

□ 1520

Columbus said: "Our Lord Jesus desired to perform a very obvious miracle in the voyage to the Indies, to comfort me and the whole people of God."

That's evidence that God can use somebody to create a miracle, and the person being used doesn't even know what he did. Of course, there are those who say Columbus is the perfect example that you can be a huge success for all of time even if you don't know where you're going, don't know where you are when you get there, and don't know how you got there so long as you can get the government to pay for it. Unfortunately, there are too many in government today who believe that's

the key to all success—to get the government to pay for it.

Francis Scott Key, he was there on the ship in the Chesapeake Bay on September 14, 1814, in part of the War of 1812, which was when the British unmercifully bombed that small Fort McHenry. In the morning light, he saw our flag. The fourth verse of what is now our national anthem is:

“Oh! thus be it ever when freemen shall stand between their loved home and the war’s desolation!

“Blest with victory and peace, may the heaven rescued land praise the Power that hath made and preserved us a Nation.

“Then conquer we must when our cause it is just, and this be our motto: ‘In God is our trust.’

“And the star-spangled banner in triumph shall wave o’er the land of the free and the home of the brave!”

I want to conclude with one other historic reference from the Supreme Court, itself, back when the Supreme Court did not believe that the Constitution was a living, breathing document that would be subject to the whims of people appointed who brought their own biases to the Supreme Court and twisted it and turned it into whatever document pleased them.

I am also thankful to God that we have had some incredible Justices on the Supreme Court who believe the document called the “Constitution” was exactly as the Founders intended. It is not a living, breathing document that can be molded like silly-putty around somebody’s fingers and whims.

In 1892, the Supreme Court said this in the Church of the Holy Trinity vs. The United States:

“No purpose of action against religion can be imputed to any legislation, State or national, because this is a religious people.” This is historically true. “From the discovery of this continent to the present hour, there is a single voice making this affirmation. The commission to Christopher Columbus recited that it “is hoped that by God’s assistance some of the continents and islands in the ocean will be discovered.”

It goes on to read:

“The First Charter of Virginia, granted by King James, I in 1606, commenced the grant in these words:

“In propagating of Christian religion to such people as yet live in darkness, language of similar import may be found in the subsequent charters of that colony in 1609 and 1611; and the same is true of the various charters granted to the other colonies.

“In language more or less empathetic to the establishment of the Christian religion, declared to be one of the purposes of the grant, the celebrated compact made by the pilgrims on the Mayflower, in 1620, recites:

“Having undertaken for the glory of God and advancement of the Christian faith a voyage to plant the first colony in the northern parts of Virginia the fundamental orders of Connecticut

under which a provisional government was instituted in 1638 and 1639 commenced with this declaration:

“And well knowing where a people are gathered together the Word of God requires that to maintain the peace and union there should be an orderly and decent government established according to God to maintain and preserve the liberty and purity of the gospel of Our Lord Jesus, which now profess of the said gospel which is now practiced amongst us.”

The Supreme Court went on and concluded that these, and many other matters that might be noticed, add a volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of organic utterances that this is a Christian Nation.

It may not be now, but it started that way.

Mr. Speaker, just as Martin Luther King felt a calling as a Christian minister and just as Lincoln did in ending slavery, we owe so much to the religion of Christianity that everyone can worship or not as they wish.

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

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker’s appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913 and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, of the following Member of the House to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People’s Republic of China:

Mr. WALZ, Minnesota.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker’s appointment, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 431 note and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, of the following Member of the House to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission:

Mr. BISHOP, Georgia.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 14, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to Section 1002 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (P.L. 107-306) as amended by section 701(a) (3) of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, I am pleased to appoint the following individuals to the National Commission for the Review of the Research and Development

Programs of the U.S. Intelligence Community.

The Honorable Rush D. Holt of New Jersey Ms. Samantha Ravich of Clark, New Jersey Ms. Ravich is appointed at the recommendation of Speaker John Boehner to ensure there is an appropriate ratio of Republican and Democratic appointees serving on the commission.

Thank you for your consideration of these recommendations.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
House Democratic Leader.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I intend to talk about the Federal Reserve, but preliminarily, having listened to my colleague from Texas, I did want to note a little bit of a dissent.

He cited Queen Isabella of Spain and King James of England for having decided what kind of country we should be. Now, the question of the religious nature or not is obviously a legitimate one to debate, but I was a little surprised to be told that I was to be in any way bound by what Queen Isabella or what King James said hundreds of years ago. I thought one of the purposes of the American Revolution was to tell European monarchs that we would here in America make our own choices.

But I want to talk today about the Federal Reserve and particularly, frankly, about my disappointment in a debate, I guess, I’ve been having—it’s been kind of one-sided because he’s never spoken to me—with Mr. George Will.

I know it’s common advice to Members of Congress and to other political leaders not to get into an argument with the people in the media. I think that’s a great mistake. I think that respect for openness and democracy should make this a two-way street and that the notion that responding to criticism in the media that’s inaccurate is somehow inappropriate or hypersensitive is a great mistake. What I would have looked forward to was a debate, with probably Mr. Will and others, about the Federal Reserve.

I did file legislation last April to change the structure of the Federal Reserve’s Open Market Committee, which votes to set interest rates to the extent that we can, and it now consists of the seven appointees to the Federal Reserve Board of Governors who are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate—people selected in that democratic way but with 14-year terms to guarantee some independence. They are Presidentially appointed and confirmed by the Senate, but they serve for 14 years so that there is not, presumably, the chance for one President