

from China and they are here complaining about all this government is bad stuff, well, you are cutting this program and that program. That is why I think they have lost a lot of credibility with the American people, Mr. Speaker, is because there is no consistency with their argument.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Consistency.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. No consistency. What they said last year, they did not do this year. What they did last year, they do not want us to do. There is no consistency to their argument at all. Consistency is the word for today, the lack thereof on the Republican side.

As we close, because I know we just have a few minutes left, and I want to yield back to my friend from Florida, I think it is very interesting what we are seeing happening already. We talked a lot in the last couple of years about oversight and that when the Democrats were in charge, Mr. Speaker, we were going to provide oversight.

Now, we start seeing things open up in Iraq, with all these contracts, from all these big corporations who were getting all these big government contracts, all of the sudden you are starting to see come out of these committee hearings exactly what has been going on. Now you are starting to see maybe the administration was strong arming some scientists to spin global climate change data. You are starting to see this all percolate up.

I think one of the other things we said we are going to do is execute our constitutional obligation to provide oversight, and we are seeing that, and we are seeing the results of that with the global warming, with the war in Iraq, things happening, that didn't happen in Katrina, all starting to rise up.

I want to thank the gentleman from the Pittsburgh area and the gentleman from Connecticut, my two favorite people from Florida. I want to thank you and I yield to Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for her closing remarks.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I think your comments are a good segue to where we should close which is that the Congress has now finally reasserted our constitutional role to be a check, a check and a balance over the other branches of government, particularly over the executive branch in which that authority and oversight was completely ceded over the last 12 years.

I sit on the House Judiciary Committee. We had an oversight committee today on the presidential signing statement where the President, this President in particular more than any other President combined, has issued signing statements, his opinion and his interpretation of legislation which is really the judicial branch's responsibility, that he would just choose not to implement or implement in the way that he wanted to, a particular section of law, wholly inappropriate.

Congress is back in our appropriate role, and I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania to talk about our Web site, but first to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I just want to warn the gentleman from Pennsylvania that you need to say both the e-mail address and the Web site or you will be scolded by some of the more veteran Members of the 30 Something Group. So I want to give you that piece of advice as you close.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I appreciate the gentleman from Connecticut alerting me to that.

For the Members who would like to tell the constituents how they can learn something more about the 30 Something Working Group, I would encourage them to e-mail us at 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov or they can visit the Web site at www.speaker.gov/30something.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, the 30 Something Working Group appreciates the hour granted to us by Speaker NANCY PELOSI.

APPOINTMENT OF HON. STENY H. HOYER AND HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH FEBRUARY 5, 2007.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARE) laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 31, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STENY H. HOYER and the Honorable CHRIS VAN HOLLEN to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through February 5, 2007.

NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointment is approved.

There was no objection.

CIVIL LIBERTIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, there is a question that often comes to my mind. I wonder to how many Americans this comes to their mind.

We are a great superpower, the undisputed economic and military superpower of this world. Have you ever asked yourself why? What is so special about us that we have this privileged position in the world?

We no longer have the most oil in the world or gold or silver or diamonds. We no longer have the best work ethic in the world. We no longer have the most respect for technical education. We no longer have the most respect for the nuclear family. Nearly half of our children are born out of wedlock. What makes us so special?

I have asked myself that question a lot of times, and I think there are two

reasons. There may be others, but I have noted for myself two reasons I think. One of those is the enormous respect that this country, that this government, has for our civil liberties. There is no other Constitution, there is no other government, that has this great respect for civil liberties.

The Constitution written in 1787 was hardly dry before our Founding Fathers wondered if it was clear that most of the rights, most of the power, should belong to the people, and so they wrote what we call the Bill of Rights, those first 10 amendments which delineated very clearly that most of the rights belonged to the people.

Civil liberties are always a casualty of war. Abraham Lincoln, my favorite President, violated our civil liberties in the civil war. In World War II, we interned the Japanese Americans. I served here with Norm Mineta, former Secretary of Transportation. Japanese Americans. He told me, "ROSCOE, as a little boy, I remember holding my parents' hands when they ushered us into that concentration camp in Idaho."

Those wars were ended and we got back the habeas corpus that was denied during the civil war, and the Japanese Americans were released from those internment camps.

We are now engaged in a great war, a war like no other that we have ever fought. I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that in our zeal to catch terrorists that we may threaten the civil liberties that I think are largely responsible for making us this great, free Nation.

I think these civil liberties have established a climate and milieu in which creativity and entrepreneurship can flourish, and I think we put at risk who we are in our superior position in the world if we put at risk these civil liberties. We need to be very careful, and actions like the PATRIOT Act, warrantless wiretaps, detention without either charging or giving counsel to the accused, we must be very careful, Mr. Speaker, that we do not put at risk those things that have made us such a great Nation. But this is a subject for another day.

A second reason, which is the subject for today that I believe that we are such a great, free Nation, undisputed superpower in the world, I believe that our Founding Fathers understood that God sat with them at the table when they wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

I have here in the front of the little Constitution that I carry a statement from Alexander Hamilton one year before they wrote the Declaration of Independence, and I think that it kind of epitomizes the belief that most of our Founding Fathers had.

The sacred rights of mankind are not to be rummaged for among old parchments or musty records. They are written as with a sunbeam in the whole volume of human nature by the hands of the divinity itself and can never be erased or obscured by mortal power.

Is there any better evidence that our Founding Fathers believed that God sat with them at the table when they wrote these great documents?

I would like to read something from the Declaration of Independence, that first document, in 1776. "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

Five times in the Declaration of Independence God is mentioned. Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that our courts may declare the Declaration of Independence unconstitutional because it mentions God?

As I mentioned earlier, the Constitution, which was the fulfillment of the promise made in the Declaration of Independence, written, by the way, 11 years later in 1787, this Constitution sought to assure the permanence of these God-given rights noted in the Declaration of Independence to the citizens of this new country. They did that by delineating a very limited Federal Government. If the Federal Government is limited, obviously the powers, the rights that it does not have belong to the people, but the ink was hardly dry on this document before they wondered was it really clear, would people really understand from this Constitution.

It is certainly implicit there in the fact that our Federal Government is given very few powers. You would need never believe they meant that today, Mr. Speaker, by the size of our Federal Government. We really need to take a look at that because we are doing a lot of things that I think that if our Founding Fathers were resurrected would be quite surprised that we thought their Constitution permitted the Federal Government to do.

They were concerned that maybe it was not clear that these precious rights given to us by God were to be secured to the people and not to the government, and so they started 10 amendments through the process of two-thirds of the House, two-thirds of the Senate and three-fourths of the State legislatures, and 10 of them made it through, and we know them as the Bill of Rights.

The rights of the people are so frequently mentioned in these Bill of Rights, which is why we call them the Bill of Rights. The first amendment, the right of the people peaceably to assemble. The second amendment, the right of the people to keep and bear arms. The third amendment does not mention rights, but it certainly delineates the right of the people not to have the military quartered in their houses except in time of war. The fourth amendment begins with the words the right of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to note that this does not say the rights of the citizens. It says the rights of the people, and our Founding Fathers did dif-

ferentiate in this great Constitution between people and citizens because when they are delineating the requirements for the presidency or other offices they note the requirement for citizenship.

The fifth amendment, which delineates a lot of rights, begins with the delineation of a right which is frequently denied to us by our governments, both local, State and Federal. I think it is the most violated part of our Constitution. The last part of the fifth amendment, a lot of rights in there, the right of the people not to have to testify against themselves, the right of the people not to have to stand trial twice for the same offense, but this last right, little noted, violated every day by all levels of government, nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

□ 1915

We need to take a serious look at that. If we can start denying one right of the people in this great Constitution, arguing that times have changed, are not all of these rights at risk?

The sixth amendment, enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial; the seventh amendment, the right by trial; and then the eighth amendment, the people have the right not to have excessive fines or cruel and unusual punishment.

The ninth amendment, the lost amendment, the amendment that almost nobody reads, the amendment that I think very few people understand, it is a very simple one. The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

This is written in old English and legalese. What does it mean? What it means is that just because a right is not given to the people specifically in the Constitution, don't disparage that right to the people, to whom that right belongs.

Fundamentally, all rights belong to the people. They choose, they choose to give certain power, certain rights to their government.

Because when there are a lot of people who need government, the government must have some rights. Our Founding Fathers wanted our government to have little power and few rights.

The tenth amendment, the power is not delegated. They might just as well have said, rights not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by the States or reserved to the States respectively or to the people.

If you were writing this in everyday English, and not using legalese, you would say, if you cannot find it in article 1, section 8, the Federal Government cannot do it.

There is a whole lot of what we do that I can't find in article 1, section 8. I would submit that we have amended our Constitution 27 times. If we think

it is outdated, we ought to be doing something that this Constitution prohibits us from doing, then, sir, we need to amend the Constitution. We don't need to ignore it.

Essential to our understanding of our origins is an understanding of what our government really is. I am afraid, sir, that too few understand this.

When Benjamin Franklin came out of the Constitutional Convention in 1797, as the story goes, he was asked by a woman who was sitting there, Mr. Franklin, what have you given us? This quote is in the front of many copies of the Constitution. His answer was, a republic, madam, if you can keep it, a republic.

But I thought we have a democracy. I don't know if we cite that Pledge of Allegiance just from rote and never think about what it says. But you remember those words in there, the republic for which it stands, not the democracy, but the republic for which it stands. What is the difference between a republic and a democracy and why did Benjamin Franklin make a point of telling this lady, a republic, madam, if you can keep it?

Let me give you a couple of examples of a democracy that will help you understand why he didn't say that they had given us a democracy. An example of a democracy is two wolves and a lamb voting on what they are going to have for dinner. You may smile a little because you know that if two wolves and a lamb are voting on what you are going to have for dinner, it is not going to be clover.

Another sample, and this is a very sad example, but if you think about it, this is really an apt example of a democracy, and that is a lynch mob. Because, clearly, in a lynch mob the will of the majority is being expressed, and that is what people say democracy is, that the majority rules.

So what is a republic? There is an incident in our history that helps me understand the difference between a republic and a democracy, and this happened during the Truman administration. The steel mills were going on strike, our economy was already in trouble, and it was going to be in bigger trouble if that strike occurred. Then we did some manufacturing, and we made some steel, and it mattered. Today, it probably wouldn't matter, because so little manufacturing in steel is made here, but it mattered then.

Harry Truman in his take-charge style issued an executive order, one of only two, by the way, that the Supreme Court has set aside. What he said in that executive order was that he nationalized the steel mills that made the steel mill workers civil servants, employees of the government. As employees to the government, they couldn't strike.

That was a very popular action that had very high approval from the American people. In a democracy, that

would have been just fine. But the Supreme Court met in an emergency session and, in effect, what they said, Mr. President, no matter how popular that is, you cannot do it because it violates the Constitution.

You see, the fundamental difference between a democracy and a republic is a rule of law. In a democracy, what the majority wants prevails. In a republic, it is a rule of law that prevails. Now, we can change that law. We have changed it 27 times. But it takes a very deliberative process, two-thirds of the House, two-thirds of the Senate, and then three-fourths of the State legislature. This is a long-time process. It gives a lot of time for reflection.

The last time we tried to amend the Constitution it didn't quite make it, the Equal Rights Amendment, you remember. Nobody denies that women should have equal rights with men. But what that amendment says, that you couldn't differentiate between men and women. If you had a draft, you would have to draft women.

We can change this Constitution, but it takes a very deliberative process and a super majority vote.

Then the last half of that statement, if you can keep it, I wonder what was in Benjamin Franklin's head, in his mind. Was he concerned about threats from outside our country? We were a long ocean away with sailing ships from any potential enemy. I doubt that his concern was a threat from without. I think that he was more concerned about a threat from within, a republic, madam, if you can keep it.

This needs a longer discussion, but that, too, is a discussion for another day. To really understand who we are, we need to go back to our origins and how our Founding Fathers came here. Most of them in our early days came from the British Isles and the European continent, and they came here to escape two tyrannies. One was the tyranny of the crown, and the other was the tyranny of the church.

Most of them came from countries where there was a king or an emperor who incredibly, from our perspective, claimed and was granted divine rights. What that says was the rights came from God to the king or the emperor, and he would give what rights he wished to his people. That is incomprehensible to us that for hundreds of years people could have lived under that kind of government.

Well, those who chose not to live that way came to this country. When they wrote the Bill of Rights, their concern about the tyranny of the crown gave rise to the second amendment.

Now, you may ask people what the second amendment is, and almost all of them will tell you that it says the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed. That is about half of the second amendment.

Let me read the first part that puts that second part in perspective. A well-regulated militia, that is every citizen

with a gun, that is the militia, a well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state. I asked some of my friends, who wants to limit the right to keep and bear arms? What do you think that means?

Remember, they came here to escape the tyranny of the crown. If we have a citizenry who have the right to keep and bear arms, never, ever could a small oligarchy at the seat of government take over and oppress the people.

The second tyranny that they came here to escape was the tyranny of the church. In England, it was the Episcopal church. On the continent, it was the Roman church. In England, it was a state church, supported by the state, empowered by the state. On the continent, the Roman Catholic Church was the state church for many states, supported by the state and powered by the state, and these religions could and did oppress other religions.

Our Founding Fathers were so repulsed by this that when they came here in old Virginia they would not let Roman Catholics vote. But, to their great credit, when it came time to write these precious 10 amendments, they recognized that is not really what they came here to do. So they wrote the establishment clause of the first amendment, and it is very clear. I have no idea why people have trouble understanding it.

It says, Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion. Don't make any law establishing a state religion.

Then they went on to say, and let everybody worship as they please, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. That is a really misunderstood establishment clause.

Early history books will present a very different picture of our origins than that which really existed. If you go back to a history book of 50 years ago, it will be unrecognizable as compared to the history book of today. The history books of today have been bled dry of any reference to our Christian heritage.

I would like to pause here for just a moment to note that I am going to quote from a lot of our Founding Fathers, and they are going to use the word "Christian." That was the lexicon of the day. If they were here today, they would be saying Judeo-Christian. Every time I read the word "Christian," please translate that Judeo-Christian, because that is the context in which they used that word.

Current history books, and indeed our culture, contains three great lies. The first of these lies is that our Founding Fathers were atheist and deist. Now an atheist is someone who does not believe in God. Deist, God, atheist, the alpha primitive, don't believe in God. A deist is someone who believes there is a God. They believe he created the world, but don't bother trying to talk to him or pray to him, because when he created the world he also put in place several laws, and your

destiny will be determined by how you relate yourself to your laws. Although they believed in a supreme being, they didn't believe he was a personal God or made any difference whether you tried to talk to him or not, and he certainly was not going to talk to you.

The second great lie is that our Founding Fathers did not want to establish a Christian Nation.

The third great lie is that they established a wall of separation between the church and the state.

Our national freedom was not free. It was enormously costly. Five of the 55 signers of the Declaration of Independence were captured and executed by the British, nine of them died on the battlefield of the Revolutionary War, and another dozen lost their homes and their possessions and their fortunes to British occupation. Our birth as a Nation was not cheap for these men. What beliefs and convictions motivated them to do what they did?

□ 1930

Of these three great lies, that is the wall of separation, it is very easy to dispense with a third of those because the words "separation," "church," and "State" never exist in relationship to each other in either our Constitution or the amendments.

But they do occur in one constitution. Interestingly, that is the constitution of the old Soviet empire, the constitution of the United Soviet Socialist Republic. Article 124 says: "In order to ensure to citizens freedom of conscience, the church in the USSR is separated from the state and the schools from the church."

Now, many people would like to interpret the establishment clause of our first amendment as if it was written in these words that are found only in the constitution of the old Soviet Union.

To refute the first two lies, that is, that our Founding Fathers were atheists and deists and that they did not mean to establish a Christian nation, I want to do four things. First of all, I want to let the Founding Fathers speak for themselves. I am going to cite only a few quotes from the many, many that you could find. Then we are going to take a look at what the courts said and you will be astounded at what our courts said in our early years. And then we will take a look at what the Congress did. The institution permits me to speak here in the well of the Congress. And then we will take a look at our schools.

Patrick Henry was the firebrand of the Revolution. Every school child knows his words: "Give me liberty or give me death." But I will wager, Mr. Speaker, that you will not find in any current textbooks the circumstances in which he uttered these words: They were in a church in Richmond, Virginia, St. John's Church in Richmond Virginia March 23, 1775, and this is what he said: "An appeal to arms and the God of Hosts is all that is left us. But we shall not fight our battle alone.

There is a just God that presides over the destinies of nations. The battle, sir, is not to the strong. Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God. I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

Did your children ever bring home to you this full quote from Patrick Henry?

Was Patrick Henry a Christian? The following year, 1776, he wrote this: "It cannot be emphasized too clearly and too often that this great Nation was founded, not by religionists, but by Christians," or in today's vernacular, Judeo Christians, "not on religion, but on the gospel of Jesus Christ. For that reason alone, peoples of other faiths have been afforded" . . . "freedom of worship here."

Benjamin Franklin was said to be a deist; that is, he believed there was a God who created the Earth but then he just let the Earth and its inhabitants determine their destiny by how they related themselves to laws that he had established. Let me read to you something that Benjamin Franklin said. This was in 1787. We had a deadlocked convention.

It wasn't certain that after 11 years, we were going to be able to write a Constitution that would protect all of the rights, big States and little States and people, that we wanted to protect. And this is what he said: "In the days of our conquest with Great Britain when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayer in this room for divine protection. Our prayers, sir, were heard, and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of superintending providence in our favor. To that kind providence we owe this happy opportunity to establish our Nation. And have we now forgotten that powerful friend? Do we imagine we no longer need his assistance?"

And then I love this quote: "I have lived, sir, a long time." I believe he was 81 years old, the oldest member of the Constitutional Convention, revered Governor of Pennsylvania. "I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth, that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without his notice, it is probable that a new nation cannot rise without his aid. We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writings that except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that built it. I therefore beg leave to move that henceforth prayers imploring the assistance of heaven and its blessings on our deliberations be held in this assembly every morning before we proceed to any business."

That, Mr. Speaker, established a precedent that we honored this morning when we opened this day and this Congress with prayer. We have a chaplain; so does the Senate. There is a

chaplain of every religious persuasion, or many, including Muslims, who serve our military. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the only place today we cannot offer a prayer is in our schools. I have often asked myself the rationality of this.

Thomas Jefferson was also said to be a deist. Let me read what he says and see if you believe he was a deist: "I am a real Christian, that is to say a disciple of the doctrines of Jesus. I have little doubt that our whole country will soon be rallied to the unity of our creator and, I hope, to the pure doctrine of Jesus also."

On slavery Jefferson wrote: "Almighty God has created men's minds free. Commerce between master and slave is despotism. I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep forever."

George Washington, the founder of our country, a deeply religious person. We think of him often as commander of the Army. This is his quote: "It is impossible to govern the world without God and the Bible." Boy, are we trying to do that? "Of all the dispositions and habits that lead to political prosperity, our religion and morality are the indispensable supporters. Let us with caution indulge the supposition," that is, the idea, "that morality can be maintained without religion. Reason and experience both forbid us to expect our national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

And in his prayer book, George Washington wrote this: "Oh, eternal and everlasting God, direct my thoughts, words, and work. Wash away my sins in the emaculate blood of the lamb and purge my heart by the Holy Spirit. Daily, frame me more and more in the likeness of thy son, Jesus Christ, that living in thy fear, and dying in thy favor, I may in thy appointed time obtain the resurrection of the justified unto eternal life. Bless, O Lord, the whole race of mankind and let the world be filled with the knowledge of thee and thy son, Jesus Christ."

John Adams, our second President and President of the American Bible Society, this is what he said: "We have no government armed with the power capable of contending with human passions, unbridled by morality and true religion." Mr. Speaker, I wonder if maybe this can be a factor in our problems in Iraq. "Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other." This by the second President of the United States.

John Jay, our first Supreme Court Justice, said "Providence has given to our people the choice of their rulers, and it is the duty as well as the privilege and interest of our Christian Nation to select and prefer Christians for their rulers." This from John Jay, the first Supreme Court Justice.

John Quincy Adams, also, like his father, President of the American Bible Society. As a matter of fact, I think it was he who said that he valued the

presidency of the American Bible Society more than he valued the presidency of the United States. This is what he said: "The highest glory of the American Revolution was this: It connected in one indissoluble bond the principles of civil government with the principles of Christianity. From the day of the Declaration, the day" the Founding Fathers "were bound by the Laws of God, which they all acknowledged as their rules of conduct."

And later Calvin Coolidge, "Silent Cal." An interesting story is told of him. He was a man of few words. It was hard to get him to talk. He was sitting at dinner with a lady who said, "I have a wager that I will get you to say three words tonight." And the only words he uttered that whole evening were "You lose."

Calvin Coolidge said this: "America seeks no empires built on blood and forces. She cherishes no purpose save to merit the favor of Almighty God." He later wrote: "The foundations of our society and our government rest so much on the teachings of the Bible that it would be difficult to support them if faith in these teaching would cease to be practically universal in our country."

President Coolidge, they have ceased to be practically universal in our country. What now?

I think, Mr. Speaker, you see from these quotes from just a few of our Founding Fathers, and there are dozens of others I could have brought, that certainly our Founding Fathers were deeply religious people. They were not deists and athiests.

Now let us move to the Supreme Court. Some of these quotes will shock you. The People versus Ruggles. He had publicly slandered the Bible, and somehow this came to the Supreme Court in 1811. "You have attacked the Bible." This is what the Supreme Court said: "You have attacked the Bible. In attacking the Bible, you have attacked Jesus Christ. In attacking Jesus Christ, you have attacked the roots of our Nation."

Did they intend this to be a Godless Nation?

"Whatever strikes at the root of Christianity manifests itself in the dissolving of our civil government. This was the Supreme Court. And then the same Court a little later, in 1885, in *Vida versus Gerrard*, they were using the Bible in teaching one of our schools, and somehow that got to the Supreme Court. And this is what they said: "Why not use the Bible, especially the New Testament? It should be read and taught as the divine revelation in the schools. Where can the purist principles of morality be learned so clearly and so perfectly as from the New Testament?" Can you imagine anything like that coming from our Court today?

And then in 1892, and this was in a suit involving the Church of the Holy Spirit in which they contended Christianity was not the faith of the people,

and this is what the Supreme Court said in 1892: "Our laws and our institutions must necessarily be based upon and embody the teachings of the redeemer of mankind. It is impossible to demand that they should be otherwise; and in this sense and to this extent, our civilization and our institutions are emphatically Christian. No purpose of action against our religion can be imputed to any legislation, State or national, because this is a religious people." This is the Supreme Court. "This is historically true. From the discovery of this continent to this present hour, there is a single voice making this affirmation." And then they go on to cite 87 different legal precedents to affirm that America was formed as a Christian Nation by believing Christians.

And then in 1947, our Court did an about face, 180 degrees, repudiating everything they have they had done for 160 years. And you will see no Supreme Court reference today going back beyond 1947 because if you went back beyond that, every one would be consistent with the quotes that I have read here.

We are having trouble understanding that what our Founding Fathers meant in this great establishment clause in the first amendment was to ensure that there would be freedom of religion. We are ever more interpreting this as requiring freedom from religion. Our Founding Fathers would be astounded if they could be resurrected and see how we have interpreted their Constitution.

□ 1945

In the early 1850s, Humanism and Darwinism was sweeping our country. And there was the assertion that America was not a Christian Nation. After a year's study, now we are turning to the Congress. After a year's study, this is what the Senate Judiciary Committee said in its final report in March 27, 1854.

"The First Amendment clause speaks against an establishment of religion. The founding fathers intended by this amendment to prohibit an establishment of religion, such as the Church of England presented or anything like it. But they had no fear or jealousy of religion itself, nor did they wish to see us an illreligious people." And I love the language that our founding fathers used, so poetic.

"They did not intend to spread over the public authorities and the whole public action of the Nation the dead and revolting spectacle of atheistic apathy. Had the people during the revolution had a suspicion of any attempt to war against Christianity, that revolution would have been strangled in its cradle."

At the time of the adoption of the Constitution and the amendments, the universal sentiment was that Christianity should be encouraged, not just any one sect or denomination. The object was not to substitute Judaism, or

Islam or infidelity, but to prevent rivalry among the Christian denominations to the exclusion of others. Christianity must be considered as the foundation on which the whole structure rests.

"Laws will not have permanence or power without the sanction of religious sentiment, without the firm belief that there is power above us that will reward our virtues and punish our vices." This is what our Congress said.

The Continental Congress bought 20,000 copies of the Bible to distribute to its new citizens. And for the first 100 years of our country, every year our Congress voted monies to send missionaries to the American Indians.

Continuing the Senate Judiciary Committee's 1854 reading. "In this age, there can be no substitute for Christianity. By its general principles, the Christian faith is the great conserving element on which we must rely for the purity and permanence of our free institutions."

That was the religion of our founding fathers, or the Republic, and they expected it to remain the religion of their descendants. Well, there is little question, little question how the Congress felt, and the courts.

Let us turn now to our schools. Oh, by the way. The same Congress in 1854 passed this resolution. Can you imagine this today? "The Congress of the United States recommends and approves the Holy Bible for use in our schools."

The New England Primer used for 200 years. This is how they taught the alphabet. A. A wise son makes a glad father but a foolish son is heaviness to his mother.

B. Better is little with the fear of the Lord than abundance apart from him. C. Come unto Christ, all you who are weary and heavily laden. D. Do not do the abominable thing, which I hate, sayeth the Lord. E. Except a man be born again he cannot see the Kingdom of God. Clearly religion was important in our early schools.

The McGuffey Reader, used for a hundred years. A few years ago they brought it back with the hope that if kids used that, they could read, because what they were doing today they were not learning to read.

This is what McGuffey said. "The Christian religion is the religion of our country. From it are derived our notions of the character of God, on the great moral Governor of universe. On its doctrines are founded the peculiarities of our free institutions. From no source has the author drawn more conspicuously than from the sacred Scriptures. For all of those extracts from the Bible, I make no apology."

Of the first 108 universities in our country, 106 were distinctly religious. Harvard University, the first university. This was in their student handbook. Let me read it. "Let every student be plainly instructed and earnestly pressed to consider well, the main end of his life and studies is, to

know God and Jesus Christ, which is eternal life, John 17:3; and therefore to lay Jesus Christ as the only foundation of all sound knowledge and learning."

For more than 100 years, more than 50 percent of all Harvard's graduates were pastors. We now have exposed these three great lies from our founding fathers, from our courts, from our Congress, from our schools. Our founding fathers have all spoken. Clearly we were founded by religious people intending to be a religious Nation.

What have we reaped in the way we have changed? America 100 years ago had the highest literacy rate of any nation. Today we spend more on education than any nation in the world. And yet since 1987 we have graduated more than one million high school students who could not even read their diploma.

We have spent more money than any other Nation in the industrialized world to educate our children, and yet SAT scores fell for 24 straight years before finally leveling off at the bottom, where they still are compared with others in the world in the 1990s.

In a 1960 survey 53 percent of America's teenagers had never kissed. 57 percent said they had never necked, that is kissing and hugging, and 92 percent of teenagers in America said they were virgins in 1960.

Before that, more than a decade before that, I was getting my doctorate at the University of Maryland. The girls dorm was right down the hill from Moral Hall where I did my work. The Dean of Women would not let the girls go barefoot because she said that bare feet were too sexy.

There are far too many coed dorms and coed rooms in the University of Maryland today. By 1990, just 30 years later, 75 percent of American high school students are sexually active, by 18. In the next 5 years, we spent \$4 billion to educate them on how to be immoral, to trumpeting the solutions of safe sex, and it worked.

One in five teenagers in America today lose their virginity before their 13th birthday. 19 percent of America's teenagers say they have had more than four sexual partners before graduation. The result: Every day 2,700 students get pregnant, 1,100 get abortions, 1,200 give birth. Every day another 900 contract a sexually transmitted disease, many incurable.

AIDS infections among high school students climbed 700 percent between 1990 and 1995. We have 3.3 million problem drinkers in our high school campuses, over half a million alcoholics, and in any given weekend in America, 30 percent of the student population may spend some time drunk.

A few years ago a young woman in a high school in Oklahoma wrote this poem as a new school prayer. "Now I sit me down in school where praying is against the rule, for this great Nation under God finds mention of him very odd.

"The Scripture now the class recites, it violates the Bill of Rights. And any

time my head I bow, becomes a Federal matter now. Our hair can be purple, orange or green, that is no offense, it is a freedom scene. The law is specific, the law is precise, only prayers spoken out loud are a serious vice.

“For praying in a public hall might offend someone with no faith at all, in silence alone we must meditate, God’s name is prohibited by the State. We are allowed to cuss and dress like freaks, and pierce our noses, tongues and cheeks, they have outlawed guns but first the Bible.

“To quote the Good Book makes me liable. We can elect a pregnant senior queen, and the unwed daddy our senior king. It is inappropriate to teach right from wrong, we are taught that such judgments do not belong.

“We can get our condoms and birth control, study witchcraft, vampires and totem poles, but the Ten Commandments are not allowed. No word of God must reach this crowd. It is scary here I must confess, when chaos reins the school is a mess.

“So Lord this silent plea I make, should I be shot my soul please take.”

Our Nation which used to lead the world in every arena now leads the world in these areas. Number one in violent crime. We are number one in divorce. We are number one in teenage pregnancies. We are number one in volunteer abortions. We are number one in illegal drug abuse. And we are number one in the industrialized world for illiteracy.

Alexis de Tocqueville, a great, young Frenchman, toured our country for 5 years. He wrote a great two-volume treatise on democracy, which is still a classic. And this is what he said. “In the United States, the influence of religion is not confined to the manners, but shapes the intelligence of the people. Christianity, therefore reigns without obstacle, by universal consequence. The consequence is, as I have before observed, that every principle in a moral world is fixed and enforced.”

And this great quote. “I sought for the key to the greatness of and genius of America in her great harbors, her fertile fields and boundless forests, in her rich minds and vast world commerce, in her universal public school system and institutions of learning.

“I sought for it in her Democratic Congress and her matchless Constitution. But not until I went into the churches of America and heard her pulpits flame with righteousness did I understand the secret of her genius and power.”

He said, “America is great, because America is good. And if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great.”

In 1963, Abraham Lincoln declared a National Day of Humiliation. And this is what he said. “We have been the recipients of the choicest bounties of heaven. We have been preserved these many years in peace and prosperity. We have grown in numbers and wealth and power, as no other Nation has ever

grown. But we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace and multiplied and enriched us.

“And we have vainly imagined in the deceitfulness of our hearts that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace.

“Too proud to pray to the God that made us. It behooves us then to humble us ourselves before the offended power, to confess our national sins and to pray for clemency and forgiveness.”

Abraham Lincoln understood that this was a new experiment that might not succeed. In the Gettysburg Address he says this. “Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth in this continent a new Nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.”

That may sound very strange to us, and this should be unusual. But remember, they came from countries that had a king or an Emperor. “We are now engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that Nation or any Nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure.”

We have forgotten from whence we came. Actually this generation has not forgotten, it never knew. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this great free country, the undisputed economic and military super power of the world is at risk if we have forgotten from whence we came.

Abraham Lincoln said this to our Nation, and I will close with this. We need to hear it again. “For all those who have died in all of our wars, it is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great tasks remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause to which they gave the last full measure of devotion, that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom.”

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I yield back.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FARR (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today until 3 p.m. on account of a death in the family.

Mr. BUYER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. CAPPS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. CAPPS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. SOLIS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MCGOVERN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. FOXX) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, February 5, 6, and 7.

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FORTENBERRY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HULSHOF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAMBORN, for 5 minutes, today.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reports that on January 30, 2007, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 188. To provide a new effective date for the applicability of certain provisions of law to Public Law 105-331.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 41, 110th Congress, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARE). Pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 41, 110th Congress, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, February 5, 2007.

Thereupon (at 7 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 41, the House adjourned until Monday, February 5, 2007, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

475. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Special Local Regulations; Annual Gasparilla Marine Parade, Hillsborough Bay, Tampa, FL [CGD 07-05-156] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received January 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

476. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Regulated Navigation Area; East Rockaway Inlet to Atlantic Beach Bridge, Nassau County, Long Island,