

a lot of folks who, because of the recovery, are doing better today than they were a year ago, much better.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI) listed some companies. I have some in my district. I can think of Ellwood Forge and Ellwood Quality Steel. Both are doing a lot better this year than they did last year, not only because their companies are doing better but because as a country we're doing better. That's what it means when manufacturers see an increase in orders. It means that we're stimulating our economy, we're growing, we're moving again, and that's what that symbolizes. That's the first thing that turns around is that manufacturing sector, and in western Pennsylvania we're seeing that impact very directly.

We've seen it in some of the infrastructure projects in all of our districts across the country to have something of lasting significance that's going to be there in the decades after we've recovered.

Now, is everything in the economy where we want it to be? No, of course not. It hasn't fully recovered. We're not out of the woods yet. We're not completely out of the hole that it took us decades to dig, but we're getting better. Again, GDP growth is strong, stock market has recovered to some extent, jobs are much better, and we're moving in the right direction. And that would not have happened were it not for the actions that this Congress took.

□ 2120

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Before I yield to the gentleman from New York, I think it's important again to reiterate, these are two separate philosophies. We did not have one vote in the House of Representatives from the Republican side. They, in many instances, continue to argue for cutting taxes for the top 1 percent—hopefully that will trickle down to the middle class, hopefully that will trickle down to manufacturing. And we saw from the 1980s on, people took that money and they invested it in China, manufacturing in Mexico and China and other places. What we're saying is, reinvest back in the United States—transportation, energy, infrastructure. Rebuild the country. A pro-growth agenda from Democrats—cutting taxes for businesses, cutting taxes for the middle class, and jump-starting the economy, making sure that we have fair regulation, referees on the field, and making sure we don't let corporations run the country, whether it's Wall Street and the financial markets, or whether it's the oil industry saying approve this permit even though I don't have a plan; in case we have a catastrophe, let it all go. We're the corporations, we run the show.

We're reigning that back in, trying to jump-start small businesses with the fund we provided last week, \$30 billion to loan \$300 billion for community banks. Get the local banks loaning money again and stop relying on these globalized banks who are in it to make

a profit and have no connection, no tie to the community.

So I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative RYAN.

You know, the talk about the contrasts, the sharp contrasts between the party in control now in the House, with the Democrats advancing dollars that invest in small business, invest in innovation as an economy, clean energy. You think of all those strategies compared to the catering to Big Oil, big banks, Wall Street, making certain the biggest amongst us are taken care of. I contrast that with all of the work being done in my district, in the 21st Congressional District in New York, in the Capital Region, it has always had a spirit of pioneer. It's in our DNA. We have within the confines of that district an energy revolution of sorts, it's the birthplace of electricity. So we're continuing on with a global center for renewable energy at GE, nanoscience in the district, the semiconductor industry, superconductive cable, talking about advanced battery manufacturing.

When we looked at the Recovery Act and how the President wanted to bring us into the new ages, allow for transitioning, a transformation of the energy economy, that's what this is all about. What we have had expressed in this Recovery Act are opportunities to grow new opportunities with advanced battery manufacturing. The battery looked at by GE, as they're soon to establish their plant, not only provides, in its concept of an alternative battery, not only for generation of electricity, not only for powering heavy vehicles, but also it is there for energy storage, so that with the transmittent energy of renewables, that transmittent nature, the opportunities to provide for storage there creates all new opportunities, the battery as a linchpin. The same is true with superconductive cable, where you can transmit far more electrons per inch of cable compared to the traditional cable, where renewables are being developed and new opportunities with nanoscience to create lighter blades, more efficient outcomes, more power per dollar invested. All of this is what holds great promise for our economy, for jobs, for small business innovation, for the emerging technologies. That's what this investment is all about.

And finally, you see a commitment to small business, to the pioneer spirit, to the invention and creative genius that has always been part of the American culture. So I'm really proud of the efforts that we're making to grow back this economy, to grow back the investments in basic research and R&D. That's what this is all about with the Recovery Act.

I think that people are now looking at this contrast, Representative RYAN, they're looking at the slow, steady progress, that climb upward from what was a precipitous drop in that left-

handed side of the V formation. The precipitous drop in jobs, in the growth in unemployment, the lack of investment, the household income loss, now has taken a sharp u-turn, and we see the road to recovery, the progress because of the wisdom of the types of investments made in the Recovery Act promoted by the White House and very much supported by Speaker PELOSI here.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I totally agree with the gentleman. Here you have tax cuts for businesses, you have \$30 billion for community banks to loan out up to \$300 billion, you have tax cuts for individuals, you have the extension of unemployment benefits and health care through COBRA, you have infrastructure projects, billions of dollars, you have billions of dollars for Pell Grants so people can go to school. We've taken the banks out of the student loan business so people get a better deal when they take out a loan to go to school. And as you said, we're taking \$1 billion a day that's leaving this country to go to oil-producing countries and driving that back into the United States, the kind of technology that you have, the kind of nuclear technology and production that Mr. ALTMIRE has in western Pennsylvania, fuel cells in Mr. BOCCIERI's district, manufacturing and engineering in my district, and all of the above in Mr. MURPHY's district.

Mr. TONKO. Well, simply said, the policies of the past gave us the catastrophe in the gulf; the policies of the present give us opportunities at home.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. MURPHY, would you like to wrap up? We've got about 1 minute left. Because I know you can, of all of us, you can put it all together in 1 minute.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. When it comes down to it, of all the things that drive the recovery in this economy, it's people spending again. And the fact is we'll go back to where we started. At the heart of our economic recovery legislation is putting power in the hands of average, everyday working-class families. That's what drives this economic recovery, and that's what the Democrats have invested in.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TEAGUE). Without objection, the ordering of a 5-minute Special Order in favor of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is vacated.

There was no objection.

THE EMPEROR'S NEW CLOTHES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it's always an honor to be here and to be speaking on the floor where so many who have served this country so honorably and well have done the same

thing. I never lose sight of that fact. It gets a little discouraging at times.

It's interesting to hear the stimulus is working because that's what George W. Bush was doing. And as I recall, in 2006, the Republicans lost the majority because Democrats convinced them that it was the wrong thing to do. And you know what? The Democrats were right. They appropriately won the majority because, as they said, we should not be deficit spending, you're killing the country, you're killing the economy by running up this kind of debt, and they won the majority in 2006 because they were right. We should not have been deficit spending like that. But that went on.

□ 2130

So it's interesting to hear, just 4 short years later, that it turns out that what President Bush was doing and was encouraging to be done is actually the good thing. Though, I still tend to go back and think of those of us on the Republican side who agreed that we needed to get out from under the deficit spending and that we needed to get spending under control. Having compassion and spending money to a deficit level is not the same thing. It's the Federal Government, like a parent, who is just throwing money at their kids, thinking that's going to make them happy and that everybody will be loving and caring.

I happen to agree with my friend Jim Dobson, who knows a lot about raising children. He said, You show me a child whose parent never said "no," and I'll show you one messed up kid.

More and more, we keep seeing people run to Washington. "Give us money. Give us money. Yeah, let's don't deficit spend, but give us money." It has got to stop. It has got to stop. When the Democrats promised they would stop the deficit spending if they were given the majority in November of 2006, they diagnosed the problem correctly, but then they didn't use the treatment they promised when they took over the majority.

It's interesting. I went back, and I found an article and speeches from early 2007 when we were talking about how well the economy was going at that point. Yet, at that time, those who promised to stop the deficit spending instead dramatically increased the deficit spending. It is amazing to see how the economy took a nosedive once the Democrats took the majority.

So I didn't plan to talk about the stimulus this evening, but I've heard from enough people who have been begging for us to, please, stop the deficit spending. When the Federal Government runs up such an enormous deficit, they suck up all the capital in the world, and the businesses that would like to hire people can't keep their lines of credit open anymore. You have got this administration's regulators telling banks, Now, you'd better not keep extending that line of credit to that business because, even though it's

still hiring people and seems to be doing well and has never missed a payment, we're concerned that maybe someday it will, and you don't want your bank to be under the heightened scrutiny that we will put on it if you keep extending lines of credit to this company.

So companies lose their lines of credit. They can't borrow money, and they can't grow their businesses. As we have often seen, if you're not growing, then you're usually dying. So it's just interesting. It's interesting.

I've heard my friends on the other side of the aisle yelling and fussing about, you know, a \$100-\$200 billion deficit in 1 year—that it's just outrageous, that it's unconscionable, and how could we do those kinds of things. They're right. We shouldn't have been deficit spending, but I really expected them to stop. This year, it is expected we'll have a \$1.3 to \$1.6 trillion deficit by the Federal Government in 1 year. Who would have ever dreamed that the same people who said just some short years ago that a \$160 billion deficit was reprehensible would today be saying that 10 times that much of a deficit is really a good thing and that the country is doing better?

I don't think there is any better indication of just how well things are going in the private sector than last month, because we got good news. There were 431,000 new jobs created last month. That was great news. 411,000 of the 431,000 jobs were temporary of census workers. I'm not sure that's news that's quite as good as we originally thought.

So we have an administration and a majority who are ecstatic in thinking that the emperor, though naked, has regal clothes on and that the economy is doing great and that the stimulus is working so very well because we created 411,000 jobs last month for temporary census workers. That emperor has no clothes on. It's not a great economy. Now, it should be. It's trying to be. It's trying to come back. Yet, as the private sector tries to do better, boom, we hit them with a health care bill that is going to cost them so much more money than it had cost them before.

It's telling businesses, if you've got over 50 employees, then you're going to get hammered with a \$2,000-per-employee tax. So, you know, we're hearing people say, Well, we had 56. We had to let them go. We had to let people go. We can't be over that cap. We have people being let go because the health care costs are now going to be so much, and the added taxes are hitting. We have people who are selling homes and who are seeing there are going to be added taxes for them.

This was supposed to be a health care bill that helped the working poor. Yet, a few weeks ago, when I was at a jobs fair in Marshall, Texas, I had one gentleman tell me, Look, we're giving, you know, entry-level jobs, but we're giving them really good health insurance.

Well, unfortunately, once the full extent of this health care bill kicks in, under the bill, he won't be able to do that anymore. They'll have to go on Medicaid.

If you make 133 percent of the poverty level or less, under that wonderful bill, you'll get forced into Medicaid, like it or not, even if you've got an employer who is willing to provide you health care. Oh, by the way, if you're above 133 percent of the poverty level and you can't afford the great health insurance policy that is dictated by this Zeus of a Congress and President, then bad news. You're going to pay extra income tax. You can't afford the health care insurance we've mandated? You get an extra income tax. Good news. Good news all the way around.

I did want to address something that has caused me a great deal of concern. All of this actually does, but this hit me as I was seeing more information about the 9/11 conspirators. I use that term because they had filed documents indicating that they were 9/11 conspirators.

This is an article I saw on Sunday. The headline from Politico, which is a newspaper here in Washington, reads, "Chances dim for swift 9/11 decision." This was by Mr. Josh Gerstein on 6/20/2010.

It reads, "Attorney General Eric Holder said the decision over where to hold the trial for alleged 9/11 plotter Khalid Sheikh Mohammad was 'weeks away' 3 months ago.

"Now advocates on both sides of the issue say they expect the Obama administration to punt the decision until after the November midterm elections—when the controversial plan could do less damage to the political fortunes of endangered Democrats and might face less resistance on Capitol Hill.

"Holder, last week, explicitly denied the midterms had anything to do with the timing but would only say discussions are continuing. The White House had no comment."

So the article goes on, and it discusses at quite some length the 9/11 trial and its problems and about figuring out what to do about it.

Then, while I was looking this weekend, I saw some great news. This is from The New York Times. This is exactly quoting from The New York Times' article:

"Five charged in 9/11 attacks seek to plead guilty."

So they are going to plead guilty.

"Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: The five Guantanamo detainees charged with coordinating the September 11 attacks told a military judge on Monday that they wanted to confess in full—a move that seemed to challenge the government to put them to death."

Man, that's great news because we had this article on Sunday, saying the Attorney General and this administration can't decide what to do about the trials. It's great news. They're going to plead guilty.

□ 2140

Another quote from the article said that at the start of what had been listed as routine proceedings Monday, Judge Henley said he had received a written statement from the five men charged, saying they had planned to stop filing legal motions and to “announce our confessions to plea in full.” Great news. They’re agreeing to plead guilty to confess everything. Awesome news. Awesome news.

The trouble is, the date of this New York Times story was December 9, 2008. The 9/11 conspirators, as they are self-confessed, agreed to plead guilty to the atrocities regarding 9/11. They were not going to file any more pleadings. They were throwing in the towel. They were ready to be sentenced to death. And if you go back and look at this article, Mr. Speaker, it talks about how they’re ready to accept martyrdom. Isn’t that something? They told a military judge they wanted to confess in full. They were ready to be put to death for their crimes. Isn’t that something? It said they planned to stop filing legal motions and to announce our confessions to plea in full.

But a strange thing happened on the way to the five 9/11 charged conspirators for plotting and carrying out—seeing that it was carried out, at least—the 9/11 atrocities. This administration took office a month after that story and said, You know what? Basically, in essence, You guys, don’t plead guilty. We want to bring this to New York and create a circus out of it. Put the island of Manhattan in great danger. Probably cost them—one estimate was a hundred million dollars they don’t have. They’re trying to figure out where to come up with the money for their own budget right now. Yes, they’re going to bring them to New York and put on a circus.

So the guys withdrew their indication they were going to plead guilty. They were ready for the big show. And now we’re told that there probably won’t be a decision until after the November elections. They were ready to plead guilty, and now we have to wait 2 years because this administration wanted to jump in and make a circus out of justice. You don’t do that. It’s not justice when you attempt to make a circus out of it.

I had a rule in my courtroom. I would allow one camera remain in place, could not be moved, and the moment I saw one juror look over at the camera, the camera was out. Everybody knew the rules. It had to be a pooled camera. So all networks pooled from that one camera. And the first one to file the motion to bring the camera or use the camera were the ones that got to put the stationary camera in there and everybody else pulled footage from those. Because when you’re talking about justice, when you’re talking about court proceedings, you cannot talk about making a big show out of the trial. It’s no longer justice. It’s now a circus.

And, in the meantime, we have over 3,000 people who lost their lives in the

9/11 attacks, who see justice frittering away yet one more time. It’s heartbreaking. Heartbreaking. These guys were ready to plead guilty, as announced in this article December 9, 2008, in The New York Times. And now we’re talking 2 years later before we ever even think about, figure out what we’re going to do. They were ready to plead guilty but for this administration’s meddling with the third branch.

And for those that think that the Congress does not have the authority to create military commissions, I understand their ignorance—there’s a lot of it out there, but that’s been going on for years—called the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Because under the Constitution, this body had the authority to create the UCMJ, which we did, long before I was here, of course. But they did. And that’s why.

Now when the Bush administration tried to create a military commission without coming through Congress, that was not constitutional. That’s not the President’s job. It’s the Congress’s job under the Constitution. So when the Congress came back in 2006, created the Military Commissions Act, then it was certainly upheld, because it was appropriate. Of course, in that bill it referred to those who are at war with America as enemy combatants, a term that’s been around for at least 70 years. But that got changed last year. We had an amendment to the Military Commissions Act of 2006. The term “enemy combatant” has now been changed officially in the act that President Obama signed. We wouldn’t want to offend these poor enemy combatants that want to kill us and destroy our way of life. So they’re now referred to under the bill as unprivileged alien enemy belligerents. Four words now.

Anyway, that’s where we are with regard to the 9/11 attackers, the 9/11 plotters; and if you go back and read the pleading filed by Khalid Sheikh Mohammed on behalf of himself and the four others charged that should have pled guilty in January of 2009, but for the intervention by the executive branch through the Department of Justice and the White House, but for their meddling, these guys may well have already been put to death, since that’s what they were willing to accept. And I just know that they have a very rude awakening awaiting them in the next life. But, unfortunately, that will not be experienced by them for some time still to come. Really tragic.

And then we see not only has there been that interference with the 9/11 plotters and the intervention of the White House and the Department of Justice. And, I don’t know, maybe the name should be changed from Department of Justice to Department of Procrastinated Justice, because it should have happened by now, but for this group intervening. Then we see what’s happened down in the Gulf Coast, what continues to go on. We’ve got video every second reminding us of that. And the more you read, the more disconcerting it gets.

Now we’ve heard one of the all-time experts on global warming finally admit early this year that, well, actually, there’s no evidence of the planet warming since 1995. And, yes, in the last few years it’s probably been cooling; and, yes, the Middle Ages were a lot warmer in the Northern Hemisphere than it is here now. Of course, I’m sure it’s easy to remember from history the Middle Ages, the Nords, all those folks. They had some pretty high-powered automobiles which are creating all the global warming back in those days. But, apparently, it was such a wonderful thing to this administration and to our friends across the aisle that British Petroleum was onboard with global warming and they were going to, apparently, make a lot of money in the carbon credit business. They were excited about it. And they were the Big Oil advocate teamed up with the Democrats in the Senate and with this administration.

And so people wondered why this administration didn’t come out much more quickly and condemn British Petroleum. Well, they were still hoping they were going to salvage their crap-and-trade bill. But they also knew if their big ally, British Petroleum, was not onboard, then it might be more difficult to convince others that it was going to be such a good thing for the energy business. So they really didn’t want, apparently, to condemn British Petroleum too roundly too quickly because they were still hoping they could salvage a passage of the crap-and-trade bill.

And they really at the time thought they needed their ally—their very, very close ally—British Petroleum. And there was an article indicating that in fact Senator KERRY on April 22, when the Deepwater Horizon blew, that Senator KERRY was communicating with British Petroleum about trying to get that global warming bill passed.

□ 2150

Things got put on hold, obviously, after that explosion took place. And yet still over 60 days later, the Jones Act has not been suspended, so the Netherlands could come in, as they had offered. They have got some amazing machinery that would help with the separation. They could build island barriers, save so much of the pristine beaches, and still, no Jones Act suspension. Obviously that was a bill to give protectionism to unions, and certainly the unions did not want to see that bill suspended.

But for all the criticism of President Bush, within 3 days of Hurricane Katrina occurring—August 29 was when it occurred, September 1 is when President Bush had signed an order suspending the Jones Act so that foreign vessels could come in and assist us in our time of need after Hurricane Katrina. Over 60 days later, this administration still has not done it.

So I hear all the talk about, We’re doing absolutely everything we can.

How about putting a signature on the suspension of the Jones Act? Just do it 19 days like President Bush did, and you'll be able to have all this outside assistance come in.

One of the things that I've seen—and it's been hard for me over the years, when somebody wants to come help me after I've had some family tragedy or something, is, I just don't like to accept—I don't want anybody to put themselves out. But what you find out is, if you've done something for somebody else, it blesses their heart when they get to do something nice for you.

You know, we have done some very nice things for so many countries, as is reflected in the cemeteries all over Europe, in American soldiers that have been buried around the world, where they gave their lives—not so that we could be an imperialist nation, because if we were, France would be speaking English, the Netherlands would be speaking English, Germany would be speaking English. But that was never our goal. Japan would be speaking English. That was never our goal. It was a goal to bring liberty and freedom, bring the very gift that we have in this country to others. It's such a wonderful inheritance. But the problem is, though we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights, among them are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, like any inheritance, any gift, if you don't fight for it, then mean, evil people will take it away.

So the Jones Act has not been suspended, and we have a fund that was created with—you know, British Petroleum said, We were going to do it anyway. And it sure sounds like, from what we've been hearing, British Petroleum deserves to pay a great deal more than that. But one of the great things the Founders did was create three branches of government so that when a responsible party has done something wrong, you don't have the Congress or the President come in and say, Here's your fine. Here's your fee. This is what you've got to pay. We don't have that. We have hearings and trials in court. And if you want to avoid having a long drawn-out trial process, then you can come in and work out a settlement agreement.

Some companies have found out, after they've done wrong and harmed people, that they actually end up better off creating a fund on their own, something that is acceptable to others so that they can be compensated for the harm that's been done without protracted litigation. That's all a very noble thing. Having a fund supplied by British Petroleum, that's a very good thing. But when you take it out of context, of the three branches of government—and this is more a judiciary issue—and you allow either the legislative or the executive branch to just say, Here's what you owe. Put up the money, and we'll appoint our pet person here to dictate who gets what, then you have broken down the Constitution. That's not supposed to happen.

Because the same President and Attorney General who sit down with somebody at the very time that they are investigating criminal charges—and they've made a big deal in the media about investigating criminal charges. They said, By the way, we're investigating you. I mean, it goes without saying. They've said it all in the media, We're investigating you for criminal charges. We think you need to put this money up. The same executive branch that can dictate creating a fund like that—no matter how willing the perpetrator is to put up the fund—that same executive branch can also say, And by the way, why don't you just take the blame for everything? Why don't you just take the blame for everything? Let's don't even get into what the government might have done wrong, what our administration didn't do, what our Department of Interior didn't do, what our Minerals Management Service didn't do, or the fact that we just made a big splash in June of 2009 about our deputy assistant secretary coming in to this department who worked for British Petroleum ever since she left the Clinton administration in January of 2001, and never mind that she knows more, according to the previous Inspector General, about why that price adjustment language was cut out of the 1998 and 1999 offshore leases that made—I thought originally hundreds of millions, now apparently it's billions of dollars for her employer, Big Oil. But it cost the Federal Treasury billions of dollars that went to big oil. Let's just avoid all of that discussion about the cozy relationship between this administration's regulators and British Petroleum. Let's just avoid all of that, and you just take all the responsibility.

There's a reason that an executive branch is not supposed to do that, because it opens the door to abuse. And, in fact, there are Federal laws—just like I'm familiar with State laws in Texas—that say, basically it's a crime for a prosecutor in Texas to call in a defendant and say, I will not indict you, or I will drop the indictment if you will put x number of dollars into the fund that I dictate. Well, that's a crime. You can't do that. There's a reason that we have three branches of government.

I heard someone ask once of the brilliant Justice Antonin Scalia, Don't you think the reason we've had more liberty in this country than any other country in the world is because of our Bill of Rights? And I just love Justice Scalia. He is so brilliant and yet so forthright. He said, no. And I'm sure my answer will not do justice to his. But my recollection is, basically, no. The Soviets had a much better Bill of Rights than we have. And it hit me. I remembered. I studied the Soviets' Bill of Rights, and they actually did. It was a great Bill of Rights. But he said, No. The reason you've got more liberty in America is because the Founders did not trust government, so they wanted

to make it as hard as they could for government to pass any laws, to force anybody into anything.

□ 2200

You set up three branches as the Founders so that you couldn't just quickly pass a law. And even if you did, you have an executive branch that is elected outside of Congress. So it's not like a prime minister, where we elect one of our own in here to be the leader, similar to a President. We've got an executive branch.

And that's not enough. We set up a judicial branch that's appointed in the Federal system so that all of these things would help create gridlock. Today you hear people say, I'm tired of gridlock. The Founders thought it was the best gift they could ever give is a way to clog up the government so they wouldn't rush in and make laws unless they were absolutely necessary. We've gotten away from that. It's gotten too easy.

As we saw when the Republicans in 2001 had the White House, House, and the Senate, spending started like it hadn't before. Compassion was equated with giving away money. Whereas, if you go back to 1995, when Republicans took Congress as the majority, finally you started having a balanced budget, because this body creates the budget and the Senate eventually, hopefully, agrees. And then you've got a way to control spending.

We had a balanced budget once the Republicans took the majority, and things went great. And it's amazing to me—well, it's humorous, actually, to hear President Clinton taking credit for a balanced budget. He didn't do it. The Congress did. And in some cases, he was brought in kicking and screaming, but the Republican Congress balanced the budget.

It wasn't until they got giddy by having their own party in the White House that the brakes came off and spending increased so that we had \$100 billion, \$200 billion in deficit in 1 year. And that was so outrageous until this last year, when it was over a trillion, and this year maybe as much as \$1.6 trillion in 1 year. It's unbelievable. It's really irresponsible.

And now we read today in the paper that our majority leader is saying they are giving up all hope of passing a budget, too politically difficult. And as we heard one of the Democratic leaders say in 2006 before they won the majority, if you can't provide a budget, you can't govern. There's a lot of truth in that.

So we need to get away from the executive branch being the Congress, being the executive branch and the judicial branch. We saw that with the auto task force. This body created the bankruptcy laws. Bankruptcy is something provided for in the Constitution. But it wasn't created until the early 1800s, where the courts actually set up the system of bankruptcy.

And it was set up because the Founders believed that apparently nobody, no

business or body should ever be too big to fail. Because if you are failing, you can go through bankruptcy. And, in fact, if you are too big to fail, it is absolutely essential that you go through bankruptcy and reorganize and downsize so you will never put this country at that kind of risk again because you are still too big to fail and, in fact, have gotten even bigger. And that's what we've seen with Goldman Sachs. They've gotten even bigger. They should have been allowed to fail previously.

Well, I tell you, there is a brilliant man named Thomas Sowell. And I didn't vote for Barack Obama in 2008, but I sure would have voted for Thomas Sowell. His article says quite a lot. His editorial says here, and it's just been posted this week, but he says, "When Adolf Hitler was building up the Nazi movement in the 1920s," and I am quoting from Thomas Sowell in his editorial, "leading up to his taking power in the 1930s, he deliberately sought to activate people who did not normally pay much attention to politics. Such people were a valuable addition to his political base, since they were particularly susceptible to Hitler's rhetoric and had far less basis for questioning his assumptions or his conclusions. 'Useful idiots' was the term supposedly coined by V.I. Lenin to describe similarly unthinking supporters of his dictatorship in the Soviet Union."

And this isn't in the article, this is my comment, but we do have useful idiots today who are heard to say, Wow, what we really need is for the President to be a dictator for a little while. They know not what they say.

Anyway, back to quoting Thomas Sowell. "Put differently, a democracy needs informed citizens if it is to thrive or, ultimately, even survive. In our times, American democracy is being dismantled, piece by piece, before our very eyes by the current administration in Washington, and few people seem to be concerned about it. The President's poll numbers are going down because increasing numbers of people disagree with particular policies of his, but the damage being done to the fundamental structure of this Nation goes far beyond particular counterproductive policies."

"Just where in the Constitution of the United States does it say that a President has the authority to extract vast sums of money from a private enterprise and distribute it as he sees fit to whomever he deems worthy of compensation? Nowhere. And yet that is precisely what's happening," and he goes on.

And I will tell you, there is a reason we have to rely on the justice system, because if we didn't have that branch of government that could be the final arbiter of disagreements between groups, then there would be people like me who have seen the damage that rushing through, taking the cheaper way to drill in such a difficult area, seen the damage, the loss of lives,

those whose lives are still in jeopardy because of their grave injuries, the damage to the environment—and I just drove from New Orleans to Panama City. And there is anticipation of doom and gloom coming to many places, yet those people, the beaches are beautiful. From Panama City through Alabama through Mississippi, they are beautiful. But people aren't showing up to the beaches. They could at least come and enjoy them.

But BP just did an unconscionable thing. And if we did not have a justice system, if we were back to the days, as Israel once was, of just having a judge and I were the judge, you know, the tendency would be some people would be horsewhipped that cut corners and did all this damage. But there's a reason we don't have a judicial dictatorship so one man can't say you ought to be horsewhipped for what you have done.

What they've done is outrageous. And you can't help but think, because they had such good friends in the administration and in the majority, they thought they were bulletproof. They thought they could do whatever they wanted. And the President, their big buddy, Senator KERRY, the majority, especially in the Senate, they would cover for them. They would take care of them. They didn't know that when they did something this outrageous they would be thrown under the bus. But we should not have one branch that does that kind of dictation. It's not good. It's not good at all.

And then we have the problem with Israel being accosted by its enemies, and we are siding with the wrong people. I had a teacher in elementary school. She always took up for the bullies when they beat up the little guys. I know because I was a little guy in elementary school, and she always sided with the big bullies that had flunked a couple of grades and were bigger than the rest of us.

□ 2210

I will never forget those guys took my brand-new football I got for Christmas, and I went to get it back and my nose was bloodied, my face was pulverized, but then, as now, I don't run from a fight. And when the teacher was told by other students I was trying to get my nose to stop bleeding, she came into the boy's restroom, grabbed me, took me down to the classroom, marched me in front of the class and said, See, now, class, this is what happens when the little boys try to play with the big boys,

Well, that's kind of what's going on here. We've got bullies trying to bully Israel. We're siding with the wrong guys. There will be a price to pay if this continues. Israel's our friend. They have great value for human life, like we do in this country. If they were not in the Middle East, we would spend trillions of dollars trying to protect ourselves in that area from the things that are growing right now. We owe

them more than a thank you, and yet the U.S. voted to force them to disclose their nuclear weaponry, if any. You don't do that to friends. It's what Hezekiah did. He showed Babylonians all his armaments, his treasury and Isaiah told him, as a result, it is all going to be taken away. You don't show your enemies all of your defenses because they will figure out a way to overcome them.

I was just downstairs, in fact, in a little supper with Shaun Alexander, played football for Alabama, and was MVP with Seattle in the Super Bowl, just a great guy. But he mentioned four verses of scripture that really meant so much to him, and one of those was, he said, Deuteronomy 30:19, and I'm quoting from the most quoted book in this history of the Congress. In fact, our first 150 years, oftentimes our legislators were afraid to file a bill without having some scriptural basis to back it up. But Shaun quoted from Deuteronomy 30:19, I call Heaven and Earth to witness against you today that I've set before you life and death, the blessing and the curse. So choose life in order that you may live, you and your descendants.

Verse 20 goes on: By loving the Lord, your God, by obeying His voice and by holding fast to Him, for this is your life and the length of your days, that you may live in the land that your Lord swore to your fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob to give to them.

He also quoted from Matthew 5:24, No one can serve two masters, for either he will hate the one and love the other or he will hold to one and despise the other.

You cannot serve God and man. You know, these days, some want to serve a constituent and they get pulled away because they're torn. They'd like to serve a tremendous power in this country, torn between constituent service and power. And then in some cases, as we see here, apparently George Soros has made more money probably than anybody in this country because of British Petroleum and the moratorium and what all has happened there. Of course, this country apparently is standing for \$2 billion to help Brazil do deep exploration, and that will make hundreds of millions for Mr. Soros. I'm happy for anybody who make lots of money, but sometimes people in this body are torn between their constituent service or being a part of a powerful team.

It's why people in here are often gotten to move their vote one way or the other. I was told that before I got here. One of the hardest things is not when people come to you and say, yes, you're going to do this, you're going to vote this way, because most in this body are stubborn enough to say, no, I'm not going to do that. But where they get you is they say, come on, we thought you were a team player, we want you on our team, we want you one of the good guys on our team. And they hit you up on the team player thing.

And so good people in this body, in the Senate, even in the judiciary apparently when they allowed the auto task force, taking without due process in violation of the Constitution, turned bankruptcy upside down. They even convinced the judiciary to even look the other way and let the Constitution and the bankruptcy laws be turned upside down. So there are people who want to be part of the team, you know, and they forget the Constitution; and when that happens we break down what so many have fought and died for to give us this gift.

I heard my colleagues in the prior hour talking about how well the stimulus is going. I keep coming back, and Mark Levin quoted this in his book, "Liberty and Tyranny," and it ought to be a textbook, it's so good. But he quotes from Henry Morgenthau, the Secretary of the Treasury under Franklin D. Roosevelt. In 1939 Secretary Morgenthau was testifying—well, actually he wrote this. He said, We have tried spending money. We have spent more money than we have ever spent before, and now after 8 years, we have an unemployment rate that is just as high today as it was when we started, and we have an enormous debt to boot.

Human nature has not changed much since the 1930s. When the government starts spending money, then ultimately you're going to have a choice. You're going to have to keep borrowing or printing, and then ultimately you get in a position the Soviet Union was in. You can't print it fast enough to pay your debts, you can't borrow it fast enough, nobody will loan it to you anymore. So you have to go up and announce you're bankrupt as a nation and out of business.

By the way, one other thing I wanted to mention, and this happens when you refuse to enforce the laws. We had a President who just decided he was going to impose a drilling moratorium; and so the judiciary came in, considered the Constitution, considered the action after it viewed all the excuses and everything for imposing it, said this is arbitrary and capricious, you can't do this, there's no basis for a moratorium of all of these.

If you want to go after BP—he didn't say this, I'm saying it—you want to go after BP, say they're suspended until you make sure they're not cutting corners on other rigs, because we know they cut them—it sure looks like they cut them at least on Deepwater Horizon, that's one thing. But to do it on all the rigs when indications that we saw somewhere there were 750 safety violations for BP and in the same period I think Exxon, maybe Shell, had one? There's a reason maybe you could justify doing that with a BP rig but not all of them.

So the judge struck it down, and here already today the Secretary of the Interior says he's appealing it. Apparently, he likes the idea of having one branch of government run everything. Big mistake.

Then, not only that, a lot of folks may not know, Mr. Speaker, but there is, as I understand it, under Federal law the right of the Border Patrol to come into private landowners' land up to 25 miles from the border, anywhere, any of our borders to enforce our border. Everywhere around the border, they have that right up to 25 miles to come into private property if they need to to enforce our border.

Well, lo and behold, there is one place they can't, and that's on federally owned property like the national park in Arizona. There is apparently about 32 miles of border with Mexico that's a park that has now been announced to be closed to American citizens because there are too many illegals going across that land and tearing it up, and some have gotten violent and killed even law enforcement people in that area.

□ 2220

We can go on private property to protect our border, but we can't go on Federal land? That's outrageous. Rob Bishop has a bill to deal with that, and so do I. Rob has really done great research on this, he has really been the leader in the area of bringing this stuff out. We've got to do something; that is outrageous. We need defense, and we need to give a 25-mile, at least, area to the border patrol to patrol and just say that's not going to be national park wilderness area because our border means too much. We've got people wanting to come in here and destroy our way of life.

But I see my time is running shorter now. There were a lot of things I wanted to cover. But there are just so many people who do not understand, Mr. Speaker, where we came from and why there needs to be a firm foundation under this country. President Harry Truman—some may recall he was a Democrat—he said this: "The fundamental basis of this Nation's laws was given to Moses on the Mount." The fundamental basis of our Bill of Rights comes from the teachings we get from Exodus and St. Matthew, from Isaiah and St. Paul. I don't think we emphasize that enough these days. If we don't have a proper fundamental moral background, we will finally end up with a totalitarian government which does not believe in rights for anybody except the State. Boy, was he prophetic.

James Madison, given credit for writing the most in the Constitution, he said this on November 20, 1825: "The belief in a God all powerful, wise and good, is so essential to the moral order of the world and to the happiness of man that arguments which enforce it cannot be drawn from too many sources nor adapted with too much solicitude to the different characters and capacities to be impressed with."

Franklin D. Roosevelt said, "The skeptics and the cynics of Washington's day did not believe that ordinary men and women had the capacity for freedom and self-government. They

said that liberty and equality were idle dreams that could not come true. You know, they are like the people who carp at the Ten Commandments because some people are in the habit of breaking one or more of them." A lot of truth then.

Patrick Henry said this: "Bad men cannot make good citizens. It is impossible that a nation of infidels and idolaters should be a nation of free men. It is when a people forget God that tyrants forge their chains."

So much, so much truth in our heritage. And I just want to conclude with this, Thomas Jefferson's own words: "God who gave us life gave us liberty. And can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are the gift of God, that they are not to be violated but with his wrath. Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just, and his justice cannot sleep forever."

This government is not God, and the only protection from those who think they might begin to be is the enforcement of the three branches of government and their separate powers, and we've got to get back to that to save this Nation.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PLATTS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and June 23 on account of family medical reasons.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal 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 Mr. SCHAUER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MURPHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRAYSON, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, June 23, 24, and 25.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, June 28 and 29.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FORBES, for 5 minutes, June 23 and 24.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today, June 23, and 24.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, June 28 and 29.