

from some base of crude oil. And all of that is affected, and the costs of all those items that are produced in our refineries and petrochemical plants will be affected because of this arbitrary, capricious, and punitive decision to just stop deepwater drilling.

I would hope the administration would re-evaluate their position, quit suing Americans, get out of the courtroom and get down on the Gulf of Mexico and fix this problem and let people go back to work.

I yield back.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I appreciate the gentleman from Humble and his remarks that are right on target. I have some closing remarks, but I'd like the gentleman from Houston to conclude.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. BRADY, I just want to join you and Congressman POE in inviting the President to come to Houston. Come meet, firsthand, these people, these fine men and women who are so committed to finding and producing American oil and gas cleanly and safely. These are our neighbors and friends, Congressman BRADY and Congressman POE, who we live with, alongside, have picnics with. These are good people. We all know how committed they are to this Nation and to finding American oil and gas cleanly and safely.

Come to Houston, President Obama. Meet them firsthand. See how much pride they take in their work, how much pride they take in their country, and how valuable and important their role is in this Nation's economy.

I yield back.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Well, thank you.

And in conclusion, let me just say, these are not Republican workers. These aren't Democrat workers, these aren't Libertarian workers, these aren't tea party workers. They're just American workers. These are their jobs. These are their hopes, their dreams, and they didn't do anything wrong. They've paid for the bailouts of other industries. They're not asking for that. They just want to go back to work on the rig that's been safe.

Historically, these energy workers, 50,000 wells in the gulf, this is the first accident. It wasn't their fault. You don't ground them all because of it.

Yet, their lives are at stake. And our energy prices, our energy independence, revenue to our State and Federal Government, small businesses who will never survive this moratorium ever if it goes the full 6 months, did nothing wrong, whose reach is all throughout the United States of America.

We have a lot at stake here. We are asking Republicans and Democrats in Congress to join us in asking the President to end this moratorium. Accept, adopt the safe practices, the newest, the safest practices proposed by experts in the industry. Allow this safe drilling to go forward. Stop sending our rigs overseas. Stop sending our jobs overseas. Stop sending our service companies overseas, our capital, our best

and brightest minds, and ultimately our headquarters.

Keep America going on the path of energy independence. But don't hurt these 2 million workers who are tied to this important industry.

With that, I appreciate Congressman CULBERSON, Congressman POE, being here tonight, as well as Congressman SCALISE.

These are jobs. Put our American energy workers back to work.

□ 1630

#### THE GOVERNMENT IS BUYING TOO MUCH LAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KISSELL). 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, again it's certainly a privilege to get to speak in this hallowed hall, where so many courageous decisions have been made, and also so many ill-begotten decisions have been made.

Speaking of which, today in our Natural Resources Committee we voted a bill out of committee to deal with the disaster in the Gulf of Mexico, disastrous oil spill that hopefully, maybe, prayerfully, maybe, they have gotten the cap on things and are going to be able to stop the oil from destroying lives and livelihoods.

But our bill did some amazing things. For example, the bill we passed in committee—should be coming to the floor now for a vote for the whole Congress—provided \$900 million a year for the next 30 years, through 2040, to buy more land for the Federal Government to sit on. Now, it was pointed out that actually we already own so much land, we have so many Federal parks, national parks that we can't take care of them, and we are not taking care of them.

There is a report that indicated that just in maintenance alone we are \$3.7 billion behind on just doing necessary maintenance to keep the Federal parks from falling apart. And we are not taking care of that. And here we voted \$27 billion to buy more land for the Federal Government to sit on. And it's important to understand when the Federal Government buys any land at all, that land is immediately taken off of the tax rolls. And the schools, the local governments, the State governments are prohibited from taxing that land. So that land that has brought so much revenue in taxes to those schools, hired teachers, all that kind of thing, hired local servants, it goes away.

And there for a while when this started 100 years-plus ago, old people were assured locally, well, don't worry, though, like if we take timberland, we will sell timber, and we will give you a cut of the proceeds. Well, that's gone away. So the Federal Government takes land and the local folks get nothing.

Some say, oh, no, but it creates green jobs. Right. And just like Spain has found this year, as the report of the country that this administration and this majority has said repeatedly we want to emulate because they have moved toward a green economy, Spain has found that for every one green job that's been created they lost two jobs. And I am tired of looking into the faces of people who have lost their jobs due to no fault of their own, but due to terrible decisions by the public servants that were elected to come here to Washington and not meddle, not take over the country, but just to make sure there was a level playing field, people had an opportunity, not happiness, but the opportunity to pursue happiness. And what we find repeatedly is when this government, when any government weighs in and steps in and buys or takes over land, money, property, it doesn't really leave anybody happy.

So, I got a little chart here we put together yesterday that shows where we have been on money that was appropriated in the budget, been appropriated to buy land. You've got over \$100 million here, not quite \$150 million in 2008, and that was with this majority. This majority took over in 2007, 2008, and they had already gone many times from where we were in 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007. By 2008, the majority started just going many times over. That's how we got over \$100 million to buy land in 2008. And then the same majority in 2009 kicked it up quite a bit more over the \$150 million mark. 2010, this year, we are approaching nearly \$300 million to buy more land for the Federal Government to sit on. And in this bill that passed committee today, there is this provision for \$900 million. Why don't we just call it a billion? You know, you are that close. Doesn't seem like \$100 million means that much to this administration. But it's \$900 million a year for the next 30 years to buy more land.

I had such great hopes. We were hearing responsible economists telling us, you know, there is a way out of this runaway deficit. Now, \$1.5 trillion in 1 year, you know, it took the Bush administration a number of years to do that. And here, boom, 1 year we got it done here with this majority and this administration.

But economists have said, you know, get responsible. Quit frittering away money like it was no issue, like it's growing on trees, because it's growing off of China, and they're saying they about got enough. And we are printing it. Got printing presses running like crazy printing it. We will eventually pay for that with inflation. So the vote today was as if we got all the money in the world. Why not just buy more land?

And what we heard from people who live in the Western half of the country was, you've already taken so much of our State, why do you have to keep taking more and more? One Congressman from Utah, ROB BISHOP, had offered a verbal proposal: How about, if

you're so inclined to spend that much money, how about if we just say, okay, we will only buy land from now on from States in which the Federal Government owns less than 20 percent of the State? Because when you look at the Western United States, the red represents land owned by the Federal Government, you begin to understand why people in the West are saying haven't you taken enough of our land?

This country didn't start out owning all the land. And as we've seen over and over, we're not taking care of what we've got. And we've got people who have lost their jobs, and yet last summer we passed a bill for \$700 million to buy wild horses more habitat because there had been a bill before that that this majority passed that said you can't do anything about the overgrowing population of wild horses on Federal land. You can't use birth control, you can't sell them off in auctions. So they have proliferated.

And at a time when Americans are being thrown out of their homes in record numbers this year, foreclosures are up higher than ever before, bankruptcies continue to be filed, the folks in charge decide, you know what, let's take care of the wild horses. They matter more to us than all these people getting thrown out of their homes and losing their livelihoods. That's more important.

We have lost our priorities. And I understand it didn't just start in the last year-and-a-half. The President I admire greatly, who is smarter than most people give him credit for, a good man, he listened to maybe the worst Secretary of the Treasury we've ever had, Hank Paulson, as he ran around like Chicken Little saying the financial sky was falling, but give me \$700 billion and I can go make my friends rich, and I can fix everything. So Goldman Sachs didn't suffer, AIG didn't suffer. And the American people are suffering.

□ 1640

And I know I've heard people on the other side of the aisle, including this week, talking about, you know, all the rich, fat-cat Republicans, yet if you look at the truth—which is a good thing to look at time to time—you look at the truth and you find out that Wall Street families give to Democrats four times as much as they give to Republicans. You look at BP and you wonder why it took the Federal Government to intervene and call their hand? And they really haven't completely yet. And then you find out they gave much more to this administration than they did to the McCain campaign. They got heavy on Democratic lobbyists from administrations that were Democratic. They'd signed on to the crap-and-trade bill. We're pushing that to be passed.

So this administration, this majority didn't want to buck their good friend that was going to help them push through some things that were not going to help America even though

they were going to help BP get richer. So they hated to call their hand, and that's why it took so long. And we're fixing it by buying more land for the Federal Government. How in the world that makes sense.

Now, we also had the committee vote against my amendment that was very important, protecting our homeland. My amendment to the bill was very simple, and it arose out of finding out during hearings that there was only one entity within the Mines and Minerals Management Service that was allowed to be unionized, and that was the offshore inspectors. Unionized. Well, union contracts usually have restrictions on travel, restrictions on how much that can be worked, things like that. And it reminded me a great deal of the job of sentry. And in mock war games when I was in the Army, I sat sentry. I wasn't about to go to sleep, be court-martialed for that, at least an article 15 punishment because you're it. You're the protection for the rest of the people there. You're supposed to be standing guard. That's what our offshore inspectors are. And they're unionized.

And we were told by the Director of MMS that the real check of how we can be so sure that they're doing their job, we send them out in pairs. And we found out the last pair of offshore inspectors that went to the Deepwater Horizon rig before it blew was a father-and-son team. Yeah. So much for checks and balances. But that's what we got.

So my amendment just said for people who are offshore, deepwater rig inspectors, you can't strike and you can't threaten to strike. Just like if you're in the military, you can't go on strike. You're protecting the country. Our offshore inspectors are what stand between our homeland and environmental disaster and the loss of lives as we had on the Deepwater Horizon rig. And all but one Democrat voted against my amendment, so our offshore inspectors can strike, can get out there on a rig and say, "You know what? I'm what stands between our homeland and disaster, and either you give me what I want or I'm going on strike and you'll have no protection. And who knows, you may have another Deepwater Horizon happen because I'm not checking anything."

If you've got a problem with your contract, then get your Congress, get others to help if you're working for the Federal Government. But if you're not working for the Federal Government as a government employee and yet at the same time you are the protection for a country, you shouldn't be able to strike. And in this case, even though MMS had become basically, we're told, a stagnant pond that stunk it up because of the cozy relationship between the people that worked there and Big Oil, it had to be divided into three parts.

Well, we haven't found out how it's going to work out. I tried to find out

what else was going to be unionized once it was split into three parts, was told they didn't know, didn't know how exactly it was going to come out. But from east Texas, we often find if you want to fix a stagnant, stinking pond, it doesn't help if you just divide it up into three parts. You've got to do something to fix it, and we haven't seen that happen.

And, in fact, when we found out that a person involved in the leases that may have critical testimony as to why the price adjustment language was pulled out of the 1998-1999 leases that have now cost the Federal Treasury billions of dollars—1998-1999, under the Clinton administration. You want to know why they pulled that language out? It made billions extra for the oil companies, but it cost our treasury billions, because that language is normally in there.

Why did they dictate that it be pulled out? And I was told at a hearing by the Inspector General, well, I wasn't able to talk to people that were critical into finding out why they pulled that language out because they've left government service. When the Clinton administration left, they left. And then after hearing President Obama talk about the cozy relationship between the people in the government managing minerals and Big Oil, I had a hunch and checked. And sure enough, that person, one of the people I was told had been involved and had direct knowledge about the language being pulled that cost us so many billions of dollars, made it for companies like BP, found out she'd gone to work for British Petroleum when she left the Clinton administration. And in June of last year, she came back to work for the same people that managed the affairs of British Petroleum offshore.

Yep, the President knew what he was talking about. He has helped create a cozy relationship between those who were supposed to keep Big Oil honest and Big Oil.

And we find out BP had 800 or so safety violations. And this administration dealt with those in a strong way—by giving them a safety award for a wonderful safety record. And yet they were apparently the only company that had that horrible safety record when compared with Exxon and others that had one or zero violations.

You wonder why was BP entitled to a safety award, and then you find out who they gave most of their contributions to in the election. You find out they were going to support bills that the administration wanted pushed through when other big oil companies would not. So you begin to understand. They felt bullet proof. They felt like they had such good friends in the administration and in the majority that certainly nobody would ever throw them under the bus. Well, guess what? When the public heat got hot enough, they got thrown under the bus.

And how did we deal with it today? We passed a bill through committee to

appropriate \$900 million a year for the next 30 years to buy more Federal land. I haven't figured out how that solves the problem in the gulf. And, in fact, it creates a worse problem because, as we've already seen from this administration, they do not like to lease land for drilling.

And, in fact, in the prior administration, 7 years before this administration took office, a leasing process was begun to lease land in the Utah, Wyoming, Colorado area. And it took 7 years to get to the point that companies would be in a position to make a knowing bid, and the bid could be chosen, the high bid, for the lease. Those leases, after that 7 years, were let at the end of 2008. Immediately, Secretary Salazar came in and ordered that the checks not be cashed and then ordered that they be returned, that he was not going to allow the leases that took 7 years to come into being to exist because they were done at, in his words, the midnight hour.

□ 1650

For 7 years, he calls it the midnight hour, as the Bush administration left. So there went one source of oil that was going to help eliminate the need for deepwater drilling, and we've seen that happening over and over.

Last year, as I understand, the second most rich deposit of uranium was declared off limits. It came through our committee. That was a bill we voted out to put our second best source of uranium off limits, and that all at a time when we're trying to figure out ways how to get off carbon-based fuels, and nuclear should be one of those ways that we utilize, especially when you find out, as we have in our committee, that 90 percent of our uranium we're using in our nuclear plants right now is imported, and yet we have uranium that could be used for that.

God has so richly blessed this country with resources, when you take them all into consideration, like no nation in the world. When you look at all the natural resources that would produce energy, nobody comes close to this little country where we've had until more recently an experiment, as the Founders called it, in a democratic Republic, in an elected representative government.

We appropriated \$900 million a year for the next 30 years to buy land to put more of it off limits. You know, we heard when gasoline went to \$4 a gallon that actually there is land about 500 square miles in this country where within a 500-square-mile area, from the thicker tar sands, if oil is \$80 a barrel, they can do it and be able to make money, produce maybe 1 trillion barrels of oil. We've also heard in the entire Middle East there may only be 1 to 3 trillion barrels of oil; and yet, since then, we've heard there may be 3 to 5 trillion barrels of oil in that same area, as long as oil is \$80 a barrel or higher.

When you start realizing that, you go Why are we not like 90 percent effec-

tive in providing all our own energy? Why do we continue to fund people that hate us like Chavez and countries in the Middle East who are harboring terrorists and in which terrorists are farm fed and farm grown.

I mentioned yesterday here on the floor about Yemen. I just wonder how many New Englanders, how many people who live in Boston know that this year for the first time they've gotten rid of their contract for liquid natural gas, liquefied natural gas from areas that are very friendly to us, some in the Caribbean. That's been done away with, and now the contract for the next 20 years is with Yemen. Now, I know they're nice folks. I've met some nice folks from Yemen, but they also happen to harbor terrorists; and when people from Guantanamo were released to Yemen, they ended up getting away and those terrorists are at large, maybe back here in the United States now.

Another thing, of course, that occurred today, in addition to this massive appropriation that came out of committee, we find out the Senate has voted to send the so-called financial reform bill to the President for signature to come into law. Breaks my heart. Now, there's some things in there that are good reform rules and changes that needed to be done, but there are also poison pills in that bill.

For example, the systemic risk council in which we have some Federal, unelected, unconfirmed by anybody in Congress bureaucrats who are going to decide what businesses they deem to be a systemic risk and, therefore, businesses that the Federal Government will never let fail.

What happened to America? We used to be the land of the free. When the government gets to pick and choose, we're going to let your business be the one that lives because nobody can compete effectively with a business that can run in the red because they know the government will not let them fail because other businesses can't run in the red. They have to declare bankruptcy. So what used to be the land of the free has become the land of the government's hand-picked winners and hand-picked losers. We're not going to allow the opportunity to sink or swim as God as given us, as we've been endowed with by our Creator, because our government has now come to the point where it's decided we're not going to let you decide who wins by how hard you work and how smart you work; we are going to pick winners and losers with our systemic risk council.

There are things in there, once again, they're going to cripple community banks who have suffered enough because of the greed, in some cases avarice, displayed in some of the investment banks. It nearly brought the finances to a standstill. Community banks have just been lumped in with them, and they've been hurt by the regulators and it is tragic.

So much for the financial reform bill because it deforms the market that

used to exist, and this government has gotten so busy picking winners and losers and meddling and telling car makers what kind of cars to make and exactly what they've got to do to make them, how to make them, what they can do to make them, and how they got to be when they're finished. We've gotten so busy into the minutia of things that we shouldn't be involved in that the government—we haven't done our jobs, because if we had there would never have been somebody that was able to bilk people out of \$50 billion of their life savings so they could squander it on himself. There were plenty of red flags that went up, but we were too busy as a government meddling to actually do the job to make sure everyone has a level playing field, everybody has an opportunity and people are playing fair, and when they're not playing fairly we punish them.

That's what government is supposed to do; and if as the Founders you look at Romans 13:1-4, you see that as the Founders believed, government's ordained by God. And if you believe as philosophers have pointed out that a democracy ensures that a people are governed no better than they deserve, then you see that we get what we deserve.

So for generations they have been deserv-ing of more opportunity than the last generation before them, and now we come to a place where 70 percent of adults in America when polled say they don't believe their children will have as good a life, as good opportunities as they've had. That has never been the case in American history that a majority of Americans would say that. We've lost our way.

But if you're concerned about the detainees in Guantanamo, there's good news. We've been releasing detainees. And this is a report from this year: it's believed that roughly 20 percent of the 560 detainees released from Guantanamo are back on the terror front lines.

□ 1700

Interesting, huh?

But I really like this story about Abdullah Massoud. He came to Guantanamo, as the House panel was told previously, he came to us without one leg from about the knee down, and we fitted him with a prosthetic leg before he left while he was in U.S. custody. So the leg, this report indicates, the artificial limb cost American taxpayers between \$50,000 and \$75,000. But it was nowhere to be found after Massoud had directed a homicide attack that killed 31 people, and then two months later blew himself up to avoid capture. Now, that was in 2005 that he had been released and did that, so you would think that a smart administration would come in and learn from mistakes of prior administrations.

We heard friends across the aisle over here say over and over, you got to stop deficit spending, and our friends across the aisle won the majority in 2006 for

that very reason. Republicans were deficit spending. Now by a margin of about 8 to 1 or 10 to 1 that has been increased in deficit spending for one year. Extraordinary.

Well, then we get back to the issue of morality, because this is what it all comes back to. As Chuck Colson said previously, when you demand the morals of Woodstock, you are going to have to expect some Columboes.

Think about it. When the morality that is demanded by those in charge is one that says if it feels good, do it, then somewhere you are going to have some nut that thinks it might be interesting to find out how it feels to kill people. It might feel good, so let's do it. You can't demand the morality of Woodstock and not expect some terrible tragedies to be wrought from that.

That can also be pointed in the direction of the loss of life of the unborn. We used to talk in terms of over 40 million abortions. Now we are talking about over 50 million abortions.

So we have got to get back to a morality that recognizes there is something more important than ourselves, and it is not the government. It is that we have been endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights, and among those are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and unless we are willing to fight for our endowment, to fight for our inheritance, then, as so many generations, so many countries before us, we lose that for which so many paid the ultimate price. We have an obligation as a government to protect those who have entrusted us with this responsibility.

When I was a judge, one of the jobs was to qualify people for jury duty for anything from significant civil cases to capital murder cases. There were some disqualifications listed in statute, and many times, thank goodness, not that often, but over my 10 years I would have people come in and say, I won't be able to be qualified to be on a jury because I am a Christian, and I am not supposed to judge lest I be judged, and I am supposed to turn the other cheek.

What they didn't understand is, and I never sought to use my position to force my beliefs on someone else, but if they would read their scripture more carefully, they would find out as individuals, we are to forgive and turn the other cheek, but the government is given the responsibility that no individual has.

As Romans talks about, God has given the sword, and the government is his minister to punish evil. And if you do evil, be afraid, because that sword is not given in vain.

You have to understand our history, and that is where maybe we begin to fall down, when people didn't learn our history, and they didn't find out that the Founders were so excited, 1775, 1776, especially around the time of the Declaration, July 4, 1776, because they said we have within our grasp something that philosophers have only dreamed

about. We have the chance to govern ourselves.

In England they had a parliament, but the king could throw them out at any time, and did. This was going to be a nation for the first time not like Rome, where there was a Caesar, but where people would govern themselves. And that sword would be given not to a Caesar, not to a king, not to a duke, but to the people, we the people.

So a method of government was set up such that the people as the government would hire servants to come in and do what they hired them to do, and if they didn't do what they were hired to do and said they would do, were told to do, then they could be fired and replaced by other servants, public servants, to do what the government, the people, we the people, said must be done.

So when citizens of this country, these United States, are called for jury duty and they refuse to serve and they try to do so on the basis of saying, well, I am a Christian, then they have rejected Romans, they have rejected teaching in both the Old and New Testament, they have rejected the sword, the power that was ordained and put in their hand, and said I am not going to do my job. I reject the power that God has placed at my disposal to protect my country.

And when people don't go out and vote, it is the same thing. They are rejecting the power that was put in their hand to govern this country. And when they don't support good candidates, they are rejecting the power that was put in their hands to hire their own servants to carry out their will. And when they don't run for office when they feel that calling to do so, the same thing. They can't say they are an obedient Christian, the way I read scripture and the way so many before us in the founding of this country read it, if they are willing to walk away from that power that is put in their hand to govern this country by hiring servants and firing servants when they don't do their jobs.

Now, I have been told by my staff, you have to be careful talking about those things, because you have an election every 2 years. Somebody could come in and say, okay, I am using your words against you. The people have the right to hire and fire, and so I am saying it is time to fire you.

Well, I am not afraid of that, because I believe I am doing what my district hired me to do. I serve at their pleasure and at their will, and if they say I am not doing the proper job because I believe in this little experiment in elected representative government, this incredible gift that this Nation was given so long ago and has fought to keep ever since, I believe in it to the point where, yes, it will hurt to be defeated, it will hurt your pride. But I can also say thank the Lord, I know there is something else for me to do.

The people, for good, for bad, in a democracy, get the government they de-

serve. And I think it is too important that people understand that to worry about somebody using my own words against me. Come on and use them, and I will run on my record.

□ 1710

Speaking of the record, we were talking about Guantanamo and people—detainees—that have been released. This article was incredibly good news. The headline in the New York Times said, "Five Charged in 9/11 Attacks Seek to Plead Guilty." Hallelujah. What great news that is.

From Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. "The five Guantanamo detainees charged with coordinating the September 11th 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. That is such great news. Such great news.

Unfortunately, that was on December 9, 2008. December 9, 2008, the five people alive still most responsible for the killing—the wanton, lustful, murderous killing—of over 3,000 people in New York City and in the Pentagon were ready to plead guilty, and this administration came in and snatched defeat for justice from the jaws of victory. It just seems like somebody owes an apology to the victims' families from 9/11 for taking a victory and justice being done and throwing it away, costing millions—some project hundreds of millions, maybe billions—to try these terrorists who, 2 years ago, were ready to plead guilty, and now, with the encouragement of this administration, are ready to play games. Very tragic.

As the last minutes come to an end for this session of Congress, for today, which will be the last for this week, I want to close as I try to normally do by pointing to some history so that, Mr. Speaker, people will understand where we came from. There is no way to really chart a good path of where you're going in the future unless you honestly know where you've been without it being a deception.

There are those who continue to say that George Washington was not a religious man, that he was a deist, didn't really believe in religion, didn't practice religion; and those are great lies. Anyone can go read the huge book George Washington's Sacred Fire written by the same guy that wrote this, Peter Lillback, over in Philadelphia.

Here is a letter, text written by the moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly, Rev. John Rodgers, in his correspondence with Washington during the war about giving away Bibles to the American troops. The Presbyterians as a group wrote:

"We adore Almighty God, the author of every perfect gift, who hath endued you"—talking about George Washington—"with such a rare and happy assemblage of talents as hath rendered you equally necessary to your country in war and in peace; the influence of your personal character moderates the divisions of political parties."

He had such integrity and character that it moderated through all the squabbles between the parties. They say on further:

"A steady, uniform, avowed friend of the Christian religion, who has commenced his administration in rational and exalted sentiments of piety, and who in his private conduct adorns the doctrines of the Gospel of Christ." That's not a deist.

But, anyway, the letter says Washington "adorns the doctrines of the Gospel of Christ, and on the most public and solemn occasions devoutly acknowledges the government of divine Providence." That's where we came from. They recognized his character. I read yesterday where Washington's own order said that there could be no higher compliment to the soldiers than that they put on Christian qualities, the qualities of a Christian.

In June of 1985 in a decision, *Wallace v. Jaffree*, unfortunately it was in dissent, but William Rehnquist pointed out the deception that was being talked about by Lillback in the *Wall of Misconception*, and these are Rehnquist's words:

"The wall of separation between church and state is a metaphor based on bad history, a metaphor which has proved useless as a guide to judging. It should be frankly and explicitly abandoned."

And in the Supreme Court decision, *Lynch v. Donnelly*, the decision itself actually said:

"The Constitution does not require complete separation of church and state. It affirmatively mandates accommodation, not mere tolerance, of all religions, and forbids hostility toward any." And yet we find today as we dealt with hate crime issues, the only group which it is becoming lawful and unfortunate to show prejudice against are Christians. The same people our Founders kept talking about.

Patrick Henry correctly warned future Americans the following:

"Bad men cannot make good citizens. It is impossible that a nation of infidels or idolators should be a nation of free men. It is when a people forget God that tyrants forge their chains."

John Adams wrote, August 28, 1811:

"Religion and virtue are the only foundations, not only of republicanism"—and that doesn't mean our Republican Party at all; it means the system where we have elected Representatives—"they are the foundations not only of republicanism and of all free government, but of social felicity under all governments and in all the combinations of human society." This is just so important that people understand these things.

Harry Truman stated this:

"The fundamental basis of this nation's laws was given to Moses on the Mount." And isn't it ironic, when this Hall of Representatives was built and decorated, above every door up in the gallery is a profile of all of those that our predecessors believed were the

greatest lawgivers of all time. The greatest.

Hammurabi. Some say, why is Napoleon up there? The Napoleonic Code. The Justinian Code, of course. But in the middle is the only face that's not a side profile and that is because he was considered to be the greatest lawgiver of all time. As it says under his face, Moses. That's the Moses Truman was talking about.

Truman goes on:

"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."

John F. Kennedy said, "The rights of man come not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God."

Supreme Court Justice Douglas remarked, "We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being."

James Madison said in November of 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 it."

□ 1720

Our history is so full of such incredible quotes. But those words that are carved into the Jefferson Memorial, so powerful, are these: "God who gave us life gave us liberty. And can the liberties of a Nation be thought secure when we have removed from their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are of 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; that His justice cannot sleep forever."

That's why we begin every session every day in this Congress with prayer led by a minister from that podium, going back to the unanimous motion by Benjamin Franklin, that unless the Lord build a house, they labor in vain that build it. If we have the morals of Woodstock, we can expect more tragedies. We can expect more greed and more avarice, more lawlessness, and more rights to be usurped by the servants that were elected and selected and hired. And we owe the future generations so much better than that.

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

#### 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 Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RANGEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HONDA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, 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. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, July 21 and 22.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, July 22.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, July 22.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, July 19, 20, 21, and 22.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 689. An act to interchange the administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal lands between the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3360. An act to amend title 46, United States Code, to establish requirements to ensure the security and safety of passengers and crew on cruise vessels, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4173. An act to promote the financial stability of the United States by improving accountability and transparency in the financial system, to end "too big to fail", to protect the American taxpayer by ending bailouts, to protect consumers from abusive financial services practices, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4840. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1981 Cleveland Avenue in Columbus, Ohio, as the "Clarence D. Lumpkin Post Office".

H.R. 5502. An act to amend the effective date of the gift card provisions of the Credit Card Accountability Responsibility and Disclosure Act of 2009.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 19, 2010, at 12:30 p.m., for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8341. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of two violations of the Antideficiency Act, Case Numbers 06-03 and 07-03, pursuant