

money. Where has it come from? I don't know.

Remember, the United States Congress has not passed a single appropriations bill this year. We are running on the appropriations bills from last year under a continuing resolution that was passed on September 30, before we went home at the end of September. But the Office of Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight did not exist until June of this year, so where is the money appropriated that is responsible for running this agency?

Well, I am told it is reprogrammed from other places within HHS, and HHS has the money for this implementation. But I beg to differ. Those monies are supposed to be appropriated by the United States Congress. We are, by law, under the Constitution, responsible for the purse strings. We are supposed to be the ones that write the checks to the Federal agencies to allow them to do their work; and it is by that activity that the United States House of Representatives is able to keep a little bit tighter leash, as far as oversight is concerned, on Federal agencies.

But here we have a brand-new Federal agency that, as best as I can determine, was not called for in the law that was signed by the President. You have various offices, all of which will be employing multiple people. So every one of these places on the flowchart are going to have a number of people working there and answering to the director of that part of the Office of Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight.

Wouldn't it be great to have at least one hearing in the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, or the Health Subcommittee, to ask the folks who are in charge of this to come in to the committee and tell us what they are doing?

Who has been in charge? Just for an example, who has been in charge of looking at this to see if there was duplication? Surely all of these functions, some of them were probably already being performed by the Department of Health and Human Services. Have we got anybody looking at the duplication of effort that may now be occurring?

Everyone bemoans the growth of Federal Government. Everyone bemoans the rapid rise in Federal debt. But do we have anyone who is looking at where duplication may be occurring, where there may be cost savings?

If there is an Office of Insurance Programs and the Office of Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight, maybe there is another office that can be closed in the Department of Health and Human Services. If there is a Division of Rules Compliance, maybe there is another office at either Health and Human Services or the Office of Personnel Management that is no longer necessary. Why have we not had the oversight hearing to understand where the duplication is occurring and where the additional costs may be being expended that are actually unnecessary?

What is the total employment for this entire flowchart? What is the total employment? What is the total salary information? Is there anyone who is being paid in excess of what would be the normal Federal pay level? We don't know the answer to any of these questions.

What is the background of the individuals who have come here? Are they basically people who have contributed to political campaigns in the past, or are these people who have brought with them particular expertise? And again I would argue, if there is particular expertise that they are providing, is that expertise then not necessary in another office that is currently in existence in the Department of Health and Human Services?

Look, let's be honest. This health care bill that was signed into law last March was not a bipartisan product.

□ 1910

The only thing that was bipartisan about this bill was the opposition. Democrats crossed the aisle and voted with Republicans against this bill. No Republican voted in favor of this bill last March.

What have we seen as a result of this election? A profound, profound change in what the American people saw and did in regard to the United States Congress. There are six new doctors in the freshman class. Absolutely unprecedented, again, in my time in Congress, and I think it says something about the people who actually deliver the health care in this country, what their opinion is of Congress at this point. "My golly, if this is what they are going to do, maybe I better get up there and take care of it myself." After all, that is the way doctors are wired.

This is a flawed process that led to a flawed product. It must be repealed. I look forward to that day in January when that repeal vote is held. In the meantime, and after that, until we can actually get things under control, the oversight process and the funding for the implementation must be under strict scrutiny.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker of the House:

Nov. 15, 2010.

Hon. LORRAINE C. MILLER,
*Clerk, House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MADAME CLERK: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for deposition testimony and documents issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia in connection with a civil case now pending before that court.

After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations re-

quired by Rule VIII of the Rules of the House.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House.

REDUCING THE DEFICIT

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, tonight, since we have heard over and over about how destructive the deficits are from the President, I thought we would discuss some of the ways we can work on that. There are plenty of good solutions.

We discussed yesterday the fact that this administration pushed through a \$400 billion land grab bill that would allow them to spend \$400 billion to just buy land. I like my friend from Utah Rob Bishop's proposal that before people from States that don't have much, if any, Federal ownership of land keep pushing through bills to buy up land in other States, that they should be required to sell land first to the Federal Government in those States, so that any State that has less than 20 percent ownership by the Federal Government needs to find out what it is like when the Federal Government takes over land in a State, deprives the local government of any tax base from that land, deprives the local area of any economic growth to speak of from that land.

Yes, there are parks in certain ones that are very active and provide money to the area, jobs, things like that. But more often, when the Federal Government comes in and grabs land and puts it off limits, it just starves the local schools, it starves the local government of any assistance.

Now, originally when the Federal Government started grabbing land and taking it away from local areas, yes, they paid something for some of it, but there was an agreement; look, we know we are taking away all of this revenue from local government, from schools, so tell you what: We will provide you with part of the revenue off of the land, whether it was from the trees, which are one of our greatest renewable resources, or whether it was from natural resources like oil, gas and minerals of different kinds.

But that all changed, and so many local governments and schools have been left high and dry, which is often the case. The Federal Government makes you promises, and you rely on those promises to your detriment, and unlike in the law with any individual who makes promises on which you rely to your detriment, raising the legal issue of promissory estoppel, you can't use it against the Federal Government. In fact, all that you get is a look from some people in Federal Government that, well, it is all your fault, because you trusted us. Did you not know you can't trust our Federal Government?

So we don't even know what land has been purchased with that \$400 billion that we were borrowing from China and other places. But if we just quit buying, sold what we had, sold our interest in General Motors and Chrysler, sold our interest in Wall Street, sold off Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, sold off things that this government shouldn't be doing, opened up the Federal Reserve books so everybody could see what was going on, clean that up of anything that there is Federal involvement in that there shouldn't be in the way of assistance and ownership and money just flowing to Wall Street buddies of this administration, we could save a lot of money from that, \$400 billion just from that one bill.

Then when you look at the \$10 billion that we are in arrears on maintenance and upkeep for our current buildings on national parklands, the reason is we are just squandering it buying more and more land, and in many cases we are buying land adjoining parks that really has no similarity to the characteristics that made it a park in the first place. Sometimes it was just some friend in Congress that some wealthy landowner was able to get to push through a bill to make it a part of a national park, which forced the Federal Government to buy it.

We need to have a committee go through and examine exactly what is really characteristic of a national park for the reason that it was set aside. You have got some that will be enormous, whether it is Yellowstone or the Grand Tetons, some beautiful national parks, Grand Canyon and others. But for those that are not so big but we just added thousands of acres, we need to take a look at disposing ourselves of that land for a price and getting out of that business, and then using the money to actually help the national park facilities that we have, and with the rest of it, bring down the deficit.

One of the other things that we could do to save money and actually would be a far better foreign policy is in a bill I introduced in this Congress, the 111th. It is H.R. 4636. I have filed it in the 110th and in the 109th Congress, this is the third time, and it doesn't look like it is going to get to the floor in this Congress, but I have hopes for the next Congress.

What this bill does, and the summary of the bill at the top, officially it says "To prohibit United States assistance to foreign countries that oppose the position of the United States in the United Nations."

Basically in essence it goes through, it is a very short bill, just 5 pages, nothing like a 2,800- or 1,300- or 2,000-page bill, 5 pages, but in essence any nation that votes against the United States' position in contested votes more than half the time will receive no financial assistance from the United States the following year. Each year, on or about March 31st, we get a report from the U.N. on all the votes and how each member nation voted, so it is

really easy to calculate after March 31st of each year exactly how nations voted.

Now, some would say, oh, well, that is not caring and loving, and you have said before that you are a Christian. How can you treat nations like that? And it is very important that people understand the basis for a Christian approach to government.

We don't use our office to shove our beliefs down on others. But just so people know where the philosophy comes from, it is helpful to take a look. In fact, I was noticing online regarding the book by Jerry Boykin, just a real national treasure, a national hero, a lieutenant general in the United States Army, part of the original Delta Force. It has been my honor and pleasure to meet with him and share a meal with him.

□ 1920

But this is a real hero. And he has a book out, "Never Surrender." Publishers Weekly went through and said, Lieutenant General Boykin's illustrious military career takes center stage in this personal account of religious faith in the proverbial foxhole. He was thrust into several harrowing encounters such as the events portrayed in the film "Black Hawk Down," the Iranian hostage crisis, and the current war on terror.

Boykin delivers frontline perspectives on the military missions in which he engaged, and the accounts are charged with excitement. Some may find his writing a bit polarizing. He's not subtle regarding his dislike for Democratic political figures like Jimmy Carter and JOHN KERRY. Others will be inspired by how he faced death on a number of occasions and held tightly to his faith as a buoy through tumultuous and dark times.

Toward the end of his career, Boykin began giving public talks, inspiring people to faith in God and to ideals of the United States. While Boykin is to be commended for his patriotism, bravery, and conviction, the book never successfully explains, this says, how his military career co-existed with some of the more pacifist tenets of Christianity.

And so sometimes people hear debate on the floor, they hear people taking different positions, and a question like this being raised by Publishers Weekly is often helpful because we know where people are ignorant so that we can help bring them along so that you can understand where people are coming from the different faiths that exist here in the Members of the House of Representatives.

But, regarding that, many know scriptures. I've heard friends across the aisle accusing people on this side—I've had Democratic friends say, Jesus said you're to be kind one to another; treat your neighbor as yourself. The Golden Rule, of course, is often used here. Helping widows and orphans. Things like that. We are to turn the

other cheek. We're to be humble as individuals. But when it comes to the government, the government has a far different role. The government's role is exactly as the oath we take in this Chamber and will do so on January 5, 2011, exactly what it says.

One of the most important—I think the most important—is providing for the common defense. Protect the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. You have to go back to the founding of this country. It is easy to look at the back of a dollar bill and understand those are the two sides of our great seal on the back of a dollar bill. On the one side, the eagle with the ribbon through his mouth, *e pluribus unum*; out of many, one.

We welcome immigrants. We do. Thank God for the immigrants that have come to this country. I asked my mother once—my late mother once—what we were on her side of the family, and she said, Son, you're a duke's mixture. I said, Well, that sounds good. What does that mean? And she said, Well, if we were in the dog world, son, you would be a mutt. So apparently I come from many different areas of the world in my genealogy. But that's what *e pluribus unum* was designed to address. We welcome people from all over the world. They come here and become one people. We welcome people that speak all kinds of languages. But in order to do as that phrase says that our Founders thought was so important, we need one language.

You go do research. Or, as I was an exchange student in the Soviet Union, you find one of the problems they have was trying to make sure all of these people within the Soviet Union spoke the same language. They were very aggressive about it. Pretty mean-spirited about it. We're not. But we need people to speak the same language. And when I see people across the country saying, Let's teach these immigrants in their own language, let's teach these children in the language of the country they come from, I know they mean well. But what they do is condemn those children to manual labor jobs. Like my good friend Gus Ramirez back in Tyler, Texas, said, his parents immigrated from Mexico, and his dad was exceedingly strict about it. Gus said his mom and dad spoke Spanish in their home, but in essence he said, Son, if you're going to be anything in this country, you've got to speak good English. And that is why I expect you kids to speak English in the home.

As a result, Gus has been city councilman, county commissioner, a successful businessman. But if you really care, you would want these young children to reach their God-given potential. Be the president of the company, not the ditch digger for the company. Just teach them English. And we can be one Nation under God, *e pluribus unum*; out of many, one.

On the other side, though, you have the pyramid with the triangle above it and you see the all-seeing eye of God.

The eye represents the all-seeing eye of God. And above it the Latin phrase “annuit coeptis,” meaning he, God, has smiled on our undertaking. They believe that. Because as Ben Franklin said at the Constitutional Convention, during the contest with Great Britain when we were sensible of danger, Franklin said, we had daily prayer in this room. Our prayers, sir, were heard and they were graciously answered. They knew that. They knew that God was smiling on their undertaking.

But underneath the pyramid are the words “novus ordo seclorum,” Latin, meaning in essence, “new order of the ages.” Now order of things. And the reason they had that was they knew there had been a parliament in England, of course. They talked about it. They knew that there had been a senate in ancient Rome. There had been other places where there had been legislating groups. But they also knew in all of those there was a king or a Caesar or somebody who could overrule whatever was done and even disband the legislative body.

So what they were designing was a government where the people would be the government. The people would rule themselves. That’s why this was a totally new order of things. This was not a new world order. It was a new order of the ages where people would get to govern themselves. And for most of this country’s history people understood they were the government and that you would have the hiring day and you should prepare yourself for hiring day so that when you went and voted or hired servants to go do your will, that you, the people as the government, would hire successful servants who would do the will of the government. That was their thought. That’s why it was a new order of the ages. People were going to govern themselves.

So in that context, when we know that the government of this country was supposed to be we, the people, and that those of us who are elected and sent to this august body, we’re supposed to be servants. That was the point. So if you look to a chapter that addresses the government’s obligation, it’s different from those of individuals—individuals being kind. But when you’re government here, when you’re the servants that are supposed to carry out the government job, you have an obligation to protect the people that sent you here. You’re the servants that are supposed to protect the people. If you’re in the military, you’re the extension, you’re the instrument of the government to protect the people.

So when you look at Romans 13, and this is in the New American translation, you will find it says—Romans 13:1—let every person be subordinate to the higher authorities, for there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been established by God. Parenthetically, here, that means in the United States, in this new order of things, the people are that authority.

□ 1930

It is the people who elect, who hire the servants, and so the collective will of the people is the government, as carried out by their servants, they send to places like Washington.

Verse 2 says: Therefore, whoever resists these authorities opposes what God has appointed. Those who oppose it will bring judgment upon themselves.

However, here in the United States, this government was created where the people are the government, so they are expected to do their jobs—to hire good people. So, when the people get upset, they’re resisting the servants in this country. They’re not resisting the government. They are the government. They’re resisting the servants and the arrogance and the atmosphere of arrogance that has so resided in this city for so long.

Verse 3 goes on: that basically rulers are not a cause of fear to good conduct but to evil.

Do you wish to have no fear of authority? Then do what is good. You’ll receive approval from it.

For it, the government, is a servant of God for your good; but if you do evil, be afraid, for it, the government, does not bear the sword without purpose. It is the servant of God to inflict wrath upon the evildoer.

So, apparently, the folks at Publishers Weekly were not aware of that basis that I know our friend and our hero, General Jerry Boykin, was aware of. He was the sword. He was part of the sword as the military. So, if you do evil, whether it is in Iran or in Panama or wherever our military and the Delta Force was sent, Romans 13 says to be afraid because they don’t bear that sword in vain. If you do evil, they’re coming after you.

Why would they do that? Because they are part of the instrument that is to protect the people in this country so that the people can go about carrying out the beatitudes that Jesus pointed out.

Some say that Washington surely wasn’t a Christian, but in his own resignation that he sent out to the 13 State Governors, he ends his resignation like this—and I won’t read the whole thing, but it says:

I now make it my earnest prayer that God would have you and the State over which you preside in His holy protection and to entertain a brotherly affection and a love for one another, for their fellow citizens of the United States and particularly for their brethren who have served in the field and, finally, that He would most graciously be pleased to dispose us all to do justice, to love mercy and to demean ourselves with that charity, humility and peaceful temper of the mind, which were the characteristics of the Divine Author of our blessed religion and without a humble imitation of whose example in these things we can never hope to be a happy Nation.

He signed with the words: “I have the honor to be, with great respect and es-

teem, your Excellency’s most obedient and very humble servant, George Washington.”

Well, he understood. He got it. He was the servant of the government. That was part of the new order of things, the New Order of the Ages—people governing themselves—but the military is the instrument. It is the sword. Some people may not be aware, but a sword is not meant as a loving touch to people. Normally, it could be used to knight people in some places like England of old, but the sword is an instrument of war, and it’s not wielded by the government in vain. If you come after this country, it’s supposed to be wielded in response. When we are attacked, when an act of war comes against this Nation as attacking a Nation’s embassy is—taking embassy personnel hostage is an act of war—then there should be a sword to execute wrath immediately.

I was at Fort Benning when that happened in 1979, and our President did nothing but, in essence, beg the Iranians to let them go. It seemed that it was 2 or 3 days that the spokesman in Iran for the Ayatollah was saying, The students have them. The students have them. It seemed to me, as a member of the United States Army at the time, that he’s leaving himself a backdoor.

President Carter should have said, Okay. You’re saying the students have them. You get our hostages out within 48 hours or we accept what happened as what it is, an act of war, and we are bringing the full wrath of the United States military to Tehran. If you harm those hostages, then to use the words of Romans 13:4, be afraid because we’re not going to wield the sword in vain. You will pay a very heavy price.

Since our President didn’t do that—he allowed them to keep the hostages for well over a year—it has been a great recruiting tool for the terrorists for the last 30 years. Look. Remember 1979? We committed an act of war against the United States, and they did nothing. They, you know, just sat around and looked helpless.

There was the disastrous effort in the desert, and from what people I know and trusted back at the time had told me and from what I’ve read since and from what I’ve heard from people involved since, President Carter scaled down the escape effort going into Iran from what was originally proposed. As a result, they didn’t have enough helicopters when they got to the staging area.

As we should have learned from Vietnam and as we should know in Afghanistan, unless you’re going to have rules of engagement which say to our men and women in uniform that we’re going to give you everything you need and that your life is precious to us, so you protect yourselves, and you go win the war, and do everything you can to win, and we’ll give you everything you need to win—unless we’re willing to do that, we shouldn’t send them. Don’t send

them. This President hasn't shown sufficient commitment to those in Afghanistan, and if we're not going to do that, we need to get them out. We need to bring them home.

Yet there are people who want to destroy us over there who we haven't adequately addressed, and it is turning into another Vietnam, it seems. That's not our role. If you believe the Biblical perspective, we're to execute wrath on those who have done evil, and we haven't finished doing that.

So I have this bill in this Congress, H.R. 4636. I don't know what the number will be next year. Just so people know how things stand, I'll give you some of the numbers:

Heck, Pakistan. I think we gave Pakistan \$738 million, and they voted against us last year 87.5 percent of the time. Shoot, the Philippines. They've shown that as a government they don't have a lot of love and adoration for this country. They voted against us a majority of the time, and we gave them over \$116 million. Russia, which just provided their best anti-aircraft weapon from Lebanon to Iran, heck, we gave them nearly \$100 million. They may have used some of that \$100 million, since money is fungible, to build the S-300s to provide to Iran so they could shoot down Israeli or American planes. We might simply, if we have a courageous President, someday go after the nuclear threat that is looming in Iran. South Africa, they voted against us most of the time last year, and these figures say we gave them \$574 million. Sudan, they voted against us 90 percent of the time last year. We gave them \$337 million.

Interesting stuff here.

Let's see. You've got Yemen, Yemen which provided people who apparently attacked us in what was an act of war against the USS *Cole*. We didn't respond, really, as if it were an act of war. We didn't wield a sword and do what we should have, but we gave Yemen about \$17 million last year, and they voted against us most of the time, naturally.

□ 1940

These attempted terrorist attacks of the packages that were sent, apparently planned and emanating from Yemen, well, we're giving Yemen money to help that country as they attempt to fight everything we believe in, most everything we believe in, in the U.N.

Venezuela, our dear friend Venezuela. We gave them \$10 million. There may have been some other pockets we used money from, but from this pocket we gave them nearly \$10 million, and, of course, they vote against us the vast majority of the time.

Uganda votes against us most of the time. We gave them \$351 million.

Let's see, others. Bangladesh, they voted against us 80 percent of the time. We gave them \$105 million. Bolivia, they voted against us 70 percent of the time. We gave them \$103 million.

Brazil, heck, we just provided a \$2 billion loan for their deepwater drilling program. Probably didn't hurt that that was George Soros' single largest investment, as far as we know. So the \$2 billion that the U.S. taxpayers are standing good for on a loan will sure help make him rich. That's a great thing, I'm sure, if you're a big Soros fan.

Cambodia votes against us most of the time, and we gave them \$58 million. Let's see, we've got—well, gosh, we gave Cuba \$45 million. Wasn't that special? And they vote against us 90 percent or so of the time.

Republic of the Congo, we gave them \$104 million, and they vote against us most of the time. Heck, Egypt, we gave them just this pocket of money at \$1.7 billion. As I understand, it's more than that, and they voted against us 81.8 percent of the time. Ethiopia voted against us 83.3 percent of the time, and we rewarded their opposition to things we hold dear by giving them \$455 million.

India, \$100 million, and they vote against us about 89 percent of the time. Indonesia, where the President just visited, it seems like he got a pretty good reception, but when it came to his positions, they voted against him about 80 percent of the time in the U.N., but we did reward them with about \$190 million.

Now, people are out of work. They're struggling, they're trying to make ends meet as best they can, and yet we're just giving money away hand over fist, like we were just the richest folks in the history of mankind, that we got money to burn. We're just throwing it away, and as I've said previously, and it continues to be true, you don't have to pay people to hate you; they will do it for free. It's that simple.

Why keep paying billions and billions of dollars to countries that despise us, that oppose everything we believe in, that oppose our love of freedom and liberty, that oppose our belief in equality of men and women and different races? Why do we keep giving billions of dollars to people that oppose that and are doing everything they can to make life an absolute hell for people based on religious beliefs, race, creed, color, national origin, gender, treat women like property? I mean, why do we keep giving people billions and billions of dollars?

I know charities across America are hurting right now. They're not getting the contributions they do normally in a good economy, because when people lose their job, they run out of money. They're barely providing for themselves and their family, the people under their roof. They're not able to give like they do during the good times. And so charities are hurting here in the United States.

But what we find with this government—and it's not new to this administration—this administration is doing it, but it's been going on for a long time. It's not new. With all fairness to

the Obama administration, it's been going on a long time. We are in a world of hurt. We're being told by nations around the world that you're spending money like an irresponsible person. You've got to stop spending money in such a crazy fashion.

So, normally, if we were acting as a responsible person or a responsible entity, we'd say, you know what, we're pretty broke right now, so we can't keep giving money to people that hate us and are doing everything they can, many of them funneling money to groups who use it to hurt us. That might seem strange. But then you look around the world. We recently just re-armed Lebanon. Let's see. Lebanon. Oh, yeah, that's right, they went to war against Israel. We're helping groups that keep attacking our dear friend Israel. Why are we giving them money? Do we honestly think we're going to buy their love and affection?

You can't buy love and affection. When you try, what you purchase is contempt, because they know that we know they hate us, they know that we know they vote against us most of the time. So how could they think otherwise, that we're the most stupid, irresponsible people in the world to keep paying people to hate us? It makes no sense.

You know, these nations are sovereign. We respect a nation's sovereignty. Make your own calls. Vote as you want to vote. If you're in the U.N., vote as you want to vote, but we're not going to pay you to oppose us at every turn.

That's why I keep filing this bill, and that's why I am hopeful that eventually we'll get it passed. We mean no ill will to these countries who keep opposing us, who want to treat women like property, stone women to death, what they call honor killings, and what I would have found someone guilty of murder in my court back in Texas, because it sure looks and sounds like murder to me under our law, and under our law is where we're supposed to be found, not under sharia law, not under some other nation's law, but under our law.

So why do we keep paying countries to mistreat women and children and torture their own people and to deprive them of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness? They're sovereign. They can make their own choices, but we should not pay them to hate us.

Now, in follow-up for the rest of this time, I know our President has said before we're not a Christian Nation, and I will not debate that with the President because he may be right, he may very well be right, but what I know is where we came from. As a student and a lover of American history, I know enough about our founding and apparently a great deal more than our President learned when he was in school in Indonesia and other places. He didn't learn the history of this Nation as I did. Well, what would you expect?

Of course, in Indonesia they're not going to teach you American history,

certainly not the best parts. They may teach you parts that make you think less of America, I can see that, and perhaps that's why Indonesia votes against us most of the time in the U.N. They just don't have our values, and, of course, in their schools they would teach their values, which include being against the things that we hold dear.

But we have history to rely on, and so I'm just going to go through some historic writings and speeches just, Mr. Speaker, so people know a little bit more about our history and where they came from, because as great philosophers have said through the ages, if you don't know where you came from, you cannot possibly find the proper direction ahead.

□ 1950

John Quincy Adams was the first son of a President to have been elected President. In September of 1811, in a letter to his son, who was a U.S. minister in St. Petersburg, Russia, John Quincy Adams said, "So great is my veneration for the Bible, and so strong my belief, that when duly read and meditated on, it is of all books in the world, that which contributes most to make men good, wise, and happy—that the earlier my children begin to read it," the Bible, "the more steadily they pursue the practice of reading it throughout their lives, the more lively and confident will be my hopes that they will prove useful citizens of their country, respectable members of society." That was John Quincy Adams.

Another from Abraham Lincoln. This was March 30, 1863. These are Abraham Lincoln's own words. We have them in writing from him. This is March 30, 1863, his prayer proclamation. Lincoln said in part, "We have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious Hand which preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched and strengthened 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 ourselves before the offended Power, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness." Abraham Lincoln.

Forty-five days before his assassination in his second inaugural—and that's inscribed in the marble on the north wall of the Lincoln Memorial—he's talking about the North and the South. And I realize the President says we're not a Christian nation, but Lincoln was addressing what had been founded as a Christian nation and what had been founded upon Christian tenets. As a Christian nation, we welcome people of all walks of life, of all nations, all races, national origin, gender. We welcome them because that is part of the Christian teaching for individuals. But he was trying to theo-

logically deal with the issue of a horrible, horrible war, like the Civil War, where brothers fought, family members fought and died at the hand of another.

Lincoln's words, March 4, 1865, he said, "Both read the same Bible," talking about the North and the South, "and pray to the same God. The prayers of both could not be answered. That of neither has been answered fully. The Almighty has His own purposes." Then he quotes from scripture and says, "Woe unto the world because of offenses."

"Yet, if God will that the war continue until all the wealth piled by all the bondsmen's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said"—another scripture quote—"the Judgments of the Lord are true and righteous."

I know that our current President reveres President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and so I figured he would certainly be rewarded in knowing Franklin D. Roosevelt's own words. So for the sake of this body and anybody that might happen to see, I will provide Franklin D. Roosevelt's own words. For example, March 4, 1943, in his first inaugural address, these were his words, "First of all, let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself. In such a spirit on my part and on yours, we face our common difficulties. They concern, thank God, only material things. Practices of the unscrupulous money changers stand indicted in the court of public opinion, rejected by the hearts and minds of men. They know only the rules of a generation of self-seekers. They have no vision. And when there is no vision, the people perish." That, of course, Proverbs 29:18. "The money changers have fled from their high seats in the temple of our civilization. We may now restore that temple to the ancient truths. We face arduous days that lie before us in the warm courage of national unity; with the clear consciousness of seeking old and precious moral values. In this dedication of a nation, we humbly ask the blessing of God. May he protect each and every one of us. May He guide me in these days to come."

More words of Franklin Roosevelt, December 6, 1933. If I were asked to state the great objective which church and state are both demanding for the sake of every man and woman and child in this country, I would say that great objective is a more abundant life.

Franklin Roosevelt, December 24, 1933. Roosevelt said, "This year marks a greater national understanding of the significance of our modern lives of the teachings of Him whose birth we celebrate. To more and more of us, the words 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself' have taken on a meaning that is showing itself and proving itself in our purposes and daily lives. May the practice of that high ideal grow in us

all in the year to come. I give you and send you one and all, old and young, a Merry Christmas and a truly Happy New Year. And so, for now and for always, God Bless Us, Everyone."

Continuing, Franklin Roosevelt's own words, this is December 24, 1934: "Let us make the spirit of Christmas of 1934 that of courage and unity. That is, I believe, an important part of what the Maker of Christmas would have it mean. In this sense, the Scriptures admonish us to be strong and of good courage, to fear not, to dwell together in Unity."

Another excerpt from Franklin Roosevelt, 1935. "We cannot read the history of our rise and development as a Nation without reckoning with the place the Bible has occupied in shaping the advances of the Republic. Where we have been the truest and most consistent in obeying its precepts, we have attained the greatest measure of contentment and prosperity."

Continuing on with Franklin Roosevelt's words. January 20, 1937, he said in part of that inaugural address, "I shall do my utmost to speak their purpose and to do their will, seeking Divine Guidance to help each and every one to give light to them that sit in darkness and to guide our feet in the way of peace."

Again, Franklin Roosevelt, January 6, 1941. "We look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms. The first in freedom of speech and expression. The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way. This Nation has placed its destiny in the hands and heads and hearts of its millions of free men and women; and its faith in freedom under the guidance of God." Again, Franklin Roosevelt, January 20, 1941: "A Nation, like a person, has something deeper, something more permanent, something larger than the sum of all its parts."

□ 2000

"It is that something which matters most to its future, which calls forth the most sacred guarding of its present. It is a thing which we find difficult, even impossible, to hit upon a single simple word, and yet we all understand what it is, the spirit, the faith of America. It is the product of centuries. It was born in the multitudes of those who came from many lands, some of high degree, but mostly plain people who sought here early and late to find freedom more freely."

"The democratic aspiration is no mere recent phase of human history. It is human history. It permeated the ancient life of early peoples. It blazed anew in the Middle Ages. It was written in the Magna Carta. In the Americas its impact has been irresistible. America has been the new world in all tongues to all peoples, not because this continent was a newfound land, but because all those who came here believed they could create upon this continent a new life, a life that should be new in freedom. Its vitality was written into

our own Mayflower Compact, into the Declaration of Independence, into the Constitution of the United States, into the Gettysburg Address. If the spirit of America were killed, even though the Nation's body and mind constricted in an alien world lived on, the America we know would have perished. That spirit, that faith speaks to us in our daily lives in ways often unnoticed. We do not retreat. We are not content to stand still. As Americans, we go forward in the service of our country by the will of God." Franklin Roosevelt.

Again, Roosevelt, January 25, 1941:

"To the Armed Forces. As Commander in Chief I take pleasure in commending the reading of the Bible to all who serve in the Armed Forces of the United States. Throughout the centuries men of many faiths and diverse origins have found in the Sacred Book"—Sacred Book is capitalized—"words of wisdom, counsel and inspiration. It is a fountain of strength and now, as always, an aid in attaining the highest aspirations of the human soul. Very sincerely yours, Franklin D. Roosevelt."

That's inscribed on the inside of the New Testament that my uncle got going into World War II that my aunt gave me.

"December 7, 1941, a date which will live in infamy, the United States of America was suddenly and deliberately attacked by Naval and Air Forces of the Empire of Japan. Our people, our territory and our interests are in grave danger. With confidence in our Armed Forces, with the unbounding determination of our people, we will gain the inevitable triumph, so help us God."

And I have one other from Roosevelt. This was Franklin Roosevelt's radio broadcast June 6, 1944:

"My fellow Americans"—and for those, Mr. Speaker, that may not be aware, this is D-day, June 6, 1944—Franklin D. Roosevelt said, "Last night when I spoke with you about the fall of Rome, I knew at that moment that troops of the United States and our allies were crossing the channel in another and greater operation. It has come to pass with success thus far, and so in this poignant hour I ask you to join with me in prayer.

And then Franklin Roosevelt prayed these words for the Nation over national radio. It would have been TV, but radio is what he had. Roosevelt said:

"Almighty God, our sons, pride of our Nation, this day have set upon a mighty endeavor, a struggle to preserve our Republic, our religion, and our civilization and to set free a suffering humanity. Lead them straight and true. Give strength to their arms, stoutness to their heart, steadfastness in their faith. They will need Thy blessing. Their road will be long and hard for the enemy is strong. He may hurl back our forces. Success may not come with rushing speed, but we shall return again and again. We know that

by Thy grace and by the righteousness of our cause, our sons will triumph."

Parenthetically, if I might insert into Roosevelt's prayer here, General Jerry Boykin had an outcry in this country from the left when he said words to the effect, at a church, we prevailed in Iraq with such speed because our God was stronger than their God. Had those same people and forces that attacked General Boykin at the time been around June 6, 1944, D-day, there's no question they would have had to attack Franklin D. Roosevelt for this type of prayer. Nonetheless, it's part of our history, so I continue with Roosevelt's words:

"For these men are lately drawn from the ways of peace. They fight not for the lust of conquest, they fight to end conquest. They fight to liberate. They fight to let justice arise and tolerance and goodwill among all Thy people. They yearn but for the end of battle, for their return to the haven of home. Some will never return. Embrace these, Father, and receive them, Thy heroic servants into Thy kingdom."

And for us at home, Roosevelt says, "Fathers, mothers, children, wives, sisters and brothers of brave men overseas whose thoughts and prayers are ever with them, help us, Almighty God, to rededicate ourselves in renewed faith in Thee in this hour of great sacrifice.

"Many people have urged that I call the Nation into a single day of special prayer. But because the road is long and the desire is great, I ask that our people devote themselves in a continuance of prayer as we rise to each new day. And again, when each day is spent, let words of prayer be on our lips invoking Thy help to our efforts."

Roosevelt goes on. He says:

"Give us strength too, strength in our daily task, to redouble the contributions we make in the physical and the material support of our Armed Forces. Let our hearts be stout to wait out the long travail, to bear sorrows that may come, to impart our courage into our sons, wheresoever they may be.

"And, O Lord," Roosevelt continues, "give us faith. Give us faith in Thee, faith in our sons, faith in each other, faith in our united crusade. Let not the keenness of our spirit ever be dulled. Let not the impacts of temporary events, of temporal matters, of but fleeting moment, let not these deter us in our unconquerable purpose. With Thy blessing," Roosevelt finishes, he says, "we shall prevail over the unholy forces of our enemy. Help us to conquer the apostles of greed and racial arrogances. Lead us to the saving of our country and with our sister nations into a world unity that will spell a sure peace, a peace invulnerable to the scheming of unworthy men and a peace that will let all of men in freedom reaping the just rewards of their honest toil. Thy will be done, Almighty God."

That was Franklin D. Roosevelt. What a powerful prayer.

A couple of things to finish. Ronald Reagan, 1978, his own words in his own hand. He was talking about Jesus of Nazareth, Jesus Christ, and he says these things about Jesus. Reagan says: "Either he was what he said he was or he was the world's greatest liar. It is impossible for me to believe a liar or charlatan could have had the effect on mankind that he has had for 2,000 years. We could ask would even the greatest of liars carry his lie through the crucifixion when a simple confession would have saved him? Did he allow us the choice, you say, that you and others have made to believe in his teaching, but reject his statements about his own identity?"

□ 2010

In 1981, in his inaugural he said, in part, Ronald Reagan's words: "Your dreams, your hopes, your goals are going to be the dreams, the hopes, and the goals of this administration, so help me God. I am told that tens of thousands of prayer meetings are being held on this day, and for that I am deeply grateful. We are a Nation under God, and I believe God intended for us to be free. It would be fitting and good, I think, if on each inaugural day in future years it should be declared a day of prayer.

"The crisis we are facing today does require, however, to believe that, together with God's help, we can and will resolve the problems which now confront us. And, after all, why shouldn't we believe that? We are Americans."

Reagan concluded with "God bless you."

Mr. Speaker, that is my conclusion as well.

OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF MONDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2010, AT PAGES H7418 AND H7419

ECONOMIC ISSUES: THE GOOD, THE BAD AND THE UGLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. I come here to address the House on economic issues facing us this month and next month. And I come here to talk about the good, the bad and the ugly. First, the good.

The Federal Reserve Board is going to buy \$600 billion worth of long-term bonds, quantitative easing. This will increase America's share of the American market for manufacturers' goods. That's why it has been condemned by China, Germany and Japan, because they know it means moving jobs from Germany, Japan and China to the United States.

This is an effective tool that is reversible. We can expand the money supply now, and then the Federal Reserve