

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely.

Mr. GARAMENDI. The PAYGO, meaning as applied to us in the Congress.

Mr. TONKO. Exactly. And it creates that sort of stewardship over the budget that doesn't find us in situations where we paid for two wars, we initiated a part D Medicare doughnut hole which impacted our senior population with their pharmaceutical needs and gave a tax cut to the wealthiest of Americans and did it all off-budget. And so that when this President assumed office, one of the first tasks assigned the administration or embraced by the administration so as to truth in budgeting and honesty in budgeting is to bring it online, which grew the deficit, but it was a truthful budget. You can't continue to have an off-budget, borrow from China or whatever, in order to pay for programs and say, Okay, we'll pay for it into the future. The PAYGO concept requiring us to find the revenue sources in order to do these orders of programing or tax cuts will be accompanied by the mindset, the logic of just how do you pay for it. And PAYGO means being fiscally responsible.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Excuse me for interrupting. That was the policy during the Clinton period, and it led to the surplus because it put fiscal discipline into this building and over on the other side in the Senate. Similarly, it has now been reinstituted by the Democrats a year and a half ago.

□ 2050

I want to just wrap up here. I want to go back to "Make It In America" and wrap with this. Our time has almost expired here.

Mr. TONKO. Sure.

Mr. GARAMENDI. With this "Make It In America" agenda, as Speaker PELOSI and soon to be Minority Leader Pelosi said as she exited the Organizational Caucus of the Democratic Party today, there are two principles that the Democratic Caucus will follow: One, we will make it in America so that America can make it. Two, we will do this on behalf of the middle class so that those jobs are there.

Interestingly, while the President hasn't used this term very often of "make it in America," President Obama has nonetheless proposed policies that are directly in line with this—specifically, that every business in America be given the opportunity to immediately write off any capital investments they make. Now, it's already in the law. In the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, there is in the law an automatic write-off of a capital investment made by a small business. That was increased in a subsequent bill that we voted out, without any Republican support, that allows small businesses to write off immediately.

The President would go further. I've introduced a bill that would do that—other members of the Democratic Cau-

cus have also—so that businesses would be incentivized to invest now in the capital equipment that will provide the foundation for future jobs. Invest now.

This is part of our strategy. It is an overarching Democratic strategy, one that we have been working on for some time, beginning with, among the first bills passed by Congress and signed by the President way back in 2009, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

Would you like to wrap this up here?

Mr. TONKO. Let me just state this, that the landmark Small Business Act, which is intended to create jobs—we're anticipating 500,000 jobs—allows for investment in exporting, which I believe is critically important; it allows for investment in our modernization of manufacturing and small businesses, and it allows for the unleashing of some \$300 billion worth of loan opportunities to our small businesses.

We profess small business to be the economic engine, to be the springboard to the economic recovery. To the credit of Speaker PELOSI, whose leadership has led this House through the 111th Congress, we have made that our focus. We came out of a deep, deep recession, and, unfortunately, there wasn't enough time for us to feel the effects of the progress made by such legislation. I just think we need to pursue that path to progress.

Thank you very much, Representative GARAMENDI.

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

#### THE ECONOMY, UNEMPLOYMENT, AND THE ADVENT OF THANKSGIVING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POLIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. AKIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good evening.

I would like to talk about several different topics today. One, I think, is on the hearts and minds of Americans everywhere. I want to talk a little bit about unemployment. I want to talk about the economy and what the solutions are to this problem. This isn't very complicated, but people try to make it more complicated than it needs to be.

When we get done with that subject, I'm going to change gears and do something that's a little bit more topical for the Thanksgiving season. I'd like to tell you the actual story, a great adventure story, about the Pilgrims, about the Thanksgiving that they celebrated and about the many other ways that they have blessed our country.

First things first, let's talk a little bit, though, about something that's on everybody's minds—the problem of unemployment and the problem of the continuous and rapid growth of the Federal Government, which stifles our

freedoms and liberties, which buries us in red tape and bureaucracy, which raises our cost of living, and which makes life more and more miserable for Americans as they lose their freedoms, and the Federal Government's out-of-control spending that accompanies that.

These are problems we've talked about, and these are problems that the voters have voted on. The voters seem to think that this is a problem in spite of the fact that we're going to try and shove socialized medicine down the throats of Americans and in spite of the fact they don't want it. We're not dealing with unemployment. We're not dealing with the causes for unemployment, but I think we need to talk about it a little bit because it isn't as complicated as some of my colleagues seem to make it out to be. It's not a matter of class warfare. It has nothing to do with that. It's just simple economics.

Now, if you want to talk to anybody who is a small business man and ask him what are the things that kill jobs and ask him what are the job killers, I would bet you he's going to be talking about things on this list right here.

The first thing is excessive taxation. The second is insufficient liquidity. What does that mean? It means it's hard for businessmen to get money from banks.

Economic uncertainty. People don't want to take risks when they don't know what's going to happen next. Then, of course, there is a whole lot of red tape and government mandates. All of those things are enemies to jobs and job creation.

Now let's go into this just a little bit because this isn't so difficult. It's not a matter of class warfare. It's not a matter of rich people not paying enough. In fact, there is an interesting statistic or two. What percent of the overall tax burden do you think the top 1 percent of Americans carry? What percent do you think the top 10 percent of Americans carry? Well, the top 10 percent of Americans carry about 70 percent of the tax burden in this country. How about the bottom 50 percent of Americans? What percentage do they carry? Less than 10 percent. So I guess we've got a pretty graduated income tax. If that were the solution, we'd already be in great shape, but let's get back to the basics about jobs.

First of all, why is it that excessive taxation kills jobs? Well, the reason is that the people who own small businesses create most of those jobs. Small businesses—maybe we should say medium and small businesses, which have 500 or fewer employees, are the businesses that hire 80 percent of Americans.

Now, my Democrat friends can't seem to make this connection. If you kill the business, you're not going to have the jobs. If you tax the businessman's hide off, he's not going to hire people because he's not going to have the money to buy new equipment, to

put up new buildings, to invent new technologies, and to expand his business. So the connection is pretty straightforward. If you want to kill jobs, you tax the guys who own those businesses. A lot of those business owners don't really think of themselves as wealthy, because they've started some little businesses that have grown and grown and grown, and as they grow, they keep putting more and more money back in the businesses. They haven't stopped to consider the fact that they may be multimillionaires, but they keep putting the money into the businesses and the businesses grow and they hire more people.

If you're just so hung up on the fact that somebody is filthy rich and if you're so hung up on the fact that they may be having more fun than you are and that you've got to tax them into the dirt, well, then you're not going to have any jobs. You just can't have it both ways. If you want jobs, you have to have healthy businesses, and you can't have healthy businesses if you tax them out of existence. So excessive taxation is just going to be a job killer.

Insufficient liquidity. That is, if you run your banks and if you have bank regulators all over the banks so they can't make any loans, it's hard for the businessman to get money to invest in new things.

Obviously, economic uncertainty. Let's say you own a business, and you've got lots of money tied up in it. Are you going to take a great big gamble when you don't have any idea what next goofy policy the administration is going to come up with or what kind of additional taxes and red tape and bureaucracy you're going to face? No. You're going to hunker down. You're going to say, Wait a minute. I'm not going to take any risks in this environment. Business is off.

A lot of people are boarding up their businesses. A lot of businesses are shutting down. A lot of jobs are being shipped overseas. We create such a hostile environment for business that the big businesses say, Okay. You show us the rules. If you don't want to have your jobs in this country, we'll take the jobs somewhere else. The small businesses just close their doors, and the jobs are gone forever. So the economic uncertainty is a job killer.

Of course there is red tape and government mandates. There is one that should be on this list, and that is excessive government spending. That is also something that has always, historically, been a problem.

Now, on top of the unemployment problem, on top of the runaway Federal Government that is no longer a servant but has taken on the effect of master and is bossing Americans around and taxing them out of house and home and ruining the economy—if that's not bad enough, we've got another problem that's coming, and it's something that we need to deal with in the near future.

□ 2100

That's the problem of a huge tax increase that's just around the corner at the beginning of the year.

So, if we're already in trouble with close to 10 percent unemployment and we know that excessive taxation is one of the things that is a job killer, do we want to then apply a whole bunch more, another huge tax increase to the economy? Most people would say you have to be crazy to do something like that. Most people, when they look at history, say that's the dumbest thing in the world to have a huge tax increase right when the economy is having a hard time, and yet, that's precisely what is going to happen next year if the Congress doesn't take action.

What's happening is, because of some rules in the Senate, the Bush tax cuts, a series of Bush tax cuts are going to expire, and when they do, you can see some of the jumps here from 2010 to 2011. This ordinary income tax, a bracket of 35 percent, is going to jump to 39.6 percent; capital gains going from 15 to 20. You know, the capital gains, that's an important one because that's a place where people who invest in businesses have money. If this tax is low enough, they can plow it back into business. As you raise it up, there's less money going back into businesses. And these are different kinds of dividends, going from 15 to almost 40 percent.

And the death tax, wow, is that ever taking a jump. Everybody who needs to die, you need to die this year, that's for sure, because death tax is zero. It's jumping to 55 percent. So when you get beyond the first million or two that are protected from the death tax, what's happening is, your dad owns a farm and he has a lot of fields and he's got a lot of pieces of equipment, and your plan is to follow in your dad's footsteps and be a farmer, and your dad dies and you find out you're going to have to sell 55 percent of your farm to pay the taxes that your dad owes on his death. Isn't good enough to tax him when he's alive. You tax him when he's dead. So we have a death tax. Well, by the time you get rid of selling half the fields and half the pieces of equipment you say, well, I can't run the farm. Well, that's really smart tax policy, isn't it, that we shut down a small business by jumping the death tax from 0 to 55 percent.

We have child tax credits here that are going up, marriage penalty, lowest tax brackets going from 10 to 15 percent. So, these taxes are coming. Most people would say, that studied economics a little bit, would say this is not what you should be doing during a recession. In fact, regardless if you're a Republican or Democrat, history says this is not what we should be doing.

You could learn—and I'm kind of surprised that the Democrats haven't taken a lesson from Kennedy because he had a recession when he was President. He cut taxes and the economy sprung right back, and of course Ron-

ald Reagan did it. I don't expect the Democrats to learn from Ronald Reagan, even though he used to be a Democrat, but JFK, you think they could learn from him.

You think maybe they could have learned from FDR even. FDR had a guy who was Secretary of the Treasury who was Henry Morgenthau. Henry Morgenthau came up with the same idea that Obama and company came up with a couple years ago, said we're going to stimulate the economy by spending tons of money. It's a little bit like grabbing your bootstraps and pulling and hoping to fly around the room. You know, they're going to spend a lot of money, spend enough money that will get the economy going. That's the idea.

Now, no normal rational person that's not been smoking those funny cigarettes can come up with such an idea. If you came home and your husband or wife said to you, hey, we've got too much credit card debt here, or I'm not making enough money, you know, things aren't going right economically, what do you think we should do? Oh, let's spend money like mad. You would think somebody was crazy. That's what people have tried. Henry Morgenthau tried it. He tried it for 8 years. He came and appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee. His words were, We have tried spending money. We're spending money, more than we have ever spent before and it does not work, I say, after 8 years of the administration. We have just as much unemployment as when we started and enormous debt to boot.

Now, I would hope that we could learn something from history. This is FDR. This is World War II vintage-type stuff. We should have learned from this. We could have learned from JFK. No. Could have learned from Bush. We could have learned from Reagan. When you're in trouble like this, what you want to do is you want to back off on the taxes and back off on the Federal spending. We're going the exact opposite direction. It doesn't make any sense to be raising taxes. We know that taxing small business is a job killer, and yet, we're forging ahead, trying to get everybody paying attention to the fact that, oh, the rich's guy got too many cigars or too many cars or something like that.

But the trouble is the rich guy, who owns that company, is the one who's hiring people. He's the one making the decision to add a wing on the building, put a new machine tool under the wing, to invest money in new processes, to come up with a better way to do things, to be more competitive than a foreign competitor and put Americans back to work. Those are the kinds of people that you need to have taking your money and plowing it back into the economy.

Now, there's some people think through this idea of Federal Government spending money that you can put people to work by the Federal Government hiring them. That seems on the

surface like a bright enough idea. Certainly if you take some tax money and you go out and hire some people, those people have a job. Doesn't that put people back to work? Well, yes and no. The people you hire do get a job. The trouble is for everyone you hire, there are two people in the private sector that lose their job because the government's sucking that money for those salaries out of the private sector. The private sector then becomes less efficient, and economists will say that you lose about two jobs out of the private sector for everybody you put on the government payroll. I mean, if putting people on the government payroll worked, we'd all work for the government. They tried that in the Soviet Union. It wasn't such a hot idea.

So, what's the danger? Why am I talking about this stuff? It should be a day when politics is over, the elections are over, we could get back to work and do the right thing. Well, the right thing here is paying attention to the fact that America is in trouble with a 10 percent unemployment rate. It's actually more than that because I don't know if you know it or not, but anybody who's been unemployed for a certain period of time, they don't count them anymore. So they're not unemployed, even though they don't have a job. That's sort of an interesting way to count, isn't it?

But anyway, here's what happened a number of years ago. I actually was here in Congress when this happened, and these charts go back a few years, but I think it's kind of interesting. This is the gross domestic product. So these vertical lines are America's GDP, and this is before and after a tax relief which occurred in 2003 about the first or second quarter of 2003.

And so the tax decrease we're talking about here is the very tax that's going to expire. So when we cut this tax in 2003, what happened to GDP? Well, here's GDP going along like this before. We do the tax cut and take a look at what happens to GDP afterwards. Now, that suggests that if there's any causal relationship at all that the tax cuts gave us a better GDP.

Let's take a look at the same tax cut not applied to gross domestic product, but let's take a look at it applied to jobs. These lines are job creation. The ones that go down mean that we are losing jobs. The ones that go up mean that we're creating jobs. This is what the economy is doing. Now, this, again, is this May 2003 when these tax relief measures went into effect. Look at all the jobs we're losing here, and look at the snappy turnaround right here when you let the small businessman keep some of what he earns. My goodness, what a turnaround.

Now, here's a very unpleasant thought. If these tax cuts had this positive effect when the tax cuts went into effect on jobs and on gross domestic product, if these tax cuts had that positive an effect, what happens when we reverse that same thing? What happens

when we turn it upside down? What happens when the tax cuts expire? Are they not likely to exert the exact opposite force on our gross domestic product on our already high unemployment? Now, we're not in this situation.

□ 2110

Right now we're having trouble with unemployment, but why do we want to put a force on it that's going to make it even worse. If these things did some good when they went into effect, why do we want to let them expire? It's bad enough the way it is. If we extend the tax cuts, it may not fix the 10 percent, but it may not go to 15 percent anyway. So this is what happened when the tax cuts went into effect to job creation, and that's why the economy took off.

Now, one of the things, it seems to me, that my dear socialist friends don't quite understand is that if you are a happy socialist, what you want is, you want the government to be doing well, you want to have lots of money that you can slop around and spend on different programs. And of course we've been doing too much of that, spending more than we have. But you would think you would want a strong economy because what a lot of people don't realize is, if that economy isn't strong, not only are individuals hurting, not only are States that have to balance their budgets hurting economically, the Federal Government revenues are also way down.

I was surprised during this time period when people wanted to say that the tax cuts had cost us a whole lot of money, that when you took the money they claimed the tax cuts cost in lost taxes and added it to the war in Iraq and Afghanistan that the amount of money total was less than what it cost us to have the economy in the tank in these first couple of years. So when the economy is bad in your home, it's bad in your State. It also is lousy in the Federal Government. So you put all of these tax cuts in place. You think, Oh, that's fiscally irresponsible because then the government is going to go into debt more and more. Oh, is that really so? The fact is not so.

Let's take a look at what happened. Here are Federal revenues. This is the year. That is the tax cut. So Federal revenues are coming down here. We cut taxes, and the Federal revenues actually go up. Now that seems like making water run uphill. Why is it possible that the Federal Government would get more money when we reduce taxes? It is known to some people as a Laffer Curve. But what this is, it's the effect that when the economy gets going, we collect more tax revenues.

Let's look at it this way: let's say that you are made king for the year, and your job is to collect as much revenue as you can collect in the selling of loaves of bread. So you start to think. You say to yourself, Well, I could put a one-penny tax on a loaf of bread and people would eat a whole lot of bread

because we're not taxing it very much, and we'd raise a certain amount of money. And then you think, Wow, but if I could do that with a penny, I could move that decimal over and charge a dollar a loaf of bread. Then I would get much more money. How about \$10 a loaf? You say, Well, wait a minute. So \$10 a loaf, I could get \$10 every time. But people wouldn't buy bread anymore. It would be too expensive. It would go on the black market, or they would buy cake or something else.

So common sense would tell you that if you are king for the year and you are taxing bread, that there is some point between a penny and \$10 perhaps, there is some point where there is an optimum amount of tax where people will still pay it and still buy bread. And if you raise the tax, what, in fact, happens is the revenue that the government collects goes down rather than up. In other words, it's not possible to just keep taxing too much because if you do, it basically drives the amount of money you collect down. So there's an optimum point.

And my point here is that if you are a happy socialist, you want the economy strong, and the way to do it is to let the people that run the businesses have enough money to make those investments so that the economy is strong, and we have more Federal revenue coming in. This is what happened '04, '05, '06, '07. The Federal revenues start going up even though we did these tax cuts. Now what we want to do is to reverse this. We're going to get rid of the tax cuts which is then going to have more effect to drive the economy down. It's going to create more job loss, and it's going to make the GDP worse.

We are having trouble learning some very basic lessons from history where we are at a point where we are overtaxing the economy. And if we want to get this economy going, we have to learn from JFK, we have to learn from Ronald Reagan, we have to learn from Bush II that the way to deal with this thing is to cut government spending and to cut taxes. It's a very straightforward answer. But we also have to realize that if we don't deal with the tax increase that's coming up, we are going to add significantly to the already existing economic problems of our country.

So what's the solution? It's not complicated. Make the Bush tax cuts permanent. Now we, Republicans, have proposed that for years. The Senate Democrats have opposed it. The Democrats in the House have opposed it. They say all of these tax cuts are for rich people, and they talk about the classes of society in America. And the one thing they can't seem to remember is the fact that if you don't have a strong business, you're not going to have jobs, and you're just going to have to get used to it.

In America, some people get stinking rich; and it's okay; and it's all right for them to have their money because a lot

of times, if they get enough money, they start spending it on other people anyway. And so what you've got to do is let those businesses have some money to work with because the government is not going to create the jobs. And by letting these tax cuts expire, you are just going to further damage the economy and increase the suffering of Americans all across our country.

So the solution is straightforward, at least to what we should be doing with these tax cuts. What we should be doing is keeping the tax cuts and voting to make them permanent and not letting them all expire. That's the commonsense way to approach the thing. It's not going to necessarily get us out of all the problems we're in right now, but it's going to prevent them from getting a lot worse.

And what we have to do then obviously is to get back into the business of cutting back on Federal spending, and we're going to have to cut back on government red tape, and we're going to have to dismantle some of the complicated and redundant different Departments that we don't need to be paying for. We have to start looking at the Federal Government and say, What does the Federal Government have to do and all of the stuff that it would be nice if the Federal Government did that cost money, we're going to have to just stop doing that. We're not going to get it out of waste, fraud, and abuse because there isn't a budget line item that says that. What we're going to have to do is we're going to have to reform the system.

The one thing I believe the Republicans are looking at very closely—I'm certainly very interested in it and am trying to sell it to my Republican colleagues—is the idea that we have an opportunity, though we can't pass legislation through the Senate and even if we did, it's unlikely that President Obama would sign it. But what we can do is we can send bills to the Senate, and the public can watch and see that we've heard the message. We understand. We want less taxes. We want more affordable government. We want to shrink and reduce the Federal Government in places where it doesn't really need to be putting money, and we can do that.

But there is one thing we can do and that is in the House here, we can change the rules. We can change the system. The House, with Democrat and Republican leadership through many, many years, is really a series of fiefdoms, as different committees gain lots of power.

And if we take a look at that system and we design a system which is not so much designed to spend money but to make it hard to spend money, then we can start making some progress to develop the tools here in the House to try to reduce a government that is literally a runaway government that is no longer the servant of the people but is increasingly becoming a fearful master.

That is our task; and we will be evaluated by the American public, I have no doubt, on our ability to perform the task. And to the degree we have a majority in the House, we can at least start in the House by saying, Let's change the whole committee structure. Let's take a look at how we do the budgeting process. Let's take a look at how these earmarks fit into who spends the money, who makes money, and how do we hold the committees accountable for reducing the size of the Federal Government.

All of these things are ahead of us, but we need to stop this train wreck coming, and we need to make these tax cuts permanent. That's the quick answer to something that we need to be doing.

Now I'm going to turn to perhaps a little bit lighter topic, a completely different topic, and that is the advent of Thanksgiving coming along next week. The Thanksgiving story is one that, as I have gotten older, I get to love the story more and more. It's a fantastic adventure story. It's a story of people of tremendous courage, tremendous vision who took very great risks and gambles and blessed you and I and all true Americans, blessed in ways that we've forgotten and in ways that we need to remember. I'm going to grab a picture, if you will excuse me a second.

□ 2120

Last year, I had this picture on a larger format. Unfortunately, I just had this framed copy. The picture that is by my side, some of you may recognize, is a small version of the picture that is in the Rotunda here not so far from where I am standing.

The picture is called "The Pilgrims at Prayer," and I would like to talk to you about this little group of Pilgrims that came over and gave us our Thanksgiving, the particularly famous Thanksgiving that took place in Plymouth, Massachusetts. There was an earlier Thanksgiving in Virginia, but this particular group of Pilgrims, though, gave us a lot, lot more than Thanksgiving. So while it is the Thanksgiving season, I think it is appropriate to think a little bit about their great example to us, because it is the principles and ideas of people like this that we need to reproduce and we need to follow their example as we move America forward in the days ahead.

So let me start by saying, first of all, who were these Pilgrims that we talk about that were at Plymouth and that gave us Thanksgiving? Who were the Pilgrims? They were really a couple of groups of people, but about half of them, and some of the very influential ones, were called Separatists. They were what you might call in their day sort of the evangelical Christian types of England, except that they were a little bit of a weird subset in this regard.

They had listened to the writing of a Scottish theologian that followed Knox in about the 1580s or so, and he started

finding in his Bible this interesting idea that the Bible, particularly the Old Testament, or, for Jewish people, the Torah, there seemed to be a distinction between civil government and church government.

Now, that may seem very obvious to us today, but in those days, if you recall, there was a king half the time running the church and a church half the time running the kingdoms, and the two were very much interconnected and very much intermixed dating back to the time of Charlemagne.

But they came up with this idea that the Bible seemed to indicate that there was a difference between church government and civil government, and they got that from looking at the story about Moses. Moses was like the civil authority, but he had a brother who was running the worship service, Aaron. And so he saw that example, but then there were other examples that were less known.

There was a guy, Uzziah, who was a king, and he went into the temple and started burning incense because he thought he was able to do anything he wanted. A couple of courageous priests stood up to confront him, and he started to stick his finger at them and give them a lecture and say, Off with their heads, and he looked and his hand was covered with leprosy.

So there were these stories, particularly the story of Saul, the first king, where he offered the sacrifice and Samuel read him the riot act and said, You've really have blown it now, buddy.

So you have these examples in the Old Testament where civil and church government were separate. So these guys, the Separatists, had learned from their Scripture and had decided in their day that they didn't want their church to be run by the King of England. This was following old Henry VIII, who had separated the English church from the church in Rome, and so the church was being run by the King of England. These guys decided what they were going to do in Scrooby, England. They decided that they would get this manor house. They would all get together and worship and start their own little church, and the church wasn't under the King and it wasn't under the King's thumb. Well, as you can imagine, that did not meet with the approval of the King, and he said, I am going to harry them out of England.

And so these Separatists were given all kinds of very tough treatment—fines and taxes. Their wives were put in the stocks and made fun of and all kinds of difficult things so that these Separatists couldn't really live in England and they couldn't have their little church that they had started or their series of churches. And so, as you know the story, they moved to Holland where they could have freedom to start their own church.

So they lived in Holland for some time. It was a difficult existence. They

had to work 7 days a week and many, many hours a day; very, very difficult economically for them. But they didn't complain, and they were able to have their church worship service the way they wanted. That lasted for some period of time as these Separatists were in Holland, but a couple things happened that convinced them to look around at something else, and the main thing was that their children were picking up some bad habits from the Dutch kids and they didn't like that. They had come there because they had some very strong theological beliefs about what was right and wrong. They were worried about their children and the culture in which they were living, and so they cast about for what God would have them do.

So the picture that is printed, it is a wonderful painting. It is about 10-by-20 feet in the Rotunda. This picture depicts the key turning point for a bunch of these Separatists, and this is in the town of Delfthshaven. And if you take a look closely at the picture, certainly you can't see it here in the camera, but it says "Speedwell." That is the name of the ship. And these are the Separatists gathering together at Delfthshaven in a farewell to their pastor, John Robinson, who they loved dearly.

John Robinson was a very even-tempered, peace-loving man. He had risked his life a number of times trying to separate groups of different Christians that were fighting each other, and his parishioners said he had the wisdom to see trouble coming and to steer his little flock away from the trouble. So they loved John Robinson.

He is now preaching his last sermon, because he will not go with the Pilgrims to America but, instead, will stay behind with the members of his church that were still going to be back in Holland.

And so, as you can imagine, if this is your last time and you have all of these friends who are going on this absolutely incredible expedition to plant a plantation in the middle of the wilderness all the way across the ocean, you are going to give them your best shot. You are going to talk to them about the things that you think are most important.

So we have a recording of what he was preaching about. And he, first of all, bewailed the state of the Calvinists and the Lutherans. And he said, "For though Luther and Calvin were bright lights in their own day, yet were they living today they would readily embrace the additional truth that God is breaking forth from his word."

What he was saying, in effect, was that our understanding that we get from the Bible is not static; it is something that moves over time. And as people learn lessons from history, we should learn from them, and we should continue to learn the additional things that God is going to teach us in practical sense from his Bible.

In a sense, his idea of the Bible was it was a gold mine. It was full of truth.

And as men over time read it and understood it, they could improve the lot of civilizations. It turns out that this was a pretty good theory in all practical sense. Whether you happen to have any interest in theology or not, it turned out to be a pretty good theory, and you will see why in just a few minutes as we follow this little group of people on this incredible adventure story.

You have to think about this. When people came to America in Jamestown and other places, it was men. They came here, to some degree, to say they were going to spread the light of Christ to the heathen, but mostly they were looking for gold. That is what the history books show us.

But this little group of people were different. They were going to take their wives and their children on a one-way trip across the North Atlantic to try to plant a civilization. And they were doing it not as a bunch of dogs that had their tails tucked between their legs because they had been chased out of one place and chased out of another place, but with a vibrant vision of a challenge to build a new civilization based on new principles and new ideas. They wanted a change from the European civilization because, Robinson goes on and says: Now, when you go to this new land, be very careful what you adopt as truth, sayeth he, for it is unlikely essentially that a Christian civilization can spring so rapidly out of such thick anti-Christian darkness.

He was talking about Europe, and how Europe was very resistant to ideas that the Bible would suggest were a good way to do things. So he was saying: Now, when you go over on this great expedition, be really careful what you do, because how you set things up is going to be very, very important. And you don't want to set it up just the way they did in Europe, but continue to use the Bible as the blueprint.

So this group of people are going to leave Delfthshaven here and they are going to go across and rendezvous in England with the ship Mayflower.

Now, it turns out this old Speedwell was a leaky bucket. They tried to take a couple of attempts to start from England to go over to America, and the seams on the Speedwell opened up and it started to leak so badly they had to turn around and come back, and then they had to take some of the different passengers off and some of their supplies off. They had to leave the Speedwell behind. It got to be kind of complicated and expensive.

Eventually, like a family getting off on a vacation late, they eventually get in the Mayflower everybody they could fit in there with what supplies they could and started across the North Atlantic. Well, that delay put them in the North Atlantic in the fall, which is a rough time to be crossing the North Atlantic.

Well, the old Mayflower started getting beaten by storms. In the begin-

ning, the Pilgrims—and let me maybe clarify this point now. The people in the Mayflower at this point are really two groups. About half of them are these Separatists, which you see here, and the other half were just jolly old blokes off the streets of England that were part of the merchant adventurers financing this trip to plant a colony over in the New World.

□ 2130

The idea of the colony, of course, was it was going to make money for the people that were financing this undertaking, and they were hoping they would get rich from it. So you have really a little over 100 people, about 50–50 between these Separatists that have a vision for a new civilization and other people that are just there mostly hoping to make a good living and to turn a page in their lives.

So they come across the North Atlantic, and in the beginning the sailors all start making fun of them because they are all seasick. It is pretty miserable to be seasick. You almost feel it would be better to die when you turn green. So the sailors would call them "puke socks." That was what one of the boatswains called them, "you puke socks," because everybody was sick and feeling pretty bad.

But the storms intensified as they crossed, and after awhile the poor old Pilgrims noticed that the sailors weren't joking so much about it. They looked a little bit upset too, because the storms got really severe. And in spite of their prayers and everything else, the Mayflower was just beaten by storms.

One time in the middle of the night they heard a groaning and a crack as though they had run into a rock or something, and it turned out one of those great big huge oak beams that was supporting the main mast had started to sag and break under the weight of the mast and the tremendous pressure of the wind and the rigging and the sails.

So they were almost thinking they had to turn the Mayflower around and go back to England, when one of these passengers, one of the Separatists, remembered there was a big printing press screw jack in the hold, which they fought out of the hold and managed to get it in position and cranked it up to support the oak beam so it would not be sagging.

They continued the trip across the ocean, and because of the storms were blown significantly off course and landed the first time out in Massachusetts, which, of course, is not Virginia. Virginia in those days went as far north as New York, but they were headed much further south. They weren't surprised. They knew they had been blown north by the storms.

So there they are after a couple of attempts to try to come south down the outside of Cape Cod. The winds were very unfavorable, it is late in the season, the storms are rough. These old

square riggers, the Mayflower, they were not great technological wonders at being able to sail into the wind, so consequently they didn't want to get with a hard wind to be driven on to the sandy beach, because the ship would break up and that would be the end of the deal.

So they are anchored out at Provincetown, and it is getting I guess into about the November timeframe, getting pretty chilly up in Massachusetts. They realized that they are not in Virginia and so their charter didn't apply. So now we get the first real lesson in civil government from the Pilgrims, and, boy, what a great lesson for all of us it is today.

Because the charter didn't apply, the two groups that were in the Pilgrims were known as the saints and the strangers. The saints were the Separatists, that is the saints here at prayer, and the strangers were the ones that were strangers to God. And the strangers are saying, hey, it is like Australia, you know. No rules, mate. Everybody for himself. We get to shore, we can do whatever we want to do.

It had quite a smell of anarchy about it, and it was then that the saints said, no, we kind of need to pull things together. So they exercised some leadership, took a piece of paper and wrote a document. It is called the Mayflower Compact, one of the greatest American documents produced. We don't have a copy of it. We have copies, but we don't have the original. It was viewed by the Pilgrims as not really an astounding thing, but subsequently we have considered it of great import.

So it starts "In the name of God, amen." It goes on to say, "We do covenant and combine ourselves together in a civil body politic for the glory of God, the advancement of the Christian faith, and to frame such just and equal laws as may seem good."

And so what is it that is so special about this Mayflower Compact? Well, as far as I know, it is the first time in human history where you have a group of free people under God creating a civil government to be their servant. Does that sound like a familiar pattern? Of course. It is very similar to what our Declaration of Independence is saying.

You have to understand in the context of history how innovative what they had done really was, because in Europe, the model for civil government was the divine right of kings. If you are a politician, it was a great deal. You say "God put me here as king. When I say jump, you are supposed to say 'how high?'"

So Europe had been dominated by the divine right of kings, and each king felt like they weren't a servant, they were the boss. God put them there, and they tell you what to do. That is how Europe did things.

But these Separatists when they came across the ocean had the concept that we are trying to infuse in the Republican Party as we deliberate very

soberly about changing the system, that we are going to change the system from Europe and the divine right of kings to the system that the government would be the servant of the people and that individual citizens had God-given rights and it was the responsibility of the government to protect your God-given rights.

That is what the Mayflower Compact was all about, and that is why this very first moment, as they are at the great big oak table in the great room of the Mayflower, why this moment is so significant to all of us, because the Pilgrims gave us the model of American civil government.

Now, to them it was sort of a straightforward idea, because they had already struggled with this question in the context of their church government. In Scrooby, England, they had decided to separate themselves from little old King James. He was a little bit of a weird fellow. He had some very strange social habits. They didn't want him running their church.

So a group of free people under God had covenanted together to create a New Testament church, and they took that model of the New Testament church and simply picked it up and applied it to civil government. A group of free people under God created a civil government, not a church government, to be their servant.

Now, they believed those two were separate, so they didn't tangle up the church with their civil government, but they used the same pattern. So the Mayflower Compact is really to our knowledge the first written constitution pulling these elements together; that under God, free people are creating a civil government to be their servant. That is the basic pattern. It is called the covenantal view of civil government. It is the first written Constitution in America that is on that same pattern. That was 1620.

Now, I will continue with the story of the Pilgrims, but just to jump forward, it is not so long after that, 1620 to 1634, you have a more advanced constitution for Boston, and then a very highly advanced constitution called the Fundamental Orders of Connecticut, only 18 years later. So that is 1638, very early.

The Fundamental Orders of Connecticut has basically the whole model for the whole U.S. Constitution. It has federalism, separate branches of government, a lot of the technical sophistication of the U.S. Constitution just 18 years after these Pilgrims had started with the Mayflower Compact. So you have a tremendous period of the development of the concept of American civil government very early.

Well, I told you this group of Pilgrims here had blessed us in a lot of ways. It should be obvious, two of the ways they blessed us—these are ideas that just completely undergird America. The first is separating civil government from church government. That is something they took from the Bible. It is amusing, isn't it?

The second thing they did was give us our model of civil government, which is the fact that the government is to be the servant, not a fearful master. So those were pretty good ideas.

They also came, and I think this is a pretty important concept, they came with the belief that they could learn things from the Bible and should use the Bible as a blueprint to guide how they did things. And that same concept was picked up later by the people who would follow after the Pilgrims.

So let's finish the story a little bit and get to Thanksgiving. The Pilgrims, they are on Provincetown at the tip of Cape Cod, and they do the Mayflower Compact. Then they take pieces of a prefabricated boat called a shallop that was stored in their holds and they put that together. It had been damaged some by the storms coming across. It took them a number of weeks to build it up. But a shallop is a pretty good size rowboat. It would carry more than a dozen people, it had a sail and a rudder.

They took the shallop up in the shallow water around the inside of Cape Cod, and they had their first encounter at Eastham beach, there just about sunrise. A whole bunch of Indians screaming and yelling shot arrows at them. It wasn't exactly a warm welcome. They shot some of their muzzle loaders off and nobody got hurt. And they continued around the inside of Cape Cod.

They were looking for a place, and Cape Cod, I have a chance to go there in the summer times, it is known as Barnstable Harbor. Translated, that means Barnstable Harbor.

They were out in the surf, the sand is shallow there, they are out in the shallop and it got to be dark, and they are trying to figure out, the wind is coming up, it is starting to snow, they are getting ice all over their clothes. They try to make a run in to where they thought the entrance to Barnstable Harbor was, and they were mistaken. It was not. It was just a sandy beach, and the surf was starting to pile in on the beach. And right when they are in the waves, the guy by the name of Clark says—grabs the steering oar, and he swings the shallop around in a desperate maneuver. He says, "If ye be men, pull for your lives."

□ 2140

And they laid into the oars and were able to snatch the shallop out of the waves and out into the deep water. Again, the snow. It's dark and the snow is coming down. Ice is freezing on their clothes. And eventually, eventually they manage to find something where they can pull into the lee of this piece of land where they got out of the heavy blowing wind and were able to pull their boat up on the shore where there weren't any waves, and they spent a waterlogged Sunday on this island. It turned out when they got up in the morning, it was an island in the middle of a beautiful harbor, which we now



know as Plymouth, Massachusetts. The island was named after the seaman Clarke, who said, If ye be men, pull for your lives.

And so they start making rapid discoveries. They find that there's an area of land that's clear where they can plant crops. There's beautiful fresh water coming down from a hillside and a high area that they can fortify to try to protect themselves, defend themselves from whatever problems there might be. Particularly, they were concerned about the Indians that were in those parts. They didn't see any Indians, but they were worried that there might be some because the other Indians over in Eastham had not been too friendly. Of course, there's a reason they hadn't been too friendly. It's because there had been some ships that had come by and stolen some of them and sold them off into slavery. It put the Indians in a bad mood, you might say.

And so you have the Pilgrims now late in the season, in fact, about Christmas Day, starting to build their first shelters in Plymouth. As you can imagine, the trip had been tough. Their supplies were limited. And the people that were getting in and out of the wet boats and trying to work on building shelters there started to get sick. And over a period of the next couple of months, more and more of them died, to the point that in some days as many as four Pilgrims at a time would die. There was a time, a day or two, when everybody was so sick there were only two or three that were able to get up and feed everybody else and sort of show themselves on the palisades of the little fortification they'd made just in case the Indians made some sort of attack.

But they were in rough shape. In the middle of the night sometimes a man would take his dead wife, would drag her out across the frozen ground and bury her under leaves and rocks. And it was very tough. There were children, wives, and adults. By the time that March came around, half of the Pilgrims—almost half the Pilgrims had died.

Now you might ask yourself, these are people that came with a vision. They had a vision that God was calling them to found a new Nation based on new principles, new ideas, ideas that they took from the Bible. And you'd say, Well, where was their God? He blew them off course by the storm and now half of them died. You'd think they might get discouraged. It's easy to be discouraged, as you can imagine, in those conditions. Very few families didn't have someone who died in that first couple of months.

And so the captain of the Mayflower, who had anchored the Mayflower there in Plymouth Harbor for the winter to try to give them some protection, in the spring decided he had lost half his crew, decided he had to sail back to England. And so he prevailed on the Pilgrims. He said, Now, you need to go

back with me to England because this little adventure hasn't worked too well. Half of you are dead; half my crew is dead.

And so you can picture standing on the shore, Plymouth, and the wind is blowing through the pine trees behind you and you're looking across to the harbor. There's the Mayflower and the boatswain is giving the call. Sails are being squared to the wind. The sail is being raised. Men are walking or actually turning a big crank. It wasn't quite a capstan. It was a different type of arrangement to lift the old seaweed-covered line that held the anchor to the bottom of the harbor. And first large, then small, the Mayflower disappears over the horizon and there's just the sound of the wind in the trees. And every one of the Pilgrims stayed there on that beach because they believed that God had called them to a mission, to the beginning of something that was going to be great that He would bless, in spite of the fact that half of them had died.

It wasn't too long after that that they had their first Indian sighting. The lookout said, Indian coming. You mean Indians? No. Indian. They look out and here's this tall brave dressed in a loincloth walking boldly down the street. He looks at them and in perfect English says, Do you have any beer? Quite a reception from their first Indian guest.

It turned out he was an Indian that was a chief of a tribe up in Maine. He liked hitchhiking down the coast. And he could speak English. He'd actually gotten to know English pretty well and developed a taste for smoked duck and for beer and things. Until he had eaten a good supply of the Pilgrim's food, he wouldn't tell them too much. After he had a good meal, he told them about the Indians in the parts. He told them about the fact that the land where they were living had been considered cursed by the Indians because the Patuxets that had lived there had died of a plague. And so God in his providence took the Pilgrims to probably one of the only places on the eastern seaboard where they could stay where there weren't hostile Indians.

It turned out they made a good alliance with Massasoit, who was a good Indian chief and had become a friend of the Pilgrims. Massasoit talked to them about the last of the Patuxets that was living by himself, alone and lonely. And when Tisquantum understood the plight of the English settlers in Plymouth, he decided to join them because he knew something about it. He had been shanghaied, sold into slavery, bought out of slavery by some monks, traveled to England, learned to speak English, and gotten a trip back in a ship to go back to the Patuxets. He got there and the Patuxet tribe was wiped out, I assume by small pox or something. And so he's living by himself.

Now he joins the Pilgrims and helps them and teaches them all kind of useful lessons. He told them that in a

short period of time that the streams would be full of little fish and they could use that to plant corn. He taught them important things like taking your moccasins off and wiggling your toes in the mud so you can catch eels, which they could fry up for food. All sorts of useful things Tisquantum taught them. Of course, we know him as Squanto, friend of the white man.

Squanto lived with them some time and helped the settlers there. They were living under the conditions of the contract that the merchant adventurers had set up. And one of the things that they had set up was it was going to be a socialistic society. Everybody was going to pitch into the common store. They had common land. They're going to grow food on the land. Everybody had to work the field. Everybody had to wash everybody else's laundry. And that wasn't working too well. In fact, Governor Bradford—he was elected Governor soon after Governor Carver had died, probably of cerebral hemorrhage—Governor Bradford said in his diary of Plymouth Plantation, as though men were wiser than God, he said this idea of socialism—he didn't use the word socialism—taking everything in common may have been a good idea to Plato and other ancients as though they were wiser than God.

But he basically pitched out socialism and said every man can have his own field, could grow his own corn, and his diary said that it made hands very industrious. People who would feign to be sick or too weak to work now were out busy in the cornfield growing corn for their family and the women didn't complain about washing other people's clothes.

Anyway, they got rid of socialism. Eventually, after about a year or so, decided to celebrate a day of thanksgiving. And so they invited a couple of Indian chiefs to join them for thanksgiving. The trouble is the Indian chiefs, Massasoit, brought along about 90 braves. So when the Pilgrims saw this massive number of Indians they were going to feed for a meal, they're thinking, Oh my goodness, this isn't going to work very well.

Fortunately, the Indians did some hunting. They brought deer and turkey and a number of other things, berries that they had collected. And they had a wonderful Thanksgiving. The Indians didn't know they had just been invited for one Thanksgiving dinner. They stayed 3 days and enjoyed Thanksgiving over and over again. In the meantime, they had footraces and contests and shooting with bows and arrows and all kinds of other things that they did that was a lot of fun. It was a great couple-day celebration of thanksgiving in Plymouth Plantation.

Thanksgiving became a very popular holiday in the colonies up and down the eastern seaboard. And the first national day of thanksgiving was called by George Washington to celebrate the adoption of the U.S. Constitution. It was later set at a particular time in

November—I think it was the third Thursday in November as I recall—and it has stayed there to this time.

□ 2150

So we have the story now of the Pilgrims. As you celebrate your Thanksgiving this year, it might be helpful to think back and say there is more than Thanksgiving with the Pilgrims. They were a group of people who were willing to change the system, to think of different ideas. They came here and separated civil and church governments. They came here and created the model of a written constitution, the idea that the government is to be the servant of the people, that people have God-given rights and that it is the job of government to protect those rights, as we stated another 150 years later in our Declaration of Independence. They came here with the idea that, after trying socialism, it wasn't going to work. They realized that it was not biblical, that it was a form of theft, so they kicked socialism out. They learned that in the early 1620s.

So we can thank these people because of the fact that they were innovative and had that spirit and desire. Even when half of them died and the Mayflower was going back, they clung to their vision. They had the courage to create a new civilization. In the words of Bradford Prince, as written in his diary, they felt that perhaps they'd lit a candle on a dark shore. They felt that perhaps they could be stepping-stones for people who would come after them to found a great Nation. So the dream that they had of coming here to do something new, unlike what Europe had done, was very much in their hearts. It was very much a part of their thinking as they scratched that existence on that lonely, rock-strewn Massachusetts shoreline. To this day, as we celebrate Thanksgiving, we can remember their first Thanksgiving when they put a few kernels of corn on a plate to remind them of how close to starving to death they had been at one time.

It's a beautiful story. There's a lot more to it, a lot more adventure to it. There were knife fights in cabins. I haven't had time to cover all of that with you, but the basics are there. This is a great bunch of Americans, a wonderful adventure story and a time for us to give consideration to the fact that we also have been given a challenge, a challenge of a beautiful land that was established on a firm foundation. It's our job to keep it that way and to pass it on to our children—a government that is the servant of the people and not the master.

God bless you all. Have a wonderful Thanksgiving.

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

#### OUR POLITICAL HERITAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 6, 2009, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, I had the great privilege and honor to deliver my first speech as a Representative of the people of the 10th District of Illinois. As I end my time in the House of Representatives and begin with the honor of serving the great State of Illinois, I want to thank those that I have served with and reflect on my time in this great body.

Our Jefferson's Manual of House Rules traces its heritage back to the Palace of Westminster, in London, England. Early in the 1800s, I worked under a member of the House of Commons during the time of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, and in Parliament, great weight is put on a member's maiden speech.

In the speech that I gave in the House of Representatives, a new Member outlines the principles for which he stands, and as I began my service to the people of northern Illinois, I highlighted the political tradition of the men and women who represented us in this House. A look at their accomplishments and service mirrors who we are and the gifts that we can provide to this great Nation.

Our community has a 180-year-long tradition of electing leaders who are very independent and ahead of their times. Ours is a rich tradition, and I can only hope that history will find my contributions to be consistent with the predecessors', whose roots trace back to 1818 when a new State of Illinois stood on the frontier of a growing Nation.

My predecessors were committed to the people of Illinois and to the good of this Union. At the same time, they understood the important role of the United States and of the world as a beacon of freedom, and while they fought for similarities here at home, they also fought for human rights abroad and condemned those who would spread intolerance and hate wherever it occurred.

Within its current boundaries, our congressional district encompasses a diverse community, including northern Cook and eastern Lake Counties, and it stretches from Wilmette, north along Lake Michigan's shore, to Waukegan. To tour our district is to see firsthand both the promise of the American Dream and those who have not yet realized it.

Our residents enjoy both great benefits and serious challenges. We are home to some of the wealthiest communities in the Nation, and yet we also have some of the most economically challenged communities in Illinois. We have pristine wetlands and forests, as well as one of the worst polluted harbors in the Great Lakes, and we have more than 1,000 tons of highly radioactive spent nuclear fuel stored just 120 yards from Lake Michigan. We are also home to the only training center for new recruits in the United States

Navy. Each day, thousands of my constituents commute to Chicago, fighting some of the worst traffic congestion in the Nation each morning into the city and repeating the process every evening.

In serving the people of the 10th District, I have been honored to follow a long list of role models who have represented us in the Congress:

Our first Representative, John McLean, was one of the State's pioneer political leaders. He took his seat in the Old House Chamber on December 3, 1818, serving just 1 year. He was later elected to the United States Senate to fill a vacancy caused by the death of Senator Ninian Edwards in 1824 and served through March of the following year. While our pathfinder's service was very brief in both Chambers of this Congress, he was honored by the State, which named McLean County after him.

It was about this time that the first European family settled on the North Shore in what is now Evanston, residing in a place that was described as "a rude habitation of posts, poles and blankets." More notable, though, was the construction of the first permanent structure on the North Shore, a roadside grocery, serving cold beer and liquor to travelers. This grocery was described as "the headquarters of counterfeiters, fugitives from justice and, generally speaking, a vile resort." Ironically, 100 years later, Evanston would become the international headquarters of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, and it is from these Spartan but colorful beginnings that we trace our suburban history.

Numerous shifts in population have brought many changes to the boundary lines of today's 10th Congressional District, and redistricting has changed its landscape no fewer than 10 times in the last 190 years. We face another change soon as Illinois prepares to lose a congressional seat before the next election. By 1902, Lake and northern Cook Counties were part of the 10th District, and the first outlines of the current district were formed as a new phenomenon in American living emerged, the suburbs.

In 1913, the election of a Progressive candidate, Charles M. Thompson, was indicative of the new independent spirit of the 10th District voters and of our willingness to elect whomever will best represent our interests, regardless of incumbency or party affiliation. Independent, thoughtful leadership are common themes among the men and women who represented our 10th District. Our leaders include:

John Stuart, a law partner of President Lincoln's; James Woodworth; Isaac Arnold; Charles Farwell; Lorenzo Brentano; George Foss; Abner Mikva; George Adams, a Civil War veteran who fought in the First Regiment of the Illinois Volunteer Artillery; and Robert McClory, who served for nearly 20 years and was a House manager for the Equal Rights Amendment in 1972.