

I wonder if my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) has any comments along those lines.

Mr. GOHMERT. I have the same concerns my good friend from Arizona has. As has been discussed here, people around the world, nations around the world watch everything we do to determine are we serious about providing for a defense for America. Are we serious about providing a defense for our allies. Are we serious about standing up against rogue nations, against attacks on freedom and liberty.

I know there is some disagreement among historians, but there are those who believe that when the Secretary of State 60 years ago gave a speech which in essence indicated that Korea was really outside our sphere of influence, North Korea had been massing and they had been preparing, but it happened that they began moving south after that speech. People notice when there is a weakness evidenced in America's leadership, and often it leads to acts of violence.

Do you think it was any accident that the flotilla went against the Israeli blockade of Gaza where thousands of rockets had flown into Israel, destroying, killing, terrorizing Israelis. We agreed originally that the blockade was necessary because of all of the death and destruction. Was it any accident that the flotilla ends up setting sail to try to at least challenge that blockade after this White House snubs the prime minister of Israel, treats them worse than Chavez or some Third World dictator, treats them so shabbily, and begins to side with Israel's enemies, like in May voting with Israel's enemies to make them disclose all of their weaponry. I mean, was it any accident that is when those who want to challenge Israel's very existence sent the flotilla south? I don't think so.

When it comes to strong leadership that protects America, I mean, my friends have been discussing this issue of Guantanamo. I know that you would be as delighted as I was to read the headline, "5 Charged in 9/11 Attacks Seek to Plead Guilty." A New York Times article, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: "The five Guantanamo detainees charged with coordinating the September 11 attacks told a military judge on Monday that they wanted to confess in full, a move that seemed to challenge the government to put them to death. At the start of what had been listed as routine proceedings Monday, Judge Henry said he had received a written statement from the five men dated November 4 saying they planned to stop filing legal motions and to 'announce our confessions to plea in full'. Speaking in what has become a familiar high-pitched tone in the cavernous courtroom here, the most prominent of the five, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed said, 'We don't want to waste our time with motions.'" That was what they said.

This administration, unfortunately, came in after, just a month after this

because this is December 8, 2008. These guys were ready to plead guilty. They were ready to be put to death. They had already proclaimed, as Khalid Sheikh Mohammed did, as well as authorized by the other four, they were ready to plead guilty and take their punishment. Oh, no. The strong leaders in this administration came in and said, whoa, whoa, not so fast. We want to give you a show trial in New York City, cost ourselves billions of dollars, put New Yorkers at risk so you can have a big show, and we can pound our chest and talk about how civilized we are.

What civilized nation would not protect itself so it can remain civilized instead of being overtaken by barbarians? The civilized thing to do is to protect the civilized people that put you in office. But that is not what this administration did. They came in and basically said, you know what, hold off on that guilty plea. Once these guys heard they were going to get a show trial, well for heaven's sake, they pulled back on their guilty pleas and here 2 years later, 2 full years later, this administration has now announced basically that we are not sure when we are going to get around to bringing them to trial. We are not sure where we are going to try them. It has shown weakness in leadership.

I just remind my friend, and I know he knows the quote from John Stuart Mill, who said in the 1800s: "War is an ugly thing, but not the ugliest of things. The decayed and degraded state of moral and patriotic feeling which thinks that nothing is worth war is much worse. The person who has nothing for which he is willing to fight, nothing which is more important than his own personal safety, is a miserable creature and has no chance of being free unless made and kept so by the exertions of better men than himself."

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is kind hard to top that. The message I was hoping that could be relayed more than anything else is that there has been a general lackadaisical, asleep-at-the-wheel, detached perspective of this administration when it comes to national security. And unfortunately, we live in a 9/11 world where there are those out there who don't hold to the ideals of freedom and protecting innocent life, like has been the ideal of America. This administration is continuing down this path.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to have to come to this floor in future days and have to decry what we failed to do. I think there is still time for this administration to wake up and realize that allowing Iran to gain nuclear weapons, allowing North Korea to proliferate nuclear capability, missile capability throughout the world, allowing terrorists to use the forms of liberty to destroy liberty itself in our civilian courts, allowing the potential of terrorists to gain control of an EMP capability that could threaten our whole society, standing by while the Senate

sits quietly and does nothing to pass the GRID bill passed in the House of Representatives, these are very, very important things, Mr. Speaker. I just hope somehow this administration realizes that their first purpose and their first responsibility to God, country, and their fellow human beings is to protect the lives and constitutional rights of the citizens of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that happens.

#### GETTING BACK TO OUR CONSTITUTION

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, I have so much respect and abiding love and appreciation for my dear friend from Arizona, as well as my friend from Colorado and my friend who was here earlier from Iowa, my dear friend STEVE KING. Congressman KING and I were down in Guantanamo together, and I heard him earlier talking about pulling back the privileges and punishing assaults at Guantanamo Bay against our own servicemembers.

□ 2150

I did recall something that he may not have recalled. There is another severe form of punishment when such an assault is committed on our guards at Guantanamo, which apparently is pretty customary down there, of throwing urine or feces on our guards. They have to come up with creative ways to do that, and do so.

One of the other ways—and it's the only other way in addition to taking some of their outdoor exercise time down to 2 hours. The other thing that they have been known to do in order to really punish them, to actually torture them, is to take away some of their movie-watching time during the day. It's just devastating, you know, to the Guantanamo detainees to have some of their movie-watching privileges taken away because they threw feces or urine on one of our gallant servicemen or -women. You've got to take away some of their movie-watching. It really teaches them a lesson. It just shows them we're not going to be messed with. If you mess with us, you won't get to watch as many movies today as you would have otherwise. We'll show 'em.

I was also hearing on the news today that Uyghurs, Chinese Muslims who have been transferred out of Guantanamo, had given interviews, indicating, actually, they were a lot better treated in Guantanamo than they were at home in China. So, despite the way some people have tried to characterize the prison in Guantanamo, it is not quite as bad—in fact, not by a long shot. It provides better living conditions than many of these people have ever had in their lives.

Then again, some of them wanted to blow themselves up, and they haven't had that opportunity down there. So, if their version of a great, abundant life is to blow themselves up and to kill a lot of innocent people, then, yes, they have not had that kind of abundant life of blowing themselves up and killing innocent people in Guantanamo Bay.

But the messages that are coming out of this administration are particularly worrisome. When our own enemies perceive weakness in the President of this country or his administration, it propels them into action. It propels them into actions that harm the United States that they would otherwise be afraid to move forward with. In fact, when one thinks about President Bush, with support from Democrats and Republicans alike, going into Iraq, one of the things that came out of that was a country teetering once again on the edge of nuclear proliferation, a nuclear program going forward.

When President Bush ordered our troops into Iraq, the potential terrorist-harboring state of Libya realized, uh-oh, this President is quite serious. He is willing to commit American troops into harm's way to take out a ruthless leader who at least says he supports terrorism and supports threatening the United States. "Maybe I'd better cancel our nuclear program and make peace with the United States."

One of the byproducts of the invasion of Iraq was a message that, at that time at least, there was a President who would step up and who was not afraid to take action when someone continued to try to threaten the United States.

A friend who publishes in the Jerusalem Post—and I've had the opportunity, honor and privilege to read some of Caroline Glick's writing here on the House floor before—has great insight so often into areas of foreign policy, not only with regard to Israel but with regard to the United States and our place in international stability when we do show that we can and will be strong. There was an article that was published in the Jerusalem Post, written by Caroline Glick on November 26, 2010. Caroline's perspective and the things she has to say, I think, are important enough to read into our RECORD, Mr. Speaker, for anyone who may not otherwise have been privy to her observations. This is her article.

It begins, "Crises are exploding throughout the world. And the leader of the free world is making things worse." I'm quoting from Caroline Glick.

"On the Korean Peninsula, North Korea just upended 8 years of State Department obfuscation by showing a team of U.S. nuclear scientists its collection of thousands of state-of-the-art centrifuges installed in its Yongbyon nuclear reactor.

"And just to top off the show, as Stephen Bosworth, U.S. President Barack Obama's point man on North Korea,

was busily arguing that this revelation is not a crisis, the North fired an unprovoked artillery barrage at South Korea, demonstrating that, actually, it is a crisis.

"But the Obama administration remains unmoved. On Tuesday, Defense Secretary Robert Gates thanked his South Korean counterpart, Kim Tae-young, for showing 'restraint.'

"On Thursday, Kim resigned in disgrace for that restraint.

"The U.S. has spoken strongly of not allowing North Korea's aggression to go unanswered. But in practice, its only answer is to try to tempt North Korea back to feckless multilateral disarmament talks that will go nowhere because China supports North Korean armament. Contrary to what Obama and his advisers claim, China does not share the U.S.'s interest in denuclearizing North Korea. Consequently, Beijing will not lift a finger to achieve that goal.

"Then there is Iran. The now inarguable fact that Pyongyang is developing nuclear weapons with enriched uranium makes it all but certain that the hyperactive proliferators in Pyongyang are involved in Iran's uranium-based nuclear weapons program. Obviously, the North Koreans don't care that the U.N. Security Council placed sanctions on Iran. And their presumptive role in Iran's nuclear weapons program exposes the idiocy of the concept that these sanctions can block Iran's path to a nuclear arsenal.

"Every day, as the regime in Pyongyang and Teheran escalate their aggression and confrontational stances, it becomes more and more clear that the only way to neutralize the threats they pose to international security is to overthrow them. At least in the case of Iran, it is also clear that the prospects for regime change have never been better.

"Iran's regime is in trouble. Since the fraudulent Presidential elections 17 months ago, the regime has moved ferociously against its domestic foes.

"But dissent has only grown. And as popular resentment towards the regime has grown, the likes of President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, supreme dictator Ali Khamenei and their Revolutionary Guards have become terrified of their own people. They have imprisoned rappers and outlawed Western music. They have purged their schoolbooks of Persian history. Everything that smacks of anything non-Islamic is viewed as a threat.

"Members of the regime are so frightened by the public that, this week, several members of parliament tried to begin impeachment proceedings against Ahmadinejad. Apparently, they hope that ousting him will be sufficient to end the public's call for revolutionary change.

□ 2200

But Khamenei is standing by his man, and the impeachment proceedings have ended as quickly as they began.

The policy implications of all this are clear.

"The U.S. should destroy Iran's nuclear installations and help the Iranian people overthrow the regime, but the Obama administration will have none of it.

"Earlier this month, Gates said, 'If it's military solution, as far as I'm concerned, it will bring together a divided nation.'

"So in his view, the Iranian people, who risk death to defy the regime every day, the Iranian people who revile Ahmadinejad as 'the chimpanzee' and call for Khamenei's death from their rooftops every evening, will rally around the chimp and the dictator if the U.S. or Israel attacks Iran's nuclear installations."

Continuing with Caroline Glick's article, she says, "Due to this thinking, as far as the Obama administration is concerned the U.S. should stick to its failed sanctions policy and continue its failed attempts to cut a nuclear deal with the mullahs.

"As Michael Ledeen noted last week at Pajamas Media, this boilerplate assertion, backed by no evidence whatsoever, is what passes for strategic wisdom in Washington as Iran completes its nuclear project. And this U.S. refusal to understand the policy implications of popular rejection of the regime is what brings State Department wise men and women to the conclusion that the U.S. has no dog in this fight. As State Department spokesman P.J. Crowley told The Wall Street Journal this week, the Parliament's bid to impeach Ahmadinejad was nothing more than the product of 'rivalries within the Iranian Government.'

"Then there is Lebanon. Since Ahmadinejad's visit last month, it is obvious that Iran is now the ruler of Lebanon and that it exerts its authority over the country through its Hezbollah proxy.

"Hezbollah's open threats to overthrow Prime Minister Saad Hariri's government if Hezbollah's role in assassinating his father in 2005 is officially acknowledged just make this tragic reality more undeniable. And yet, the Obama administration continues to deny that Iran controls Lebanon.

"A month after Ahmadinejad's visit, Obama convinced the lame duck Congress to lift its hold on \$100 million in U.S. military assistance to the Hezbollah-dominated Lebanese military. And the U.S. convinced Israel to relinquish the northern half of the border town of Ghajar to U.N. forces despite the fact that the U.N. forces are at Hezbollah's mercy.

"In the midst of all these crises, Obama has maintained faith with his two central foreign policy goals: forcing Israel to withdraw to the indefensible 1949 armistice lines and scaling back the U.S. nuclear arsenal with an eye towards unilateral disarmament. That is, as the forces of mayhem and war escalate their threats and aggression, Obama's central goals remain

weakening the U.S.'s most powerful regional ally in the Middle East and rendering the U.S. incompetent to deter or defeat rapidly proliferating rogue states that are at war with the U.S. and its allies.

"Having said that, the truth is that in advancing these goals, Obama is not out of step with his predecessors. George H.W. Bush and Bill Clinton both enacted drastic cuts in the U.S. conventional and nonconventional arsenals. Clinton and George W. Bush adopted appeasement policies towards North Korea. Indeed, Pyongyang owes its nuclear arsenal to both Presidents' desire to be deceived and do nothing.

"Moreover, North Korea's ability to proliferate nuclear weapons to the likes of Iran, Syria and Venezuela owes in large part to then-Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice's insistence that Israel say nothing about North Korea's nuclear ties to Iran and Syria in the wake of Israel's destruction of the North Korean-built and Iranian-financed nuclear reactor in Syria in September 2007.

"As for Iran, Obama's attempt to appease the regime is a little different from his predecessors' policies. The Bush administration refused to confront the fact that the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq are to a large degree Iranian proxy wars.

"The Bush administration refused to acknowledge that Syria and Hizbullah are run by Teheran and that the 2006 war against Israel was nothing more than an expansion of the proxy wars Iran is running in Iraq and Afghanistan.

"Obama's failed 'reset' policy towards Russia is also little different from his predecessors' policies.

"Bush did nothing but squawk after Russia invaded U.S. ally Georgia. The Clinton administration set the stage for Vladimir Putin's KGB state by squandering the U.S.'s massive influence over post-Soviet Russia and allowing Boris Yeltsin and his cronies to transform the country into an impoverished kleptocracy.

"Finally, Obama's obsession with Israel land giveaways to the PLO were shared by Clinton and by the younger Bush, particularly after 2006. Rice, who compared Israel to the Jim Crow South, was arguably as hostile toward Israel as Obama.

"So is Obama really worse than everyone else or is he just the latest in the line of U.S. Presidents who have no idea how to run an effective foreign policy? The short answer is that he is far worse than his predecessors.

"A U.S. President's maneuver room in foreign affairs is always very small. The foreign policy establishment in Washington is entrenched and uniformly opposed to bending to the will of elected leaders. The elites in the State Department and the CIA and their cronies in academia and policy circles in Washington are also consistently unmoved by reality, which as a rule exposes their policies as ruinous.

"The President has two ways to shift the ship of state. First, he can use his bully pulpit. Second, he can appoint people to key positions in the foreign policy bureaucracy.

"Since entering office, Obama has used both these powers to ill effect. He has traveled across the world condemning and apologizing for U.S. world leadership. In so doing, he has convinced ally and adversary alike that he is not a credible leader; that no one can depend on U.S. security guarantees during his watch; and that it is possible to attack the U.S., its allies and interests with impunity.

"Obama's call for a nuclear-free world combined with his aggressive stance toward Israel's purported nuclear arsenal, his bid to disarm the U.S. nuclear arsenal, and his ineffective response to North Korea's nuclear brinkmanship and Iran's nuclear project have served to convince nations from the Persian Gulf to South America to the Pacific Rim that they should begin developing nuclear weapons. By calling for nuclear disarmament, he has provoked the greatest wave of nuclear armament in history.

"Given his own convictions, it is no surprise that all his key foreign policy appointments share his dangerous views. The State Department's legal advisor, Harold Koh, believes the U.S. should subordinate its laws to an abstract and largely unfounded notion of international law. Undersecretary of Defense for Policy, Michele Flournoy, believes terrorists become radicalized because they are poor. She is advised by leftist extremist Rosa Brooks. Attorney General Eric Holder has decided to open criminal investigations against CIA operatives who interrogated terrorists and to try illegal enemy combatants in civilian courts.

"In all these cases and countless others, Obama's senior appointees are implementing policies that are even more radical and dangerous than the radical and dangerous policies of the Washington policy establishment.

□ 2210

Not only are they weakening the U.S. and its allies, they are demoralizing public servants who are dedicated to defending their country by signaling clearly that the Obama administration will leave them high and dry in a crisis.

"When a Republican occupies the White House, his foreign policies are routinely criticized and constrained by the liberal media. Radical Democratic Presidents like Woodrow Wilson have seen their foreign policies reined in by Republican congresses.

"Given the threats Obama's radical policies are provoking, it can only be hoped that through hearings and other means, the Republicans in the Senate and the House of Representatives will take an active role in curbing his policies. If they are successful, the American people and the international community will owe them a debt of gratitude."

That was as published in the Jerusalem Post posted November 26, 2010. Interesting.

It is quite disconcerting when we realized that this administration is sending out signals we won't stand by our friends and thinking that if we send a message out that we will embrace those who want to destroy our way of life, destroy our country and have pledged to do so; if we just show that we're willing to be compassionate, they'll be deeply moved and they'll come around to our side. Hardly.

History teaches us very clearly that when people who despise another nation get messages that that nation they despise is weak or will not defend itself, then they are provoked to action to destroy it, to take it over. Now, hopefully we're a long way from that happening because there are enough people here in Washington that believe that strength and a showing of strength and a showing of willingness to do what it takes to keep our oath to provide for the common defense of this country, that that is what keeps us at peace, that is what helps prevent wars. I believe it was Reagan who used to talk about no one was ever attacked because people believed they were too strong. They attack because they think there is a weakness they can take advantage of.

That's why after we pulled out of Vietnam and that footage remains being shown to Muslims in an attempt to radicalize them, see, America flees in the face of danger. See what happened in 1983 after the Marine barracks was blown up and nearly 300 Marines were killed? They left Beirut. See what happened back in 1979 when an act of international law, what international law would say was an act of war, American soil was attacked when our embassy was attacked, hostages taken. We did nothing but beg for Tehran to let them go for over a year. That was another sign of weakness.

When another act of war on the USS Cole was committed, we responded by lobbing some rockets doing virtually no damage to people who were at war with us.

So what are our enemies who want to see the United States destroyed, who have sworn to destroy this country and our way of life, what are they to think when repeatedly we show weakness and we show that those who have nothing but hate, disdain, and contempt for this country will be met with a warm embrace? What are they to think but to have more contempt for this country?

Now Caroline Glick mentions international law and that this President is advised by people who believe the U.S. should subordinate its laws to an abstract and largely unfounded notion of international law. I took a course in international law at Baylor Law School under a visiting professor from Japan. I did a research paper. Got an A on it by the dean of a Japanese law school who was visiting Baylor for that year.

And in having a conversation with him after the course was over, I said, For all of the reading we've done, all of the studying, the discussion, the debate, I come back to the conclusion that basically in short international law is whatever the strongest nation around says it is. And he says in essence, you have learned from this course well. That's exactly right. International law is whatever the strongest nation around says it is.

And yet in response to attacks, threatened attacks, threatened efforts to destroy our way of life, what we have seen is an effort to bow before those who want to destroy us, those who are not our friends.

I filed in the three Congresses that I have been in office here, and I will file in the fourth one next year, the U.N. Voting Accountability Act that says a nation that votes against us more than half the time in the U.N.—they're sovereign nations; they can do what they want to. We're not going to tell them how they have to vote, but any nation that votes against our position more than half the time will not get a dime of financial assistance from this country for the following year. As I said, you don't have to pay people to hate you. They'll do it for free. And it's still true.

America, the United States of America is truly the greatest nation in the history of mankind. There are more liberties and more freedoms in this country than have ever been observed by the citizens of any country. As great as Solomon's Israel was, it didn't have the liberties for the people that this Nation has.

This is a nation that is supposed to be governed by the people who, on Election Day, go out and actually hire people to do their bidding for the subsequent years. For too long, not enough people have come on hiring day to make sure that the best people got hired. For too long people have not studied the applications, the resumes, done the interviews of those who are seeking to be hired as the servants to go do their bidding as the people are the government.

And so as the old adage goes, democracy ensures people are governed no better than they deserve. So we've gotten what we've deserved whether anyone likes it or not; whether anyone likes the prior President, the Nation got what we deserved; whether anyone likes this President or not, the Nation got what we deserved.

And absolutely a truism that you can take to the bank, Madam Speaker, is that in 2012's elections, we will have a President elected or reelected who's no better than the Nation deserves.

Now, there is one area of tremendous ignorance in this country. And there is nothing wrong with ignorance in an area of someone's knowledge unless they persist in that ignorance and refuse to learn and fill that void.

We are told by our President that this is not a Christian nation, and I

will not debate that. Maybe we're not. But I know how the Nation was founded, and I know enough history. And there are so many wonderful books. This is another one by William Federer, America's God and Country. And I have read all of the things that I am about to enter into here in different areas as I studied history, was a history hanger major at Texas A&M. But Federer has put these together succinctly to help illuminate how we got started.

So in going back to July of 1776—hopefully most people in America would know July of 1776 is when the Declaration of Independence was signed, made public.

□ 2220

But in July of 1776, Benjamin Franklin was appointed part of a committee to draft a seal for the newly United States which would characterize the spirit of the Nation. Now, this was not adopted, but this was Benjamin Franklin's proposal. He proposed, and this is a quote, "Moses lifting up his wand and dividing the Red Sea, and Pharaoh in his chariot overwhelmed with the waters. This motto: 'Rebellion to tyrants is obedience to God.'" That was Benjamin Franklin's proposal for our national seal.

Of course what we ultimately had, going back to 1776, the Great Seal, two-sided seal, is reflected on the back of every dollar bill. On the one side the eagle with the ribbon through his mouth with the Latin words *E Pluribus Unum*, meaning out of many, one. We come from all over the world, immigrants loving immigration, immigrants coming from all over the world, come here to the United States and become one. One in language, one in tradition, one in our history, one strong American people. The intent was, back then as they came from all areas of the world, that there would be no hyphenated Americans.

When you came here, whether it was Europe, Africa, Asia, you came here, you were no longer African, European, Asian, South American, you were American. You were brothers and sisters together in this land. And although you celebrate traditions of your rich culture from wherever your immigrant ancestors had come from, still you would be here and become one people.

Well, in a letter that Ben Franklin wrote in March of 1778, Ben Franklin is attributed with this writing. "Whoever shall introduce into public affairs the principles of primitive Christianity will change the face of the world."

Another quote from Benjamin Franklin was, "A Bible and a newspaper in every house, a good school in every district—all studied and appreciated as they merit—are the principal support of virtue, morality, and civil liberty."

In Ben Franklin's pamphlet entitled "Information to Those Who Would Remove to America," which was written to Europeans who were considering the

move to America, or intending to send their young people to seek their fortune in this land of opportunity, Ben Franklin wrote the following: "Hence, bad examples to youth are more rare in America, which must be a comfortable consideration to parents. To this may be truly added, that serious religion, under its various denominations, is not only tolerated, but respected and practiced." Ben Franklin went on to say, "Atheism is unknown there," talking about America, "infidelity rare and secret; so that persons may live to a great age in that country without having their piety shocked by meeting with either an atheist or an infidel." Further with Ben Franklin's quote, "And the Divine Being seems to have manifested his approbation of the mutual forbearance and kindness with which the different sects treat each other; by the remarkable prosperity with which he has been pleased to favor the whole country," unquote from Ben Franklin. He was talking about the sects, s-e-c-t-s, and denominations. These were Christian denominations he was talking about.

In a letter to Robert R. Livingston, 1784, Ben Franklin wrote this: "I am now entering on my 78th year. If I live to see this peace concluded, I shall beg leave to remind the Congress of their promise, then to dismiss me. I shall be happy to sing with old Simeon, 'Now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation.'" In another letter that Ben Franklin wrote, April 17, 1787, he said, "Only a virtuous people are capable of freedom. As nations become corrupt and vicious, they have more need of masters."

Then on June 28, 1787, Ben Franklin delivered a powerful speech to the Constitutional Convention, which was embroiled in a bitter debate over how each State was to be represented in the new government. The hostile feelings created by the smaller States being pitted against the larger States was so bitter that some delegates actually left the convention. Ben Franklin, being the president (governor) of Pennsylvania, hosted the rest of the 55 delegates attending the convention. Being the senior member of the convention at 81 years of age, he commanded the respect of all present. And as recorded in James Madison's detailed records, he rose to speak in this moment of crisis.

This is from Federer's book. But this speech that Ben Franklin gave in 1787 at the Constitutional Convention truly was given at a moment of crisis. They had been going for nearly 5 weeks, and nothing but anger and bitterness had persisted in the convention. They were nowhere close to coming to any kind of agreement on anything, much less a Constitution.

Now, I was taught in school that Benjamin Franklin was a deist, that he believed some deity, some power, some something created the universe, created the nature that we have come to know, and then steps back and never

intercedes, never lifts a finger, never does anything to interfere with the ways of man. Yet when you read his own words, you read letters he wrote, things he said, it's quite clear a deist he was not. Here he was about 2 years away from meeting his maker. He was suffering from gout at the time. He had, as the senior delegate, governor, president, whatever you wish to call him from Pennsylvania at the convention and considered the host, he still had to be helped in. He was not doing well physically. But mentally he was sharp as ever. His wit was amazing as ever.

And this is the speech that Ben Franklin gave up in this time of critical crisis in the Constitutional Convention in 1787. He was addressing the president of the Constitutional Convention, President Washington—not President of the country yet because there was no Constitution, so there was no President under that—but the president of the convention was addressed. And he said, “Mr. President, the small progress we have made after 4 or 5 weeks close attendance and continual reasonings with each other—our different sentiments on almost every question, several of the last producing as many noes as ayes, is methinks a melancholy proof of the imperfection of the human understanding. We indeed seem to feel our own want of political wisdom, since we have been running about in search of it. We have gone back to ancient history for models of government, and examined the different forms of those republics which, having been formed with the seeds of their own dissolution, now no longer exist. And we viewed modern States all around Europe, but find none of their Constitutions suitable to our circumstances.

□ 2230

“In this situation of this Assembly, groping as it were in the dark to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, Sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of lights to illuminate our understanding?”

“In the beginning of this Contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayer in this room for Divine protection. Our prayers, Sir, were heard, and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of a superintending Providence in our favor.

“To that kind Providence we owe this happy opportunity of consulting in peace on the means of establishing our future national felicity. And have we now forgotten that powerful Friend? Or do we imagine we no longer need His assistance.”

Ben Franklin goes on and says, “I have lived, Sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth, that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a

sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aide?”

“We have been assured, Sir, in the Sacred Writings that, ‘except the Lord build the House, they labor in vain that build it.’”

Franklin then says, “I firmly believe this, and I also believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the Builders of Babel. We shall be divided by our partial local interests, our projects will be confounded, and we, ourselves, shall become a reproach and by word down to future ages.

“And what is worse, mankind may hereafter from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing governments by human wisdom and leave it to chance, war and conquest.

“I therefore beg leave to move, that henceforth prayers imploring the assistance of Heaven, and its blessing on our deliberations, be held in this Assembly every morning before we proceed to business, and that one or more of the clergy of this city be requested to officiate in that service.”

Franklin sat down. Federer notes, “The response of the convention to this speech by Benjamin Franklin was reported by Jonathan Dayton, the delegate from New Jersey.”

Delegate Jonathan Dayton from New Jersey wrote these words. When he says “the Doctor,” he is talking about Benjamin Franklin, as some affectionately called him.

Dayton said, “‘The Doctor sat down; and never did I behold a countenance at once so dignified and delighted as was that of Washington at the close of the address; nor were the members of the convention generally less affected. The words of the venerable Franklin fell upon our ears with a weight and authority, even greater than we may suppose an oracle to have had in a Roman senate.’”

“Following Franklin’s historical address, James Madison moved, seconded by Roger Sherman of Connecticut, that Dr. Franklin’s appeal for prayer be enacted. Edmund Jennings Randolph of Virginia further moved:

“‘That a sermon be preached at the request of the convention on the 4th of July, the anniversary of Independence, and thenceforward prayers be used in ye Convention every morning.’”

“The clergy of Philadelphia responded to this request and effected a profound change in the convention when they reconvened on July 2, 1787, and Jonathan Dayton again records these words:

“‘We assembled again, and every unfriendly feeling had been expelled, and a spirit of conciliation had been cultivated.’”

“On July 4th, the entire Convention assembled in the Reformed Calvinistic Church, according to the proposal by Edmund Jennings Randolph of Virginia, and heard a sermon by Rev. William Rogers. His prayer reflected the hearts of the delegates following Franklin’s admonition:

“‘We fervently recommend to the fatherly notice . . . our Federal convention . . . Favor them, from day to day, with thy inspiring presence; be their wisdom and strength; enable them to devise such measures as may prove happy instruments in healing all divisions and prove the good of the great whole . . . that the United States of America may form one example of a free and virtuous government . . . May we . . . continue, under the influence of republican virtue’—and that’s with a little ‘r,’ not this Republican Party—“to partake of all the blessings of cultivated and Christian society.’”

With that prayer, Rev. William Jennings concluded, as requested, by the gentleman from Virginia, Edmund Jennings Randolph. And as a result of Franklin’s speech, as a result of following through on Franklin’s request to begin with prayer, as followed by Randolph’s request for a sermon, and ending with a powerful prayer, we got a Constitution, although it’s certainly ignored around this town so often.

And even by the Supreme Court, as they did when they ignored the bankruptcy law and the Constitution to allow the travesty of the GM and Chrysler debacle to become law, as unconstitutional and illegal as it was, we still have a Constitution that we have got to get back to.

We still have a situation that Franklin noted, that so many in our early days noted, can sustain us if we continue with the prayer, as Franklin sought, if we continue to hold to those values in which this Nation was founded.

But a Nation in which you destroy the family, destroy the nuclear family, you’ve destroyed the building block for any great, truly great society. That has been broken down. You enslave people, basically, or make them indentured servants, by doling out money from Washington, luring young people into ruts from which they can never rise. It’s disgraceful. It’s immoral.

This Congress, this city, this government should be propelling young people, encouraging, invigorating, incentivizing people to reach their God-given potential, for heaven’s sake, not luring them into ruts from which they can never rise, not luring them into ruts from which they can only clamor and beg for more help from Washington.

□ 2240

They are to be empowered, empowered with opportunity, not with hand-outs but with opportunity to reach their own God-given potential. A mother eagle does not continue to feed her babies indefinitely. The little hatchlings are not fed for the rest of their lives. They are nurtured, they are taught, and then they are given the opportunity to spread their wings and fly.

It drove me from the bench as a judge to have seen repeatedly what this Congress’ laws had done to lure people into holes and give them no way out. That

was never the intention of the Founders. That should never be the intention of a moral society. You help those who truly cannot help themselves. But for those that can, you don't keep telling them to get in the wagon and continue to make fewer and fewer people pull the wagon until they can no longer bear the load and the whole system collapses of its own weight. You can't keep doing that.

We have done so much damage to this Nation, 1 trillion 5, \$1.6 trillion deficit last year, \$1.3 trillion projected for this year, \$3 trillion in 2 years? Incredible. Do people not know even modern history? The Soviet Union didn't even spend that kind of equivalent, but they spent quickly enough trying to keep up with our defensive posture through the defense system, and with their own socialistic programs, they could not get anyone to loan them more money. Gee, does that sound familiar? We are having to buy our own debt. We are not having to, we just won't quit spending. It's immoral. It's just so irresponsible.

And I hear people saying, but it's just so hard to make these difficult cuts. It isn't. As a freshman here in 2005, in 2006, standing on this side of the aisle, I heard people rightfully on the other side of the aisle saying, you guys are running a deficit budget, between 100 and \$200 billion, that's irresponsible. And the Democrats who said that were right. We should not have been running a deficit budget in 2005 and 2006. It was irresponsible. It needed to stop. Friends on that side of the aisle said, you put us in the majority, we'll end this crazy spending in such a deficit form. And yet, when the gavel was handed to Speaker PELOSI in January of 2007, what we began to experience was spending like this Nation has never known, until January of 2009, when the spending went on steroids, and instead of having a \$100 to \$200 billion deficit, in 1 year, we went to having nearly between a \$1 and \$2 trillion deficit in 1 year.

How long before we face the same consequence that the Soviet Union faced when countries around the world said, look, we have been warning you that if you didn't get your spending under control we wouldn't loan you any more money? We won't. We're

done. You're on your own. And then the Nation realizes, you can't print enough money to pay your way out of the debt the Soviet Union had created and the very kind of debt we are creating now. So they had to announce, we're out of business. The States are on their own.

It can happen here. It has got to stop. And it's not that hard. All we have to do is go back to the budget of 2006 or even 2007, the Republican Congress created, and say, do you know what? We as Democrats condemned the Republicans for spending too much in the 2006, 2007 budget, and so let's go back to that budget. We condemn them for spending too much in 2006 and 2007, let's go back to that budget. Let's use that budget. And let's stop these automatic increases every year. I've been filing that bill every Congress. It's time it passed.

I brought it to the attention of our leaders in 2006, in January, February, 2006, yet no action was taken by the Republican Congress, and obviously the last two Democratic Congresses haven't, a zero baseline budget bill, no automatic increases. Go back to 2006, 2007, no automatic increases, we get the spending under control, we get credibility around the world, we took care of our indebtedness. And we are still strong and even stronger. That's where we need to go. And then we send a message loud and clear, and I hope that Speaker BOEHNER will do as I have encouraged to be done, invite Prime Minister Netanyahu to come stand at that podium, address a joint session so the world can see both sides of this aisle standing and applauding the leader of our great friend and ally in the Middle East, Israel. Let the nations see that, and then that symbolism be followed by action where we don't reward our enemies and the enemies of our dear friend, Israel, and we don't punish our dear friends and dear allies. If you're our friend and ally, we work with you. If you're not, good luck. You're on your own. We're not going to keep propping up countries that hate us. It's irresponsible as well.

There are so many lessons to be learned from history, both ancient, both our own Nation and foreign and current history. And may God have

mercy on us if we do not learn those lessons.

And with that, Madam Speaker, I yield back.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WU (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and for the balance of the week.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. RICHARDSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, December 7.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, December 7.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today, December 1, 2, and 3.

Ms. FOX, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 1, 2010, at 10 a.m.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to Public Law 111-139, Mr. SPATT hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 6398, To require the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to fully insure Interest on Lawyers Trust Accounts, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CBO ESTIMATE OF THE STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 6398, A BILL TO REQUIRE THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION TO FULLY INSURE INTEREST ON LAWYERS TRUST ACCOUNTS, AS AMENDED

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—												
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2011-2015	2011-2020	
NET INCREASE OR DECREASE (-) IN THE DEFICIT													
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact	12	10	1	-3	-5	-6	-8	-3	0	0	15	-2	

H.R. 6398 would amend existing law to extend federal deposit insurance to amounts held in certain interest-bearing accounts through December 31, 2012. CBO estimates that enacting this legislation would increase the cost of resolving failed institutions over the next few years but such costs would be offset by higher insurance premiums by 2020.  
Source: Congressional Budget Office.