

said, Gee, banks have all your financial information. Why shouldn't the government? I was aghast and said because the banks can't come to your home, bust down the door, throw you to the ground, put a boot on your back, and put you in handcuffs and drag you off. But the government can and does. So we've got to be very careful to make sure that the government does not overreach what they're allowed to do.

Yes, banks and third parties may have financial information, but it does not mean the government is entitled to it. In fact, it's just the opposite. They're strictly forbidden to have that kind of information until Speaker PELOSI's House and HARRY REID's Senate passed a bill that said, Oh, yeah, we'll create this financial bureau, and now we're finding out they're gathering the financial information of people. Then we're assured you don't have to worry about ObamaCare, even though we're hiring all these investigators and we're not going to check their background, we're not going to make sure that they're not a problem or have a criminal record; but we'll make sure, or try to, that they finished high school, and they may need to review your medical records to see what kind of government-mandated insurance policy you need.

Where does this stop? The government under ObamaCare will have every American's medical records. The financial bureau thinks they can have everybody's financial information. That's the government having that. Then we find out the NSA has gotten orders so they can get every single call that we have made to somebody. There is no specificity in an order like that. This has to stop. This is an issue where both sides of the aisle have a kindred spirit. We want to protect people's liberty; but some that are so close to this issue have seen how much can be gleaned from people's complete phone records and they say, Look, this is really dangerous in America. I know how dangerous it is. I've been sounding the alarm for years now.

The Muslim Brotherhood has profound influence in this country and in this administration and in this government. As we've already seen, the largest demonstration in the history of the world in Egypt, they figured it out: we don't want the radical Islamists, the Muslim Brotherhood running our country. Well, I don't want them running ours either, but they're there. Secretary Napolitano couldn't even tell me how many Muslim Brotherhood members she had giving her advice. She didn't even know. At least she said she didn't.

This is a dangerous situation. We are in danger. There are people who want to take our liberty and destroy our country, but that's no reason for us to voluntarily give up all our liberty, give up all our privacy in the hope that maybe we can stop others from taking it from us. When you give up liberty, you've given it up. We're supposed to

have the government protecting us from these kinds of intrusions, not demanding all of the most private aspects of our lives. If somebody wants to disclose private information or private pictures about themselves, that's their business; but the government shouldn't be able to come in and get a picture of your most private information about your life and spread it around the government. That is happening, and there is so much more potential for it to continue to happen and to get worse.

The PATRIOT Act seemed like a good thing if we could have adequate oversight and make sure that the kinds of things we've now found out are going on, make sure they weren't going on. Now we know they are. I've been surprised. I've talked to some of my liberal friends across the aisle that expressed concerns about giving authority to the government to get this kind of information, and I was surprised some of them voted "no" against JUSTIN AMASH's amendment. But that's the thing: the NSA and CIA put pressure on Republicans. They say, Hey, you're conservative. We're with you. You've got to help us have these tools. We're preventing people from being killed. You've got to let us have all this private information about everybody. We promise that we're not abusing it. And it persuades people on our side and then on the other side. I talked to a friend who showed me a printout that he had been given, and it said, Well, no, I think exactly like you do. I don't want them having that much information. But, see, Louis, it says the law says that this can only be done—and it quoted—to protect against international terrorism and foreign intelligence information. I said that's right, that's what the law says, but that's not what they're doing. Really? I mean, it said this. I said, Right, that's what the law allows, but they're going so far beyond that. This is something we need to work on together. This is an issue where the left and the right can come together.

Look, we want to secure people's safety and security, but we can't keep giving up private liberty. Let those that want to tweet out their most intimate details do so. Fine. Go for it. Be a fool. But for those who just want to be Americans and live their private lives and be left alone, the government should not be watching everything they do through their computers, through their debit and credit card purchases and transactions, through every phone call they make. I thought I was being rather cute when I told my colleagues across the aisle who were very concerned that the government might get more than just information about contacts with foreign terrorists because that's what we were told. Look, the only way we gather information about who you're calling, who's calling you, is if you make a call to a known foreign terrorist or you get a call from a known foreign terrorist or you make a call to a member of a

known terrorist organization or you get a call from a member of a known terrorist organization. That comforted me. So I told my friends publicly that if you're worried about having the government gather information on who you're calling, who's calling you, then when you call your foreign terrorist friends, use somebody else's phone. It was amusing at the time, but now it turns out this government is gathering everybody's information and they're storing it and they'll have it and there's no indication they're ever going to get rid of it.

When I was in college, I was required to read Kafka's book "The Trial." I thought it was the silliest novel I had ever read because it was one circumstantial, just crazy event after another. The poor man never knew who was charging him, what he was charged with. I thought this is just somebody creating a nightmare scenario, but thank God we live in America and this can never happen here. Yet I see the seeds of a Kafka novel unfolding before us.

I hope and pray, Mr. Speaker, that we will come together on both sides of the aisle and say let's secure our borders so only people that are legally coming in come in. Then once that's done, we can get an immigration bill done. Then, because we're doing that, we don't have to keep giving up liberty to have security. Then let's clean up this law so that some judge who's completely forgotten what the Constitution really means doesn't go off and sign an order to give the government every single phone call that's made to every single individual in and outside the United States. Otherwise, John Adams will look from Heaven, and he will be regretting that he sacrificed so much for us to have the liberty that we're squandering.

I yield back the balance of my time.

THE SHINING CITY ON A HILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to be recognized by you here on the floor of the House of Representatives, and it's my privilege to follow the gentleman from Texas as we close out this legislative week and a lot of the Members are on their way to the airport, or at the airport now, going back to serve their constituents. I'll be there myself, and I trust Mr. GOHMERT will be too.

I wanted to come to the floor and talk about this country that we have, this civilization that we have, the foundations of our civilization, and what's required to retain them and enhance them and move this country beyond the shining city on the hill and to a place beyond there onward and upward. Ronald Reagan often described the shining city on the hill. He described it as an America that is. An

America that was and an America that is. We were always challenged by the dream, but he didn't actually articulate, that I recall, something beyond this shining city. But societies must progress, and those that progress the most effectively and those that can be sustained the longest need to be built upon solid pillars.

The shining city on the hill standing true and strong on a granite ridge was built on a solid foundation, and I argue that the foundation of it are the pillars of American exceptionalism, and those pillars are listed in the Bill of Rights. You add to that free enterprise capitalism, Judeo-Christian values, the foundation of our culture, which welcomes all religions, and on top of that the dream that inspired legal immigrants to come to America, and that dream embodied within the vision of the image of the Statue of Liberty. That's the American Dream. That's the American country that we are. And that's the foundation upon which we've got to build our American future.

How did we get here? What was the reason that these pieces came together? How was it that our Founding Fathers came to a conclusion that we would have freedom of speech, religion, assembly, the right to keep and bear arms, freedom of the press, that we would have property rights, that we would have Fourth Amendment rights against unreasonable search and seizure, that we would not have to face any kind of jury but a jury of our peers, and that we would not suffer double jeopardy and that justice would be blind and every person would stand before the law to be treated equally? The statue that we see of Lady Justice holding the scales of justice perfectly balanced is almost always shown to us blindfolded because justice is blind. But justice is not a feeling. Justice is something that has to be delivered by the law.

These are pillars of American exceptionalism, as are those rights that are not enumerated in the Constitution that devolve respectively to the States or the people, those enumerated powers that we have for Congress or those delegated to the Presidency, the executive branch, and the judicial branch of government. All of this is laid out as foundations that have been—although they've been altered to some degree over the years, we have adapted to those principles more often than we've altered our constitutional principles because our Founding Fathers got it right.

Where did that come from? How could it happen that these Founding Fathers could come together on what was an obscure place on the planet and get these ideas so well articulated that they could be the foundation of the greatest Nation the world has seen, the strongest economy the world has seen, the most dominant culture and civilization that the world has seen, the furthest reach in our economy, the furthest reach in our influence strategically?

□ 1345

How did this all happen?

And I would take you back, Mr. Speaker, to think a little bit about the formation of, I'll say, modern history. I take you back to Mosaic law before the time of Christ when Moses, who looks down upon us right now, the only face that is looking directly at us from all of these faces of law providers in history, Moses looks down over this Chamber in full-face form, and he's looking back here and he sees, as we should see, "In God We Trust," our national motto.

How did that come together, Mr. Speaker?

It was when Moses came down from the Mount with the law, God's law, and the foundation of that law, the way it was separated out through the tribes and the way the law and the way justice was delivered, emerged out of Mosaic law and appeared also in Greek law. And as the Greeks, masterful people as they were, they were shaping the Age of Reason. So we had Mosaic law that informed the Greek Age of Reason, and the Age of Reason, where I imagine that Socrates and Plato and Aristotle and other philosophers sat around and challenged each other intellectually like gunslingers did in the West with guns, they did it with their brains. And young philosophers would go up to Socrates and challenge him with their philosophy, and Socrates would take it apart because he was the top guy and he informed others. But as they were proud and prideful of their ability to reason and the culture of Greece at the time, they had to infuse Mosaic law to uphold their rationale. And some of them, as they voiced Mosaic law, were teased by other Greeks that said, Well, you got that from Moses.

But my point in this is that as civilization was progressing, Mosaic law came down from the Mount, was handed to civilization. It emerged through the Greek civilization as the Greeks were developing their Age of Reason, and we're talking about the foundation of Western civilization. And almost concurrently with that, Roman law was emerging as well.

Now, I'll take you then to the time of Christ. Christ taught us our values, the very values of repentance and redemption that didn't exist in any form before then, and that's his gift to us. But I make this point in talking about the law, and it is this:

Think of Mosaic law coming down, being infused within the Greeks, transferred also to the Romans. Roman law ruled over that part of the world where Christ stood before the high priest Caiaphas. And if you remember, Mr. Speaker, the high priest said to Jesus: Did you really say those things? Did you really preach those things?

And Jesus responded to the high priest, as the Jews were watching, he said: Ask them. They were there. They can tell you.

That was, Mr. Speaker, the assertion by Jesus that he had a right to face his

accusers. That principle remains today in our law, that we have a right to face our accusers. And when he said: Ask them. They were there. They can tell you, he's facing his accusers and demanding that they testify against him rather than make allegations behind his back.

And what happened when Jesus said that? They believed and the high priest believed that Jesus' answer was insolent and the guard struck Jesus.

Jesus said: If I speak wrongly, you must prove the wrong. If I speak rightly, why do you punish me?

He asserted his right to be innocent until proven guilty before a Roman court. Those two principles remain today in our law: a right to face your accuser; innocent until proven guilty. You face that jury of your peers, as I said. You need a quick and speedy trial. They didn't have to wonder about that in those days; it happened quickly. And the punishment came quickly as well, right or wrong.

This foundation of law was wrapped up in Roman law, and it was spread across Western Europe as the Romans occupied areas like Germany, England, as we know it today, on into Ireland. And when the Dark Ages came, when the Visigoths sacked Rome in 410 A.D., then we saw civilization itself tumble and crumble, and we saw the heathens break down anything that represented the old culture, anything that represented real civilization.

While that was going on—they were tearing buildings into rubble, they were burning anything that was written documents—while that was going on, the priests, and let me say the descendants of the disciples of Christ, began to gather up any papers and documents they could get their hands on. Some went to Rome to be secured and replicated by the monks and the scribes there. A lot went to an island off of Ireland where the monks and the scribes replicated those documents there. That was the foundation of the relearning of a civilization, a civilization that had been lived for centuries, having lost the ability to reason.

That Age of Reason that they were so proud of in the time of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle was lost to civilization for centuries as people just lived by instinct and didn't leave much of a record of their rationale and didn't develop science, technology, or thought. And at a certain time, this information that was preserved in the documents of the classics, both Biblical and religious information, and any document that the monks and scribes could get their hands on, they preserved. And they analyzed it and they studied it, and they took a continent and taught that continent how to think.

As the church emerged from Rome and from the St. Patrick side of this thing out of Ireland, they built monasteries across the continent, and they were the centers of knowledge. They began to educate the classical information that they had preserved primarily

from the Roman but also from the Greek era, and they reeducated an entire civilization and re-created civilization based on what, Judeo-Christian values, the Age of Reason, and that reason that tied the values of faith together with the values that will allow for science to be developed.

And that brings us to that year, let's say the years emerging from the Middle Ages, and Martin Luther stepped on to the scene in the 16th century and brought us, on top of that, the Reformation Period where he made the point that cast across the globe that you can honor God in a lot of ways. A mother changing a baby's diaper honors God more than a thousand rote prayers that you don't give meaning from your heart into.

And so the Protestant work ethic got added to all these values that have been added together. And the competition between the Protestant and Catholic Church within Christianity ended up, it was rough and it was brutal, but the effect of it on our civilization and on our society has been good because the competition that drove from that made us all better, and each religion drew from the other.

And, by the way, the Eastern Church was separated when the Turks sacked Constantinople. So the Eastern Orthodox and Russian Orthodox were separated, and they evolved in a little bit different way, but we're tied together. We're tied together culturally. We're tied together historically. We're tied together by our common humanity and our belief in, and this is the unique component, their belief in redemption.

These attributes that I've discussed now, they're embodied within Western Europe as we emerge into, as we had emerged into the Age of Discovery, meaning Christopher Columbus and the explorers who came over here to the Western Hemisphere, that component, as well as a little bit later, the dawn of the Industrial Revolution.

Think about where we are here in America. We are the recipients of some of the wisest, most analytical people that the world has ever produced, our Founding Fathers. They are a product of a culture and a civilization that believed in Adam Smith's free enterprise and the rights to property, and they believed they were free men, that they were free. In fact, they said so in the Declaration of Independence when Jefferson wrote in the Declaration: A prince who exhibits the characteristics of a tyrant is unfit to be a ruler of a free people.

A free people. They saw themselves as a free people before the Declaration. They didn't become necessarily free people as a product of, although they certainly had to earn it. They declared their freedom from England, but they saw themselves as free people before they issued the Declaration of Independence.

But that brings us now to July 4, 1776. I brought this history around from a couple thousand years, or a little bit more, more than 2,000 years.

On this continent now we have the wisdom of the Founding Fathers. I believe they are inspired by God, and it was by Divine Guidance that the Declaration was written, but it arrives here this, with what, these rights that we have—freedom of speech, religion, the press, and assembly, the right to keep and bear arms. The balance of these rights from the judicial side of it, the property rights from the Fifth Amendment, the devolution of power down to the people or the States, all of this landed on a continent with unlimited natural resources, so we believed at the time. All of these rights, free enterprise, strong Judeo-Christian faith and values, the reason many came here, unlimited natural resources, and a concept of manifest destiny.

Now, who could create a giant petri dish that's so robust that it could settle a continent in the blink of a historical eye and leave such a foundation for the growth of population and the image and inspiration of faith and freedom, who could do that? Not man, but the entity that shaped their movements and their thoughts.

So here we are, the recipients, God-given liberty, defined in the Declaration. It should be inarguable. It should be unchallengeable. I think it is. But we're a Nation that cannot be reverse-engineered and come up with a better result. We're a Nation that has components of American exceptionalism, pillar after pillar of American exceptionalism, none of which can we pull out from underneath the edifice of this shining city on the hill and expect that this shining city would not collapse. Yes, it would.

And so what is our charge here? It is not as hard as the charge of our Founding Fathers. It is not as hard as those who picked up their muskets and marched into the Red Coats' muskets and the Revolution. It is not as hard as the blue and the gray that clashed all over the battlefields here in this country and put an end to slavery and reunified this country. It's not as hard as the doughboys that marched off to war. It's not as hard, certainly, as those 16 million Americans who put on uniforms to defend our country in the Second World War. It is certainly not as hard for us as the 450,000 who gave their lives during that war. It's not as hard, either, as those who marched off to Korea and are honored down here in their memorial, the memorial that says on the slab in front of them:

Our Nation honors the men and women who answered the call to defend a country they never knew and a people they never met.

None of what we are charged with right now is that hard. And yet some despair and some think that we can create this new America that is not tied to the pillars of American exceptionalism; we can sacrifice some of those principles and we'll still be a country okay because we've got some political pressure that says we should sacrifice this principle or we should

chisel away some pieces out of this beautiful marble pillar of American exceptionalism. Imagine what it would be like, which if this Congress and this culture that directs this Congress, what if we decided you're going to have limited speech. Certain things you can't say, and we'll give you the list of words you can't utter because if you do that, you're going to be violating somebody's sense of political correctness?

What if we said that you can assemble, but we're going to diminish your right to assemble because sometimes we disagree with what comes out of those meetings? You know, the Greeks did that. They had meetings in their city-states. Remember the Greek black ball system that they had. The demagogues would emerge, people that could step up before the masses in Greece and the city-state and issue a speech that was rhetorically so inspiring that the Greeks marched off in what turned out to be the wrong direction. And what would they do? They would label him a demagogue. They would bring the demagogue before the city-state and then they would excoriate him, and then they would have a vote.

It's like the Greek system today: two gourds, two marbles, one black and one white one. They called them balls, of course. As each of the Greeks walked through, they would drop their voting ball in one gourd and they would drop their discard ball in another gourd, and if the demagogue got three black balls, he was banished from the city-state for 7 years. That's how they muzzled the people that led them in the wrong direction with emotional rhetoric.

But can you imagine if we did that, if America would banish people into the hinterlands for, let's say, giving a speech that was disagreed with by three people? That's all it took—three. They were restrained, of course, because they didn't want to be the next one banished. But that was the system.

We're not going to limit freedom of speech in this country, and we're not going to limit freedom of assembly. We're not going to say you cannot get together and talk about these things because we know that an open public discourse and dialogue, what emerges from that are—we believe in this reason that we have inherited from the Greeks and other civilizations, that what will emerge is the most logical, rational policy.

□ 1400

That's what I'm advocating for, Mr. Speaker. I want the most logical, rational policy. And I think we need a policy that's right for America.

I have an obligation to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States and represent my constituents and represent my State and represent my country. And all of those things should be compatible with each other. And I believe they are. And I've not found myself in a conflict here between them.

So I suggest that we have open dialogue, we have open debate. I challenge this civilization to be reasonable, have reason, be analytical, be a critical thinker.

We send our kids off to school, and sometimes they're just taught a mantra, but they're not taught to take ideas apart and understand the components of them and put them back together. Well, I've just taken America apart and described some of its essential components, history apart, and put it back together, Mr. Speaker, and, hopefully, informed this body of some of the principal reasons why America is such a great Nation.

We're a great Nation because we have God-given liberty. We would not be a great Nation if we didn't exercise those God-given liberties. If we don't have access to those rights, if we don't put our positions out there in front of the public and challenge the people in this country to analyze those alternatives—what if we went down one path?

What if some leader from on high, let's just say King George, not Prince George today, but King George, what if he decided we're going to go down this path, and no one shall discuss anything outside of this line that I've described for you?

What kind of a country would we be?

Would we believe that one mortal individual can chart a path for this country superior to the collective wisdom of 316 million people?

I don't think so, Mr. Speaker. And I don't think thinking Americans will either.

But I know that this country's full of emotionalism. As I watched the reactions to the George Zimmerman trial and verdict, I saw a lot of people who simply denied the facts that had been proven in law, and seemed to be incapable of considering anything that didn't concur with their conclusion that they had drawn before they saw the facts.

Now, I engage in this debate. I challenge people to debate with me because I believe one of two things: if I can't sustain myself in debate, I need to go get some more information. I need to get better informed. Or could it be that I'm wrong?

Only two alternatives can come from not being able to sustain yourself in a debate, and I'll go back and get all the information that I can get, but I'll also reconsider, and anybody should. That's why I challenge people to debate. I'll take it up, and we will see who can sustain themselves. We may not get this all resolved in one discussion.

In fact, in this Congress it's been a very rare thing, over the last 10-plus years that I've been here, to see anybody stand up and admit, I was wrong. What you said changes my position. What I learned changes my position.

No, there are too many egos involved in this Congress for that to happen very often. It will happen a little bit privately, it will happen incrementally, but it doesn't happen publicly, unless there's some kind of leverage brought to bear.

So here's my point, Mr. Speaker, and that is this: Our southern border is porous. It's not as porous as it was 7 or 8 years ago, mainly because the economy has grown in Mexico at about twice the rate that it's grown in the United States over the last 4½ or 5 years. We don't have as much pressure on our border.

But I can tell you this: 80 to 90 percent of the illegal drugs consumed in America come from or through Mexico. I can tell you that in Mexico they are recruiting kids to be drug smugglers. Between the ages of 11 and 18 they have arrested and, I believe, incarcerated, and the number of convictions is at least this: over 800 per year over the last couple of years at that ratio of those who are kids who are smuggling drugs into the United States.

We pick up some on our side of the border. That adds to that number, the ones that we catch. Many get away. Every night some come across the border smuggling drugs across the border. Increasingly, the higher value drugs, heroin, methamphetamine, cocaine in some form or another, are being strapped to the bodies sometimes of young girls, teenage girls.

The media is replete with this. Anybody that reads the paper should know, especially those that live on the border, should know that there are many, many young people coming across the border unlawfully who are smuggling drugs into the United States.

They should also know that now, the drug cartels, and I mean specifically, the Mexican drug cartels, have taken over drug distribution in most of the major cities in America. I think intel will tell you every major city in America. And the numbers that I've seen go from a little over 200 cities in this country to 2,000.

I don't know what population that dials it down to or what areas. I haven't seen the map. But it should be appalling to a country and a civilization to see that that's taken place.

When you understand that, according to the Drug Enforcement Agency, of every chain of illegal drug distribution we have in the country, they will tell you, at least privately, as they have to me on multiple occasions, that at least one link is illegal aliens that are smuggling drugs into the United States.

It's important that we know that as a Congress, as a country, as a civilization. If we deny those facts, if we deny the information that comes, even out of the Obama administration that certainly supports those, if you deny the information that comes out through the major media that's there, if you deny what we're told by our law enforcement officers on the border of the United States that are continually interdicting drugs at about the same rate that they did 6 or 7 or 8 years ago, when the population of illegals was flowing over the border at a faster rate than it is today, the illegal drugs coming across the border are roughly similar to that time.

That says there's still a high demand in the United States. A high demand means drugs are likely to come in. If we are enforcing our borders and tightening security the price of drugs should go up. If you look at the price of drugs, I think you're going to find that we haven't been very effective interdicting drugs coming across our southern border.

Part of that is they find new ways to smuggle, and some of those reasons are because kids are being used to smuggle drugs into the United States. That's appalling to me.

The death across the Arizona border, it's still there. It happens through the summer. And this debate taking place now in the middle of the summer is going to end up with more people being found out there on the desert, in the brush, who have lost their lives trying to get into the United States of America.

We need a secure border. We need to build a fence, a wall, and another fence, so we've got two patrolling zones. We need to put the sensory devices on top of there. We need to use our boots on the ground in the most effective way possible.

No nation should have an open borders policy. No nation should have a blind-eye policy towards the enforcement of the laws. No nation can long remain a great nation if they decide to sacrifice the rule of law on the altar of political expediency.

No nation like the United States of America can continue to grow and be a strong nation if we are going to judge people because they disagree with our agenda, rather than the content of their statement.

We have to be critical thinkers. We have to be analytical. We should understand facts from emotion.

And let's pull together, let's understand that we do have compassion. We do have compassion, for every human person deserves dignity. We need to treat them with that warmth, treat them with that love, as the American people always have, just like the Korean War veterans did when they gave themselves for a country they never knew and a people they never met.

But we must not sacrifice the rule of law on the altar of political expediency.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HORSFORD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a medical-mandated recovery.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 26, 2013, at 10 a.m.