

that are involved in this type of activist behavior and legislating from the bench. Every single Federal judge takes an oath to uphold the Constitution. When they fail to do so and let their own whims and ideological positions interfere with applying the Constitution, not interpreting but applying, these judges have failed to fulfill their term of good behavior, and they should be fired by impeachment.

Likewise Californians that are outraged, like I am, should be up in arms and should take action to initiate a referendum to pass a State constitutional amendment to enforce their will and overturn these judges' despicable opinions, and these judges deserve to be censured or sent home for bad behavior.

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

(Mr. HOLT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SUBSIDIARITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak about the role of government in our collective political lives and of the relationship between such government and civil society.

It has been 219 years since this new constitutional republic formally entered the international stage. In 2008 I am privileged to stand in this historic Chamber of the United States House of Representatives in the second session of the 110th Congress. We should, representative and citizen alike, take great pride in our collective perseverance. Our longevity and survival as the numerically and geographically largest and most prosperous republican form of government in recorded human history is a testimony to the strength of this polity.

An important part of that proud history has been our commitment to seri-

ously debating the contours of any entity which we constitute to exercise power over the source and content of self-government: that is, "We the People." In other words, we must continue to ask ourselves, what is the proper scope and role of governmental powers in and around our lives?

□ 1645

My colleagues, "subsidiarity" is a word not often used on this floor. Yet, is a word and concept which is foundational to much of what we do as representatives, the system of government under which we operate and the presuppositions upon which much policy is debated in this Chamber as well as in that other body.

Subsidiarity. It has been defined as the belief that "a community of a higher order should not interfere with the life of a community of a lower order, thereby taking over its function." Subsidiarity "holds that nothing should be done by a larger and more complex organization which can be done as well by a smaller and simpler organization. In other words, any activity which can be performed by a more decentralized entity should be. This principle is a bulwark of limited government and personal freedom."

Other intellectual and philosophic traditions have spoken of sphere sovereignty, principle pluralism and federalism. But behind all of these complex-sounding terms is a simple fact, understandable by each of us, that there should be a proportional relation between the proximity of an individual and the amount of power of any governmental entity, be it local, county, State or Federal, may possess in relation to them.

In other words, that government which is closest to us is usually the best government for which we should give function. Let me give the analogy of a human body. If we would say the body politic is like a human body, we would say that a healthier body politic is one which, like the human body, is infused with activity, or energy. In other words, if you had a human body, and you had oxygenated blood that only went to 90 percent of it, that 10 percent might very well die and be considered unhealthy.

If you would have 100 percent of the oxygenated blood go to the brain, the rest of the body could not function, and the body would therefore die. Similarly, with the body politic, if all the power and if all the energy is visited here in Washington, D.C., the rest of the body politic tends to wither. It loses its energy. It loses its enthusiasm. And ultimately, it withers and dies.

Thus, as citizens, we do not, or should not, think it wise nor reasonable to immediately ask the Federal Government, the unit of government that is most distant from our lives, to solve each and every problem which our family, our neighborhood, our town, our city, our county, our State,

or our region can address. Or, as academics may describe it, subsidiarity provides appropriate discernment for responses to respective needs in particular ways.

Foundational to the proper functioning of subsidiarity is a commitment to constitutionalism and the rule of law. In 1852, that great ex-slave, writer, abolitionist and statesman, Frederick Douglass, called the Constitution "a glorious liberty document." Because of the principles contained within it, and the antecedent rights which it protects, we cannot quarrel with Douglass' description. His description is apt because the Constitution enshrined a system of government, based upon a moral foundation, which thereby allows the people to rule through majorities, and nonetheless simultaneously protects fundamental minority rights.

Now, while we ourselves have not always lived up to it, subsidiarity requires, and the Constitution affirms, that no citizens, based upon arbitrary and amorphous demarcations like skin color, are permitted to be excluded from "the governed" from which consent is required.

Thus, intrinsic to a proper understanding of and commitment to subsidiarity, the rule of law embedded within the Constitution requires a reasonable moral foundation upon which to anchor our commitment to law and the system of governments which we implicitly or explicitly support. As Robert P. George has written, "Where reason has no sway in practical affairs, the sole question is who has the power."

Severance from a moral foundation would leave our belief in and carrying out of the rule of law without a means by which to be secure. Law itself becomes power. Arbitrary will becomes the corrupted lodestar of societal compromise and the entire depth of justice, which now becomes a completely vacuous term. To use an analogy from Roy Clouser in his book, "The Myth of Religious Neutrality," "even the most violently anarchistic organization would quickly fall apart if it became devoid of all observance of norms of fairness or trust among its own members." And while although often unnoticed and unspoken in the day-to-day happenings of politics and life, the rule of law, constitutionalism and subsidiarity are vital guide-rails of our collective republican lives.

As Professor Robert George has said, "The obligations and purposes of law and government are to protect public health, safety and morals, and to advance the general welfare, including preeminently, protecting people's fundamental rights and basic liberties."

"At first blush, this classic formulation, or combination of classic formulations, seems to grant vast and sweeping powers to public authority. Yet, in truth, the general welfare, the common good, requires that government be limited. Government's responsibility is

primary when the questions involving defending the Nation from attack and subversion, protecting people from physical assaults and various other forms of depredation, and maintaining public order. In other words, however, its role is subsidiary: To support the work of the families, religious communities, and other institutions of civil society that shoulder the primary burden of forming upright and decent citizens, caring for those in need, encouraging people to meet their responsibilities to one another while also discouraging them from harming themselves or others."

Subsidiarity, then, is formed upon a commitment to the rule of law so that in our various spheres of societal life, anarchy and normlessness do not start to behave as is they have defined the rules of engagement in the fields of activity once and for all.

The commitment to the rule of law makes plain why an appropriate understanding of the limited judicial function is so important in democratic self-government. As Judge Andrew Kleinfeld of the 9th Circuit has written, "that a question is important does not imply that it is constitutional. The Founding Fathers did not establish the United States as a democratic republic so that elected officials would decide trivia, while all great questions would be decided by the judiciary. That an issue is important does not mean that the people, through their democratically elected representatives, do not have the power to decide it. One might suppose that the general rule in a democratic republic would be the opposite, with a few exceptions."

Thus, when I hear that my friends on the other side of the aisle asked the Supreme Court Justice nominees whether they, in the course of their tenure, are going to "expand freedom" or constrict freedom, and when I hear current declamations that nominees need to understand it is their duty, their job, their purpose, as judges, to "stand up for economic and social justice," I am incredulous as to what these words and terms mean. Freedom for whom? Freedom to do what? To whom? Whose interpretation of economic justice should be "stood up?" Whose interpretation of social justice? How do these ends relate to the role of a judge, which is to rule on specific cases, not engage in abstract, roving, philosophic speculations?

The rule of law, our constitutional framework, and an appreciation for the complexity of society, which genuine subsidiarity inherently takes for granted, demand better.

While what I've outlined provides the legal framework and structural timber for the division of power and cultivation of society, we the citizens are nevertheless the most important factors in such a commitment to subsidiarity. Subsidiarity requires a commitment by the citizens of the republic to comport themselves with self-restraint, with virtue and with respect for one's fellow citizens.

As the father of our Constitution, James Madison, exclaimed, "to suppose that any form of government will secure liberty and happiness without virtue in the people is a chimerical idea. We do not depend on or put confidence in our rulers, but in the people who are to choose them."

M. Stanton Evans points out that "the reasoning of the Founders in this area was identical to that provided for Edmund Burke contemporaneously in England. Self-government required observance of the moral law, respect for rights of others, restraint upon the passions. Virtue was thus a necessary precondition to a regime of freedom, and a Nation that lost its religious moorings was considered ripe for tyranny. Conversely, since religious belief and ethical conduct were matters of volition, the Founders also believed that liberty was integral to ideas of virtue."

Thus, in order for subsidiarity to remain viable, we, as citizens, must work to cultivate the proper virtues within ourselves as well as strive to be meaningful in the lives of those around us, usually starting with our families, our friends, our community, neighbors and our fellow employees.

On the other hand, society would not endure were each citizen to take upon himself or herself the maximum amount of criminal activity possible. Rampant and widespread destruction would lead to nihilistic physical and cultural chaos. Greater resources would then be needed to attempt to contain and mitigate such behavior. The people's health, safety and likelihood of perpetuating society by bringing future generations into life would become severely constricted and diminished.

George Will in his masterful work "Statecraft As Soulcraft" explained, it is obvious that "the restraining strength of individual habits and social conventions must be inversely proportional to the strength of restraints enforced by law."

In addition to these individual consequences, the collective consequence of our view of government as one people would be tarnished. As Will again tells us, "regardless of democratic forms, when people are taught by philosophy and the social climate that they need not govern their actions by calculations of public good, they will come to blame all social shortcomings on the agency of collective considerations, the government, and will absolve themselves."

Now in stark contrast, subsidiarity not only respects the various institutions and complexities laden throughout collective society, it also allows time for proper and respective maturation to take place. As George Will writes in regard on the bloodshed of mid-18th century America, "what the Nation learned in Lincoln's lifetime was that the social cohesion which proceeds from shared adherence to a public philosophy and shared emulation of

exemplary behavior and values is not the result of spontaneous combustion. It takes work. But by whom? And with what? Such work is done with laws and other institutions. It is a citizenry working on itself, on its self, collectively; on its selves, individually. It is applied political philosophy."

It is important to re-emphasize here that subsidiarity offers no congratulatory pat-on-the-back for its citizens. As genuine humility and an honest appraisal of humanity attest, we are all here works in progress. Aristotle observed that man "is the best of all animals when perfected, so he is the worst of all when sundered from law and justice because man is born possessing weapons for the use of wisdom and virtue, which it is possible to employ entirely for the opposite ends."

The dry wit of that great English parliamentarian and political philosopher Edmund Burke is instructive when he notes that "the effect of liberty to individuals is, that they may do what they please; we ought to see what it will please them to do, before we risk congratulations."

As Madison and Lincoln, two of our most prescient American statesmen might explain, because men are not angels, government is necessary, yet we must constantly appeal to the better angels of our nature, for failure to do so would result in the crushing of our intrinsic nature and the invaluable and incomparable dignity of our fellow man.

My friends, subsidiarity is an important, and some would say indispensable, philosophy not only for the reasons I already cited, but also because of the flexibility it allows the leaders, the statesmen, of such a multifaceted republic. Such statesmen do understand the nature of law. We know that law is much more than a mere necessary evil or a clever contrivance or potent payback mechanism for partisan gains. No. Law is nurturing. Law is conforming. Law is inculcating.

As J. Budziszewski has written, "we know at least that the law cannot be neutral. Everything a government does it founded on some understanding of what is good. Moreover, no law that has effect at all can fail to have effect on character."

Furthermore, true statesmen and women and leaders are discerning, wise and prudent. Again, George Will has observed that statesmen who are unaware of the ideas that shape the institutions currently in their custody, and uninterested in the ideas that shape the expectations and tolerances of the citizenry, are statesmen governed by forces they cannot comprehend.

□ 1700

Such statesmen are apt to think they have more range for effective action than they actually have, and they are apt to have less than they would were they more aware of the connections between the life of the mind and the life of society.

Twenty-seven years ago, Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan wrote that he had served in the cabinet or subcabinet of four presidents. He said, "I do not believe I have ever heard at a cabinet meeting a serious discussion of political ideas, one concern with how men, rather than markets, behave. These are the necessary first questions of government. The Constitution of the United States is an immensely intricate judgment as to how man will behave given the circumstances of the time in which it was written. It is not at all clear that it is working well, given the circumstances of the present age, but this is never discussed."

A commitment to subsidiarity requires much greater responsibility from our leaders, our policymakers and our representatives. My goal today is not to spell out precise policy prescriptions for every foreign and domestic issue before us. After all, that is most of what we do here. These are, without a doubt, important, but they do not comprise the whole of human endeavors nor the scope of activity within our policy. We must never lose sight of the importance of culture in our deliberations.

One example of where we can strengthen the bonds of social capital in communities, while also working within reasonable budget considerations, is the partnering of private and charitable entities within the faith-based initiative. Now, some pouncing on the first word, as if it represented a perverse combination of a belief in unicorns with a draconianism of State-mandated medieval indulgences have ridiculed this endeavor as a corruptly—oh—divine, power grab given patronage and power to theocratic institutions in our society, but nothing is further from the truth.

The faith-based initiative is merely an endeavor to treat faith-based charitable entities that provide social services as equal partners, partners on equal footing with nonfaith-based charitable entities in our society. You know, if a person is starving, does the source from where the food that quenches his hunger matter? If a person is without clothes, does it matter where the clothes come from that cover their nakedness? I don't think so. In reality the faith-based initiative is about eliciting greater public and private support for the smaller and often faith-based organizations which play a vital role in meeting human needs everywhere in our country.

A true appreciation for subsidiarity may encourage parishioners so situated to kindly and gently admonish and encourage our various theological traditions and establishments to meet the humanitarian and simple life needs of their fellow men and women. Perhaps larger and more elaborate parking lots, gymnasiums, multimedia screens are not of immediate concern to the poor, the homeless, those without clothing, the hungry, the starving or the repentant prisoner about to enter society.

The principle of subsidiarity helps such intermediate organizations and individuals make such determinations and meet such needs.

Economically, subsidiarity encourages us to reaffirm the time-tested virtue of the legitimate exchange of goods and service known as free-market capitalism, as well as the virtues of the industrious employee and diligent citizen. Subsidiarity requires us to not immediately seek a Federal solution to every local, county or State problem. It teaches us to be ever cognizant of the fact that the laws of economics. The laws of supply and demand cannot be suspended.

Subsidiary reminds us life is not easy, and affluence is not as abundant as the air we breathe, that each of us, as many of our forefathers and ancestors did, must sacrifice, strive, delay gratifying our immediate wants and desires, and develop our skills and attributes, which most enable us to provide an honorable service or good to the rest of society in return for appropriate compensation.

Over the years, many have written about the creative destruction and the cultural contradictions of capitalism. They have observed that capitalism, besides causing societal anxiety and consternation by its capacity for ever-changing technology and innovation may also spawn the radical individualism and consumerism which undercuts the moral, ethical and altruistic branches upon which it sits, but it need not be so.

We, the people, have the capacity to deny or control these destructive tendencies. Properly considered, subsidiarity teaches us to probe for ways to provide the time and capital needed for creative inventions and products to germinate. It teaches us to strive to provide for the needs of our own respective and concentric circles of responsibility while adjusting to ever-changing demand and supply chains.

These lessons are especially apt today as ideas and energy have replaced capital and labor is the central pillars of economic thought and comparative advantage. If our children and grandchildren are to compete successfully in this new world, we must aggressively seek innovative ways to attract investors and manufacturers.

Yet, rather than harnessing the great potential, it seems that some believe that businesses, markets and profits are, by nature, evils unto themselves. Recently we had a candidate for the President of the United States threaten to take profits from private industry. Now, I would suggest this is a dangerous bit of rhetoric.

To the contrary, it has become an almost universal judgment that on the level of individual nations' international relations, the free market is the most efficient instrument for utilizing sources and effectively responding to needs. We all recognize, says Father Richard John Neuhaus has writ-

ten, that the State has an important ancillary role in providing a framework of law and order in which people can attend to the business that is properly theirs, but note the word "ancillary," not "primary." It is thus an affront to human dignity to repress the human capacity to create, to invent and to be enterprising.

As society and technology change, as they always have, it is up to each of us to help one another transition through the inevitable historical changes that bring excitement, as well as much fear and adversity or anxiety. The principle of subsidiarity helps us to appreciate the fact that communities, towns, cities, counties, States, they are often at the forefront of developing the changes needed to build sustainable and healthy communities in a constantly changing world.

The concept of subsidiarity ultimately rests upon thing strength of individuals and families, and, in that regard, helps to remind us to protect the units of society which are at its most basic building blocks and bonds. Mere biology attests to the fact that the human race is perpetuated by the holistic union of men and women. Therefore, societies have recognized the indispensable role that families have played in the health of society. Marriage must be strengthened for other levels of society, the schools, the neighborhoods, the communities to flourish.

Although this concept has been drowned in the hot caldron of partisan political soup, and it's timely today because of the decision of the Supreme Court in my home State, I believe that Robert George has properly addressed the issue in these words. "If we are to restore and secure the institution of marriage, we must recover a sound understanding of what marriage is and why it is in the public interest for law and policy to take cognizance of it and support it. Marriage is a prepolitical form of association, what might be called a natural institution. It is not created by law. The law recognizes and regulates it in every culture. Nowhere is it treated as a purely private matter. Some toy with the idea that marriage could be privatized, and others wonder whether it might be the best solution to the controversy over same-sex marriage."

There is a reason that all cultures treat marriage as a matter of public concern, and even recognize it in law and regulate it. The family is the fundamental unit of society. Governments rely on families to produce something that governments need, but on their own they could not possibly produce, upright decent people who make honest law-abiding public spirited citizens. Marriage is the indispensable foundation of the family.

Although all marriages and all cultures have their imperfections, children flourish in an environment where they benefit from the love and care of both mother and father and from the

committed and exclusive love of their parents for each other. Anyone who believes in limited government should strongly back government support for the family.

Does this sound paradoxical?

In the absence of a strong marriage culture, families fail to form, and when they do form, they are often unstable. Absentee fathers become a serious problem, out-of-wedlock births are common and a train of social pathologies follow. With families failing to perform their health, education and welfare functions, the demand for government grows, whether in the form of greater policing, or as a provider of other social services. Bureaucracies must be created and they inexorably expand. Indeed, they become powerful lobbyists for their own preservation and expansion.

Everyone suffers with the poorest and most vulnerable suffering the most. That's why I have advocated a constitutional amendment on the Federal level to enshrine the historic complimentary definition of marriage.

All citizens must be afforded their civil rights and equal treatment under the law. There should be and are avenues whereby privileges, including visitation, inheritance and other rights can be extended to any individuals seeking to live together either through familiar necessity or bonds of friendship. However, these extensions should never be based on or related to sexual behavior, for to do so would thereby change our definition of what marriage is, simultaneously turning the children of parents in this society as a means to other ends, as well as leaving a marriage without terms of definition in terms of numerics or norms.

Let us debate this important issue and present this important issue to the citizens of the republic as subsidiarity would require, rather than having unelected judges, as they also did in 1973 and as those judges in the California Supreme Court did today, transform the norms and laws of this country through judicial fiat.

An issue like subsidiarity cannot and should not be shoved into partisan columns. It is one of the philosophic foundations for a collective commitment, a commitment much more important in partisan identity or loyalty to the commonly known term, federalism.

To abide by this commitment we must first acknowledge there are no easy solutions to our individual and collective ills, false shortcomings and hardship. We must understand the concept of equal, natural antecedent rights and their intrinsic corresponding duties, as well as the indispensable belief and equal treatment before the law. We must understand that a republic in which citizens no longer look to build relationships between men and women meet the needs of friend and stranger and protect the child and orphan is a republic whose future is worth pondering.

We must understand that limited government does not mean inactive government, does not mean simply passive reactive government, does not even, given certain circumstances, have to mean small government. Lest we forget World War II, spending on our justly used military was exponentially higher than other times of non-war-time spending.

We must understand that limited government means a commitment to constitutionalism and the rule of law, not the rule of men. We must understand that a communitarianism that ascertains its supposed community and communal aspects from what is dictated and forced through Federal bonds and the greater dependence we have on the Federal Treasury, is no authentic communitarianism at all.

We must understand that each of us lose the sense of confiscation which occurs daily in our Tax Code when costs are disbursed, when a few cents here and a few dollars there are ignored, and, thus, all eyes turn to our Nation's Capital as if it were some giant piggy bank or money tree continuously sprouting new currency bills, dropping seeds of instantly created capital and supplying jobs, as if such things were not the exchanges of goods and services we make of citizens but, no, easily dispensed commodities which exist in some filled-to-the-brim barrel labeled "jobs" in the center of Capitol or the White House.

We must understand that it cannot be more efficient to send all of our tax dollars to Washington D.C., only to turn around and have them sent right back through a maze of confusion and delay to meet the need that could have been met earlier and within closer and, thus, more efficient proximity.

We must understand the republic in which we policymakers demonstrate our purported passion for constituents by promising to meet all the needs of each of them, while the constituents demonstrate their compassion by bemoaning how much of their earned income they do not give to such policymakers, is a republic with a troubling future.

We must understand that a republic in which its citizens are merely content to receive regular disbursements of entitlements from their government and no longer strive to meet those same needs of their fellow citizens, is a republic in need of renewal.

□ 1715

We must understand that a republic which insists on standing in the way of those who request the right to merely delay their own gratification by saving, for decades, through slow and meticulous discipline, their own earned income and assets in order to end the cycle of State-assisted dependency is a republic with an uncertain future. For policymakers to extol the virtues of the American people while denying them this chance to voluntarily delay their own gratification is the epitome of hypocrisy and double-standard.

We must understand that a republic in which those with greater wealth cease to seek ways to alleviate the basic needs of their fellow citizens less fortunate is a republic whose future is worth pondering.

We must understand that a republic in which local and State officials, as well as citizens and community groups, make their dutiful marches to the halls of Washington to request all-important funds from the miraculously self-generating Federal treasury as if it were the only such place such funds could be ascertained, is a republic whose future is truly worth pondering.

We must understand that there are some things the Federal Government can and should do. Providing for the public safety and protecting the homeland are vital for nation-states whose existence would be pointless were there boundaries and territorial integrity to be compromised and ignored.

We must understand that a republic in which the Federal entity confiscates more and more income from its citizens so that they can no longer freely give to their houses of worship, to their favored charitable organizations, to their family and friends in need, to the strangers and persons in close proximity to them who they can most rapidly assist, is a republic in need of renewal.

We must understand that when any meager attempt to limit or scale back a Federal budget now totaling \$3 trillion and an administrative state which has proven virtually impossible to shrink is met with accusations of cruelty, disdain, and charges of callousness, we are on an unsustainable course.

We must understand that we are not atomistic individuals utterly without need of social capital. We are not "unencumbered selves." As men and women, mothers and fathers, brothers and sisters, friends and acquaintances, we know that families and communities should receive priority over larger more removed entities. We know that the economic, political, and cultural aspects of society cannot be separated into distinct and separate spheres. They are intertwined. Proper economic activity presupposes certain cultural assumptions. Political activity can enshrine the necessary and proper economic fundamentals of a capitalistic system.

We must understand that local, State and Federal Governments are not omniscient repositories of unassailable wisdom all of the time. That's why the voluntary and intermediate associations of society are so important: the places of worship which also do so many acts of compassion, the charitable organizations, the community organizations, the "little platoons of society" daily helping, feeding, clothing, assisting, nurturing, training, developing, and shaping the individuals of this land.

Unfortunately, some view all “government” as oppression. Possibly necessary oppression, but oppression nonetheless. This too is mistaken. A commitment to subsidiarity provides a useful antidote to such fundamentally flawed, pessimistic and cynical thinking.

We as Representatives and we as citizens should live in a polity which is constantly probing, analyzing, imagining, how to conserve what is good about the past and present while making the future a better, more fulfilling place for those that come before us.

Mr. Speaker, the Preamble to our Constitution states: “We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.”

Establish justice. Insure domestic tranquility. Provide for the common defense. Promote the general welfare. Secure the blessings of liberty. Today, the United States has 304 million people living in 50 States, over 3,000 counties, and thousands of other cities, towns, villages, and local entities. My own State of California alone is almost 156,000 square miles, possesses over 36 million people, and contains over 800,000 private nonfarm business establishments. Yet, we know that “our country is not a thing of mere physical locality.” It is so much more. How are we then to govern ourselves spread across this vast, spacious, and diverse republic? It would do no harm to renew our commitment and endeavor to further understand the dimensions of subsidiarity.

As Michael Sandel has reminded us in great detail, this self-governing Republic has constantly been asking itself what the good life, the good society, and the good citizen is, should be, and can be, since its founding—a time before automobiles, telephones, televisions or the Internet. Let us never lose this perspective. After all, commonsense and reason adamantly demonstrate that unlimited vice and unfindable virtue will lead to greater resources being needed, greater unsustainable commitments being made, and greater constrictions being placed on our individual liberty. The strengthening of, and a reappraisal for, subsidiarity will help us all avoid such a fate.

Mr. Speaker, you and others may have seen a great and inspiring movie which had the simple title “Amazing Grace.” William Wilberforce, who lived from 1759 to 1833 and was the great English abolitionist protagonist in that fine and very moving film, not only helped end the African slave trade in the British Empire, but he was also part of 69 various societal groups as part of his effort at a societal-wide “reformation of manners and morals”

in England. It later became known as the Victorian Period, but he saw 13 and 14-year-old prostitutes on the streets of London, and most of society walking by and saying that is the way it has been, and that’s the way it is going to be. He said it doesn’t have to be that way, we can change it. When he did that, he engaged these nongovernmental entities in his effort to make those changes because he understood the principle of subsidiarity as it expressed itself through so many different organizations, and understood that if he was going to change the government, he had to change the culture. He had to change the people’s hearts and minds, and that you just couldn’t do it with government, you had to do it in fact with all of these organizations, from the families all of the way up to government.

So let us today, in a different century and in a different country, nonetheless think anew how to encourage all citizens to view ourselves as not just cogs in a Federal wheel but as vibrant members, as “little platoons” ourselves, of our respective spheres of life, wherever today may find us.

As Americans, Mr. Speaker, we have much of which to be proud. It was recently written that “the United States is creating the first universal nation, made up of all colors, races, and creeds, living and working together in considerable harmony.” Let us hope that is true. Let us always be committed to “living and working together in considerable harmony.” If we are concerned about liberty, justice, social or otherwise, and the common good, which all philosophies of human interaction and political life, no matter how libertarian or communitarian, presuppose, then we must commit ourselves to thinking with renewed vigor and energy, the presence and possibilities of subsidiarity.

It is not an easy task for we are Representatives at the Federal level, but I think if we exercised humility and a proper understanding of the organization of our society and the tremendous capacity of individuals to do good when properly directed, and properly self-directed, then we can rise to that challenge.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CUMMINGS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today from 12 p.m. until 2 p.m.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ELLISON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SARBANES, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, May 22.
Mr. MCHENRY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, May 22.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. INSLER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. TANCREDO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BROUN of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

H.R. 6022. An act to suspend the acquisition of petroleum for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6051. An act to amend Public Law 110-196 to provide for a temporary extension of programs authorized by the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 beyond May 16, 2008.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o’clock and 24 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 16, 2008, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

6624. A letter from the President and CEO, Bay Area Council Economic Institute, transmitting the Council’s report entitled, “Human Capital in the Bay Area: Why an Educated, Flexible Workforce is Vital to Our Economic Future”; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

6625. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting a copy of proposed legislation to amend Section 145 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (AEA) to ensure that in national security or public health and safety emergency situations the Department of Energy (DOE) has the authority to share Restricted Data with persons not in possession of a DOE “Q” or “L” security clearance; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6626. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s Report to Congress on Postmarket Surveillance of Medical