

Big Brother Bob Inglis

by John Cobin, Ph.D. for *The Times Examiner*
April 19, 2006

Sometimes even good politicians change. I remember how surprised conservatives were when previously-considered arch conservative Barry Goldwater quipped in his old age: “The rights that we have under the Constitution covers anything we want to do, as long as it’s not harmful. I can’t see any way in the world that being a gay can cause damage to somebody else” [1996]. To the chagrin of many conservatives, an icon of their movement had fallen.

In the same way, Congressman Bob Inglis (R-SC 4th District), who broke his promise to only serve in Congress for three terms, has become shockingly liberal. While he voted to compel seatbelt usage through federal legislation he is unable to restrain himself when it comes to big spending and legislating big brother policies or projects. In true liberal form, Inglis has voted to make things like drunkenness a federal crime when such vices would be better dealt with at the local level.¹ Do we really need a new or bigger federal bureaucracy to deal with local vice? While Inglis used to vote the right way on issues important to conservatives perhaps 80% of the time during the 1990s, conservative watchdogs report that he is now only doing so about 20% of the time.

Inglis’s voting record in 2005-2006 shows that he is hardly a true conservative and certainly does not give a second thought to defying either civil libertarian or constitutional principles. His ideology runs counter to the American Founders and is closer to that of the overt proponents of socialism or to those who want more state control over our lives. His legislative activity has (1) undermined the Bill of Rights,² (2) discounted private property rights by siding with *Kelo* decision proponents,³ (3) favored aggressive warfare⁴ and antics that run afoul of the Christian Worldview, including the ghastly “global war on terrorism”,⁵ (4) supported welfare state transfers and promoted public charity at taxpayer expense,⁶ (5) approved governmental price fixing and other interventionist schemes that affect the milk,⁷ agriculture,⁸ food (packaging and composition),⁹ oil and gasoline,¹⁰ transportation,¹¹ public-use civil engineering,¹² and banking industries,¹³ and (6) supported the radical environmentalist agenda.

¹ Inglis voted “yea” on H.R. 3 (July 29, 2005, Roll Call 453) establishing a program to increase the amount of check points nationwide and the penalties for failing or refusing a BAC test.

² Inglis voted “yea” on H.R. 4659 (February 2, 2006), which extended the Patriot Act and “yea” on S. 2271 (March 7, 2006), which provided additional reauthorizing amendments to the Patriot Act. The Patriot Act is repugnant to the Fourth Amendment directly, and to other parts of the Bill of Rights indirectly. Inglis also favors legislation that is repugnant to the Ninth and Tenth Amendments, invading the sphere of authority reserved to the states or to the people. For instance, Inglis voted “yea” on H.R. 3 (July 29, 2005, Roll Call 453) establishing grants for states that enact and enforce primary seat belt laws that allows police officers to pull over a driver for the sole reason of not using a seat belt.

³ Inglis voted “no” on H.R. 3058 (June 30, 2005, Roll Call 350), the Eminent Domain Amendment, which prohibits the use of federal funds to enforce the judgment of the United States Supreme Court in the case of *Kelo v. New London* (decided June 23, 2005) with the purpose of generating tax revenue or personal financial gain of private enterprise. In spite of Inglis’s vote, both houses of Congress passed the bill, providing some protection for private property owners and supporting the Fifth Amendment which, like the rest of the Bill of Rights, apparently holds little important to Inglis.

⁴ Inglis voted “yea” on H.Con.Res. 612 (December 16, 2005) and H.R. 619, which expressed the commitment of the House of Representatives to achieving victory in Iraq. He also voted “yea” on H.Cons.Res. 341 (February 16, 2006) to condemn the government of Iran for violating its nuclear nonproliferation obligations and report Iran to the United Nations Security Council; this action was both a threat to Iran, which may produce hostile repercussions, and implicitly showed that Inglis condones the existence of the United Nations and its role in American foreign policy.

⁵ Inglis voted “yea” on H.R. 2863 (December 19, 2005), which provided billions of dollars to finance this “war” and even more funding through his “yea” vote on H.R. 4939 (March 16, 2006) that provided emergency supplemental appropriations for the global war on terror.

⁶ Inglis voted “yea” on H.R. 4745 (February 15, 2006), which provided funding for the Small Business Administration’s disaster loan program, “yea” on H.R. 4939 (March 16, 2006) to provide emergency supplemental appropriations for hurricane Katrina relief, and “yea” on S. 2320 (March 16, 2006) which funded the low energy assistance program.

⁷ Inglis voted “yea” on S. 2120 (March 28, 2006), The Milk Regulatory Equity Act of 2005, to regulate the milk industry and fix its price (with notable exceptions to some features in places like the state of Nevada).

⁸ Inglis voted “yea” on S. 1150 (June 4, 1998, Roll Call 204) to appropriate funds for intervention into agricultural production, the creation and reformation of federal agriculture programs, research (on issues like crop insurance), and education, especially those that have national or multi-state significance, and those pesticide issues which related to Mexico in particular. The bill did reduce funding for the Food Stamp Program by \$1.17 billion but increased state intervention in other areas.

⁹ Inglis voted “yea” on H.R. 4167 (March 8, 2006), National Uniformity for Food Act of 2005, that provided regulation of food packaging and food composition requirements for interstate commerce.

¹⁰ Inglis voted “yea” on H.R. 3893 (October 7, 2005, Roll Call 519) to authorize the President to designate Federal land and three closed military bases for construction of new oil refineries and to implements penalties (up to \$11,000) to prevent gasoline suppliers from overcharging consumers. The bill promotes more government investigation into price gouging after Hurricane Katrina plus grants \$10 million to establish a program to encourage minority students to study geology and enter into employment in the oil, gas, and mining industries.

¹¹ Inglis voted “yea” on H.R. 3 (July 29, 2005, Roll Call 453) authorizing \$286.5 billion over six years in appropriations for highways, public transit, and safety programs, as well as to create other public works programs. Calls for the establishment of performance standards for cars concerning rollover, side impact

The *Charleston City Paper* (April 7, 2006) reported that “Maybe our elected officials should prepare the nation to deal with the coming waves of global climatic change and do what we can to stop it. Well, two Palmetto State Republicans in Washington, Rep. Robert Inglis and Sen. Lindsey Graham, have recognized the threats of global warming.” Inglis not only agrees with leftists on issues pertaining to oil, onerous fuel efficiency requirements, the virtues of carpooling policies and gasoline conservation (and using alternative fuels),¹⁴ questionable payments for hydrogen-based energy alternatives, he agrees with them on their core fad ideology of global warming. Inglis also favors the animal rights agenda by supporting expansion of the dubious Endangered Species Act.¹⁵

Anyone wanting proof for these accusations needs to look no further than Inglis’s voting record. Just review how Inglis voted on House of Representative bills numbered 3, 619, 2863, 3058, 3824, 3893, 4569, House Concurrent Resolutions 612 and 341, and Senate bill 2271 in 2005, along with House of Representative bills numbered 3505, 4167, 4745, 4939 and Senate bills 2120 and 2320 in 2006, plus Senate bill 1150 in 1998. Bob Inglis would make Karl Marx proud.

Is Inglis really the kind of man we need representing us in Washington? Does Inglis truly stand to keep his Congressional Oath of office: “I do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me, God.” We may say that Inglis supports the Constitution *only* if we contemplate the Constitution as a *living* document. Instead of upholding the ideals of liberty as envisioned by the Founders, a positive rights notion of social justice and “freedom” through wealth redistribution would have to be injected into the underpinnings of the Oath. Undermining personal liberty for the greater good of “society” would have to become the Congressional *modus operandi*. Only in this perverse sense has Inglis kept his Oath of office.

Good people are occasionally victims of having the wool pulled over their eyes by smooth talkers—especially modern Republicans. Just think about G.W. Bush’s present Republican administration which, while enjoying solid control of both houses of Congress, has been unwilling to deliver the goods to their faithful conservative constituents. The faithful have found very little benefit from basking in the glory of Republican rule. Have the ideals of Republicans and so-called conservatives changed? Well, one thing is sure: *Bob Inglis has changed*. He is now representative of the sort of newfangled “conservatism” that predominates today’s Congress which reflects left liberalism in many respects.

Those of us who are looking to alleviate the effects of such neo-conservatism—at least in our own district—must work to unseat 4th District Congressman Bob Inglis in the upcoming general election (November 7th). It’s time to bring back bungling Bob from the Beltway. We must not stand for any more lies, deserted promises, or treachery. If the people of Greenville, Spartanburg, Union, and northern Laurens counties really want a liberal then let them elect the Democrat Bill Griffith. Let’s not stand for reelecting a liberal big brother “wolf” like Inglis who is running in conservative clothing. Electing either of these candidates will, of course, result in grandma being eaten. But if we are willing to be eaten, isn’t it better to select an honest parasite rather than to become a victim by surprise? In the Declaration of Independence, the Founders maligned those political parasites who wanted “to eat out our substance” through interventionist taxes and public policies. But apparently that sentiment carries little weight with Bob Inglis.

crash, back-over and ejection performance. It requires background checks and new licensing requirements for drivers of hazardous materials. It increases a authority of law enforcement to search trucks containing hazardous materials. It appropriates funds for highway safety program and for research initiatives concern transportation.

¹² Inglis voted “yea” on H.R. 3 (July 29, 2005, Roll Call 453) requiring new transportation construction projects go through an environmental review process before they are started.

¹³ Inglis voted “yea” on H.R. 3505 (March 8, 2006), the Financial Services Regulatory Relief Act of 2005, that implicitly condoned the present institution of monopolized fractional reserve banking and provided continued meticulous regulatory intervention into the banking industry.

¹⁴ Inglis voted “yea” on H.R. 3893 (October 7, 2005, Roll Call 519) to encourage carpooling through grants and encourages internet advertising of carpools plus grants \$2.5 million to create an education campaign about gasoline conservation. Plus, Inglis voted “yea” on H.R. 3 (July 29, 2005, Roll Call 453) establishing grants for States with buses that use alternative fuels and provides \$8.61 billion for congestion mitigation and air quality improvement programs.

¹⁵ Inglis voted “yea” on H.R. 3824 (September 29, 2005, roll call 506) regarding Animal Rights and Wildlife Issues, to reauthorize and broaden the range of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide greater results by redefining terms like “jeopardized” and considering what species are threatened. The bill provides payments and programs for affected private landowners, a means to improve the use of science, and facilitate conservation emphasizing interventionist solutions that grant state agencies a greater role.