

As President Kennedy said in 1961:

It will not be one man going to the Moon; it will be an entire Nation. For all of us must work to put him there.

President Kennedy's goal was achieved on July 20, 1969, when Apollo 11 Commander Neil Armstrong was the first person to step on the Moon.

It is good to remember how President Kennedy inspired a Nation. The torch of freedom President Kennedy described in his inaugural speech has now been passed to yet another generation. Let this generation celebrate President Kennedy's sense of idealism and public service every day.

#### TYPHOON HAIYAN

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of my home State of Hawaii, I stand today to send our heartfelt condolences to the victims of Super Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines.

Like so many people in Hawaii and around the world, I and my family have loved ones, friends, and others who were affected by this devastation in Tacloban City and in other areas of the Philippines, and they have been at the forefront of our thoughts and prayers.

In the wake of such a horrible tragedy, the positive that we can find is the outpouring of compassion, support, and, most importantly, aloha from my State towards the people in the Philippines.

The Hawaii Air National Guard is working with the U.S. Pacific Command as we speak, which is based in Hawaii, as collectively they provide unparalleled air, maritime, and ground support to the aid efforts of the Philippines authorities. All across Hawaii, as across the world, we are seeing businesses, nonprofits, and individuals standing up individually and taking the time and energy to raise resources and to provide support to these aid efforts, to these relief efforts, and helping to reunite families and friends and communities.

I continue to pray for all those who have lost homes, family, and friends, and encourage all who are able to contribute in any way possible in this recovery effort.

#### 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ASSASSINATION OF JOHN F. KENNEDY

(Mr. FARR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, as we reflect on the 50 years since the passing of President Kennedy, I want to reissue that thought about call for service. He struck me in his inaugural address of asking not what this country can do for you, but what you can do for the

country; and I immediately responded when he created the Peace Corps. I am wearing this button today proudly as a return Peace Corps volunteer.

My thoughts are as we sort of enter into the next half century of thought about America and service, President Kennedy not only urged us to go to space; he urged us to send our people to places where no person had ever gone before, no American had ever been; to all of these remote countries in poverty situations and places where nobody had ever lived. It changed the image of America around the world so positively.

So for you young people that are thinking about the future, don't think of America as just a platform to make money. America is the platform to launch peace and understanding around the world. Join the Peace Corps, serve this country, call for service. It is honorable.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO). The Chair will recognize Members for Special Order speeches without prejudice to the possible resumption of legislative business.

#### OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, first of all, it is my honor to yield to a good friend whom I have tremendous respect for, from the State of Florida, my friend, RON DESANTIS.

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I am struck by having been here to witness something that I think is pretty neat. We had a newly sworn in Member take the oath of office to become a Member of this body. Part of it is neat because he got endorsed by Duck Dynasty, which I know a lot of people like; but it was neat because I think it reminds us what our duties are here. He was asked to take an oath of office right here in the well of the House. That oath was very simple. It charged him with the duty to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

I think we need to have more of a reminder that that is our duty here. I am struck by reading the Constitution and how the Founding Fathers laid out separation of powers and checks and balances.

For example, article I states clearly: All legislative powers shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.

Article II prescribes authority for the President and imposes a duty on him to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

I think that going back on those constitutional foundations and looking at how this particular President has made claims of his authority to essentially put aside the law or change the law should cause us great concern.

For example, with this employer mandate aspect of ObamaCare, the statute said very clearly it shall take effect this January 2014.

Well, that, obviously, would have been disastrous had they implemented that. We in the House were willing to delay it by statute. The President chose to do it by executive fiat.

□ 1245

And then most recently with the idea that ObamaCare was causing people to lose their plans, a lot of people in this body said, Look, we ought to grandfather these plans in; let people keep their plans. The President threatened to veto that, and then he issued, essentially, an executive order saying he is going to extend the grandfather clause and not enforce the ObamaCare mandate that is causing the cancellations.

So, on the one hand, ObamaCare is a holy writ that people in Congress are not allowed to touch in any way with our Article I power, but the President can essentially pick and choose which parts to enforce, which parts to delay, and who to grant waivers to. That ultimately is not sustainable, and it conflicts with the basic structure of American Government.

The American Revolution, if you read the Declaration of Independence, it was a revolt against executive power and the British King. Jefferson lists all the abuses that they were revolting against. One of the things that he mentioned was that King George III, what King George III had done wrong was for abolishing our most valuable laws and altering, fundamentally, the form of government.

Students in school throughout America are taught, Congress passes the law and the President can sign or veto the law, and the President has the duty to enforce the law. Now, there is certainly prosecutorial discretion that comes with that. If the President has a good-faith belief that a law is unconstitutional, of course they have to prefer the Constitution to the statute. But here, this President has not made any claim that ObamaCare is unconstitutional; and, indeed, he can't, because it is his signature piece of legislation.

I think the key thing to think about is the Founding Fathers did not create separation of powers, checks and balances because they thought that students would need something to study in civics class. They did it because, ultimately, that structure of government was the surest way to protect the individual liberty of the American people and to preserve and maintain the rule of law.

I think disputes that we have regarding what this particular President may do should not even be about him, per se, because that just gets lost in partisanship back and forth. I think when

we see any President taking steps that may not comport with how the structure of the government was intended to operate, we have to think about what precedent that sets, not just tomorrow, but 50 years from now. And so I have introduced a resolution that enumerates some of the instances in which the President has gone beyond using executive discretion and is essentially re-writing the law, either by failing to enforce entirely or suspending affirmatively different provisions of the law.

Much has been said recently about the failure of this core promise with respect to ObamaCare, that if you like your plan, you can keep it can. Obviously, we are seeing that is not true. We are going to continue to see that. People are going to lose doctors, and it really is a deception on a massive scale.

So I was thinking, you like your plan, you keep your plan; that obviously didn't work. Maybe we should get everyone in Congress and the White House to agree with this simple proposition: if you take an oath to the Constitution, you should keep your oath to the Constitution.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me, and I know you will be someone who will take that oath seriously.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank the gentleman from Florida. What a profound novel idea: if you take the oath, you should keep it. And that doesn't even mean if you like it. It is just, if you take the oath, you should keep it.

As my friend, Mr. DESANTIS was pointing out, there are so many problems with the ObamaCare bill. And I know the President referred to the bill as "ObamaCare" many times and said he was proud to do so, and so I certainly don't mean any disrespect or anything like that. On the other hand, it is extremely difficult to call it the "Affordable Care Act" when you know it is not affordable.

And a great indication of just how affordable it is came from a lady named Jessica Sanford. I heard the President at a press conference read the letter from Jessica Sanford from Washington State. And when I heard it, I thought, well, good. At least somebody has been able to find something good from ObamaCare, because in my office we have heard from so many people who have already been adversely affected. So I thought, well, great. Three hundred-plus million people in the United States, he found one person that had a letter he could read from Jessica Sanford. Then it turns out, this article from the Daily Caller on November 19:

Jessica Sanford received a major shout-out last month when President Barack Obama mentioned her fan letter lauding her cheap, new ObamaCare coverage. But the Washington State business owner has now been informed that she can't even afford the cheapest ObamaCare exchange plan in her State. "I'm really terribly embarrassed," Sanford told the Washington State Wire. "It has completely turned around on me. I mean, completely."

The Washington State exchange Web site Washington Healthplanfinder originally gave Sanford a quote for coverage that would insure both her and her son for \$169 per month.

But after a series of corrections—and she was one of the few people who was able to get through on the Web site—she gets a quote, and it turns out that it was entirely wrong. It makes you wonder how many people got the wrong quote and won't find out and won't realize they did and will end up January 1 without insurance thinking they signed up, thinking they bought a policy they can afford only to find out they couldn't afford it.

In this case, it says the ObamaCare exchange Web site originally calculated Sanford would be eligible for a Federal ObamaCare tax credit that would lower her monthly premium total by \$452 per month, prompting the effusive letter that Obama read out loud during a White House speech.

I am a single mom, no child support, self-employed, and I haven't had health insurance for 15 years because it is too expensive. I was crying the other day when I signed up, so much stress lifted.

So the President was quick to share Ms. Sanford's gratitude and said:

Sanford's experience is what the Affordable Care Act is all about.

He went on:

The essence of the law, the health insurance that is available to people, is working just fine. In some cases, it actually is exceeding expectations. The prices are lower than we expected; the choice is greater than we expected.

But this article points out that Sanford was one of 8,000 people to be affected by 4,600 policies sold on the Washington exchange that had been quoted premium rates that were too low.

Ms. Sanford said:

I was dumbfounded. I thought this was a total mistake; they're going to correct this. This isn't true.

Now she says she can't even afford the cheapest Bronze ObamaCare plan. "I was like, forget that. I'm not going to pay." So she is going uninsured. Sanford now says of ObamaCare:

You are stuck on this big treadmill of bureaucracy. And, you know, it feels very out of control.

This article from today—this afternoon, actually—from Steven Ertelt, entitled, "ObamaCare Denies Hospital Choice for Blind Child With Rare Bone Disease," says:

As The Washington Post reports, a number of the Nation's top hospitals—including the Mayo Clinic in Minnesota, Cedars-Sinai in Los Angeles, and children's hospitals in Seattle, Houston, and St. Louis—are cut out of most plans sold on the exchange. In most cases, the decision was about the cost of care.

Here is how ObamaCare is hurting one family:

In Seattle, the region's predominant insurer, Premera Blue Cross, decided not to include the children's hospital as an in-network provider except in cases where the service sought cannot be obtained anywhere else. "Children's nonunique services were too expensive given the goal of providing afford-

able coverage for consumers," spokesman Eric Earling said in an email.

That brings up the point, the President wanted to provide everybody health insurance; and some of us, like me, were more concerned about getting them quality health care that was affordable. All this talk about insurance, insurance, insurance, the bigger, more important question should have been can we get them health care they can afford.

One of the biggest promises was it will lower most everybody's cost, and it turns out that was not true at all either. There are some in States, in a State like New York, where it was overpriced previously where it has come down some. But overall, when you add 18,000 new IRS agents that will not ever even apply a Band-Aid, they may cause a bunch of ulcers, but they will never provide any health care. And they are not from the U.S. Government to help you. They are there to go through all of your most important and most personal decisions with you—the IRS. Go figure.

This institution, the IRS, this agency that we find out got weaponized by the Obama administration to go after people they disagreed with. Richard Nixon had an enemy's list, but he never could do much with it. This administration has an enemy's list, and they have really gone after people and made them suffer for having a different political opinion than this administration.

This article points out:

For example, a pediatric appendectomy at Children's costs about \$23,000. At another community hospital, the cost is closer to \$14,000. Melzer said his hospital often bills more than community hospitals for comparable procedures because the children it treats are often gravely ill, so even a routine tonsillectomy may be more complicated.

But as a result, families like Jeffrey Blank's, which has relied on Seattle Children's since his daughter, Zoe, received a rare diagnosis of a rare bone disorder, face difficult decisions. Under some of the new law's health plans, the family would no longer be able to take Zoe to Children's for her routine checkups, or it could count as an "out-of-network" visit, saddling the family with huge bills.

As the pro-life movement warned during its adoption in Congress, health care will be rationed and health care access will be limited when the government gets involved. These lessons have been seen for decades in nations like Canada and England, and the United States is now following suit.

It makes such a great point, because when you add 18,000 IRS agents to be even more intrusive and get into your most private decisions about health care and your own health, they not only may cause you ulcers or create problems, they don't help at all. And I have no idea what the average IRS salary will be. I would imagine the IRS' average salary will be a lot higher than \$56,000. But if you just take \$56,000 as the average for the 18,000 IRS agents, it means that a billion dollars next year will go for IRS agents to harass you, that will come out of money that should be going to health care, and it is not going to help you a bit.

In fact, they are playing for the other team. They are out after you, not out to help you. And then when you add in all of these millions of navigators and you add in all the tens of thousands, maybe some make over \$100,000, and I am sure some of them will that are involved in this whole navigator process, not the lowest level but some surely will, and you think about all the billions of dollars over the next years that will be spent for navigators that, as we heard here in testimony from Kathleen Sebelius herself, yes, they can be convicted of a felony and we won't catch it because we are not checking on that kind of thing.

□ 1300

As a former judge who sentenced people to prison—for example, I never sent a woman to prison for felony welfare fraud when her crime was getting a job to try to get out of the hole the government lured her into by promising checks for every child she could have out of wedlock. I do believe in holding people accountable. I would sentence them, give them probation, and then do things like either max them out or come close to maxing out 800 hours of community service, but then make very clear as an incentive that if you get your GED or high school diploma, then I'll knock out 750 hours, to urge them to go forward and help themselves, which ultimately helps society. That is the kind of thing government is supposed to do.

Instead, this government, for too long, going back to the Great Society days, has incentivized things that lured people away from their God-given potential. It hasn't helped them; it has lured them away from their potential. Here we are now with ObamaCare not just luring people away from their health care, it has put a wall up between them and their health care.

I knew when I would hear our friends across the aisle here in the House and in the Senate talk about how health insurance is a right,—well, it is not in the Constitution as a right. I was more concerned about "health care" than "health insurance." There are ways to make it affordable.

When we see disparities of \$23,000 to \$14,000 for the same tonsillectomy, it should be very clear that we need competition, and when you have the government running everything, there is no competition. The government screws that up royally. It prevents the thing that made America so great: entrepreneurialism, competitive advantages that people have that work hard. It destroys those kinds of incentives, and now we are seeing it destroy lives.

Here is an article from November 19. "HHS Secretary Sebelius Visits South Florida to Meet With Health Care Navigators." Gee, wouldn't it be nice if we weren't paying billions of dollars for government workers that will make your health care decisions more miserable instead of giving you more freedom?

Here is an article from yesterday on foxnews.com: Second Wave of Health Plan Cancellations Looms. It says:

A new and independent analysis of ObamaCare warns of a ticking timebomb, predicting a second wave of 50 million to 100 million insurance policy cancellations next fall—right before the mid-term elections. The next round of cancellations and premium hikes is expected to hit employees, particularly of small businesses.

It goes on to say:

As reported by AEI's Scott Gottlieb, some businesses got around this by renewing their policies before the end of 2013. But the relief is temporary, and they are expected to have to offer in-compliance plans for 2015. According to Gottlieb, that means beginning in October 2014 the cancellation notices will start to go out.

So the millions of cancellations that have gone out now—people make the mistake of saying 5 million people. That is 5 million policies. That is the information I have got. There are million policies approximately so far. That is a lot more than 5 million people. That could be 15 million, 20 million people.

This article is exactly right. AEI is exactly right that come next year, a lot of people—we have heard this, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of people have been renewing their policies now before the end of the year so that they don't completely lose it until next year around this time. Next fall, there will be millions and millions and millions more who will get those notices of cancellations.

As a result, this article from Marguerite Bowling points out, Obama's legacy will be more Americans than ever reject government enrolled health care. It then points out the way it has gone from 64 percent and even up to 69 percent wanting government to be responsible for their health care to now dropping to 42 percent of Americans because people have begun to see what so many of us have been talking about for a number of years: the best solution is not more government. The best solution is not having navigators and IRS agents taking away money that could be spent on health care.

I have this article from David Martosko that points out that our President had claimed that more than 100 million Americans have enrolled. Obviously, that was just a mistake in the teleprompter. It is not his fault. Here is an article from the Heritage Foundation's Morning Bell:

The American people rose up to repeal a health care law once before. They can do it again.

It goes back and points out about the bill that had been passed under a man that I greatly revere, a great President, Ronald Reagan, and he thought he was providing America with a great gift of catastrophic care for seniors, but it didn't take but a couple of years for people to see this is a disaster, this isn't a good thing. So in 1989, they stepped up and got it repealed.

An interesting CBS poll from yesterday points out that 84 percent of Democrats want ObamaCare changed or repealed. I had not seen that before, that article.

So it is important to understand just what is at stake with ObamaCare. These things are kind of worn. I have been through them so much, and I had gone through and read the bill so I would know what was in it before I voted, which is why I voted against it. There are things in here—and I will just hit a few since people are now waking up as this thing has become a reality. People are starting to wake up and realize that, wait a minute, this was not such a good idea.

When there were some who were concerned here in this room about the President representing that abortions would not be paid for under ObamaCare, some of us had read the bill—I think at that point it was the 1,000-page bill, and then the one that came out of the committee, and then somehow it magically became around 2,000 pages, and then we end up with my copy, which is just under 2,500.

At page 119, this was a comfort to some people when they read:

The services described in this clause are abortions for which the expenditure of Federal funds appropriated for the Department of Health and Human Services is not permitted based on the laws in effect at the date that is 6 months before the beginning of the plan year.

But then it does have a provision that abortions with public funding are allowed.

Then the next section:

Prohibition on Federal Funds for Abortion Services in Community Health Insurance Option.

That is the last I can find of abortion specifically being mentioned.

What gets really clever, since we now are of the Information Age where you can go online and see bills and you can do an electronic word search, if you go online and do an electronic word search for the word "abortion"—I didn't see it. What you have to be aware of is these are really clever people. They were clever enough as they wrote this to make sure that the Speaker's office and certain staffs would be exempted. It was really intriguing how clever some of these things were.

To avoid a word search picking this stuff up, like over here at page 122, it says, "Assured availability of varied coverage through exchanges," and it says:

"The Secretary"—talking about Secretary Sebelius right now—"shall assure that with respect to qualified health plans offered in any exchange established pursuant to this title—(I) there is at least one such plan that provides coverage of services described in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph B."

Well, that surely couldn't be abortion, unless you flip back and see what (i) and (ii) of B is. Guess what? That is the abortion referenced over on page 119. That is the way you get around

people picking up those things; of course she is going to have provisions in here about that, and of course people shouldn't forget that the provision at page 429—it was a special adjustment to FMAP, determination for certain States recovering from a major disaster. This was put in there to buy the votes from Louisiana. That is why some have called it the “Louisiana Purchase.” So we have got special consideration in there for that.

There are all kinds of things I used to go through. Of course, AARP got special dispensation.

Also, this administration saw that Medicare Advantage was really helping some people out. Their costs were lower. There were a lot of people that were telling me they liked Medicare Advantage. So as ObamaCare would do it, it would try to destroy anything that people liked and was helpful and mandate that you couldn't have those provisions in your policy. They knew all along by putting this kind of thing in this bill, like at page 904, that people that liked their Medicare Advantage were not going to get to keep it. They sure weren't going to like it after this bill got through with them. At 904, it goes after Medicare Advantage and says: “Nothing in this section shall be construed as requiring the Secretary to accept any or every bid submitted by an MA organization under this subsection.”

Then the next capital C, subparagraph (ii):

Authority to deny bids that propose significant increases in cost-sharing or decreases in benefits.

Because as the government keeps mandating more and more things, like maternity care for men that are single and may be beyond their childbearing years—well, a single man that is 70 years old may think, gee, I am beyond childbearing years. I probably won't get pregnant any time soon. Maybe I don't need maternity care. Well, maybe Secretary Sebelius thinks you do. So you are going to pay for it anyway. That is the way people end up paying more than what they really need.

That was in the second volume.

I never could understand it. I keep asking questions, and nobody will give an explanation as to why, at page 1,312 in the health care bill, to make sure that everybody got the health care they needed that we had to create the Commissioned Corps and Ready Reserve Corps for service in time of national emergency over on page 1,314. It talks about national emergencies and public health crises. It gets “health” in there for part of it, but not under national emergencies.

Above that, it is talking about the purpose to “meet both routine public health and”—that is conjunctive, not disjunctive—“emergency response missions.”

Well, I wish they would put “health” in here, and we would be more assured that this isn't creating some kind of Presidential brownshirts or something,

but we can't get an answer on who these people are, what they are being trained with, what they are being trained on. Are they being trained with weapons? Are they being trained with medical equipment? What are they being trained on?

One thing that I have learned, as both a judge and a chief justice, and now in Congress, is that if words are not specific, somebody is going to figure out to just use their plain meaning. So when something says “national emergencies,” like this bill, there will be times it will be called in for national emergencies rather than just health emergencies.

□ 1315

And the next section talks about public health emergencies, both foreign and domestic, but we have already learned that they didn't put the word “health” in the national emergency. And so it is strange.

These are commissioned officers of the Ready Reserve Corps. They will be appointed by the President. Commissioned officers of the regular Corps shall be appointed by the President, and it is subject to advice and consent of the Senate; but that is for the actual appointment.

But it makes clear over here that they are subject—it says that the Corps will be available and ready for involuntary calls to Active Duty during national emergencies and public health crises. And then below the health crisis, foreign and domestic. So that is some more.

I have insurance that has a health savings account attached to it. I think Aetna could have done better, and I was looking forward to improving my policy, except that ObamaCare came in and made sure that anybody that had a policy with a high deductible and a health savings account they liked were probably not going to be able to keep it because they took shots and terrifically restricted what you could use a health savings account for.

The goal is to get rid of them because if people get that much control over their own health savings account or, as the bill I filed back before ObamaCare ever passed, nearly a year before it passed, I say give seniors a choice. Let them choose Medicare. Let people choose Medicaid.

Or it would be cheaper for us if we just say, look, we will buy you a Cadillac, not a bronze, we will buy you the best coverage, great coverage, and it will have a high deductible now, maybe \$5,000, something like that for a deductible, and we will give you the cash in a health savings account.

You get control back of your health care. You can handle it yourself. Your debit card will be coded where you can only use it for health care, but then let you make the decisions.

But this won't even let you go get your own medicine or drug unless it is prescribed. This kind of stuff is running up the costs and trying to get rid of HSAs. It is very clear.

Oh, and I love—they have got a provision in here for States, this, back 2,300 or so, they have got a provision in here that, gee, we have given out grants, but if your State has bothered to do malpractice reform, like the Federal Government hasn't done, then if you put caps on pain and suffering, for example, then you are not going to be getting the grants that other States are.

Well, there are a lot of problems with ObamaCare; and I hope that, by the end, before the election next year, people will realize that what some of us have been saying for years is true. It is in America's best interest to have health care reform, but that is not it. It is not it.

There is another issue—there are two other things I want to address very quickly. One is about Guantanamo Bay.

I had the television on when I was working at my desk in the wee hours of the morning this morning. I can't remember, maybe, 1, 2, 3 a.m., something like that, but a show where some psychologist had been, basically, corrupted by being used at Guantanamo Bay for psychological warfare. Totally false story.

I mean, there are still a lot of people walking around that don't know that no one has ever been waterboarded at Guantanamo Bay.

Having been there two or three times, you get the picture. Amnesty International comes regularly. These groups come regularly; and when you find out what is really going on there, it is really the guards that are put through all kinds of Hades. They have excrement and urine thrown on them, and they are not allowed to even get angry back.

Last time I was there, they said there had been one soldier who had responded angrily, and he was punished for it. Their instructions are when you have urine or feces thrown on you by one of the detainees at Guantanamo Bay, you just don't react. And then you get the day off so you can go clean up, change clothes.

So the inmates are constantly coming up with innovative ways to get feces and urine on our guards. That was last time. Hopefully, they have dealt with it better.

The punishment, when I was there before, they would take away some of the movie-watching time that the detainees got to have; and if it was really egregious enough, they might cut into their outdoor time a little bit.

But I was told that Amnesty International gets real upset about that, so they don't like to cut out their outdoor time, so they are more restrictive on the movie-watching time that our detainees at Guantanamo may get.

And this—what a juxtaposition. What an amazing thing.

The New York Times used to bill itself—and it is arguable that it really was accurate as the newspaper of record, but they have so corrupted their standards that they could say about an overt lie, someone misspoke.

This is not a newspaper of record. It is really just a sad day for America regarding the New York Times. But every now and then they get a story right.

But, unfortunately, now we have to sometimes go to England or other countries whose media is not overwhelmed with bias for or against a particular administration so we can get proper reporting.

But this story is from Russia Today. I mean, I was in the Soviet Union in 1973. I could read a little bit of Russian, speak a little Russian back then. I haven't had any reason to for over 30 years, so I don't remember much of anything but how to get to the bathroom.

But from Russia Today they report, and this was the first I saw, and then started looking for more information: U.S. Senate is seemingly deadlocked when dealing with the Guantanamo Bay detention facility, voting down dueling measures which would have either loosened or tightened restrictions on transferring detainees.

And then we found one, 2014, NDAA, now in the Senate, could finally mean the end of Guantanamo. More than half of Guantanamo Bay's 164 detainees have been cleared to transfer to other nations, MSNBC reports, but have remained at the prison due to congressional measures complicating the transfer protocol.

Yes, some of us are concerned that since we keep transferring people out, releasing them, and they keep killing Americans, so many of them, after they are released, I would say one is too many, but one is not near as many as have been reported going back and continuing to kill Americans.

This talks about even a good Republican who is reportedly aiding the Guantanamo Bay win for President Obama, but White House, top Senate Democrats successfully defended provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act that would loosen restrictions on transferring detainees out of Guantanamo Bay, advancing President Obama's goal of closing the facility by a margin of 55-43.

Yeah, they can vote like that because they have got enough people that aren't up for re-election next year. So they can take a vote like that.

So that caused me to go look at the law being discussed and voted on, and find this provision in there, section 1032, the authority to temporarily transfer individuals detained at United States Naval Station Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the United States for emergency or critical medical treatment.

So, okay, they say, yeah, see, we have got to get them out of there sometimes for medical treatment. They have got incredibly good medical treatment at Guantanamo Bay.

This says, status while in the United States, an individual who is temporarily transferred under the authority in subsection (a) while in the United

States shall be considered to be paroled into the United States temporarily pursuant to a provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

But then it goes on, under section 1033, to say that transfer for detention and trial, the Secretary of Defense may transfer a detainee described in subsection (a) to the United States for detention and trial if the Secretary determines that the transfer is in the national security interest of the United States.

And it does provide that Congress should be notified not later than 30 days before the date of proposed transfer. But if the President, with a wave of his hand, can wave off mandatory language in a bill that was passed without a single Republican vote, if they can wave off provisions of the immigration bill and just flat out change the law, unilaterally, as the Chief Executive, then it sure wouldn't be very hard to say, oh, whoops, we didn't give Congress notice; those people are in the United States because once they are in the United States, things take a big turn.

I remember my friend from across the aisle, Anthony Weiner, was so upset. He actually said he wanted these detainees brought to New York City and put on trial and executed there in New York City.

Well, having been a prosecutor, judge and chief justice, I knew he would be exhibit A for why, if they brought the detainees to New York City, they shouldn't get a trial there. They would have to transfer them somewhere else because you had people like Anthony Weiner who were not particularly capital punishment supporters, but wanted them to be executed. So that would have been exhibit A in why you couldn't get a fair trial if they were brought to New York.

Some of our friends get very confused and demand, we want these people at Guantanamo Bay to have the same rights under the Constitution that everybody else does.

Well, everybody doesn't have the same rights under the Constitution. When I was in the Army for 4 years, I didn't have the rights everybody else did. I wasn't free to assemble where I wanted. I wasn't free to say what I wanted to about the President.

I wasn't happy with Jimmy Carter. We saw Fort Benning going down and down and down. We saw our Nation attacked by an act of war in Tehran, and there was no response.

That is still being used today to recruit people to al Qaeda, to terrorism, because of how weak our response was then, how weak the response was when we were attacked in 1983 at Beirut and, certainly, the ongoing weak responses after the World Trade Center bombing in 1993, the USS *Cole*, the embassy attacks.

And I know there are people that would say to such embassy attacks in the 1990s, well, what difference does it make at this point?

Well, perhaps if it had made a difference to the Clinton administration, we would have been better prepared and people wouldn't have died in Benghazi.

But this is a disaster. Under the Constitution, nobody is promised a trial in a U.S. District Court. And people need to understand that, because in the Constitution there is no U.S. District Court.

As my old constitutional law professor at Baylor used to say, there is only one Court created in the Constitution. Every other court in America, Federal court, that is, owes its existence and continued existence and jurisdiction to the United States Congress. That is it.

So if are you an immigrant, our Constitution says you get due process at an immigration court. If you are in the military, the Constitution ensures you will get due process in a military court. And I can tell you, that is kind of tough.

When a soldier stands in front of a military jury, all wearing uniform, all appointed by the commanding officer to whom they account after that trial is over, it is a little different than a jury that you would get just picked at random from your peers.

□ 1330

They are not picked at random. The commanding officers, from platoon on up through company and all the way up to the installation, they send recommendations, and they eventually funnel their way up to the commanding general for a general court-martial. And then they are handpicked by the general. These are the people who will be on the jury.

Well, that is constitutional. It has been upheld many times. So I have a little trouble, having served in the military, understanding why someone who wants to destroy our country and kill all the Americans they can, why are they entitled to more rights under the Constitution than somebody that is giving their lives in our U.S. military? They are not. They are not given more rights than our U.S. military.

And, in fact, under international law, the way it has existed, going back as far as it has been recorded, when someone was part of a country or group that declared war on another country or group and they were captured, they were held until their group or country said they were no longer at war. Then we let go of the ones that promised not to be at war after the war was over and punished those who were guilty of war crimes.

And I also, Mr. Speaker, want to make sure people understand what we have at Guantanamo. Khalid Sheikh Mohammed was the leader—people call him the mastermind—of 9/11/2001. Very unrepentant. Not only is he unrepentant, he, in 2008, in December, agreed to plead guilty and went through, I believe, at least two hearings where, through in-depth questioning by the

judge, he admitted to his role in killing Americans.

We know he filed this pleading, of which I have a copy here, that was released by Military Judge Colonel Henley, declassified so we could see what Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the 9/11 mastermind—he, himself, talked about his planning it. And he had some resources where he could translate his language into English so that he could write this whole thing. There are some idioms, perhaps, that may be misused, but anyway, he is a brilliant man. He just hates Americans and loves to kill them.

But in his pleading, he says:

In God's book, he ordered us to fight you everywhere we find you, even if you were inside the holiest of all holy cities, the mosque in Mecca, and the holy city of Mecca, and even during sacred months.

In other words, it would be perfectly fine for him or one of his buddies to kill Americans in the mosque in Mecca, but heaven help the person that causes any damage at all to the same mosque.

He said, "In God's book"—and this is as if he had legal training. He does this quite well. He states a premise, and he follows it up with a provision from the law of the Koran. I mean, the Koran is a book, basically, of law.

In God's book, verse 9, Al-Tawbah: "Then fight and slay the pagans wherever you find them, and seize them, and besiege them and lie in wait for them in each and every ambush."

Further down, he says:

We do not possess your military might, not your nuclear weapons.

Of course, this President may be presiding over the United States—unless Israel protects itself, this President may be the one that sees, for the first time, a radical Islamic terrorist regime get a nuclear weapon, and that will change the world forever. We can't afford for that to happen.

But he points out, at the time he wrote this:

We do not possess your nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, we fight you with the Almighty God. So, if our act of jihad and our fighting with you caused fear and terror, then many thanks to God, because it is him that has thrown fear into your hearts, which resulted in your infidelity, paganism, and your statement that God had a son and your trinity beliefs.

And then the provision he follows that up with, from the Koran:

Soon shall we cast terror into the hearts of the unbelievers, for that they joined companies with Allah, for which he has sent no authority. Their place will be the fire; and evil is the home of the wrongdoers.

And he misspelled "their." When he said "their place," he used T-H-E-R-E. But, I mean, this is amazing stuff. He is admitting: we want to destroy you.

And if you think for a moment that Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or Ahmadinejad or Khamenei would not mind using a nuke to destroy what some of them believe were people descended from apes and pigs, as some in the Muslim Brotherhood say, well, you

have got another thing coming. These people are not stupid, but they are insanely crazy in their desire to kill innocent people.

He went on at the end of his pleading on page 6, and says:

You will be greatly defeated in Afghanistan and Iraq, and America will fall, politically, militarily, and economically. Your end is very near, and your fall will be just as the fall of the towers on the blessed 9/11 day. We will raise from the ruins, God willing. We will leave this imprisonment with our noses raised high in dignity, as the lion emerges from his den. We shall pass over the blades of the sword into the gates of heaven.

So we ask from God to accept our contributions to the great attack, the great attack on America, and to place our 19 martyred brethren among the highest peaks in paradise.

This is a guy that some people want to bring to the United States. They have no idea how desperately wrong that would be. He is being held constitutionally right where he is, and under no circumstances should he be allowed to be brought into the United States itself.

They have the perfect courtroom set up down in Guantanamo for conducting terrorist trials. Enough bulletproof material in the middle of an area where a bombing would not do the damage that it would in Manhattan.

Israel understands the threat. They understand the danger. And it absolutely breaks my heart to find out that Israel is having to seek another ally that understands the threat of radical Islam to them and to the United States.

Now, it was Prime Minister Netanyahu who asked me, after I apologized for America putting them in a position where they have to defend not only themselves but the United States, because some people here do not understand the threat, he said, I just ask that you remind your President, the people in America, that it was your President who said the words, "Israel must defend itself by itself."

I didn't remember President Obama saying that. I had to go back and do a word search. It turns out, that was slipped in in a bunch of other glowing comments about what a wonderful ally and we are not going to let Iran get nukes and all this stuff. And then he slides that little sentence in there that is profound. But "Israel must defend itself by itself." That is why I wasn't the only one that didn't pick up on that, because of the way in which he contextualized it.

But here is an article from The Blaze today, from Sharona Schwartz, "How Bad Are Things Between Israel and the U.S.? Israeli Foreign Minister Says It's Time to Find New Allies."

Israel's foreign policy for many years went in one direction toward Washington, but my policy has more directions.

This is Foreign Minister Avigdor Lieberman who said this. He said:

There are enough countries that we can be a help to, and, therefore, our foreign policy must be to search for allies. The Americans

have a lot of problems and challenges around the world that they need to solve and they have problems at home. We need to understand them and our place in the global arena.

We need to stop demanding, complaining, moaning and, instead, seek countries that are not dependent on money from the Arab or Islamic world and who want to cooperate with us in the field of innovation.

I mean, Israel has been a leading innovator in intellectual technology. They need to be our friends. They believe in the value of life, as we do. They do not name streets and holidays for people who kill innocent women, children, innocent victims, men who never saw it coming; whereas, even in Palestine, as it is called now—it was never called that before in recent history. But it is time that we realize what a friend we have in Israel and that we could never spend enough money to create the defense system we have in Israel if we will just be supportive.

One other thing I want to address before I conclude today. There are some people that are calling attention to the President's omission of the words "under God" from the Gettysburg Address when he did the entire Gettysburg Address on camera. I don't know whose decision it was to leave that out. I don't know if he was just reading it, and whoever gave it to him to read in the teleprompter took it out and he didn't realize. I don't know what happened. But, Mr. Speaker, it is important that people understand, yes, there are five existing copies of the Gettysburg Address. There is only one that Abraham Lincoln signed, the Bliss copy, unless the President has removed it, like he did Winston Churchill's bust from the White House. Unless it has been removed, it is up there in the Lincoln Bedroom. This is the Bliss copy, it is called.

And actually, at the Gettysburg Foundation Web site, they have an explanation of those five copies—the Nicolay copy, the Hay copy. So you had a couple of them there. And you can see what actually was in the copy. But the Everett copy—Senator Everett was the Speaker that went 2 hours or so, and he asked for a copy, so Abraham Lincoln made sure he got a copy.

And I was talking to a brilliant historian, Stephen Mansfield, this week. He was pointing out these things, that it was thought that Lincoln had provided his secretary with his notes. And since he had interlineated, as I see people on both sides of the aisle do all the time here—making notes, scratching stuff, putting stuff in—he had interlineated "under God." So when he gave the speech, "under God" was part of it. I don't know about anybody on this floor that wants the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to carry a copy of their speech before they made all the changes in it, just as Lincoln did.

But the last three copies, the Everett copy that Lincoln personally gave to Senator Everett, it says "that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom." And then the Bancroft

copy, that was one that also was requested by historian George Bancroft, and that has “that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom.”

And then the last copy, the Bliss copy that is most often used, is considered to be the most authoritative copy of what was said at Gettysburg, because this is the only copy that Abraham Lincoln signed. He didn't sign any of the others. He signed this one. And it went to Colonel Bliss, who was going to use it to auction and use the money to help wounded warriors.

This is a Nation under God. It had a new birth of freedom. And I hope and pray that God will give us wisdom to avoid destroying that freedom.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1345

**JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY: HE SPEAKS TO US STILL**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Our topic today is a solemn one and yet a hopeful one. It is about the 35th President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. He speaks to us still.

In November 1983, I submitted an op-ed piece to our local paper, the East Hartford Gazette, on President Kennedy. It is hard to believe that 30 years have passed since I submitted that document.

Most, including myself, and especially the Kennedy family, would rather not dwell on the events that transpired on November 22 and that ensuing weekend, but rather on the President's birth, and celebrate his heroic service. Indeed, May 29 should be a national day of remembrance.

I am proud to say that the entire New England delegation has dropped in a resolution today calling upon Congress to recognize May 29, the birthday of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, as a day of remembrance.

President Kennedy, if we were alive, would be 96 years old. It is hard to imagine, even today, because of the image of that youthful, vigorous, witty, energetic man who we still see in TV clips and who speaks to us still. That beautiful man was taken from us in the summer of his years.

For my parents' generation, December 7, 1941, as President Roosevelt appropriately put it, would be a day that would live in infamy. For my children and so many of this current generation, myself included, September 11, 2001, will be recalled as another day of infamy. For my generation, however, it remains November 22, 1963, the day the Nation stood still in shock and disbelief.

As a New Englander, the shot heard round the world on that day was not

the one fired at Lexington and Concord, but in Dallas, Texas. That shot cut down the 35th President of the United States, ended dreams of Camelot, and cut short the life of an American hero.

Almost everyone can recall where he or she was and what they were doing when they first heard the news of the assassination of John Kennedy. Fifty years after his death, the country still gropes for answers and searches to fill the void created by his departure.

It was sixth period in Mr. Desmond's French class when Mrs. Bray's voice, noticeably shaken, announced over the loud speaker at East Hartford High School that the President had been shot. An unsettling silence that was laden with anxiety fell over a perplexed and unbelieving class. Attempts to calm the class were fumbled by a visibly stunned teacher as he sought answers to a host of questions. Such an irrational act. It just couldn't be.

In what seemed to be within minutes, Mrs. Bray's tearful voice announced that the President of the United States had died. Hollow disillusionment and deep sadness engulfed not only the classroom, but the entire Nation. Despair was replaced by speculation concerning the perpetrator of such an act.

Walking home from school, conjecture of this heinous crime centered on the KGB and Castro as likely culprits, but even conjuring up these villains brought no resolve.

When I reached home, my mother, with Kleenex in hand, sat motionless next to the TV. She was glassy-eyed, shaken, and unable to comprehend the events of the day that saw the first President born in this century—and the first Catholic—struck down.

The family gathered around the TV and waited for Dad to come home. Surely, he could explain. When my father arrived, everything from the Russians to the Texans were mulled over, as he revealed various theories discussed in the shop at Pratt & Whitney Aircraft, but all with the same anguish and perplexity.

Thus began a family vigil with Walter Cronkite. But even he, the most trusted man in America, couldn't explain to the viewing public the way it was on November 22, 1963.

It was a numbing experience for our family and the rest of the country as we sat in shock, traumatized, as the first real-time media account of the sixties unfolded in our living room. In a weekend that never seemed to end, we witnessed a Nation in mourning, the apprehension and then murder of Lee Harvey Oswald, and the subsequent arrest of crime figure Jack Ruby, all unveiling and unfolding themselves on TV. The plot only seemed to become more complicated.

The complexities of American society and the very fabric of our way of life in this Nation hit home like never before.

What I most recall, and what I believe most Americans recall, from that

weekend are the vivid scenes and images of that ordeal:

The distressed widow in a blood-stained pink suit, with all the dignity and strength and nobility that she could muster, being met at Andrews Air Force Base by Robert Kennedy; the long lines passing through the Rotunda to pay their last respects, including James Michael Fitzgerald from our hometown in East Hartford; the veiled face of Jacqueline Kennedy as she kneeled over the coffin, clutching the hand of her daughter, Caroline; the Kennedy brothers in silhouetted support of the First Lady and the family; those boots placed backwards in the stirrups of Black Jack, the horse following the caisson; the procession of world leaders en route to Arlington; a weekend of images culminating in John-John's final salute to his dad.

I will never forget that weekend of tragedy, wrought with emotion and dream-crushing reality. Its impact and the impact of other events in that decade perhaps won't be fully understood, though we are fixated on this.

Before I yield to our leader, to put it in perspective, I would say this. As William Manchester noted:

In November of 1963, among the living were Robert Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Jr., and 58,209 young men who would die in Vietnam over the next 9 years.

I yield to our leader, noting that, as we said at the outset, we prefer not to dwell on the events of the day but on the heroic nature of this President and what he meant to so many people—and continues to do so. He continues to speak to us, as does our leader, NANCY PELOSI, who knew him personally.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for calling this Special Order. Congress has adjourned for the Thanksgiving holiday, but I thank you for staying so that we can acknowledge and observe the 50th anniversary of a great loss for our country.

My colleague, Mr. LARSON, spoke so beautifully about what happened on November 22, 50 years ago, and how your mother reacted. You could have been speaking for every family in America.

Certainly, we took special ownership of President Kennedy, as the first Catholic President, but everyone who enjoys firsts understands that that pioneer action, that courage, that success that he had was not just about him being the first Catholic President, but embracing the people of our country more fully.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, tragedy struck the heart of a Nation in Dallas, Texas. Fifty years ago, President Kennedy was taken from us, suddenly and unexpectedly, and the entire Nation was shaken and mourned.

As you said, we don't want to dwell on that sad day. We want to spring from it and talk about what went before and what has come from the legacy of President John F. Kennedy.

Today, 50 years later, we rise on the floor of the House to pay tribute to