

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendments a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3547. An act to extend the application of certain space launch liability provisions through 2014.

A YEAR IN REVIEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WAGNER). 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. Madam Speaker, tonight, one of the things we did was to take up the National Defense Authorization Act. It was to extend the power of the President.

There were some good things in it. I applaud the inclusion of the conscience exception that would allow members of the military to do as members of the military have done throughout our history—be able to have, for example, a Bible on a desk, which are things that now have begun to result in persecution—and, actually, knocks against the military—things that our greatest Commander in the history of our country, George Washington, felt were noble things. Under this administration's watch, these things have now begun to result in persecution.

When you go back to the bill, the Authorization for Use of Military Force, that was passed on September 18, 2001, when the United States did not even know who had attacked us, it is incredible. I don't fault the legislature at the time, the Congress—the House and the Senate. Americans were scared. Churches and synagogues were packed all over America. I have never seen anything like it in my lifetime the way people especially flocked to churches and were praying fervently. Then after there was not another attack within 90 days, it was as if Americans began to say, Never mind, God. We don't have to worry about that because we haven't been attacked again.

The NDAA is basically added to the Authorization for Use of Military Force against September 11 terrorists. That is the name of it.

It says in section 2(a):

The President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons.

Then it sets out War Powers Resolution requirements consistent with section 8(a):

(1) Of the War Powers Resolution, Congress declares this section as intended to constitute specific statutory authorization within the meaning of section 5(b) of the War Powers Resolution, 50 U.S.C. 1544(b).

It goes on and it is more extensive, and as I say, the NDAA actually modifies and extends things.

When that was passed, we didn't even know who had attacked us. I, obviously, was not here in Congress at the time, but we were afraid and concerned. We didn't know what was going to hit next, but it, perhaps, in retrospect, was a granting of more powers than should have been granted by the Congress because it is subject to being abused.

Fortunately, I don't consider it to have been abused by President Bush. Some blame him for Iraq. I wasn't here at the time, but I can't help but wonder when people supported the numerous successful efforts by President Bush at the United Nations in building a big coalition of countries to support our efforts to curtail Iraq's military efforts of not allowing U.N. inspectors to check on them. I don't blame the Democrats who voted for the authorization to go into Iraq, and I don't blame the Republicans, because Saddam Hussein gave every indication to the people who were in Congress at the time and to the President that he was up to no good. That was a long time ago.

Now we find that the President is using authorities that were granted, and this administration is using authority that was granted to do things like help rebels who we knew at the time in Libya had al Qaeda infused within them. We just didn't know how extensive, and many of us pointed that out. Now, this fall, we see that this administration has sent hundreds of tons of weapons to the Syrian rebels, and we find out that the Syrian rebels who are fighting a cruel dictator named Assad are engaging in more brutality, particularly against Christians, in the original roots where Christianity was born.

These are areas in which Apostle Paul established churches. It is the only city in the world that still speaks the original Aramaic that Jesus was believed to have spoken. This is an amazing place. This isn't just some trivial area in which a few Christians happen to be. This is right to the very founding of the Christian church. So many people came to America to have the freedom to worship without persecution. They fled Europe and fled other places so they could worship without persecution in a Christian church, and now this administration is using incredible powers that were bestowed on the President by Congress to help the wrong people.

I go back to a visit to the Middle East earlier this fall when allies basically were saying, We do not understand what you are doing. The Muslim Brotherhood is that which supports radical Islam, and it was the radical Islamists—the Muslim Brotherhood—that supported the 9/11 attacks. It was the Muslim Brotherhood that basically supported the training and all of the efforts the Taliban was doing. It is the

Muslim Brotherhood that was engaged in trying to take down Qadhafi, which, without American help, they may not have done. It was the Muslim Brotherhood that took control in Egypt and was persecuting Christians as the Coptic Christian Pope, the Egyptian Pope, verified himself in meetings with him this fall. Now, in Syria, you are backing the people who are at war with you? We don't understand.

So it appears that we have gone from being at war, as President Bush talked about, with anyone who has supported the terrorists—you are either with us or you are with them—to now, not only not being at war with those who are at war with us, but to helping them.

□ 2015

As a Christian, to know that votes we have taken in Congress have helped enable this administration to provide weapons, weapons of war, to people who are brutalizing, raping, killing, seeing reports of the beheadings of Christians in Syria.

Though I greatly appreciate some of the things that were included in the NDAA, and in the past I have even helped work on bipartisan agreements, bicameral, with the Senate and the House, worked on an effort to rein in the President's authority to just indefinitely detain American citizens—and I think we had a great solution we worked together to get inserted, so I don't believe the President can do that any longer with the language now being used—I still can't continue to support what we are doing. I hope that we will have a bipartisan effort in the new year to actually end the authorization for use of military force against September 11 terrorists now that we seem to be helping those who are associated with the radical Islamist terrorists instead of being at war with them.

HORIZON INDUSTRIES

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to stand here and congratulate the National Industries for the Blind, that is the NIB, on their 75th anniversary and the great work they do for Texas' First Congressional District.

NIB's mission is to "enhance opportunities for economic and personal independence of persons who are blind, primarily through creating, sustaining, and improving employment."

Unfortunately, 70 percent of working-age Americans who are blind are unemployed. However, the NIB is trying to reverse those upsetting trends by providing more employment opportunities for people who are blind through their more than 250 locations across the United States.

Horizon Industries, which is a division of the East Texas Lighthouse for the Blind, is located in Tyler, Texas, and currently employs 70 blind and visually impaired individuals. When I visit Horizon Industries, East Texas Lighthouse for the Blind, I am overwhelmed with amazement and appreciation for the dedication, the ability, the desire, and the outright help that

these visually impaired American workers are working with.

Horizon, one of their jobs, they convert paper products into industrial cleaning cloths for the General Services Administration and its customers. These incredible employees have also manufactured 35,661 miles of parachute cord for the Department of Defense, much of which was shipped directly to our troops who are deployed in Iraq and Afghanistan. Horizon Industries has empowered blind Americans through employment since 1976.

These marvelous friends, whose visual impairment has heightened their other senses to an amazing extent, are dedicated, they love this country, they want to help this country, are a blessing and an asset to their community, to east Texas, to Texas, and this country. May God continue to bless these wonderful, lovable, dedicated Americans as they continue to bless America.

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. GOHMERT. To address the Affordable Care Act, as it was improperly and inaccurately labeled, is an article from Ben Shapiro in Breitbart today that said:

On Friday, PolitiFact bowed to the inevitable and named President Obama's "If you like your health care plan, you can keep it" statement its Lie of the Year. That came after PolitiFact labeled that statement "half-true" in June of 2012 and then defended its "half-true" rating in October 2013.

PolitiFact said:

It was a catchy political pitch and a chance to calm nerves about his dramatic and complicated plan to bring historic change to America's health insurance system, but the promise was impossible to keep.

Of course, there's more to the story than that: the promise was a lie when it was made, given that Obama knew at the time that insurance plans would be canceled. But PolitiFact, even in naming the statement the Lie of the Year, soft-pedaled it:

Obama fought back against inaccurate attacks with his own oversimplifications, which he repeated even as it became clear his promise was too sweeping.

So even PolitiFact, doing all they could to defend something that ended up absolutely not being true, they finally had to come around and actually admit when the whole country basically—most of the country—could see the truth, even PolitiFact had to finally get around to being factual.

Here is another story from John Nolte, the Breitbart, 12 December, today. He said:

During Thursday's White House press briefing, the press corps erupted in protest over the Obama administration's lack of transparency and media access. The press corps seemed to be in complete agreement that the Obama White House has been less transparent than the Bush White House. Quite a condemnation for the self-described "most transparent administration in history."

I have also noted in the news today statements from some of our leaders in our Republican Party here in the House that immigration will be a top priority for 2014. I would not have a problem with immigration being a top

priority in 2014 if the administration would first enforce the laws that enter in effect regarding this Nation's security and its immigration laws.

We had a hearing today in Judiciary and heard testimony about the administration from Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ICE, that actually they are not complying with the law. The law says if somebody claims asylum, then they are detained until such time that they have the matter ultimately adjudicated. We learned that actually about 75 percent of those claiming asylum, which has grown multiple times from where they were in 2008 when President Bush left, a dramatic, dramatic increase in numbers of people coming across our southern border and claiming asylum, and apparently this administration is releasing about 75 percent of them.

And I was quite sad to hear testimony that even though they are making policy, that these individuals, deputy directors, could not give us the exact numbers of how many people they were releasing, how many people reported back for their hearings; and so that was quite a bit discouraging.

So when you know that there have been so many misstatements by this administration that turned out to be far less than accurate or true, then I do not know why Republicans and Democrats would want to take up immigration. Just the discussion about legal status, amnesty, anything of the sort, creates a massive magnet drawing people across our borders illegally, as we have heard testimony repeatedly, statements repeatedly, from our ICE agents, our Immigration and Customs Enforcement people. They say it increases dramatically every time we start talking about legal status and amnesty. We see huge numbers of people, numbers that we get about the people dying coming across deserts, not having adequate water and food to get across. Why would we do something to create a magnet until we have a secure border?

There are a lot of things that need to be reformed. But for those who continue to say, oh, yeah, but we will have real security in the next bill, look, there is money that this administration has, there is manpower this administration has, there is the ability this administration has to secure our border. What it does not have is the will.

If it turned out the administration were really and truly serious about securing our border, they could be confirmed by the border States. Then you would see me, along with most of the people I know, willing to sit down and immediately work out an immigration reform package. But to debate it in committee and on the floor, to talk about it, to make speeches before the border is secure, I am afraid makes us complicit in drawing people across deserts that will not make it and will die in the desert because we started talking about promises, dangling shiny

objects to draw people to us, when we had not put proper protection in place to make sure that innocent people did not die trying to get here.

For those who say we need to vastly broaden the number of visas, there are some areas that I am in favor of increasing visas. There are a lot of things we can talk about, but it does not serve those who we will draw across deserts who won't make it, it doesn't serve them any good purpose until the administration secures the border. So with all the wonderful talk about triggers and, oh, but we are going to finally secure the border, well, President Reagan got fooled on that and regretted it.

I just think it will be a terrible mistake to do anything other than take up a resolution. I filed one basically saying that until the administration secures our borders, as confirmed by the border States, not Homeland Security, which we have trouble getting straight answers out of, but as confirmed by the border States, who are important, critical stakeholders in the immigration and secure border issue, when they confirm the borders are secure, then we immediately move in to dealing with immigration reform. To do otherwise is a mistake that will do great damage to people that we draw in, unfortunately, to their great damage and possible demise; and it will do great damage to this country.

Let's get the immigration, set it on hold, not take anything up until the President is committed and does actually secure the border. Then we get something worked out, and it won't be a difficult issue at all. But for those that say, oh, I think we can trust Homeland Security or we can trust groups in Washington or we can trust Homeland Security, sure, we can trust this administration. They say that once we give them everything they want in an immigration bill, then they really and truly will start securing the border to the extent that the law requires.

□ 2030

I am sure I look stupid to some, but I say that is a massive mistake. Follow the law. If you won't enforce and follow and execute the law faithfully now in accordance with the oath that was taken at the beginning of office, then why should we think things will change after you have gotten everything you want and there is no more incentive to follow the law.

Well, we get back to the promises made about the so-called Affordable Care Act. Here is an article from The Wall Street Journal today that says ObamaCare raised the cost of your kids' braces. And again, those of us who have used the term "ObamaCare," we don't mean anything any more derogatory than the President when he called Massachusetts health care "RomneyCare." It was just a way to identify Massachusetts health care. The President didn't mean anything

derogatory when he says "RomneyCare." People who use "ObamaCare," including the President, don't mean anything derogatory, but it certainly identifies for people more than the Affordable Care Act does, as we have seen man-on-the-street interviews on television that people don't know the Affordable Care Act and ObamaCare are actually the same thing.

This article points out:

Here is something your orthodontist is not smiling about, a new tax rule raised the cost of braces this year thanks to a change from the Affordable Care Act that places an annual \$2,500 contribution cap on flexible spending accounts which let workers set aside pretax dollars to cover medical expenses. Some consumers may be spending more on braces, expensive eyewear, or other medical supplies they would typically buy with the accounts. Before the new rule, there was no official cap on how much taxpayers could stash into the account, although many companies typically set their own limits of \$5,000. For a person in the 25 percent tax bracket, it cuts the maximum tax break in half to \$625 from \$1,250.

And then it goes on to explain how these increase the cost of braces and orthodontic care.

Another issue here, this article from The Wall Street Journal as well, dated December 11, says, "Juking the ObamaCare Stats." It says:

Most of Washington seems to have bought the White House claim that the 36 Federal exchanges are finally working, and glory, glory, hallelujah. But if that is really true, then what explains the ongoing secrecy and evasion?

We have had so much trouble getting specific, direct answers about people who have actually purchased insurance through the exchange.

Now, Health and Human Services, HHS, if they don't have these numbers, if they can't even tell us the number of people that have actually purchased insurance, then how in heaven's name will they ever be able to tell people whether or not they are actually covered and how extensively they are covered and whether or not they are going to take care of expenses. I mean, the fact that they can't come in here and give us specific information on who signed up, how many have signed up for this, that or the other, is a terrible harbinger for just how bad and disastrous this health care bill is.

As we have continued to have a number of hearings where we get nothing but obfuscation when specific facts are requested from the administration, we know that somebody has this information in this administration and it brought to mind the legal doctrine called spoliation. Now in our American courts in every State, in Federal court, we have very strict laws about the admittance of hearsay into evidence before a jury because our rules are there to protect the finder of fact, the jury, from hearing evidence which does not have really enough credibility to it, and hearsay has to be a specific exception or it is not allowed. It must be direct evidence; otherwise, it is not allowed, with very tight exceptions.

One exception that most jurisdictions, as we have in Texas, it is called spoliation. The doctrine is this, in essence. If one party in court has control of evidence that would be admissible toward proving or disproving a fact and that party does not, will not, or say they cannot produce that evidence to prove or disprove a fact, in that case the judge, as I used to be, could turn to the jury and instruct the jury that even though this is not direct evidence because of our justice system and the effort to achieve justice in America better than any court system in history, we can direct the jury under the doctrine of spoliation that this party had evidence in their possession that they have either refused to produce, cannot produce, or will not produce. Since this party has possession or had possession of that evidence, then, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, you may consider the fact that they are not producing that evidence as evidence itself that if produced that evidence would disprove what they are claiming. That is called, in essence, the doctrine of spoliation.

So that is the evidentiary doctrine that came to my mind as we continue to have hearings and the Obama administration fails to produce specific information about sign-ups to ObamaCare. So if we were in a court of law, it certainly appears that that instruction might be appropriate. Ladies and gentlemen of America, the administration has evidence in its possession that it either cannot, will not, or refuses to produce. Therefore, Americans, ladies and gentlemen of America, you may consider as evidence the fact that they will not produce that information as evidence that it does not support what they claim.

Basically, that is what we have here. They are refusing to produce evidence, information about ObamaCare. So I think the American people would be justified. I think a jury in my court would be justified in presuming, a legal presumption, that their failure to produce this evidence is evidence that their claims are not supported by the evidence they refuse to produce.

Here is an article from The Weekly Standard, December 11, entitled, "Sexiest man alive brought in to boost ObamaCare enrollment." I don't really know who Adam Levine is; probably my daughters do. Apparently, he was designated as such by People magazine. Apparently he has been enlisted, according to Bloomberg, as having been hired by this administration to give credibility to ObamaCare.

To me, again, that seems like if you have to hire some sexy guy to come in and promote and tell people, promote ObamaCare as being so wonderful and great, it is a pretty clear indication that as people look into ObamaCare personally that they don't like what they see, and that is what we are hearing from most constituents. Thankfully, there are a few people who have benefited from ObamaCare; but the

people we are hearing from, the vast majority, have been hurt, not helped.

Here again, another article from the Washington Examiner, Brian Hughes from today, actually 5:08 p.m. today. It says, "HHS extends more ObamaCare deadlines." It goes on to talk about that the Obama administration announced today that they would take steps to push back an already delayed deadline, help those struggling to obtain health coverage on January 1, and extend a Federal insurance program for those with preexisting conditions.

They keep extending deadlines. If HARRY REID and Senate Democrats had not been so dead set on shutting down the government on October 1 as they did, if they had been at least willing to forgo their desire to shut down the government and hope Republicans got blamed, which they knew that the mainstream would do because the mainstream media would not actually look at the facts that the House was compromising repeatedly and the Senate was saying "our way or the highway," basically, by their actions, making clear they wanted a shutdown. Well, they got the shutdown, and now, in retrospect, there have got to be Democrats in the Senate saying, You know what? Since we have to keep extending these deadlines, the American people are going to figure out we could have avoided that whole shutdown if Democrats had been even remotely reasonable in the Senate and said, Okay, let's go ahead and postpone this for a year because it is not going well.

Well, they wanted a shutdown and they got a shutdown, as the Senate Democrats wanted, and now there has got to be some buyer's remorse. They created the shutdown when they should have taken one of our various compromise offers and at least extended, suspended the individual mandate the way the President illegally did for businesses.

I want to touch on another thing quickly here. Iran is, as Israel has said repeatedly, an existential threat to the very existence of Israel. If they get nuclear weapons, they want to attack Israel first as the little Satan and they want to attack America next. And we have had Wendy Sherman, who is the lead negotiator for the Obama administration, come up and brief Members of Congress. I wasn't there because I had read about her policy leadership in working out the deal with North Korea under the Clinton administration which provided them nuclear power plants, fuel, got them up and going, and also agreed not to inspect their nuclear facilities, which gave North Korea time to develop nuclear weapons.

In order to get us to give them nuclear power plants and all they needed to make nuclear weapons, basically most of what they needed, all they had to do was promise they wouldn't pursue nuclear weapons. They have got to be thinking these Americans are the most stupid people in the world.

Sure, you want us to tell you we won't pursue nuclear weapons, we won't pursue them. Now give us what we need to make nuclear weapons and we will make nuclear weapons.

Here we have some of the same people involved with the Obama administration who want to do the same type of thing with Iran. The trouble is this time it really is a threat to the United States. It is a threat to Israel, and we have betrayed our ally, unfortunately, in Israel.

But anyway, here are the people in whom the Clinton administration and numerous people now in the Obama administration have such faith in. This article today, 5:07 p.m., "North Korea State Media Says Uncle of Kim Jong Un Executed." Oh, these are great people. These are people that we shouldn't have trusted, but the Clinton administration did and Wendy Sherman did back in the 1990s. She continued to persist. Oh, we can trust these guys, even in her op-ed in 2001.

□ 2045

You couldn't trust them, and people who knew these people knew you couldn't trust the leadership. You can trust the North Koreans, but you can't trust their leadership. You can trust the Iranians, but you can't trust their leadership.

Here is another article in the National Review online entitled "Nuclear Gangbangers."

An observant Iran appreciates three laws of current nuclear gangbanging:

1. Nuclear weapons earn a reputation.
2. The more loco a nuclear nation sounds, the more likely it is that civilized states will fear that it is not subject to nuclear deterrence, and so the more likely that they will pay bribes for it to behave. Gangbangers always claim they have nothing to lose; their more responsible intended targets have everything to lose.

3. As of yet, there are no 100 percent effective nuclear-defense systems that can guarantee non-nuclear powers absolute safety from a sudden attack. The nuclear gangbanger, not the global police, currently has the upper hand.

And this administration is turning a blind eye to the deceit and the lies and the nuclear development in Iran to our detriment and the detriment of our dear friend.

Madam Speaker, in the remaining time, since this is the last Republican Special Order time before we recess in the House for the Christmas holidays, the new year, I want to say that although it apparently irritates some liberals to no end and they miss the point of why it is important to read these historic statements, some people say, Gee, we are getting lots of calls from irate people saying that the things that are being read on the House floor by Congressman GOHMERT are an affront and should never be allowed to be a part of the United States Government. They miss the entire point that the reason that I am reading them is because these poor people have not had a proper education. They do not know what a historic basis it is in going back

to George Washington who created an order that you couldn't take God's name in vain, creating in his resignation a prayer for the Nation, talking about the divine author of our blessed religion and that without a humble limitation in these things that we can never hope to be a happy Nation.

There were the proclamations thanking God, directing people to have days of prayer. There were all of these things throughout our history. So, Madam Speaker, I hope Americans appreciate the profound things that have been done by America's leaders in the past.

This is from Franklin D. Roosevelt, December 24, 1933, in a Christmas greeting to the Nation. Again, it was okay in the 1930s, just as it was throughout our history, to thank God. No one ever had a problem with Democrats or Republicans paying tribute to God in the House Chamber, in the Senate Chamber, in the White House, anywhere. These are Franklin Roosevelt's comments. He said:

This year marks a greater national understanding of the significance in our modern lives of the teaching of Him whose birth we celebrate. To more and more of us the words "thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" have taken on a meaning that is showing itself and proving itself in our purposes and daily lives. May the practice of that high ideal grow in us all in the year to come. I give you and send you one and all, old and young, a merry Christmas and a truly happy new year. So for now and for always, "God bless us every one."

The following year on Christmas Eve, Franklin D. Roosevelt gave us these words from the White House, a government property. It was entirely proper. He said:

Let us make the spirit of Christmas of 1934 that of courage and unity. That is, I believe, an important part of what the Maker of Christmas would have it mean. In this sense, the Scriptures admonish us to be strong and of good courage, to fear not, to dwell together in unity.

That was just some of his comments.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, January 25, 1941, in the prologue of the New Testament published by the Gideons and distributed to soldiers during World War II—and I have one that my aunt provided me that she said my uncle had received. It says:

To the Armed Forces: As Commander in Chief, I take pleasure in commending the reading of the Bible to all who serve in the Armed Forces of the United States. Throughout the centuries, men of many faiths and diverse origins have found in the Sacred Book words of wisdom, counsel, and inspiration. It is a fountain of strength and now, as always, an aid in attaining the highest aspirations of the human soul. Very sincerely yours, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

On December 21, 1941, two weeks after America was attacked, a day which will live in infamy, as President Roosevelt said, Franklin Roosevelt delivered this message:

Sincere and faithful men and women . . . are asking themselves this Christmas how can we light our trees? How can we give our gifts? How can we meet and worship with

love and with uplifted spirit and heart in a world at war, a war of fighting and suffering and death? How can we pause even for a day, even for Christmas day in our urgent labor of arming a decent humanity against the enemies which beset it? How can we put the world aside, as men and women put the world aside in peaceful years, to rejoice in the birth of Christ?

President Roosevelt goes on. He says:

Looking into the days to come, I have set aside a day of prayer, and in that proclamation I have said: "The year 1941 has brought upon our Nation a war of aggression by powers dominated by arrogant rulers whose selfish purpose is to destroy free institutions. They would thereby take from the freedom-loving peoples of the Earth the hard-won liberties gained over many centuries. The new year of 1942 calls for courage . . . Our strength, as the strength of all men everywhere, is of greater avail as God upholds us.

Therefore, I . . . do hereby appoint the first day of the year of 1942 as a day of prayer, of asking forgiveness for our shortcomings of the past, of consecration to the tasks of the present, of asking God's help in days to come. We need his guidance that this people may be humble in spirit but strong in conviction of the right; steadfast to endure sacrifice, and brave to achieve a victory of liberty and peace.

Our strongest weapon in this war is that conviction of the dignity and brotherhood of man which Christmas day signifies.

President Roosevelt goes on:

Against enemies that preach the principles of hate and practice them, we set our faith in human love and in God's care for us and all men everywhere.

On January 6, 1942, President Roosevelt said:

Our enemies are guided by brutal cynicism, by unholy contempt for the human race. We are inspired by faith which goes back through all the years to the first chapter of the Book of Genesis. "God created man in his own image." We on our side are striving to be true to that Divine heritage. We are fighting, as our fathers have fought, to uphold the doctrine that all men are equal in the sight of God. Those on the other side are striving to destroy this deep belief and to create a world in their own image, a world of tyranny and cruelty and serfdom.

That was Franklin Roosevelt, 1942. He knew at the time that there were the axis powers, the evil powers that included Hitler in Germany, Mussolini in Italy, radical Islamists in North Africa joining forces together, and he talked about our heritage. Here he is a year later, Franklin Roosevelt. These are official statements, Madam Speaker. This is President Roosevelt's official government message:

To you who serve in uniform I also send a message of cheer that you are in the thoughts of your families and friends at home, and that Christmas prayers follow you wherever you may be. To all Americans I say that loving our neighbor as we love ourselves is not enough, that we as a Nation and as individuals will please God best by showing regard for the laws of God. There is no better way of fostering good will toward man than by first fostering good will toward God.

Then President Roosevelt quotes John 14:15. President Roosevelt says:

If we love Him, we will keep His commandments. In sending Christmas greetings to the Armed Forces and merchant sailors of the United Nations we include therein our pride

in their bravery on the fighting fronts and all the seas.

It is significant that tomorrow, Christmas day, our plants and factories will be stilled. That is not true of the other holidays we have long been accustomed to celebrate. On all other holidays work goes on gladly for the winning of the war. So Christmas becomes the only holiday in all the year. I like to think that this is so because Christmas is a holy day. May all it stands for live and grow throughout the years.

That was Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In 1944, December 24, the official government statement by Franklin Roosevelt as President was:

It is not easy to say "merry Christmas" to you, my fellow Americans in this time of destructive war, nor can I say "merry Christmas" lightly tonight to our Armed Forces at their battle stations all over the world, or to our allies who fight by their side. Here, at home, we celebrate Christmas Day in our traditional American way because of its deep spiritual meaning to us; because the teachings of Christ are fundamental in our lives; and because we want our youngest generation to grow up knowing the significance of this tradition and the story of the coming of the immortal Prince of Peace and good will.

He goes on:

But in perhaps every home in the United States sad and anxious thoughts will be continually with the millions of our loved ones who are suffering hardships and misery and who are risking their very lives to preserve for us and for all mankind the fruits of his teachings and the foundations of civilization itself.

□ 2100

The Christmas spirit lives tonight in the bitter cold of the front lines in Europe and in the heat of the jungles and swamps of Burma and the Pacific Islands. Even the roar of our bombers and fighters in the air and the guns of our ships at sea will not drown out the message of Christmas which comes to the heart of our fighting men.

President Roosevelt goes on:

The tide of battle has turned, but slowly, but inexorably against those who sought to destroy civilization. We pray that this day may come soon. We pray, until then, God will protect our gallant American and women in the uniforms of the United Nations, that He will receive into His infinite grace those who make their supreme sacrifice in the cause of righteousness and the cause of love of Him and His teachings.

President Roosevelt finishes by saying:

We pray that with victory will come a new day of peace on Earth, in which all the nations of Earth will join together for all time, that in the spirit of Christmas, the Holy Day, may that spirit live and grow throughout the world in all the years to come.

And then finally, close with this, Madam Speaker. This is Franklin Roosevelt, January 20, 1945. This is part of his last inaugural address. And as I finish with this, may I say, Madam Speaker, that I know all of us here in the House and the Senate, no matter what our persuasions, have these same very best wishes as Franklin Roosevelt had for our American troops, our men and women in uniform today, just as those wishes were made 68 years ago.

This was 1945. Roosevelt said:

As I stand here today, having taken the solemn oath of office in the presence of my

fellow countrymen, in the presence of God, I know that it is America's purpose that we shall not fail. The Almighty God has blessed our land in many ways. He has given our people stout hearts, strong arms with which to strike mighty blows for freedom and truth. He has given to our country a faith which has become the hope of all people in an anguished world.

President Franklin Roosevelt finishes by saying:

So we pray to Him now for the vision to see our way clearly, to see the way that leads to a better life for ourselves and for all our fellow men, to the achievement of His will, to peace on Earth.

Roosevelt finishes by saying:

In the presence of God, I know that it is America's purpose that we shall not fail.

Madam Speaker, if we keep that same faith of Franklin Roosevelt, in his official capacity as President of the United States, he is right. God will not let us fail.

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

HONEST REFLECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 30 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the Speaker for yielding, and I thank the leader, Leader PELOSI, for the time and, as well, the Speaker.

It is always appropriate when we rise in this wonderful holiday season to wish Americans of all faiths a wonderful and blessed time with their families, to wish my colleagues a wonderful time with their families, and to reflect a moment on the greatness of this country that has experienced its challenges, of which I believe the Members of this body and the other body are committed to solving.

But I thought it was important today, as we leave for the recess in our districts where we will be engaging with our constituents—and this coming Saturday I will hold the 19th annual Toys for Kids that I have hosted for the past 19 years at the George R. Brown Convention Center, a way of giving back, but a way of hearing the joys and sounds of children enjoying themselves.

So I would like to make this time that I have, these few minutes, a time of joy and happiness. But I also think we must be honest, and it should be a time of confronting reality and the truth. And so I wanted to go back for a moment on work that was just accomplished just a few hours ago, when this body voted on a proposal that was given by the negotiators to the House and will be given again to the Senate on the bipartisan Budget Act of 2013.

As many Americans know, we experienced a horrific shutdown just a few weeks ago, unwarranted, bearing no results, and hurting millions of people around the Nation. I remember coming to the floor some 56 times to ask my

Republican friends to cease and desist and to open the government, open the government. So I understand the frustration and exhaustion of the American people and our hardworking Federal employees who could take it no more and asked for some minimal way to avoid the atrocious and catastrophic closing of the government on the basis of whim and opposition to an established law, the Affordable Care Act.

So what came of it was an additional \$1.012 trillion that would be spent over fiscal year 2014 and 2015, and what would allow the restoration of Head Start seats that were lost, child care, housing assistance, educational dollars for higher education, research dollars, the same needs that I expressed during the shutdown that were being denied, the addition of these dollars, minimal that they were, but enough to give us a boost over last year's expenditures, and to save some of the needs that Americans had that were lost. I support that and congratulate that step made. And it got us past sequester, which was trickery that was offered as a hammer over a commission and committee that was supposed to design a grand bargain of moving America forward.

But what we also obtained in this Budget Act, although painful, was the maintenance of our Social Security and Medicare for our seniors and the assurance that those funds would not be tampered with, and that any reform would include the widespread opportunity for Members to engage their seniors and others who were receiving these benefits so that there would be a compliance with the commitment that many of us, such as myself, have made—continued protection of Medicare and Social Security.

In the course of that, this Congress has never abandoned the unemployed, and so it was proposed by the Democratic conferees to include unemployment insurance, and, yes, the SGR that would provide seniors with their doctors by fixing the sustainable growth rate.

That was supposed to be the proposal, Madam Speaker. And tragically, in the constructed, contradictory, conflicted, misrepresented bill that came to the floor through the Rules Committee, they, with the darkness of the night, included the SGR, but they left out the helping of the most vulnerable people.

Twice on the floor today I asked that we not go home so that we could go vote on the Levin-Van Hollen-Lee amendment that would have restored and would have been paid for, the unemployment insurance.

I continue to ask tonight that we not go home or that we be called back to ensure that that insurance continues. I intend to introduce legislation very quickly to require the Congress to come back and for there to be an independent up-or-down vote on actually restoring the unemployment insurance so that it would not expire on December 28 and, as well, for that legislation