

H.R. 1992 updates the definition of “qualitative military edge” so that the asymmetric and cyber warfare are considered and would require a 2-year reporting process.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee to advance this legislation and to increase our special relationship with Israel. I appreciate the chairman of Foreign Affairs, Mr. ROYCE, for his support and cosponsorship.

And I also would like to thank my friend from across the aisle, Mr. SCHNEIDER, for his support. Good policy knows no party line, and I look forward to working together to move forward this legislation.

REGARDING THE PATIENTS’ RIGHTS REPEAL ACT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted a moment to reflect. This was a very sad day for me. Having been here during the emotional time during the debate on the Affordable Care Act, remembering the long hours and the deliberation in the committees in regular order, the opportunity for Republicans to offer amendments, and then today for the 37th time this particular act has now hurt millions of Americans.

My State is number one. Today, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to call the roll and ask those citizens of those States to call their Senators. For how can you vote for such a repeal of the Patients’ Rights Act when Texas, Louisiana, Nevada, California, Florida, Georgia, Arkansas, Alaska, Mississippi, and Oklahoma all have uninsured over 20 percent, with Texas being 28.4 percent?

It is poverty that drives the need to expand Medicaid to my State, to my Governor. It is poverty that drives this. Whether you are poor, whether you are low-income, whether you are working middle class, the Affordable Care Act is to lift your boat to give you the opportunity to have preventive health care to be able to have access to doctors. Why would anybody vote to repeal the Patients’ Rights Act?

□ 1840

RESCUING AMERICANS FROM THE TRACKS OF HEALTH CARE DE- STRUCTION

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

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Ladies and gentlemen, let me tell you why people would vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act. It has become very, very clear that no matter how well-intentioned it may have been, it will not work. Time after time, we are finding that the things that they told us just aren’t panning out to be true; and Senator MAX BAUCUS, one of the law’s

main architects, recently described ObamaCare as a huge train wreck coming down.

We have a chance to save Americans from being casualties of the train wreck. We can yank them off the tracks. Today, I voted to show that I am trying to do just that.

I call on the United States Senate and the Senators to join us in rescuing the American people from the tracks of health care destruction.

SCANDALS IN WASHINGTON

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In the past few weeks, it seems as if you can’t turn on the news without hearing of another drama, of another crisis in Washington undermining confidence in our government, whether it’s Benghazi, the IRS, the Department of Justice, or the Department of Health and Human Services. It’s hard to know what may be next.

Mr. Speaker, there is an age-old expression that goes like this: be careful to whom you give a gun and a badge.

Authority is a very delicate matter. A well-functioning government must ensure that those who are in positions of influence are committed to serving the public with impartiality and fairness. Recent revelations have done much to undermine the public trust.

Mr. Speaker, 8 months ago, our Ambassador to Libya was killed along with three other Americans. Not only is this an affront to America because we lost our Ambassador; it is also an attack on our Nation, and it undermines the international rule of law. The process by which we have tried to unpack the details of this attack has been careening all over the place. Even after several committee hearings on Benghazi, including a Foreign Affairs Committee hearing in which I participated last December, a core question remains unanswered:

Who said “stand down” when reinforcements were called for?

Now, there may be legitimate military and diplomatic reasoning here, but we simply need to know the answer to that question; or this could have been a very serious mistake with the gravest of consequences.

In the past week, we’ve learned of discrimination against specific groups by the Internal Revenue Service. These reports are causing a firestorm across our country. Our sensitivities are rightly heightened when it comes to the collection of taxes. No one wants to pay taxes, but we must have a revenue-collecting agency in order to have a functioning Federal Government. It is unconscionable, though, that this agency targeted citizens because of their political or religious beliefs.

The IRS, of all agencies, must be held to the highest of high standards of fairness and impartiality. The reported actions seriously undermine the foundation of trust necessary between citizens and their government. That’s why, this week, the Taxpayer Non-discrimination and Protection Act was introduced with my support. The legislation puts meaningful penalties in place when this foundation of trust is violated, penalties that could include prison time.

Perhaps it’s also time for the IRS to implement a new policy. Everyone they are auditing, or perhaps have audited in the past 3 years, must be provided with a fuller explanation as to why they’re going through this process so as to ensure that there is no improper targeting of American citizens based upon their religious or political beliefs. Just this morning, a friend of mine texted me, and another one called me just yesterday, worried that the audits that were undertaken against them were due to their own political leanings and engagements.

Mr. Speaker, the real issue is this: Just how deep and wide is the mind-set that pervaded the IRS that did target Americans based upon their religious or political leanings?

On another issue, we are learning that the Department of Justice seized phone records of Associated Press reporters, including records of their personal phone lines. Now, the ability to wiretap and probe needs to be in place in narrow circumstances, but the wide-ranging nature of what happened raises a number of questions, questions that beg us to ask: How do we protect the freedom of the press?

Another problem that hasn’t been widely discussed is that the Department of Health and Human Services, in effect, is also targeting people based upon their beliefs. The Department is forcing Americans to pay for drugs and procedures that many find to be inconsistent with their deeply held, reasonable beliefs or their religious traditions. When the President introduced his health care plan, he told Americans that if they liked their health insurance, they could keep it. Now we are finding in some cases that you cannot keep your doctor, that you cannot keep your own health care plan, and now you may not even be able to keep your own faith tradition. This is a form of coercion that sets up a false choice and is un-American.

All of these events are converging to erode confidence in Washington. Now, thankfully, many of these concerns actually cross the political aisle. There is bipartisan concern. These are American issues, and these events underscore why we actually do have a balance of power in Washington. There is an executive branch that enforces the law, and there is a legislative branch that writes the law. The legislative branch also has the duty to provide oversight over the executive branch, which is a duty that Congress now is rightly embracing.

It is important that in each instance here the truth is uncovered and that swift and appropriate actions are taken to help restore confidence in the impartiality, fairness, and competence of the Federal Government.

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

THE INNOCENT AND THE INCONVENIENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 55 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Speaker.

With the recent murder conviction of abortion doctor Kermit Gosnell, we've got to encourage Americans to ask: How different, really, is Gosnell's house of horrors from abortions that occur in clinics throughout the United States? The tragic answer: not much. Not much at all.

Mr. Speaker, there are Kermit Gosnells all over America—predators, child abusers, exploiters of women. Some abortionists may have cleaner sheets than Gosnell did and better sterilized equipment and better trained accomplices, but what they do and what Gosnell did for four decades—kill babies and hurt women—is the same.

Will Americans ever be told the horrifying details as to how and how often abortionists dismember, decapitate, and chemically poison innocent babies?

Where is the outrage, Mr. Speaker, over the 55 million child victims who have been brutally killed by abortion over the last 40 years and over the millions of women who have been hurt physically, emotionally, and psychologically?

Why the appalling lack of compassion? Why the empathy deficit for the victims—women and children—by so many, including and especially by President Obama and Vice President BIDEN? Women and children deserve better.

Of course, Gosnell's trial isn't the first to rip the benign facade of legitimacy from the abortion industry. As far back as 1975, Dr. Kenneth Edelin was convicted by a jury in Boston of murdering an African American baby boy who was found dead and abandoned in the Boston City Hospital morgue.

□ 1850

An investigation that led to trial revealed that the child was yet another Kenneth Edelin victim. When the jury saw the picture of the dead baby, they were appalled and persuaded that indeed a homicide had occurred. Astonishingly, that conviction was subsequently overturned by the Massachusetts Supreme Court, which simply dismissed the murder as yet another legal abortion.

Mr. Speaker, how did Planned Parenthood react to the reversal of ver-

dict? With euphoric celebration. Dr. Edelin, after all, was their guy. Years later, Dr. Edelin became the chairman of the board of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, and was even given the Margaret Sanger Award in 2008. And I would note parenthetically that in 2009, Planned Parenthood gave the Sanger Award to Hillary Clinton. And like Gosnell, not a single tear was shed by Dr. Kenneth Edelin or Planned Parenthood for the murdered child victim.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, an undercover investigative organization, Live Action, released more undercover videos that exposed the abortion industry's absolutely appalling and callous disregard for human life, human rights, and Federal law. Previously, Live Action aired several videos showing Planned Parenthood abortion clinic personnel advising women at several clinics throughout the country, including in my own home State of New Jersey, as to how to procure sex-selection abortions simply because the unborn child happened to be a little girl and other equally disturbing videos showing Planned Parenthood staffers who counsel and offer to arrange secret abortions for teenager sex trafficking victims.

One of those was in a Planned Parenthood where I went to high school in Perth Amboy. A very young Latina, 14, 15, posing as a woman who had been trafficked with a man that was posing as a pimp, talks—and I advise and ask people to watch those videos. Just go to Live Action. Google it, and you can find it. Watch how they say, We cannot only abort this young girl who has been trafficked—and I wrote, Mr. Speaker, the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 to combat this hideous modern-day exploitation mostly of women and children. And there's Planned Parenthood personnel saying how this young girl could get a secret abortion, be back out on the streets and, of course, further exploited by this person who purported to be a pimp.

The first call should have been to the police to have them arrested; instead, they talked about how to get the secret abortion.

Live Action has released undercover videos showing a Bronx, New York, abortion counselor describing how, in violation of U.S. Federal law, a born-alive baby would be placed in a jar of toxic solution to ensure his or her death.

A D.C. abortionist is also captured on film who talks about leaving a baby born alive after a botched abortion simply to die due to the elements.

An Arizonan worker said that they would not resuscitate should a baby survive an abortion attempt.

This is not just violence against children; this is a violation of Federal law.

Live Action President Lila Rose has released yet another must-see video of a Maryland abortionist by the name of Dr. LeRoy Carhart, who compares a baby in the womb—you've got to watch

this—to meat in a slow cooker and jokes about his abortion toolkit, complete with pickax and drill bit. I watched that, and I was sick. This man does so-called “legal abortions” right within range of this Nation's capital.

Mr. Speaker, some day—and I believe the day is fast approaching—Americans will look back and wonder how and why such a seemingly enlightened society, so blessed and endowed with education, advanced science, information, and wealth, opportunity could have so utterly failed to protect the innocent and the inconvenient. They will wonder how and why a Nobel Peace Prize winning President could also have simultaneously been the abortion President and Planned Parenthood's best friend, despite the tragic fact that Planned Parenthood is directly responsible for aborting over 6 million babies in their clinics.

History will not look favorably on today's abortion culture. We must instead work tirelessly to replace it with a culture of life. Women and children deserve no less.

I yield back the balance of my time.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I'm proud to rise in strong support of comprehensive immigration reform. There are many of my colleagues that have fought these battles long before I arrived in Congress, but today I join my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, in strong support of comprehensive immigration reform.

Comprehensive immigration reform is the single most important thing we can do to grow our economy. It will also help make sure that our laws reflect our values as Americans. We are, after all, a Nation of laws and a Nation of immigrants, and the two can and must be made consistent through comprehensive immigration reform.

I want to acknowledge the work of many of my colleagues both in the Senate and House in working towards this worthy goal. I've said in my district and here on the floor of Congress that never in my limited time here have I ever been more optimistic about getting immigration reform done than I am now.

Immigration reform is long overdue, and should this Congress fail to rise to the challenge, Mr. Speaker, the issue will not go away. There may be 10 million or 11 million people here without papers to be able to work, and that doesn't solve itself, so let's take this on. Let's take this on on behalf of the American people, on behalf of Americans of all ideologies, arm in arm with faith-based groups, with civil rights groups, with law enforcement, with the business community, all of whom have