



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 18, 2013

No. 87

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 18, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TED POE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

THE WOMEN'S PREVENTATIVE HEALTH AWARENESS CAMPAIGN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about core American values—values of liberty, values of freedom, values of individual rights.

Today, a bill is going to come before this body that is a blatant attempt to take away those individual rights, those individual freedoms—freedoms that are core to who we are. This bill aims to take away individual decisions from America's mothers, America's sis-

ters, and America's daughters. This bill is a travesty and a slap in the face of those core values of individual liberty and individual freedom, and this bill criminalizes doctors for doing our jobs.

Now, I'm a doctor. Core to the oath that I took was to sit with my patients, answer their questions and empower them to make the decisions that best fit their faith circumstances, their individual circumstances, their family circumstances. That's core to the oath every doctor in the United States of America has taken. That's core to my job. The bill that's coming to the floor today takes those values and slaps them in the face. They put the government right in the middle of my exam room, but the government has no place between the doctor and the patient.

What we should be debating is how we empower our patients, how we promote women's health, how we try to keep women healthy and help them plan their pregnancies, how we empower families. As a husband and as the father of a daughter, keeping women healthy is extremely important to me, and helping empower parents and families to plan those pregnancies is not only smart; it's good medicine.

The legislation I am introducing later this week, the Women's Preventative Health Awareness Campaign Act, will direct the Department of Health and Human Services to educate women about the importance of the preventative wellness exam. This is a piece of legislation that will help address the issue of planning families, of planning when you want to be pregnant. It will help address the issues of undiagnosed heart disease. It will help us diagnose cancer, and it will save thousands of lives.

I would urge my colleagues in this body on both sides of the aisle to join us in this bill. It's not only smart medicine; it will get to the core of empowering patients, of empowering women and of empowering families to make

the decisions that best fit within the context of their lives.

That's the oath that I took as a doctor; that's the promise that I make to all of my patients; and that's the oath that we take in this body—to protect those individual freedoms and the individual rights of all Americans and of all America's women.

PROTECTING LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WALORSKI. I rise today to address the importance of protecting life.

While I am home in Indiana, spending time in our communities, the importance of strong values and Hoosier common sense continues to rule the foundations of our families.

I believe it is critical for Congress to act today to protect human life and to treat women and the unborn children with the protection they deserve from the dangers of late-term abortions. We are talking about the next generation of moms and grandmothers, of aunts and sisters and of our loved ones. There is not a price that can be put on the value of an innocent human life. I have been a strong supporter of life and of defending the unborn, and I feel that it's our responsibility to protect the most vulnerable who cannot protect themselves.

I urge my colleagues to join me in the support of H.R. 1797 for the sake of protecting the unborn from late-term abortions.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AMODEI). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, later today, the Judiciary Committee will mark up the first immigration reform

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3691

bill offered by the Republicans in the 113th Congress. Since election day, no Member of Congress has done more to highlight and praise the Republicans for their new spirit of bipartisanship on immigration than I. I praise our committee and subcommittee chairmen for their new tone in the Republican-led immigration hearings.

When the Republican Party chairman said Republicans have to stop pushing Latino voters away, I said, "Right on, Reince."

When young Republicans warned the GOP to change its tune in order to remain viable, I said, "I think you're right."

When your former candidate for Vice President and Budget Committee chairman came to Chicago to talk about immigration reform, I brought him to the barrio so that the Latino community could see him and applaud his commitment to immigration reform.

Judge CARTER, the gentleman from Texas, and I shared the stage in San Antonio to discuss immigration reform deep in the heart of Texas, where we agreed on more things than we disagreed. He and I have met almost every day since January with a small bipartisan group of colleagues to fashion a bill that both parties can embrace.

And it's hard work for both parties.

On the other side of the aisle, it is hard to talk about immigrants in a new way when your party, its platform, its candidates, its talk radio, and its TV personalities have spoken disparagingly about immigrants for years. When you reference gangbangers and drunk drivers and rapists every time you talk about immigrants, it is hard to switch gears quickly; but most Republicans in this body, up until last week, were singing from a new and more harmonious hymnal.

Bipartisan work on immigration reform has been difficult on my side of the aisle, too. I have always fought for universal health care coverage, but discussing health care coverage for undocumented immigrants and their families—even in the context of a legalization program where they pay their full taxes, submit fingerprints, and pay huge fines—is a nonstarter not only for Republicans but for Democrats, unfortunately, alike. I have advocated for LGBT rights from my days as a Chicago alderman, but to work in a bipartisan manner, it's off the table.

To keep discussions going with Republicans, I am told that the Diversity Visa Program, which brings in immigrants from Africa and Ireland and around the world who diversify our immigrant pool, is eliminated—no discussion in the name of bipartisanship. Sibblings—brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens—will no longer be able to be sponsored by their family members to come to America, and the fees and fines we charge—billions upon billions—on immigrants so that they can be here legally, that will fund more drones, fences, border guards, and more en-

forcement on the border, a border that is as secure as I've seen in American history—but we'll do it.

□ 1010

I ask my Republican colleagues when is it enough?

But I want to keep things moving forward, so I hold my tongue, work within the bipartisan process and stay with the group. I speak well of Republicans who have partnered with Democrats on a serious bipartisan bill this year.

A tough, but fair bipartisan bill is moving towards passage, and our tough but fair bipartisan House bill is nearly complete. We're putting aside partisan bickering to solve a difficult policy issue for the American people.

In this moment, just in time for the Fourth of July, we get red meat politics for the barbecue and partisan fireworks on immigration.

The Arizona S.B. 1070 law was substantially struck down by the Supreme Court. No matter. Now your side of the aisle wants to nationalize it.

Sheriff Joe Arpaio is slapped by the Federal courts for systematically denying the civil rights of U.S. citizens and legal immigrants. No matter. Let's canonize him.

Police and local governments want immigrants in their communities to be able to call the police if they're a victim of crime or witnesses to crime. Too bad. Republicans in Washington know better than your cops, prosecutors and mayors at home. They will cut your Federal funding unless you commit to a full-frontal deportation and local immigration enforcement.

When 500,000 Latino citizens turn 18 every year and become potential voters, Republicans seem hell-bent on lining up and jumping off the demographic cliff.

While our country demands solutions and leadership, Republicans are feeding the partisan monster red meat as if their calendars already read 2014.

As a Democrat, I could probably stand back and watch. If you want to hang yourself on the immigration issue, who am I to stop you? But as an American, I have to tell you what I really feel. Your country needs you to step away from the partisan red meat and fearmongering that has defined your party on immigration. Come back to your senses. Do not push forward a bill that criminalizes every immigrant family and makes everyone think twice before they call 911.

You are better than this. America needs you to be.

OUR NATION'S WAKE-UP CALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, in the early 1760s, the Royal Governor of Massachusetts began issuing writs of assistance as general warrants to

search for contraband. They empowered officials to search indiscriminately for evidence of smuggling.

These warrants were challenged in February 1761 by James Otis, who argued forcefully that they violated the natural rights of Englishmen and were, in fact, "instruments of slavery."

A 25-year-old attorney who attended the trial later wrote:

Every man of a crowded audience appeared to me to go away as I did, ready to take arms against writs of assistance. Then and there the child independence was born.

That young lawyer was John Adams. To him, that's the moment the American Revolution began. The general warrants were the first warning that his king had become a tyrant.

The Founders specifically wrote the Fourth Amendment to assure that indiscriminate government searches never happened again in America. In America, in order for the government to invade your privacy or to go through your personal records or effects, it must first present some evidence that justifies its suspicion against you and then specify what records or things it's searching for.

Last week, we learned the Federal Government is today returning to those general warrants on a scale unimaginable in colonial times by seizing the phone and Internet records of virtually every American.

We're told that this is perfectly permissible under past Supreme Court rulings because the government is not monitoring content, but only the records held by a third party. But if phone records are outside the protection of the Fourth Amendment because they're held by a third party, then so too are all of our records or effects held by third parties. That means the property you keep in storage or with a family member, the private medical records held by your physician, the backup files on your computer maintained on another server, all are subject to indiscriminate search. In fact, many of the general warrants served long ago in Boston were on warehouses owned by third parties.

Even if we were to accept this rationale, then that third party, for example, the phone company, ought itself to be safe from general warrants like those that have apparently scooped up the phone and Internet records of every American. It's argued with Orwellian logic that it's permissible to seize these records indiscriminately since they aren't actually searched until a legal warrant is issued by a secret FISA court. But if general warrants can produce the evidence for specific warrants, isn't the Fourth Amendment prohibition against general warrants then rendered meaningless? And all we know of the secret FISA court and its deliberations is that out of 34,000 warrants requested by the government, it has rejected only 11—hardly a testament to judicial prudence or independence.

We're told that the information will be used only to search for terrorists.