

This week, Madam Speaker, I have also asked the gentlemen of Congress to join us in wearing red on Wednesdays. Wear red in solidarity with the fathers and brothers who fear their daughters and sisters are being physically abused and have been married off against their will.

Until they have returned, we will continue to wear red on Wednesdays in solidarity with their families. We will continue to tweet, tweet, tweet, #bringbackourgirls, tweet, tweet, tweet #joinrepwilson.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

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

Ms. ADAMS, Madam Speaker, today I rise against H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, which should be called the Painful and Oppressive to Women Act.

In January, women of the Republican Conference were so appalled by H.R. 36 they blocked it from coming to the floor. Four months later it is back. Shameful.

Madam Speaker, the changes Republicans have made to this legislation are mere smokescreens and have done nothing to alleviate the burdens placed on women who are already grappling with the hard decision of whether or not to terminate a pregnancy.

H.R. 36 poses grave dangers to women. And the American people will not be fooled. Women's health and personal decisions should be between a woman, her family, and her doctor, not a male-dominated Congress.

Most abortions take place before 21 weeks, so many women who have abortions later in pregnancy do so because of medical complications and other barriers to access.

H.R. 36 would harm women in need and increase obstacles to obtaining safe and legal abortions. I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation. It is really bad.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WAGNER) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 13, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 13, 2015 at 9:45 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1075.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1735, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 36, PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2048, USA FREEDOM ACT OF 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Ms. FOXX, Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 255 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 255

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. After general debate, the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 36) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2048) to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided

and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of May 14, 2015, or May 15, 2015, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX, Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX, Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX, Madam Speaker, House Resolution 255 provides for general debate for H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016; provides for a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act; and provides for a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 2048, the USA FREEDOM Act.

The rule before us today provides for general debate for H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, also known as the NDAA. The NDAA, which has passed Congress and has been enacted for over 50 years in a row, is a vital exercise each year in providing for the common defense, one of our most profound constitutional responsibilities.

The NDAA includes over \$600 billion in important national security funding, providing resources to each of our four military branches, our nuclear deterrent, and related agencies. The legislation fully funds the President's request for funding for our warfighters overseas and includes important steps to advance Department of Defense acquisition policies to ensure we are saving taxpayer dollars and stretching our precious defense dollars as far as possible.

H.R. 1735 also includes provisions improving military readiness, strengthening our cyber warfare defenses, and holding the line on keeping terrorists in cells at Guantanamo Bay, not in our States or back on the battlefield.

This rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 2048, the USA FREEDOM Act which addresses critical national security investigation concerns while making much-needed changes to protect the privacy of Americans.

H.R. 2048 prohibits explicitly the bulk collection of all records under section 215 of the PATRIOT Act, the FISA

pen register authority, and National Security Letter statutes. This provision prevents government overreach by ending the indiscriminate collection of records that violates the privacy of all Americans.

Madam Speaker, this bill also improves transparency, making significant FISA interpretations available to the public and requiring the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence to disclose how they use these national security authorities.

Finally, the USA FREEDOM Act ensures that national security is strengthened by closing loopholes that prevented tracking of foreign terrorists, narrowly defining which records the Federal Government may obtain, and enhancing investigations of international proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

□ 1245

Madam Speaker, I share the concern that our colleagues across the aisle have about the return of the young women taken by Boko Haram and salute their wearing red today and your wearing red today. However, Madam Speaker, I chose to wear pink today because we are dealing with a very sensitive issue about unborn children.

Today's rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This is important legislation for the House to consider, particularly this week, 2 years after the conviction of Philadelphia-based late-term abortionist Kermit Gosnell, who was found guilty of first degree murder in the case of three babies born alive in his clinic.

He killed these children using a procedure he called "snipping," which involved Gosnell inserting a pair of scissors into the baby's neck and cutting its spinal cord, a procedure that was reportedly routine.

A neonatologist testified to the grand jury that one of the babies, known as Baby Boy A, spent his few moments of life in excruciating pain. Late-term abortions are agonizingly painful, and they are happening all too often in our Nation. Americans have been asking how different those abortions are from Gosnell's "snipping." Thankfully, they know the answer to those questions and support protecting these nearly fully developed lives.

A March 2013 poll conducted by The Polling Company found that 64 percent of the public supports a law prohibiting an abortion after 20 weeks when an unborn baby can feel pain. Supporters included 63 percent of women and 47 percent of those who identified themselves as pro-choice.

That finding was not an outlier; it is representative of the public's true beliefs. According to a 2013 Gallup poll, 64 percent of Americans support prohibiting second trimester abortions, and 80 percent support prohibiting third trimester abortions.

Even The Huffington Post found in 2013 that 59 percent of Americans sup-

port limiting abortions after 20 weeks; and *Cosmopolitan* magazine, not known for its traditional values, had an article recently all about the impact of smoking by pregnant women on their "unborn babies." They weren't blobs of tissue or even fetuses, but "unborn children."

Those unborn children can feel pain, which is why they are provided anesthesia when surgery is performed on them in the womb. They can even survive outside the womb, with *The New York Times* reporting just last week on a study that *The New England Journal of Medicine* published that found that 25 percent of children born prematurely at the stage of pregnancy covered by this legislation survive.

There are countless stories—no longer so uncommon we would call them miracles—of children surviving and thriving, such as Micah Pickering, who was born right at the stage when this legislation would protect other children in the womb and is now a "spunky almost 3-year-old," according to his mother.

The legislation we consider today, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, is carefully written to advance the consensus of a majority of Americans that these late-term abortions should cease.

In order to maintain that consensus, the bill includes provisions allowing abortions in cases of rape or where the life of the mother is in danger. It also provides strong protections for minors who have been sexually assaulted, stopping abortionists from ignoring child abuse that enters their facility.

Most importantly, it protects the lives of well-developed, pain-capable children who could well survive outside the womb. America is one of only seven nations that allow elective abortions after 20 weeks, which includes such well-known human rights leaders as North Korea, China, and Vietnam. The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act would finally put an end to that.

Madam Speaker, I commend this rule and the underlying bills to my colleagues for their support, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate my colleague yielding me the time.

I rise today frustrated and angry by the state of affairs in the United States. Last night, an Amtrak train derailed which was traveling over the busiest track in the Nation. That tragedy killed at least six and injured more than 200 who were hospitalized, just days before the highway trust fund is about to expire. Republicans will spend billions of dollars in this bill on war, but let the roads and rails and bridges rot.

Thirty-eight billion dollars was concealed in a very clever way in the Defense bill under the OCO account because it does not affect the budget cap; but what are we going to do about the

busiest corridor in the United States? Nothing—as a matter of fact, according to Politico, on this very day, the Republicans in the Appropriations Committee, on a 21–29 vote, defeated an amendment offered by the ranking member, DAVID PRICE, that would have significantly boosted funding for several transportation programs, including Amtrak, the very day after this.

The Baltimore Sun tells us that the operations advisory commission for the Northeast corridor says that the estimation for loss of service on the corridor for a single day would cost \$100 million in travel delays and lost productivity.

Six people have died; 200 were hospitalized. Add the medical cost on all of that. It will only take a week or a little bit more to use up the entire account for the amount of money the Appropriations Committee is willing to put into Amtrak.

As we look at that, what we do here—saving money and cutting out and dropping everything—has to be the costs that are borne outside by people with their medical costs by the delay by being unable to get the goods and things to market. If I have ever seen a case of pennywise and dollar foolish, this one is it.

Moreover than that, that isn't even our discussion today. What I really want to talk about here is that the majority's priorities are so misplaced that they cannot even govern this body in an organized way.

Today, under this single rule—one rule—we will consider a 20-week abortion ban, which is unconstitutional, and we know it, but they are going to do it anyway; we will consider bulk data collection under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act; and then we will also do the general debate for the National Defense Authorization Act. We have an hour to do this rule to talk about those. These bills have no commonality at all, and there is no need at all to entwine them in a single rule.

The rule is called a grab bag rule that governs the floor debate for two or more unrelated pieces of legislation. Debate in this Chamber suffers when many unrelated bills are crammed into a single rule. It is legislative malpractice, Madam Speaker, practiced here all the time and getting worse term after term.

Under this procedure, arguments for and against multiple measures are interspersed, which leads to disjointed, fragmented, and confusing debates. Furthermore, each bill does not get its due consideration, which harms not only the Rules Committee, but the House of Representatives, and, above all, the American people; but the most egregious use of our time is prioritizing attacking women's health over everything else that is going on in the country.

This majority has introduced yet another 20-week abortion ban that prohibits abortions after 20 weeks based

on a widely disputed scientific claim that a fetus can feel pain at that point in time in a pregnancy, but this is not the first time we have seen this bill. It is not even the first time we have seen it in this Congress, which is only 5 months old.

Just weeks ago, on the 42nd anniversary of the Supreme Court's landmark ruling on *Roe v. Wade*, the majority prepared to bring this bill to the floor, but it was so odious, the provision in it so offensive, that even women in the majority's own party balked and rebelled against their leadership. The uproar was so loud that, in the middle of the night, the majority pulled the bill from the floor.

The first version was bad enough. It included abortion exceptions for rape and incest only to reported cases of rape. Within 48 hours, a woman had to go to report that to law enforcement, or she could not be eligible for an abortion. The new bill is worse because it says that she has to have 48 hours of counseling, but she can't get it at the hospital where the abortion would be done, so she has to go from pillar to post.

The most odious thing that they have done is the unmitigated cruelty to the victims of incest. They put an age limit on it. Can you imagine that? It is unbelievable.

I know that this bill will not go anywhere. I doubt the Senate will even take it up. It is simply something to appease people who believe anything that they hear about this, such as there is abortion on demand. There is not.

Third trimester abortions are all medically necessary, as one of my colleagues mentioned this morning. If you haven't talked to any of those women, you don't know what they have been through. In almost every one of those cases, they desperately want that baby, but sometimes, they have no brains. Sometimes, they are born with no organs. They are unable to survive.

Many times, there is a case of a woman who can preserve her reproductive system so that she can have more children. How incredibly cruel it is that we want to take that decision away from the woman and her doctor—whomever she wants to consult, but certainly scientific laws ought to apply—and put it in the hands of legislators.

Maybe we should decide who should have gall bladder operations, or maybe we should decide whether broken legs should be treated; we are all-seeing here. What happened here today is disgustingly cruel, as I said before.

The Supreme Court has long held that a woman has the unequivocal right to choose abortion care until the point of fetal viability, which is largely accepted by the scientific community to be 24 weeks.

A 20-week abortion ban brazenly challenges the Supreme Court's standards and deliberately attempts to push the law earlier and earlier into a wom-

an's pregnancy because that is the number one issue, and we have been told that.

When I started working on this issue four decades ago, I surely thought, by now, we would not decide whether or not a woman can make a decision about her own health.

How awful it is that, just less than a week after Mother's Day, when we all are reminded how brilliant and how wonderful they were, how farseeing, how great in their judgment, but we decide that every other woman in the country has not the ability to make decisions for herself.

Enough of these insults, enough of practicing medicine without a license, let's get to the business at hand and fix the rotting infrastructure in the United States of America and make it safe for our fellow citizens to get to work.

The idea that all those people are wounded and hurt today and died because we failed to keep up the tracks in the United States of America, which was known worldwide for its infrastructure and now spends barely a pittance on trying to maintain those old tracks—and the mayor of New York had just said he has bridges in New York that are over 100 years old.

I have the same thing in my district. I have bridges over the Erie Canal. Fire trucks can't even go over them and haven't been able to for the last decade.

But, no, we are not going to talk about that. We are going to talk about making women do what we want them to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Probably throughout the day, we will be setting the record straight on things my colleague has said. Victims of rape can get counseling from a hospital that performs abortion; but most egregiously, Madam Speaker, the arguments raised across the aisle about incest are astounding.

Let me be clear. If a woman is sexually assaulted and that leads to a pregnancy, there is a rape exception in this legislation that applies, regardless of the family status of her aggressor or the age of the victim.

□ 1300

As the legislation includes an exception for all women who are sexually assaulted, those across the aisle who raise incest appear to believe we should provide special exemptions under Federal law to individuals in consensual incestuous relationships. That boggles the mind. This objection is a shameful distraction from the important debate we are having about protecting well-developed, unborn children from being ripped apart in the womb.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I appreciate the work of my colleague from North Carolina.

Madam Speaker, 2 years ago today, America was awakened to the horrors of the abortion industry as abortionist Kermit Gosnell was convicted of murdering three innocent, newborn infants in his filthy abortion complex, and one of his former employees reported nearly 100 other living babies who were also murdered.

Gosnell cut the spines of crying 5-month-old babies who survived his first attempts to kill them, and our human dignity makes it impossible to ignore that image. He further brutalized the mothers—killing two of them by drug overdose; with filthy, unsanitary instruments; and by perforating their wombs and bowels.

It is no less painful for babies to have their spines snipped before birth than by Gosnell after birth. By 5 months, if not before, babies can feel pain—intense pain. It is simply barbaric to allow Gosnell or anyone else to rip these babies apart, limb by limb, whether they are in or out of their mothers' wombs.

That is why we must take a stand today to protect the defenseless unborn and pass the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I thank my good friend for her work on this bill that shows she is strong and protective of women.

Madam Speaker, I want to speak about where this bill started.

The District of Columbia was the stalking horse for H.R. 7 until women's groups and I protested vigorously.

Sorry, colleagues.

We may have chased the majority from the D.C. 20-week abortion bill only to see them now target all of the Nation's women with an even worse bill. However, not even the Republican majority can overrule the *Roe v. Wade* holding that H.R. 36 is unconstitutional for lowering the Court's as well as scientific findings on when a fetus becomes viable.

H.R. 36 focuses on a previability fetus, but it excludes any protection for the health of the woman involved. Shamefully, even traumatized rape victims are punished further by steps that require that they virtually prove they were raped before they can get an abortion.

My colleagues, now is the time to oppose H.R. 36. The Supreme Court already has.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentlewoman.

Madam Speaker, this is a very commonsense bill, H.R. 36, which is being presented by my colleague Mr. FRANKS from Arizona.

Why do we have to do this? I am going to tell you something.

It is because scientific evidence now shows that unborn babies can feel pain

by 20 weeks postfertilization and, likely, even earlier. It is because a late-term abortion is an excruciatingly painful and inhumane act against children who are waiting to be born and against their mothers. It is because women who terminate pregnancies at 20 weeks are 35 times more likely to die from abortion than they are in the first trimester, and they are 91 times more likely to die from abortion at 21 weeks or beyond. It is because, after 5 months into a pregnancy, the baby is undeniably a living, growing human, and the government's first duty is to protect innocent life. It is because, overwhelmingly, most Americans—and I am talking about men and women, young and old—support legislation to protect these innocent people. It is because the hideous case of Kermit Gosnell in Philadelphia is a brutal reminder of what can occur without this type of legislation in place.

H.R. 36 would federally ban almost all abortions from being performed beyond the 20th week of pregnancy with exceptions for instances of rape, incest, or when the life of the mother is at stake.

I want to tell my colleagues to just think of how little effort it would be today to take their voting cards out, to put them in the machine, and to press on the green button. By doing that, they are saying “yes” to protecting the most vulnerable people in our society from going through unbelievable amounts of pain.

Isn't it amazing that, in America's House, we have to pass legislation to protect the most innocent life? This is incredible that we have to even come forward and debate this. My goodness. This is just so intuitive of who we are, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as human beings. We have to protect the unborn because they cannot protect themselves. Vote “yes” on this today. Let's make sure that our children are not subjected to this pain and that their mothers are not subjected to the same pain and to the resulting loss of life.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), co-chair of the Pro-Choice Caucus.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, in 6 days, the highway trust fund expires. So what is Congress spending its time doing today? Of course, it is debating a bill that will limit a woman's access to a safe and legal medical procedure and that will place politicians in a place they should never be—between a woman and her doctor. Ask your mother, your sister, your daughter, your wife, or your neighbor, and she will tell you that women don't need politicians' interference when making their own healthcare decisions. Yet here we are again today, debating a bill that does just that.

Everybody remembers that this bill was pulled from the floor in January because it was so extreme, but, today,

the bill that is on the floor is even worse than the bill that they pulled in January.

H.R. 36 is particularly harmful to victims of rape and incest. Women who have had unbelievable trauma would be effectively forced to get permission before they could seek the medical treatment that they needed to regain some control over their bodies, their health, and their safety. They would have to jump through complex and punitive legal hoops before they could have the procedures that they need. Therefore, somebody who has been victimized once would end up being victimized again by our government.

Let's be clear. The new provisions in this law include a number of burdensome requirements on rape and incest victims:

First, there is a waiting period of 48 hours for an adult rape survivor;

Second, there is a requirement that a minor who is a victim of rape or incest would give written proof after 20 weeks that she reported the crime to law enforcement or to a government agency. A minor who is a victim of incest has to do this. There is language that specifies that the counseling or medical treatment described above may not be from a health center that provides abortion services. So let's say she goes to her doctor, and she gets counseling, but someone else in that medical practice provides abortion. She is out of luck. If she doesn't thread that needle, too bad. She can't get it.

Perhaps the most outrageous thing about this bill, though, is the fundamental disrespect that it shows to women. It assumes that women will just wake up in this country after 20 weeks of pregnancy, decide to have abortions, and then lie about being victims of rape or incest. That view is just wrong, and it is offensive to women.

By the way, as Ms. SLAUGHTER mentioned, this bill is patently unconstitutional, and even if it didn't get vetoed by the President, it would be struck down by the Supreme Court. I suggest that we vote “no” now and that we respect women's ability to make their own health decisions.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, the claim that minors have to report to law enforcement is false. They do not need to report anything to law enforcement. The law provides that the abortionist must report to social services or to law enforcement to ensure that they do not let child abuse that comes to their attention continue unchecked.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. Madam Speaker, this is a bill that is protecting babies who can survive outside the womb. These are babies who can feel pain. Knowing that this institution won't stand up for those vulnerable children in our society is a sad day for this institution.

I have seven children. This is my sixth. This is MariV. This picture was taken with the two of us the day she was born. She is now 5 years old, and

she is gregarious, awesome, fun—the most beautiful joy in our family. The way the law stands today is that, the day before this picture was taken, it would have been legal to have aborted MariV.

I want to talk about women's rights. This is a little girl. This is a little baby girl who will one day grow up to be a woman. Let's stand up and protect this little girl, not the day that she was born only, but also the day that she was in the womb. Let's protect her from the pain of abortion, from the silent screams of those babies who were aborted in the womb who aren't heard because they don't have voices in this institution defending them.

Madam Speaker, I listen to the floor debate day after day, whether in this Chamber or on C-SPAN, and I hear the other side talk about how they fight for the forgotten, how they fight for the defenseless, how they fight for the voiceless, and they pound their chests, and they stomp their feet. You don't have anyone in our society that is more defenseless than these little babies.

I believe in life at conception. I know my colleagues are not going to agree with me on that, but can't we come together as an institution and say that we are going to stand with little babies who feel pain? that we are going to stand with little babies who can survive outside the womb—ones who don't have lobbyists, who don't have money, who can't rally, who can't offer contributions to one's campaign? Don't we stand with those little babies?

If you stand with the defenseless, with the voiceless, you have to stand with little babies. Don't talk to me about cruelty in our bill when you look at little babies being dismembered and feeling excruciating pain. If we can't stand to defend these children, what do we stand for in this institution? What do we stand for in America if we can't stand up for the most defenseless and voiceless among us?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I want to just correct my friend from North Carolina, who said that nothing has to be reported to law enforcement.

It reads: if pregnancy is the result of rape against a minor or incest against a minor and if the rape or incest has been reported to either, one, a government agency legally authorized to act on reports of child abuse or, two, law enforcement.

I hope my colleague stands corrected.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. I thank my colleague from New York.

Madam Speaker and Members, I am just so perplexed by our willingness every time an abortion issue is brought up that we don the equivalent of a white coat, that we believe that we are doctors in this august body, that we should be making decisions on behalf of women who are pregnant and on behalf of their spouses and of their physicians, and that we know better than

everyone else. If we had women in America who saw their doctors as frequently as we talk about their health on the House floor, boy, they would have a lot of access to doctors.

Four months ago, this bill was taken up, and many of the women in the Republican caucus thought it went too far, so it has been amended a little bit, and now they think it doesn't go too far. Let me tell you what "too far" is.

First of all, remember that only 1.5 percent of abortions take place after 20 weeks. They take place for a lot of personal and profoundly physical reasons, and the decision is made by the physician in conjunction with the pregnant woman and her family. What in the heck are we doing putting our noses in their lives?

□ 1315

It is constitutional, Members; it is legal in this country to have an abortion.

Now, rape. If you are raped, and it is after 20 weeks, you have to go to a law enforcement officer or you have to have mental health services.

Now, let me remind you, of the sexual assaults that take place in the military, 81 percent of them are never reported. When you are raped, the last thing you want to do is relive that experience, to be victimized again because you are so offended and feel so violated. And now we are going to say, whether you are 17 or 19, you are going to have to go report this to law enforcement or you are going to have to go to a mental health officer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the additional time.

Beyond that, we are saying if there is an anomaly and your fetus is not going to be able to survive as an infant outside the womb that you are going to have to carry that to term.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me say this: I have had two abortions. One was at 10 weeks, when the fetus no longer had a heartbeat, and I was told, Well, you are going to have to wait a few days before you have that D&C. A D&C is an abortion. I said, I can't. I am in so much pain. I have just lost this baby that I wanted, and you are going to make me carry around a dead fetus for 2 days? I finally got that D&C in time. At 17 weeks, I lost another baby. It was an extraordinarily painful experience. It was an abortion.

Women who go through these experiences go through them with so much pain and anguish, and here we are as Members of this body, trying to don another white coat. I think we should put the speculums down. I think we should stop playing doctor.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today because I believe that all

human life is worth protecting. Each of us are here today because we all stand for something greater. We believe that all human life is precious. We believe that each life is worth living, that life deserves respect and protection, and every human being has equal worth and dignity. That is why everybody matters. That is why everyone counts.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act protects life, empowers women, and will save lives. This legislation represents the will of the American people. Over 60 percent of Americans support protecting unborn children after 20 weeks.

A critical component of this legislation ensures that women receive counseling or medical care for a traumatic event that precipitated her pregnancy prior to obtaining an abortion. Because the pain of an abortion is felt by both mother and child, a woman who feels that abortion is her only option over halfway through her pregnancy deserves medical treatment and emotional assistance beyond what can be provided by an abortionist.

We have a responsibility, as the elected body representing our constituents, to protect the most vulnerable among us and ensure that women facing unwanted pregnancies do not face judgment or condemnation but have positive support structures and access to health care to help them through their pregnancies. This bill protects life.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

One of our former colleagues, Barney Frank from Massachusetts, made one of the most telling statements, I think, that many of the people who are speaking today obviously, by their actions, believe that life begins at conception but ends at birth, because these are often the very same people who refuse to fund schools, who cut back on food stamps, who pay no attention to children who grow up under unseemly, unsanitary, and dreadful conditions, who take away from their parents the unemployment insurance on which they might be able to live and keep the children together.

That callous disregard of the living makes the piety of the statement of how they love life a little bit odd. You have to practice that for the living as well. The children and the neglected in this country, the rates are becoming appalling. The number of children who live under the poverty line in America, who suffer every day, frankly, who get the only food they get often at school, if they are able to get there, should really somehow soften the hearts of all the people who want to make sure that every fetus is born.

Nobody has to have an abortion, but for women who need it for medical reasons and are protected by the Constitution and make that decision—and how awful it is—and I have to echo what Ms. SPEIER said and what I said earlier, the idea that Members of the House of

Representatives or any other legal body—I have been in three. Many have usually carried this debate and decided what women should do, but in the three legislatures I have been in, I have seen people with no medical experience of any sort, never talk to anybody who was in the position, but I also do know people who change their minds when their daughters perhaps got into a position where they had to make that decision or not.

So, for heaven's sakes, let's examine really what we do here in this House of Representatives. As you say what you are going to do, tell me that you are going to make sure that children are fed, that you are going to make sure that children are housed decently, that you are going to make sure that they are able to afford their education, and that the health care they are going to need is going to be there for them so they have the opportunity to grow up into a healthy, strong American that you are talking about, because the actions belie it.

I will never forget the pain that we suffered in here while doing away with the unemployment insurance. People lost their homes, gave up almost everything. In some cases they sent their children to live with relatives. We can't divorce this debate today from that reality in America.

Go visit in your districts some of the children who live that way. Go into some of the poor areas and see what their housing is like. See what kind of nutrition that they have, and then it makes it much more palatable, I think, to understand that real point of view. But isn't a piece a whole piece, and what it really comes down to is that once people are born in this country that we are our brother's keeper, and Hillary Clinton was absolutely right: it does take a village to raise a child. Do your part on that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, 2 years ago today Pennsylvania abortion doctor Kermit Gosnell was convicted of murder, conspiracy to kill, and involuntary manslaughter and sentenced to life imprisonment.

Even though the news of Gosnell's child slaughter was largely suppressed by the mainstream media, many of my colleagues may remember that Dr. Gosnell operated a large Philadelphia abortion clinic where women died and countless babies were dismembered or chemically destroyed, often by having their spinal cord snipped, all gruesome procedures causing excruciating pain to the victim.

Today, the House considers landmark legislation authored by Congressman TRENT FRANKS to protect unborn children beginning at the age of 20 weeks postfertilization from these pain-filled abortions.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is needed now more than

ever because there are Gosnells all over America, dismembering and decapitating pain-capable babies for profit: men like Steven Brigham of New Jersey, an interstate abortion operator—some 35 aborted babies were found in his freezer; men like Leroy Carhart, caught on videotape joking about his abortion toolkit, complete with, as he said, a pickaxe and drill bit, while describing a 3-day-long late-term abortion procedure and the infant victim as “putting meat in a Crock-Pot.”

Some euphemistically call this choice, but a growing number of Americans rightly regard it as violence against children, and huge majorities—60 percent, according to the November Quinnipiac poll—want it stopped.

Fresh impetus for this bill came from a huge study of nearly 5,000 babies, preemies, published last week in *The New England Journal of Medicine*. The next day *The New York Times* article titled “Premature Babies May Survive At 22 Weeks If Treated” touted the Journal’s extraordinary findings of survival and hope.

Just imagine, Madam Speaker, preemies at 20 weeks are surviving, as technology and medical science advances. Alexis Hutchinson, featured in *The New York Times* story, is today a healthy 5-year-old who originally weighed in at a mere 1.1 pounds. Thus, the babies we seek to protect from harm today may indeed survive if treated humanely, with expertise and with an abundance of compassion.

I urge support for the legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to read from patients’ stories that I have here today, starting with the fact that women need access to abortion care later in pregnancy for a variety of reasons and must have the ability to make decisions that are right for them, in consultation with their healthcare providers and those they trust. A woman’s health, not politics, should be the basis of important medical decisions.

Kris from Indiana. When Kris went on her 20-week ultrasound, she thought she would learn the sex of her pregnancy but, instead, found out that her fetus had cystic hygroma and fetal hydrops. The doctor advised her there was no chance of survival. The only two options were to wait until she miscarried, which would risk her health and her future fertility, or to safely terminate the pregnancy. Kris said it was a hard decision, but she was happy she was able to make it with her family and those she trusted. Because of a 20-week ban in Indiana, she had to travel to Ohio to obtain her abortion care. If H.R. 36 were passed, she would have no place to go.

Lorna from Florida. Lorna is a mother of three, with a number of health issues, including lupus, a tumor on her upper intestines, and two uterine abrasions. When Lorna found out she was pregnant, she knew immediately that

the carrying of the pregnancy to term was not an option for her. She had hemorrhaged while giving birth to her last child, and her sister, who also had lupus, had died after giving birth. Lorna didn’t want to risk another potentially dangerous delivery and potentially leave her three children without a mother, and she went to the closest abortion care facility, got a free ultrasound, but was unable to obtain an abortion because of her health issues. The clinic recommended that Lorna obtain abortion care in a hospital setting, but due to her complex condition, the closest hospital that could handle her healthcare needs was in California. With help from the clinic and the NAF Hotline, Lorna was able to fly more than 2,000 miles to California to obtain the abortion care she needed at almost 22 weeks pregnant. She would not be able to do that under this bill.

Josephine from Florida. Josephine recently moved from Texas to Florida with two children to escape her abusive partner after he threatened to kill her. While trying to create a new stable home for her children, Josephine was raped and became pregnant. She couldn’t afford to pay for her abortion, nor could she arrange for transportation to get to the closest provider, who was more than 80 miles away, so Josephine attempted to terminate the pregnancy on her own by ingesting poison. She ended up being hospitalized, needing several blood transfusions, and was still pregnant. By the time she was able to gather enough resources to cover her abortion procedure and transportation, she was 23 weeks pregnant and would not have been able to do that under this law.

Mya lives in Georgia. She and her mom tried borrowing money from friends and family to pay for her abortion but couldn’t gather enough resources in time for her appointment, so they had to delay the care and reschedule. By the time Mya was able to raise enough money to make her appointment, she found out she was further along in the pregnancy than she expected and was now 21 weeks pregnant. She was able to access care, but if H.R. 36 were the law, she would have been prohibited.

Niecy from Florida was raped by a man she thought was her friend. When she realized she was pregnant due to the rape, she knew immediately she wanted to terminate the pregnancy. As a full-time student, she had no income and couldn’t tell her mom because she knew her mom would try to keep the pregnancy due to her mom’s anti-choice religious beliefs. Niecy spent 2 months trying to raise enough money to pay for her procedure. She had nothing to pawn or sell and was so desperate that she even asked the rapist for money, but he refused to help her.

□ 1330

When Niecy was past 20 weeks, she was finally put in touch with the NAF

Hotline and other funds available to provide the financial money that she needed.

Serafina from South Carolina started a new job and was working to build a stable life for her and her two kids in a homeless shelter when she found out she was pregnant. She decided terminating her pregnancy was the best decision for herself and her family. They had no home.

Unfortunately, Serafina found out that she was already more than 20 weeks pregnant. She had no items to pawn or sell, living in a shelter. Thanks to a friend willing to help her with money and a ride—and support—Serafina was able to get the care she needed, which she could not do if H.R. 36 were passed.

Gloria from Washington moved in with her parents in order to financially support them when she was faced with an unwanted pregnancy.

Do you notice in all of this, the men involved don’t have to pay anything or do anything at all? Isn’t that a strange circumstance?

When Gloria was faced with the unwanted pregnancy, she was fortunate to be working, but was only making minimum wage and had no paid sick leave and was still in her 90-day new job probationary period. Even after receiving her paycheck, she didn’t have enough funds to continue supporting her family to travel to the nearest abortion care provider 3 hours away and pay for the procedure itself.

Eventually, she decided not to pay her other bills in order to have enough funds to cover her travel and care, but then she ran into another barrier: her boss. Because the provider was more than 150 miles away, she needed to take time off work, but her employer wouldn’t allow her to do so. The situation placed the job she desperately needed in jeopardy and, fortunately, her boss eventually relented and she was able to obtain the abortion care she needed.

I will rest my case, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I would like to first express my deepest and sincerest gratitude to every last person who played a role in the creation and development of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act now before us on this unique and historic day.

Madam Speaker, we really understand what we are all talking about here. Protecting little pain-capable unborn babies really is not a Republican issue or a Democrat issue. It really is a test of our basic humanity and who we are as a human family.

I would just hope that Members of Congress, as well as all Americans, will go to paincapable.com and see for themselves what technology is now upon us in 2015; that unborn children

entering their sixth month of pregnancy are capable of feeling pain is now beyond question.

The real question that remains is: Will those of us privileged to live and breathe in this, the land of the free and the home of the brave, finally come together and protect mothers and their little innocent pain-capable unborn babies from monsters like Kermit Gosnell? That is the question, Madam Speaker.

God help us to do it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM).

Mr. ABRAHAM. Madam Speaker, I stand here as a proud sponsor of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This is strong, commonsense legislation focused on protecting the lives of unborn children and their mothers, and I am very happy that this new language is even stronger than the original bill in January.

As a doctor, I know—and I can attest—that this bill is backed by scientific research showing that babies can indeed feel pain at 20 weeks, if not before. That is why it is so important we stand up for life and stand up for this human rights issue. This is a pro-life effort that deserves bipartisan support.

I fully urge passage of this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

Mr. BENISHEK. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the rights of the unborn and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the rule for the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

I, along with many of my constituents in northern Michigan, believe that life inside the womb is just as precious as life outside the womb and that it must be protected. The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act will prevent abortions from occurring after the point at which many scientific studies have demonstrated that children in the womb can actually feel pain. All children, even the unborn, have the absolute right to life, and we need to do our utmost to protect the most defenseless among us.

I served as a doctor in northern Michigan, where I was able to witness the miracle of new life in the delivery room. Because of this, and because of my experience as a father and as a grandfather, I have made protecting the rights of the unborn my priority while serving in Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, as a medical doctor, I took an oath to protect lives. As a cardiothoracic surgeon for many years, I worked day and night to save lives in the operating room. Today, I stand proudly with my colleagues here on the House floor to defend the lives of those poor, innocent unborn children who don't have anybody else to stand up to defend them.

The scientific evidence is clear: unborn babies feel pain. They feel pain at 20 weeks postfertilization. This bill bans late-term abortions, with very limited exceptions.

According to the Charlotte Lozier Institute, the United States is currently one of only seven countries worldwide, including North Korea and China, that allows elective late-term abortions.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates enacting this bill will save 2,750 lives each year. Twenty-four States, including my home State of Louisiana, have already acted to ban these late-term abortions.

I urge my colleagues to be compassionate. I urge my colleagues to support the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act so that unborn lives in all 50 States are protected from painful late-term abortions.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM).

Mrs. NOEM. Madam Speaker, today, I rise in support of the rule for H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This is a strong bill that prevents abortions after 20 weeks, except in certain circumstances, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill today.

As a mother of three, I know the worry and anxiety that comes along with carrying a child. And many times, that worry doesn't end after birth. I still think about my children with concern every day, and I understand the difficulties and the decisions that many women have during this time.

Motherhood is a big responsibility and a huge change. As a community, we need to help women through this time. But we also have the responsibility to come together as a country and protect the most innocent and the vulnerable among us.

In this bill, we are talking about protecting unborn babies that are already 20 weeks old and mothers who are halfway through their pregnancy. That is about 5 months. At this stage, many women already have a baby bump and they are wearing maternity clothing. The baby can be as long as a banana is and kicking and moving around, even to the point where the mother will feel those kicks and that movement.

More importantly, this is the stage where we know the baby can feel pain and could be viable outside the womb with proper care. In fact, there is evidence that the pain that the unborn baby feels is even more intense than

what a young child or an adult would feel because their nervous system isn't developed enough to block that pain.

The majority of women in the United States are with us on this bill. We must protect these innocent lives when they are the most vulnerable and sensitive among us to feeling pain.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

Scientific evidence has demonstrated that by 20 weeks, unborn babies are able to feel pain; and thanks to ongoing medical improvements, premature babies at this stage are increasingly able to live outside the womb.

This bill will protect unborn babies 20 weeks and older from having to suffer the excruciating pain of an abortion death. Abortions are brutal and extremely painful, where the child is either dismembered or poisoned.

H.R. 36 will punish abortionists who violate the law, while adding important additional protections for unborn children and their mothers.

Every life at this stage is a precious gift from God, and we, as Americans, should continue to protect life. This bill will do just that.

Madam Speaker, I urge full support of the rule and for this legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, let me continue with Amy from South Carolina. This is somewhat different but certainly poignant.

Amy and her husband, Chris, were very excited about their pregnancy. Amy's previous pregnancies had been uncomplicated, so they decided to forego genetic testing. However, during the scheduled 20-week ultrasound, the couple received the devastating news that their fetus had a structural and lethal abnormality known as trisomy 18. They were advised to go in for further genetic testing, which was very expensive.

The results to confirm this diagnosis took an additional 10 to 14 days, so Amy was past 20 weeks' gestation when she made the decision to obtain an abortion. With a nationwide 20-week ban, couples like Chris and Amy would not have been able to make decisions that were right for themselves and their families.

Karina from Arizona. The night before Karina called the NAF Hotline, she literally slept against a lamppost. She is homeless and makes and sells jewelry in order to buy food. She can't afford housing.

She called the hotline because she realized she was pregnant after being raped by the father of her five children. Even though she was raped, Arizona Medicaid would not cover her abortion care.

She could barely afford food most days and could not afford the cost of the abortion, so she had to delay her care. Thanks to multiple abortion funds, including the hotline fund and a discount from her care provider, she was able to obtain the abortion she needed. This bill would stop that.

Catherine from Georgia. Catherine was planning on carrying her pregnancy to term, even though she had a number of pregnancy complications, including having to receive blood transfusions throughout the pregnancy.

When she was post 20 weeks pregnant, Catherine found out her fetus had an anomaly. She had placed a child up for adoption in the past, so she knew that adoption was not an option for her again, nor was parenting this pregnancy.

She started to save money and tried pawning the title to her car but was told it was too old and worth nothing. Catherine was able to borrow money from friends, and called the hotline to find an abortion provider.

The night before her appointment, she said even though she knew she was making the right decision, she was nervous about the protesters who would be outside the clinic. The next day, she did not let the protesters yelling at her scare her away. She was able to obtain the care that she needed.

Madam Speaker, I have just received news that the death toll has risen to seven in the Amtrak tragedy.

It is past time to focus on the real priorities that face our country, and I will insert into the RECORD articles from The Baltimore Sun and Politico that I referred to previously.

[From the Baltimore Sun, May 13, 2015]

(By Kevin Rector and Jessica Anderson)

The derailment in Philadelphia of an Amtrak passenger train headed north from Washington and through multiple stops in Maryland left dozens of people injured and killed six—including a midshipman from the U.S. Naval Academy in Annapolis.

The academy notified its brigade of the death early Wednesday morning.

"I speak for the brigade of midshipmen, the faculty and staff when I say we are all completely heartbroken by this," said Cmdr. John Schofield, an academy spokesman.

The midshipman, who was not identified, was headed home on leave, the academy said. It did not say where the midshipman boarded the train.

An online timetable for Train 188, which was carrying a total of 238 passengers and five crew members, shows it had been scheduled to pass through Baltimore's Penn Station and several other stops in Maryland prior to reaching Philadelphia on Tuesday night, though it remained unclear Wednesday morning how many passengers boarded the train at those stations.

Officials said the train derailed at Frankford Junction in North Philadelphia shortly after 9 p.m. The online schedule had it departing Penn Station at 7:54 p.m.

The timetable also includes an original scheduled departure from Washington's Union Station at 7:10 p.m., and subsequent departures from New Carrollton at 7:22 p.m. and BWI Thurgood Marshall Airport at 7:37 p.m. prior to the train's reaching Penn Station.

After Penn Station, the train was scheduled to depart Aberdeen at 8:16 p.m., Wilmington, Del., at 8:43 p.m. and Philadelphia at 9:10 p.m., according to the online schedule.

Amtrak did not immediately respond to questions early Wednesday as to whether Train 188 made all of its locally scheduled stops and how many people boarded at each, or if it was on schedule.

On Wednesday morning, Lisa Bonanno stood in Penn Station looking at an electronic train schedule above, trying to figure out how to get to work in Washington. Bonanno said she was aboard Train 188 Tuesday night, but got off in Baltimore before its derailment in Philadelphia.

"I was on that train last night," she said. Bonanno said she would probably end up taking a MARC train to work, given some delays, but that the derailment in Philadelphia would not deter her from riding Amtrak in the future.

"This is very unusual," she said. "Driving is so much worse."

The derailment happened in Port Richmond, one of five neighborhoods in what's known as Philadelphia's River Wards, dense rowhouse neighborhoods located off the Delaware River. Area resident David Hernandez, whose home is close to the tracks, heard the derailment.

"It sounded like a bunch of shopping carts crashing into each other," he said.

The crashing sound lasted a few seconds, he said, and then there was chaos and screaming.

The derailment was the deadliest incident involving an Amtrak train on the Northeast Corridor since the Maryland collision between an Amtrak train and a Conrail freight engine near Chase, in which 16 people were killed and another 175 were injured.

Officials expect the death toll of Tuesday's derailment could increase as investigators continue to move through the wreckage. The Naval Academy said grief counselors were on hand at its Annapolis campus for grieving midshipmen, faculty and staff.

Navy Secretary Ray Mabus expressed his condolences to the brigade during previously scheduled morning remarks at the academy, which wrapped up its academic year on Tuesday.

The Northeast Corridor, which runs from Washington to Boston, is the busiest stretch of passenger rail line in the country, serving 750,000 passengers and 2,000 commuter, intercity and freight trains per day, according to the Northeast Corridor Infrastructure and Operations Advisory Commission.

The commission has estimated that a loss of service on the corridor for a single day would cost \$100 million in travel delays and lost productivity. Workers who ride trains on the corridor contribute \$50 billion to the U.S. economy annually, the commission has found.

Locally, the corridor is used for Amtrak and freight trains as well as the Maryland Transit Administration's passenger MARC train service. Baltimore, a traditional railroad town, has some of the system's oldest infrastructure.

The Baltimore & Potomac Tunnel under West Baltimore, for instance, is 140 years old and a key choke point for Amtrak and other rail traffic, forcing trains to slow their speeds substantially. It has been slated to be replaced, though Amtrak officials have questioned whether funding will be provided to cover the estimated \$1.5 billion price tag.

In a statement on the derailment Tuesday, Mayor Stephanie Rawlings-Blake said her "heart aches" for the passengers who were on the train.

"Amtrak service is a way of life for so many of our city residents, as well as visi-

tors from all across the Northeast who commute to, from and through our city every day," Rawlings-Blake said. "My prayers are with the families of those who lost their lives in this tragedy. We will support the recovery efforts in every way possible as authorities work to identify the cause of the crash."

Philadelphia Mayor Michael Nutter, who called the scene of the derailment "an absolute disastrous mess" on Tuesday night, said Wednesday that the train's black box had been recovered and was being analyzed.

Amtrak said rail service on the busy Northeast Corridor between New York and Philadelphia had been stopped. Nutter, citing the mangled train tracks and downed wires, said there was "no circumstance under which there would be any Amtrak service this week through Philadelphia."

A rapid-response team from the National Transportation Safety Board was on the scene Wednesday, but the cause of the derailment remained unknown. The Federal Railroad Administration also said it was dispatching at least eight investigators to the scene.

Amtrak canceled two local trains in Baltimore Wednesday, and trains on the Northeast Corridor between Philadelphia and New York were canceled. Those looking for information about family or friends on the train can call Amtrak's incident hotline at 800-523-9101, Amtrak said.

President Barack Obama expressed shock and sadness at the derailment in a statement in which he noted that Amtrak is "a way of life for many" who live and work along the Northeast Corridor. He also thanked police, fire fighters and medical personnel responding to the derailment.

"Philadelphia is known as the city of brotherly love—a city of neighborhoods and neighbors—and that spirit of loving-kindness was reaffirmed last night, as hundreds of first responders and passengers lent a hand to their fellow human beings in need," Obama said.

Pennsylvania Gov. Tom Wolf, who was in touch with Philadelphia's mayor and other state and local officials about the derailment, thanked the first responders for "their brave and quick action."

"My thoughts and prayers are with all of those impacted by tonight's train derailment," he said in a statement. "For those who lost their lives, those who were injured, and the families of all involved, this situation is devastating."

The impact on the East Coast's broader rail network was unclear. Rob Doolittle, a spokesman for railroad CSX Transportation, said the company had offered assistance to Amtrak but that its own mainline was unaffected and it was not experiencing any significant delays through Philadelphia.

Richard Scher, a spokesman for the Maryland Port Administration, said the derailment had occurred north of the port's main freight routings but that he was unsure if delays in Philadelphia were affected port cargo transports. A spokesman for railroad Norfolk Southern, which utilizes part of the Northeast Corridor for trains moving out of Maryland into Delaware, did not immediately respond to a request for comment.

Roel Bouduin, 35, arrived at Penn Station on time Wednesday morning for the beginning of a long day of travel. The resident of Belgium was scheduled to fly from New York to Toronto at 2:30 p.m.

"My plan was to take Amtrak. That's not going to work," he said as he waited at a ticket counter to get a refund.

Instead, his friend would take the day off from Johns Hopkins and drive to New York.

"We take trains daily at home. Taking a train is safer than taking a car," he said.

That said, as he rolled his suitcase from the ticket counter, Bouduin said he would enjoy “a nice drive” up to New York.

Many commuters prefer traveling from Baltimore to Washington or New York by train versus by car.

Reginald Exum is one of those travelers. He said he regularly travels to Washington and New York for his banking job. On Wednesday, though, he was riding to Washington from Penn Station, so the derailment didn't affect his commute.

“It's very unfortunate,” he said. “I feel bad for their families.”

In 1996, 11 people were killed when a MARC commuter train rammed into an Amtrak train in Silver Spring. That crash was blamed on the MARC engineer forgetting about a signal warning him to slow down.

In 1991, another incident occurred in nearly the same spot as the Chase accident in 1987, when an Amtrak train collided with a Conrail coal train—though no one was killed.

The site of Tuesday night's crash, near curving tracks at Frankford Junction, was also the scene of a previous crash.

In 1943, 79 people were killed and at least 120 injured when a Pennsylvania Railroad train carrying 541 people—including military servicemen returning from weekend furloughs—derailed in the same location, also on its way from Washington to New York.

[From Politico Pro, May 13, 2015]

House Appropriations Republicans voted down an amendment today that would have restored Amtrak funding levels seen in previous years, citing the spending caps under the Budget Control Act.

“Any increase in the caps under which we operate, that would go beyond current law, would require an understanding, an agreement, between the White House and the two bodies of Congress,” Committee Chairman Hal Rogers said, adding that the only White House response he's seen is “consternation.”

On a 21-29 vote, the committee defeated the amendment offered by THUD panel ranking member David Price that would have significantly boosted funding for several transportation programs, including Amtrak and WMATA.

House Appropriations ranking member Nita Lowey countered Republican arguments, saying it's critical that Amtrak be fully funded, especially after last night's deadly derailment.

“While we do not know the cause of this accident, we do know that starving rail of funding will not enable safer train travel,” Lowey said. “It's very clear that cutting the funding drastically does not help improve services at Amtrak.”

The House THUD bill would provide about \$1.13 billion in Amtrak funding for fiscal 2016, down from about \$1.4 billion this year.—Heather Caygle.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, we have before us a bill that once again solidifies the majority's insistence on putting political gain before women's health. We also have a ruling that unnecessarily governs consideration of three unrelated bills, each needing its own debate. These so-called grab-bag rules harm our institution, muddle debate, and dishonor the importance of the Rules Committee and its jurisdiction.

For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This rule provides for the consideration of several important pieces of legislation.

H.R. 1735, the FY16 NDAA, was the result of months of bipartisan work and includes crucial provisions to ensure our Armed Forces are agile, efficient, ready, and lethal.

No debate over these issues would be complete without an expression of our deep gratitude and thanks to the members of our military serving at home and overseas and the veterans who served before them. By providing their compensation, equipment, and vital skills education funding in this legislation, we make a small beginning on the impossible to repay debt that we owe them.

□ 1345

Consistent with our constitutional obligation to provide for the defense of our country fulfilled by consideration of the NDAA, H.R. 2048, the USA Freedom Act, similarly meets our responsibilities to secure America by tightening necessary authorities to combat potential terrorist threats, while making fundamental reforms, such as the end of bulk collection of phone records to protect Americans' privacy and civil liberties.

The provisions of this bill that increase transparency by declassifying decisions, orders, and opinions of the FISA court and requiring the public posting of reports to Congress also ensure that Congress and the public can hold these actors accountable.

These critical reforms strengthen our national security, give the Federal Government the tools needed to combat threats, and ensure that privacy and civil liberties are protected.

Our civil liberties aren't the only rights meriting protection, however. The right to life is the most fundamental of rights, and I am proud the people's House will consider H.R. 36, the Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, getting America out of a group with North Korea, China, and Vietnam as one of only seven nations permitting such late-term abortions.

H.R. 36 provides commonsense protections for 20-week-old and older unborn children who can feel pain as you and I do. They have fingers and toes, a heartbeat, and can kick hard enough to startle their mothers. Thanks to the grace of God and the advances of modern science, many of them can even survive outside the womb.

Millions of Americans welcome these developments, and a majority of our constituents support defending the lives of almost fully developed unborn children. That is no surprise in the wake of Kermit Gosnell's horrors and will only continue as more Americans learn about the dismemberment and other grotesque practices that accompany killing an unborn child of that age.

This legislation is a necessary step in recognizing the truth that science has made more clear with the passage of

time; the unborn child in the womb is alive and a functioning member of the human family.

I urge my colleagues to join me in speaking for those who cannot speak for themselves by supporting this legislation, and I thank all of my eloquent colleagues who came down today to speak on this rule.

Madam Speaker, the rule before us provides for action by the House on three critical pieces of legislation, and I strongly urge my colleagues' support.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule for the underlying H.R. 36, the Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, because it would allow politicians, not women or medical experts to decide women's personal medical decisions.

If it becomes law, H.R. 36 would ban abortion care after 20 weeks.

This is a blatant attempt to deny all women their constitutional rights and it will pose an extremely serious threat to the health of many women in the most desperate of circumstances.

To ban abortion care would block a woman's access to safe health care and deny her ability to make decisions according to her physician's advice.

Supreme Court precedent establishes that a woman has the unequivocal right to choose abortion care until the point of fetal viability.

This twenty-week abortion ban brazenly challenges the Supreme Court's standards and deliberately attempts to push the law earlier and earlier into a woman's pregnancy.

This ban would cause a hardship for women in need of safe, legal, later abortion care for a variety of reasons including menopausal women not expecting to become pregnant and who may not discover it for many weeks.

H.R. 36 interferes with the doctor-patient relationship, the sanctity of which is a cornerstone of medical care in our country.

25,000 women in the United States become pregnant as a result of rape here in the U.S. every year.

Approximately 30 percent of rapes involves women under age 18.

According to the Department of Justice, only 35 percent of women who are raped or sexually assaulted reported the assault to police.

This ban requires women rape victims to report their ordeal before they can terminate pregnancy resulting from rape or incest.

Our vote today on this legislation will have real life consequences.

Take for example the case of Tiffany Campbell.

When she was 19 weeks pregnant, Tiffany and her husband Chris learned her pregnancy was afflicted with a severe case of twin-to-twin transfusion syndrome, a condition where the two fetuses unequally share blood circulation.

This news was devastating to the Campbells.

The diagnosis was that one of the fetuses had a strained heart and acute risk of heart failure while the other had a blood supply that was insufficient to sustain normal development.

The Campbells were told that without a selective termination, they risked the loss of both fetuses.

At 22 weeks, in consultation with their doctors, they made the difficult decision to abort one fetus in order to save the other.

Today, the lifesaving procedure for one of the fetuses would be illegal under the new 20-week ban mode.

Then there is the ordeal that Vikki Stella faced.

Vikki is a diabetic who discovered months into her pregnancy that the fetus she was carrying suffered from several major anomalies and had no chance of survival.

As a result of her diabetic medical condition, Vikki's doctor determined that induced labor and Caesarian section were both riskier procedures for Vikki than an abortion.

The procedure not only protected Vikki from immediate medical risks, but also ensured that she would be able to have children in the future.

As you see from each woman's story, every pregnancy is different.

In fact, none of us here is in the position to decide what is best for a woman and her family in their unique circumstances.

H.R. 36 would deprive women the ability to make very difficult and extremely personal medical decisions.

A woman's health, not politics should drive important medical decisions and ignoring a woman's individual circumstances threatens her health and takes an extremely personal medical decision away from a woman and her health care provider.

The Administration urges Congress in its Statement of Administration Policy to oppose H.R. 36 because it would unacceptably restrict women's health and reproductive right to choose.

Women, regardless of their status in life should be able to make choices about their bodies and their healthcare, and we as elected officials should not inject ourselves into decisions best made between a woman and her doctor.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 186, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 221]

YEAS—240

| | | |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| Abraham | Bucshon | Denham |
| Aderholt | Burgess | Dent |
| Allen | Byrne | DeSantis |
| Amodעי | Calvert | DesJarlais |
| Babin | Carter (GA) | Diaz-Balart |
| Barr | Carter (TX) | Dold |
| Barton | Chabot | Donovan |
| Benishק | Chaffetz | Duffy |
| Bilirakis | Clawson (FL) | Duncan (SC) |
| Bishop (MI) | Coffman | Duncan (TN) |
| Bishop (UT) | Cole | Ellmers (NC) |
| Black | Collins (GA) | Emmer (MN) |
| Blackburn | Collins (NY) | Farenthold |
| Blum | Comstock | Fincher |
| Bost | Conaway | Fitzpatrick |
| Boustany | Cook | Fleischmann |
| Brady (TX) | Costello (PA) | Fleming |
| Brat | Cramer | Flores |
| Bridenstine | Crawford | Forbes |
| Brooks (AL) | Crenshaw | Fortenberry |
| Brooks (IN) | Culberson | Fox |
| Buchanan | Curbelo (FL) | Franks (AZ) |
| Buck | Davis, Rodney | Frelinghuysen |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|----------------|
| Garrett | Luetkemeyer | Ross | Maloney, Sean | Pocan | Speier |
| Gibbs | Lummis | Rothfus | Massie | Polis | Swalwell (CA) |
| Gibson | MacArthur | Rouzer | Matsui | Price (NC) | Takai |
| Gohmert | Marchant | Royce | McCollum | Quigley | Takano |
| Goodlatte | Marino | Russell | McDermott | Rangel | Thompson (CA) |
| Gosar | McCarthy | Ryan (WI) | McGovern | Rice (NY) | Thompson (MS) |
| Gowdy | McCauley | Salmon | McNerney | Richmond | Titus |
| Granger | McClintock | Sanford | Meeks | Roybal-Allard | Tonko |
| Graves (GA) | McHenry | Scalise | Meng | Ruppersberger | Torres |
| Graves (LA) | McKinley | Schweikert | Moore | Rush | Tsongas |
| Griffith | McMorris | Scott, Austin | Moulton | Ryan (OH) | Van Hollen |
| Grothman | Rodgers | Sensenbrenner | Murphy (FL) | Sánchez, Linda | Vargas |
| Guinta | McSally | Sessions | Nadler | T. | Veasey |
| Guthrie | Meadows | Shimkus | Napolitano | Sanchez, Loretta | Vela |
| Hanna | Meehan | Shuster | Neal | Sarbanes | Velázquez |
| Hardy | Messer | Simpson | Nolan | Schakowsky | Visclosky |
| Harper | Mica | Smith (MO) | Norcross | Schiff | Walz |
| Harris | Miller (FL) | Smith (NE) | O'Rourke | Schrader | Wasserman |
| Hartzler | Miller (MI) | Smith (NJ) | Pallone | Scott (VA) | Schultz |
| Heck (NV) | Moolenaar | Smith (TX) | Pascrell | Scott, David | Waters, Maxine |
| Hensarling | Mooney (WV) | Stefanik | Payne | Serrano | Watson Coleman |
| Herrera Beutler | Mullin | Stewart | Pelosi | Sewell (AL) | Welch |
| Hice, Jody B. | Mulvaney | Stivers | Perlmutter | Sherman | Wilson (FL) |
| Hill | Murphy (PA) | Stutzman | Peters | Sinema | Yarmuth |
| Holding | Neugebauer | Thompson (PA) | Peterson | Sires | |
| Hudson | Newhouse | Thornberry | Pingree | Slaughter | |
| Huelskamp | Noem | Tiberi | | | |
| Huizenga (MI) | Nugent | Nunes | | | |
| Hultgren | Nunes | Trott | | | |
| Hunter | Olson | Turner | | | |
| Hurd (TX) | Palazzo | Upton | | | |
| Hurt (VA) | Palmer | Valadao | | | |
| Issa | Paulsen | Pearce | | | |
| Jenkins (KS) | Pearce | Walberg | | | |
| Jenkins (WV) | Perry | Walden | | | |
| Johnson (OH) | Pittenger | Walker | | | |
| Johnson, Sam | Pitts | Walorski | | | |
| Jolly | Poe (TX) | Walters, Mimi | | | |
| Jones | Poliquin | Weber (TX) | | | |
| Jordan | Pompeo | Webster (FL) | | | |
| Joyce | Posey | Wenstrup | | | |
| Katko | Price, Tom | Westerman | | | |
| Kelly (PA) | Ratcliffe | Westmoreland | | | |
| King (IA) | Reed | Whitfield | | | |
| King (NY) | Reichert | Williams | | | |
| Kinzinger (IL) | Renacci | Wilson (SC) | | | |
| Kline | Ribble | Wittman | | | |
| Knight | Rice (SC) | Womack | | | |
| Labrador | Rigell | Woodall | | | |
| LaMalfa | Roby | Yoder | | | |
| Lamborn | Roe (TN) | Yoho | | | |
| Lance | Rogers (AL) | Young (AK) | | | |
| Latta | Rogers (KY) | Young (IA) | | | |
| LoBiondo | Rohrabacher | Young (IN) | | | |
| Long | Rokita | Zeldin | | | |
| Loudermilk | Rooney (FL) | Zinke | | | |
| Love | Ros-Lehtinen | | | | |
| Lucas | Roskam | | | | |

NAYS—186

| | | |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Adams | Crowley | Higgins |
| Aguilar | Cuellar | Himes |
| Amash | Cummings | Honda |
| Ashford | Davis (CA) | Hoyer |
| Bass | Davis, Danny | Huffman |
| Beatty | DeFazio | Israel |
| Becerra | DeGette | Jackson Lee |
| Bera | Delaney | Jeffries |
| Beyer | DeLauro | Johnson (GA) |
| Bishop (GA) | DelBene | Johnson, E. B. |
| Blumenauer | DeSaulnier | Kaptur |
| Bonamici | Deutch | Keating |
| Boyle, Brendan | Dingell | Kelly (IL) |
| F. | Doggett | Kennedy |
| Brady (PA) | Doyle, Michael | Kildee |
| Brown (FL) | F. | Kilmer |
| Brownley (CA) | Duckworth | Kind |
| Bustos | Edwards | Kirkpatrick |
| Butterfield | Ellison | Kuster |
| Capuano | Engel | Langevin |
| Cárdenas | Eshoo | Larsen (WA) |
| Carney | Esty | Larson (CT) |
| Carson (IN) | Farr | Lawrence |
| Cartwright | Fattah | Lee |
| Castor (FL) | Foster | Levin |
| Castro (TX) | Frankel (FL) | Lewis |
| Chu, Judy | Fudge | Lieu, Ted |
| Cicilline | Gabbard | Lipinski |
| Clark (MA) | Gallego | Loeback |
| Clarke (NY) | Garamendi | Lofgren |
| Clay | Graham | Lowenthal |
| Cleaver | Grayson | Lowe |
| Clyburn | Green, Al | Lujan Grisham |
| Cohen | Green, Gene | (NM) |
| Connolly | Grijalva | Luján, Ben Ray |
| Conyers | Gutiérrez | (NM) |
| Cooper | Hahn | Lynch |
| Costa | Hastings | Maloney, |
| Courtney | Heck (WA) | Carolyn |

| | | |
|---------------|------------------|----------------|
| Maloney, Sean | Pocan | Speier |
| Massie | Polis | Swalwell (CA) |
| Matsui | Price (NC) | Takai |
| McCollum | Quigley | Takano |
| McDermott | Rangel | Thompson (CA) |
| McGovern | Rice (NY) | Thompson (MS) |
| McNerney | Richmond | Titus |
| Meeks | Roybal-Allard | Tonko |
| Meng | Ruppersberger | Torres |
| Moore | Rush | Tsongas |
| Moulton | Ryan (OH) | Van Hollen |
| Murphy (FL) | Sánchez, Linda | Vargas |
| Nadler | T. | Veasey |
| Napolitano | Sanchez, Loretta | Vela |
| Neal | Sarbanes | Velázquez |
| Nolan | Schakowsky | Visclosky |
| Norcross | Schiff | Walz |
| O'Rourke | Schrader | Wasserman |
| Pallone | Scott (VA) | Schultz |
| Pascrell | Scott, David | Waters, Maxine |
| Payne | Serrano | Watson Coleman |
| Pelosi | Sewell (AL) | Welch |
| Perlmutter | Sherman | Wilson (FL) |
| Peters | Sinema | Yarmuth |
| Peterson | Sires | |
| Pingree | Slaughter | |

NOT VOTING—6

| | | |
|----------|-------------|------------|
| Barletta | Graves (MO) | Ruiz |
| Capps | Hinojosa | Smith (WA) |

□ 1416

Mr. LUETKEMEYER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE PROCEEDINGS ON MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair may postpone further proceedings today on a motion to recommit as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? There was no objection.

UNITING AND STRENGTHENING AMERICA BY FULFILLING RIGHTS AND ENSURING EFFECTIVE DISCIPLINE OVER MONITORING ACT OF 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 255, I call up the bill (H.R. 2048) to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 255, the amendment printed in part B of House Report 114-111 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2048

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,