

But it was all throughout Chairman NADLER's district on September 11, 2001, that we saw people going into danger while everyone else was running out, and it reminded us of the strength of New Yorkers, the pride and strength and courage of Americans.

There has certainly been great sacrifice since but, most importantly, sacrifice from those who have been victims because of September 11, 2001, either due to the attack that day or service in our military.

As we are here tonight, there are 9/11 first responders who are very sick, and I just want to, right before we close, share one quick story.

This is a constituent of mine from East Hampton. This is a single mother, a sole provider of her 12-year-old son, who lived and worked within blocks of the World Trade Center on 9/11 and during the aftermath.

She said: "My colleagues and I saw it as our patriotic duty to show the terrorists that they could not destroy our neighborhood and way of life."

I think, many times, people forget that, in the aftermath of 9/11, we were not only tending to Ground Zero, but we were rebuilding the spirit of our Nation.

It is thanks to Americans like this constituent of mine and her coworkers and all those who faced the unconscionable horror, who did not cower in fear, that our Nation rose stronger than ever.

In late 2017, she was diagnosed with stage III ovarian cancer, which has never occurred on either side of her family.

Her coworker at the time of 9/11 developed prostate cancer, and three of her coworkers now have an extremely rare skin condition.

In response to learning that the fund is running out of money and would cut claims by 70 percent, she said: "I don't think I can properly express in writing how devastated I feel. Even worse, I feel extremely distraught over the others who are in the same situation as me or who are about to find they are . . . as they will, too, receive a devastating diagnosis like mine."

The one other story is Kevin from Smithtown. I represent a district that is just over 50 miles from Ground Zero, and fighting for my constituents who were affected by September 11 is my job, but it is also very personal.

Kevin is a former NYPD officer who said he "picked up human remains for 2 days, without any hesitation, because at the time that is what had to be done."

He continued to work on and around the pile for close to 12 months.

In January of 2018, Kevin was diagnosed with non-Hodgkin's diffuse large B-cell lymphoma and underwent 6 months of chemotherapy, which left him with devastating symptoms that will stay with him the rest of his life.

He wrote to me about how he missed many important moments and family functions with his children and loved

ones. He said: "To give out awards reduced by 70 percent is a slap in my face and all others that are now suffering," and he is right.

When he was working the pile day and night for months on end, he wasn't thinking about himself or what this might mean for his future. He was thinking about our Nation. He was committed to getting the remains of victims of 9/11 home to those who survived them.

Kevin was there for us, and it is important for all of us to step up to the plate for him.

Lastly, I thank Congresswoman MALONEY, Congressman KING, and Chairman NADLER for taking the lead on this legislation yet again. I thank Congressman ROSE for coleading tonight's Special Order. Hopefully, it is the start of something new and that we will see more often: bipartisan Special Orders on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I think our constituents back home all across America want to see more of us working together to get good things done. It makes them feel good that their government is working for them.

But I will tell you, with regards to the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund, it is not until this Chamber, the Senate, and the President signs it that this is done, fully funded, that we are going to be able to take credit for anything good and right, because this needs to actually get over the finish line.

Tonight is just another positive step. Everyone signing on as cosponsors is a positive step. And I hope that everyone who is watching, whether you are a Member of this Chamber, you are a staffer of a Member of this Chamber, or you are an advocate, that you get involved, cosponsor, to get our numbers up.

I thank Madam Speaker for her leadership tonight with this effort, for presiding over the Chamber during this very important hour, and I yield back the balance of my time.

STATUS OF ABORTION IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, today I would like to address the status of abortion in America.

In the past 2 months, there have been two stories that show a significant shift, I believe, in America regarding the status of abortion.

In New York, one of our original 13 Colonies, they recently expanded the right to have abortions up to 9 months and, as a practical matter, left it to be okay for a baby born alive not to receive protection. The Governor of New York was so proud of this situation that he lit up the World Trade Center and people applauded in the Senate chamber.

In Virginia, another one of our original 13 States, the Governor came out for a bill that also allows 9-month abortions. The morally bereft Governor said that, if a baby was born alive, that baby would only be resuscitated if the mother wanted.

By the way, I want to point out here there is this myth out there that late-term abortions are only for babies who may not survive.

I once heard a speech from a woman who quit a late-term abortion clinic in Ohio. She was there only one day. At that time, there were six babies delivered. Five had no health problems whatsoever, and the other had either spina bifida—I think it was spina bifida. And, of course, many people live productive lives with that disease.

Only 10 years ago, Kermit Gosnell of Philadelphia was convicted of delivering babies alive and killing them after they were born—perhaps hundreds, perhaps thousands.

□ 2045

You can read about them in a book by that name, "Gosnell." There is a movie out as well; kind of very interesting to see the mindset of the abortion industry.

But Gosnell was defiant. When they talked to him after he was convicted, as a practical matter, put in prison for life, he said, in the end, he would be vindicated. And I think when he said vindicated, he meant in 10 years that he felt America would come around to the position that it would be okay to kill a baby born alive.

Who would dream that less than 10 years later, Gosnell may be on the verge of being proven right, and that the moral compass of America had shifted so much that it would be okay to allow a born-alive baby to die.

How did we get here? There are a variety of culprits to blame. Part of it, of course, is the thinly disguised racism of our old friend, Margaret Sanger, founder of Planned Parenthood. And I should point out that even Margaret Sanger, feminist hero, was opposed to abortion because as recently as 60 years ago, even among people of that ilk, that would have been considered something that you could never be for.

But she did want her organization to reduce people from races she considered inferior, and this was typical of the views of the early progressives.

We also have people viewing it also as a way to hold down the people that we consider undesirable.

Justice Ginsberg was quoted in the New York Times that she thought Roe was decided, in part, because of a concern about population growth in populations we don't want too many of. Now, she was subsequently allowed to say that that quote was taken out of context, but that was the quote that was listed. They kind of gave her a chance to try to walk that thing back; a chance that wasn't given STEVE KING.

Later, the same point was made by an article in the Harvard Journal crediting abortion with the reduction in crime rates.

Part of the problem is the usual weight of promiscuous politicians who would obviously be for abortion; people like the Ted Kennedys or Bill Clintons or Bob Packwoods of the world; and, obviously, there are a given number of men who have a vested interest in making sure abortion is always available.

Part of the problem is the pernicious influence of Hollywood. The “Me Too Movement” has opened up eyes as to the mindset of powerful people in Hollywood and that, perhaps, is one of the reasons why the popular culture would be all largely pro-choice to the extreme or pro-abortion to the extreme.

But still, why is it in America that we are such an outlier? John Adams said that this country—that the Constitution was put together for a morally and religious people. The Pilgrims came from Europe to found a more devout country. Yet, in Europe, a much less religious country than ours, the norm is no abortions after 12 weeks. You look around. Germany, 12 weeks; France, 12 weeks; Italy, 90 days; Portugal, 10 weeks.

How did America wind up, in States like New York saying, okay for 9 months?

And you look south of the border. Mexico, most of their states don’t allow abortion to this day; and it is 12 weeks in the area of Mexico City.

So, we will have to look further why did this happen.

I had originally felt, with the advent of the ultrasound, America would become overwhelmingly pro-life. I had toured abortion clinics when the ultrasound was a little bit rare, and I could see the language that was used to mislead America as to what was going on.

In the abortion industry, they don’t use the word “abortion.” They talk about “procedures.” They don’t even use the word “fetus,” much less “baby.” They use the word “tissue.”

But I felt the ultrasound would overcome that language that I felt was one of the reasons abortion was still so common.

So who else can we blame?

Obviously, politicians have dropped the ball. Obviously, we have horrible judges who can look at the Constitution, a document founded for a moral and religious people, and claim that when our forefathers put together that Constitution, they apparently expected abortion to be legal, and abortion being illegal for so much of this country’s history.

To a certain extent, when you look at the judges, I think we have to blame the law schools, you know. Americans, whatever polls you look at, bounce back and forth between what people would say is 50 percent pro-abortion, 50 percent pro-life.

I wonder, in the law schools, the law school students, the law school faculty, what those numbers are, which is maybe one of the reasons why so few of the judges seem to be able to get the appropriate answer here.

But where I would like to put the attention is, where are the churches?

You know, it must be kind of difficult to be a minister or a priest. You have got to come up with 50 or 52 different topics a year to talk about.

Now, we have a situation going on in this country where we peaked out at over a million abortions a year, and we are still over 600,000. You look what is going on in Virginia, and you look at what is going on in New York; and it seems to me there is fertile ground for the priest or minister looking for something to say.

Nevertheless, I have taken to spending the last few weeks kind of talking to people at random as to how often in the past year, when the priests and ministers are looking for 50 different topics to talk about, how often they have addressed the abortion issue.

It is not unusual, as a matter of fact, I would say the majority of people I talked to who go to a church, it is not brought up at all. I mean, I will tell you, it would be very difficult to come up with 50 different topics a year. But how you can come up with 50 different topics a year, and with 600,000 abortions in this country every year, and not deal with that?

But I think a lot of the blame has to lie there. Whenever there are great tragedies in human history, I think people expect the clergy to step up and provide some moral guidance.

So I end this speech by saying three things:

First of all, I ask the pro-life groups not to give up.

Secondly, I ask the politicians to bring forth bills like the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, which, by the way, in itself, shows some weakness, and we have a relatively weak bill. And that is, I guess, what our pro-life position is today, or the bill we can bring to the floor.

It is kind of sad that we didn’t even get a final vote on that in the Senate, but the bill should be brought up to educate America on the state of abortion in America right now.

And finally, and most importantly, I ask the churches to finally step up.

You know, I look on a calendar, and this June there will be five weekends. Okay. So your average priest, your average minister out there is going to have to think of five topics to talk about.

So I would like to ask the people of this country, and any clergy who happen to hear this speech, to devote at least one of those 5 weeks in June to this stain of over 600,000 abortions in this country every year, and ask yourself, what is the right or wrong thing to do?

And if you are one of those clergymen who, over the last year has not addressed this issue—see, I am making your life easier for you, you only have to think of four other things to talk about, rather than the five weekends in June—I ask you to spend one week in June addressing this issue and encour-

aging people to finally say no more of this scourge in the United States.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o’clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 8, 2019, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

329. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Subpart Nomenclature Change [Docket No.: APHIS-2018-0070] received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

330. A letter from the Director, Issuances Staff, OPD/FSIS/USDA, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Eliminating Unnecessary Requirements for Hog Carcass Cleaning [Docket No.: FSIS-2018-0005] (RIN: 0583-AD68) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

331. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Standard Rates of Subsistence Allowance and Commutation Instead of Uniforms for Members of the Senior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps [Docket ID: DOD-2018-OS-0046] (RIN: 0790-AK32) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

332. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Productivity Enhancing Capital Investment (PECI) [Docket ID: DOD-2018-OS-0084] (RIN: 0790-AK46) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

333. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Retired Serviceman’s Family Protection Plan (RSFPP) [Docket ID: DOD-2018-OS-0058] (RIN: 0790-AK31) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

334. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Availability of DoD Directives, DoD Instructions, DoD Publications, and Changes [Docket ID: DOD-2019-OS-0004] (RIN: 0790-AK48) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

335. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, Division of Investment Management, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission’s interim final rule — Amendments To The Timing Requirements