United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JULY 15, 2022 No. 117

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, July 18, 2022, at 3 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, JULY 15, 2022

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. HAYES).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 15, 2022.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JAHANA HAYES to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Holy, holy, holy Lord, fill the Earth with the knowledge of Your glory. As the waters cover the sea, the stars inhabit the celestial heavens, the birds fill the air with their song, the majesty of the animals roam the forest and plains, so may Your sovereign presence reign in our lives, in this place, and in our Nation.

Lift up our eyes to the hills that we may discover from whence our help does come. You who made Heaven and Earth, speak Your creative word into our discourse, Your compassion into our engagements with one another.

Lord, You are our keeper, You watch over us so that the harshness of the day will not overtake us, the dark of the night will not overwhelm us.

Keep us, then, from all harm. Guard our comings and goings within Your eternal grace plan that we may live to sing of Your praises and accomplish the work You set before us.

In Your merciful name we pray and by Your grace we live.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(a) of House Resolution 188, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CONGRATULATING MARK FLEGENHEIMER ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize a longtime leader in our community, Mark Flegenheimer, as he retires from Michigan Sugar.

Mark has been in the sugar industry for 40 years. He first started with Michigan Sugar in 1994 before quickly moving up to become president and CEO in 1998, where he succeeded his father.

At one point, the sugar beet industry was on the brink of collapse in Michigan, a fate that many other communities across the country suffered, but through Mark's leadership and the determination of the beet growers and those who work with him, they got through these really difficult times. During Mark's tenure, in fact, Michigan Sugar has doubled its output while using 40 percent less energy to save costs and to protect the environment.

In mid-Michigan, we have thousands of family farms, including sugar beet growers. Every day they work with and depend on Michigan Sugar, and so we thank Mark for all he has done over the years.

Mark is not only a great businessman but also a really good guy, a great part of our community. He volunteers his time as a member of the Delta College Foundation board of directors and as vice chairman of the board at the Midland Center for the Arts.

Mark, thank you for your dedication to mid-Michigan, and congratulations on your retirement.

Printed on recycled paper.

SMITH FAMILY CELEBRATING 400 YEARS IN AMERICA

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Smith family ahead of their 400th anniversary of arriving to the United States.

In 1622, William Smith traveled across the ocean from England and made landfall just north of Plymouth. Mr. Smith, like so many of the original Pilgrims, left England in search of a new life as a result of religious persecution. Being Methodist in a mostly Puritan colony meant he and his family were considered strangers and outsiders in their English community.

The Smith family eventually made their way to Jefferson County, Pennsylvania, in 1816, which they have now called home for more than 200 years.

Madam Speaker, this weekend, the Smith family will gather in Clarion, Pennsylvania, to mark 400 years in the United States in the form of a family reunion. Their uniquely American story deserves to be celebrated, and I want to extend my sincerest congratulations to the Smith family for their longstanding history in the United States.

LET'S REPAIR THE WORLD

(Ms. DEAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, we all feel horror, sadness, and anger as we learn more about the horrific shooting in Uvalde, Texas, and the police officers' lack of response.

I wondered, what were they afraid of? One part of the answer is clear: semiautomatic weapons.

For the sake of us all, we must pass the assault weapons ban, just as we did in 1994.

Let us remember, the ban was backed by three former Presidents: Gerald Ford, Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan. And it was supported by police leadership then as it is today.

Republicans in 1994 had the courage to stand up to the gun lobby, and yet Republicans in 2022 cannot find such courage. I don't know why. Instead, they blame DAs and mayors and really anyone but themselves, ourselves.

We are Members of Congress with the power to ban weapons that civilians are using to murder neighbors, strangers, children, and even police officers.

No more decapitated children.

No more slaughtered shoppers or parade goers.

Let us find the courage to act. Tikkun olam, as the Jewish tradition teaches. Let us repair the world.

VETERANS-TO-CLASSROOMS PROGRAM

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

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend the much-needed pay raise for our military, passed yesterday in a bill that provides critical resources to confront the national security threats from China and from Russia.

I would also like to highlight one of my amendments. Simply put, my amendment provides funding to help veterans pursue careers in education—as teachers and as school resource officers.

The House passage of this amendment is a win for everyone:

For veterans who want to pursue a career in education.

For schools who need more qualified teachers and resource officers.

And for students who will be able to learn from worthy role models about service, sacrifice and patriotism.

The Veterans-to-Classrooms program will be an excellent opportunity for veterans to continue to serve our country.

SAFEGUARDING WOMEN'S RIGHTS

(Ms. MANNING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MANNING. Madam Speaker, in the Supreme Court decision to overturn Roe v. Wade, Justice Thomas wrote an alarming concurring opinion explicitly calling for the reconsideration of the constitutional right to contraception.

Republican State lawmakers have attempted to restrict birth control for years, and this concurring opinion serves as a rallying call to escalate attacks on access to contraceptives.

I will not stand idly by and watch extreme politicians obstruct women's private healthcare choices and diminish reproductive freedom. Access to birth control is key to achieving gender equality, improving health outcomes for women, bolstering educational and economic opportunities for all, and ensuring people are in control of their family planning.

That is why this week I introduced the Right to Contraception Act. My bill would codify the right to access birth control into Federal law and put a stop to violations of Americans' right to this essential reproductive healthcare.

I urgently ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support my legislation to protect birth control and safeguard women's right to make their decisions about their own bodies and futures.

REMEMBERING ARTEZ BENTON

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the life of a young man from my alma mater, Artez Benton.

A talented baseball player at Young Harris College, Artez tragically lost his life this past month while in Atlanta.

Born in Scottdale, Georgia, Artez was a star on the Druid Hills High School baseball team. He chose to continue his athletic career at Young Harris as an infielder for the Mountain Lions.

Artez was wise beyond his years, hardworking, and was working to become a certified electrician with dreams of owning his own home. He would begin his days at 4:00 in the morning, studying for his apprenticeship, and despite his busy and long days, Artez was sure to make time to help his father with his landscaping company and to teach his young nephew the sport he loved so dearly.

This tragedy has rocked the Young Harris community and has stolen a bright future from a young man and his family. My heart aches for the Benton family, and my prayers reside with them in this terribly difficult time.

ABORTION RIGHTS MUST BE CODIFIED

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, 1973 Roe is decided. From that day forward, Republicans have been desperate to overturn it. Twenty-one days ago, a rightwing majority on the Supreme Court overturned Roe v. Wade.

Make no mistake, these rightwing extremists are not pro-life, but pro-controlling the bodies of women, girls, and anyone who can become pregnant.

Abortion is now illegal in 16 States, and anti-abortion legislators are following suit, threatening to make abortion inaccessible for roughly 33 million women across America. And they are not done. Republicans have been clear they will not stop until abortion is banned nationwide.

Later today, the House will pass an updated version of the Women's Health Protection Act, which would establish a Federal statutory right to abortion. The Senate must follow suit and abolish the filibuster, and we must secure pro-choice majorities in the House and Senate. Our lives depend upon it.

MEXICAN CARTELS GROWING MARIJUANA IN CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, the Biden administration's open border policies are wreaking havoc across our Nation, causing crime to spike, even in my home district in northern California.

Hidden under the cover of our magnificent, forested wildlands, Mexican

cartels are using our porous borders as easy access to Federal lands to grow illegal marijuana crops.

Even though cannabis products are legal under California law, truly they are still illegal under Federal law. These illegal grows are dangerous and cause irreversible harm to the landscape and animals.

These grows are guarded by dangerous cartel members with illegal weapons that they smuggle across the border. This puts local residents, foresters, and outdoor recreationists at grave risk if they accidentally come across or near a grow.

Butte County in northern California, my home county, is designated now as a Federal high-intensity drug trafficking area. Thanks a lot.

These illegal farmers use toxic pesticides that are outlawed by the U.S. and unavailable to American growers anymore. These chemicals run off into nearby water sources, poisoning the animals and killing off plant life. They cut off water from other farmers and rivers and cause much damage to the environment.

This drug trafficking must be stopped.

WE CANNOT GO BACK

(Ms. GARCIA of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in outrage at the cruel attacks extreme Republicans have launched on women and their rights.

Because of these MAGA Republicans, our daughters will have less freedom than their mothers for the first time in American history.

This has been their plan all along. As this graphic behind me shows, women have been fighting Republican attacks for decades, and it has been a tough fight. But House Democrats won't give up. We cannot go back. We won't give up because we trust women.

Today, we will pass two bills to protect women, their rights, and their freedoms—the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act and the Women's Health Protection Act—for the second time.

Democrats are the party that stand with women. Without them, we cannot be a better America. We always have and always will be with women. We trust women.

□ 0915

MORE SPENDING IS NOT THE SOLUTION FOR INFLATION

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

Mr. ROSE. Madam Speaker, consumer prices climbed another 1.3 percent last month, bringing the Nation's total annual rate of inflation to 9.1 percent. The cost of making goods shot up, too. The producer price index hit a whopping 11.3 percent. It is costing Tennesseans and all American families an extra $5,000 a year.

There seems to be a growing consensus that we are heading toward a recession. I continue to believe that it didn't have to be this way. The Fed wouldn't have to raise interest rates had President Biden and Congressional Democrats resisted the urge to borrow and spend trillions and trillions of dollars we did not have and couldn't afford to spend.

What is their solution for getting us out of this mess? Even more spending.

But only increasing domestic production of our natural energy resources can get us back on track. President Biden appears to prefer the destruction of our country's fossil fuel energy industry rather than using it to bring the price of gasoline and diesel back down.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

FORMULA ACT

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8351) to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to suspend temporarily rates of duty on imports of certain infant formula products, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 8351

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Formula Act''.

SEC. 2. TEMPORARY DUTY SUSPENSIONS FOR INFANT FORMULA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 99 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS) is amended by inserting the following new subheadings in numerical sequence:

''		Infant formula, put up for retail sale:				
	9903.19.19	Provided for in subheading 1901.10.16, 1901.10.26, 1901.10.36 or 1901.10.44	Free	No change	No change	
	9903.19.20	Provided for in subheading 1901.10.29 or 1901.10.49	Free	No change	No change	
		Infant formula:				
	9903.19.21	Provided for in subheading 2106.90.97	Free	No change	No change	
	9903.19.22	Provided for in subheading 2106.90.99	Free	No change	No change	''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to goods entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption on or after the date of enactment of this Act and before the close of December 31, 2022.

(c) WAIVER OF OTHER DUTIES OR SAFEGUARDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the period described in subsection (b), articles of infant formula that are classifiable under any subheading added by the amendments made by subsection (a) shall not be subject to—

(1) any additional safeguard duties that may be imposed under subchapter IV of chapter 99 of the HTS; or

(2) any other import quotas, tariff-rate quotas, additional duties, or any other duties, fees, exactions, or charges that otherwise would apply to such articles.

(d) ENTRY REQUIREMENTS.—In seeking to enter articles of infant formula duty-free under this Act, importers shall provide the applicable tariff classification for such articles under chapter 19 or chapter 21 along with the anticipated tariff classification under subchapter III of chapter 99 (as added by subsection (a)) on applicable customs entry documents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The news about supply chain disruptions have filled the news, but none is more compelling and urgent for communities across America than facing challenges due to the infant formula shortage. This is an urgent issue for our families.

Between supply chain issues due to the pandemic and the closure of a Michigan infant formula plant, out-of-stock rates have reached perilous levels. The out-of-stock rate was 31 percent in mid-April and rose to 90 percent in 10 States by the end of May. In my State, Oregon, we faced an out-of-stock rate higher than 85 percent.

While these numbers alone tell a horrific story, there is no number that can capture the fear and frustration felt by families who are searching for formula to serve their babies. As a parent and grandparent, I can assure you that there is nothing as anxiety- and anger-

inducing as not being able to properly care for your child.

I have heard stories of families going store to store or posting on social media asking for help as they try to find the formula their family needs. Families have enough to worry about without worrying about how to feed their baby.

The Federal Government must provide the support needed to help these children and families and explore every possible option. This administration and Congress has made significant progress by invoking the Defense Production Act, increasing flexibility for the WIC program, and easing restrictions on imports to fill supply chain shortages.

While the FDA has exercised enforcement discretion to increase imports, imported infant formula remains subject to high tariffs. These tariffs, which increase the cost of the formula imports by an estimated 27 percent, only exaggerate the suffering families face at this time.

It is unacceptable that families would be taxed on a product that they need and have no other way of getting in the midst of this crisis. Our Ways and Means Trade Subcommittee is committed to leveraging our jurisdiction to reduce these costs.

I especially appreciate my colleague SUZAN DELBENE for her partnership and leadership on this legislation. She was integral to this effort, and we wouldn't be here today without her.

The Formula Act reaffirms Congress' constitutional authority to regulate commerce from foreign nations by temporarily suspending tariffs on imported infant formula through the end of this year. This change should help make formula more affordable and accessible to families in every State.

I am grateful for the support of Chairman NEAL; Ranking Member BRADY; Ranking Member SMITH, who is managing the bill for the Republicans; and the Ways and Means Committee in bringing this bipartisan legislation to the floor today.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 8351, the Formula Act.

I appreciate Mr. BLUMENAUER and his willingness to work with me on this bipartisan effort to address our Nation's infant formula shortage.

The Formula Act makes infant formula more accessible and affordable by allowing it to be imported duty-free through the end of the year.

Make no mistake: Mothers and families should never have to experience the extreme despair of worrying whether shelves will be stocked with the formula they need for their infants.

As a father of two, including a 1-year-old, I think I can speak for many others across America that nothing is more important than the health and well-being of our children.

The Biden administration knew of the looming infant formula shortage for months and yet failed to develop a strategy or adequately respond. While we wait for domestic production to fully resume, families should not have to pay additional taxes on imported formula to feed their little ones.

I will continue to work with my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee, as well as the full House, to use trade tools to strengthen critical supply chains like infant formula.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), a committee member and a leader on this issue.

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address the ongoing baby formula crisis and urge my colleagues to support the Formula Act.

I raised two kids, and I know the first months of parenthood are tiring and stressful, even in the best of situations.

Now, families across the country are in a dire position as they try to find the formula that they need to feed their babies.

Around the country, 74 percent of formula shelves are empty. In my home State of Washington, we are one of 10 States where over 90 percent of shelves are empty.

Severely stretched supply chains and a major formula plant going offline have left shelves barren. Unreliable formula supply is a critical problem for families. Parents are driving hours to multiple different stores just to find any formula, and that is time that parents don't have.

Changing formulas constantly is also disruptive to babies. It causes digestive problems and excessive crying.

Jessie, a mom in my district, has been struggling to find formula for her infant daughter, Amara. She is not one to ask for help, but when she was running low on her last can, Jessie joined a local social media group where other parents would post where they saw formula on shelves, and she downloaded an app that would notify her when more cans were available. Jessie was able to find formula, but she realizes that she is one of the lucky parents who had the means, the time, and the network to support Amara.

By removing tariffs on foreign formula that meets FDA's safety standards, the Formula Act will make it easier and more affordable for parents to feed their babies so fewer are finding themselves in this difficult situation. This is a commonsense solution, so let's make it happen.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MURPHY), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 8351, the Formula Act.

I thank my friend from Nebraska, Mr. ADRIAN SMITH, and Mr. BLUMENAUER for their leadership on this bill.

With families facing record-high inflation, with record-high food and gas prices, the last thing that parents need to worry about is being able to find formula, much less being able then to afford it.

H.R. 8351 ensures that families are not covering the cost of additional taxes on formula imported into the United States, and I am pleased with the relief that this bill will provide.

But, unfortunately, as has been the mantra of this administration, this crisis exemplifies just another self-inflicted wound that has been the point of the Biden administration. The administration knew about the impending shortage and failed to act to avert the crisis.

The incompetence of this administration has real world effects. We are talking about something that is basic sustenance for infants in this country. They need this, and this bill will help bring affordability to parents for their children.

Madam Speaker, I thank, again, my colleagues and encourage their support of this legislation.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation to lower prices for families I represent in mid-Michigan, and I thank Chairman BLUMENAUER for his leadership on this very important issue.

Production of infant formula in this country isn't working properly. It is not getting to the shelves, and it is denying families what they need at the most important time in the development of the life of a child. After product recalls, corporate consolidations, and obviously pandemic-related supply chain issues, this is a real struggle for American families.

As parents raising three kids, my wife and I empathize with those anxious parents out there who are struggling to find formula for their newborn children. That is why Congress has to act to increase imports of formula until domestic production can get back to the point where we can supply our domestic needs with our own production capacity.

However, as has been said, some formula imports are still subject to really high tariffs, up to 27 percent, and there is no reason at this moment that American families who are struggling should have to pay that additional cost. They shouldn't have to pay more for something that is absolutely necessary for their children.

That is why we introduced this legislation, supported by Republicans and Democrats, to suspend these formula import tariffs for the rest of the year and to lower costs for families with children. I really do urge my colleagues, all of us, to join. This is something we ought to be able to do together to immediately reduce prices

for families who have needs, for families with small children, to make sure that until we can get our domestic production back online, we can supply what we need at a cost that is affordable to those families that are simply trying to take care of their kids. That is our obligation. That is why we swore the oath to come here and do this work. We have the tools in our hands to get this done.

I urge my colleagues to join us in this effort.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, Mr. BLUMENAUER, for his leadership and his cosponsor from Nebraska for his leadership.

Ninety percent of the stores in Houston are without baby formula. Texas was one of the hardest hit States. One of the most potent, powerful, and sad days was when I was able to find baby formula from a disaster organization, and in my district, in those early days, had a baby formula giveaway. Volunteers were looking to make sure that we were not giving out expired-date formula. All I can say is the lines of cars and the women who stopped to get out of the car to simply hug us, the strollers that came up—baby formula is a lifeline.

□ 0930

Baby formula is a lifeline. This legislation breaks the crisis of the supply chain and provides a regulatory scheme that ensures we can have production.

The disappointing aspect of all of this is the shutdown of the center point of manufacturing, if you will, and many were not notified. This legislation says that we are committed as Members of the United States Congress to modify safety requirements to the extent that no formula is jeopardized but that the lifeline for babies is our first priority.

I am grateful for this legislation because the shelves in Houston, Texas, are gradually coming back. They are not there yet. Just a few weeks ago, we had one of the largest cargo planes land at Bush Intercontinental Airport. The gratification of families was unspeakable, could not be mentioned.

This cannot ever happen again. It is important for Congress to be advanced and prepared to ensure that babies, who are innocent and without the ability to speak, are taken care of.

Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. BLUMENAUER for this kind of leadership. Thank God relief is on the way.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the dialogue that we have been having here today. I think it is important, as my colleague just mentioned, that we work together to make sure this doesn't happen again.

I think we need to look across the Federal agencies to make sure that these very powerful agencies that have the power to shut down an industry, perhaps, that they have to plan ahead for what happens if that occurs so that people don't suffer as a result.

When we hear the statistics that 90 percent of stores didn't have something, that means they had none, not just more expensive product that we see across the economy. It is hard to believe that the inflation rate is announced at 9.1 percent when it sure seems like things are a lot more expensive than just 9.1 percent more than last year.

The fact of the matter is, let's work together to prevent this formula situation from ever happening again.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the partnership with my good friend, Mr. SMITH. We have been able to move this expeditiously. I do appreciate his observation that there are challenges that we meet, and we would hope that our government and the various agencies that are involved are able to respond quickly. That, of course, is something that we need to empower them to do, these partnerships.

Sometimes there is a little tension about the role and nature of government agencies, but this is an example, admittedly, where we want to get ahead of the curve, and the powers that agencies have can be used constructively.

I am pleased that our committee, for example, sprang into action dealing with the invasion of Ukraine by Russia to suspend tariff advantages for Russia, and we moved that quickly on a bipartisan basis. Particularly in this case we have 26 members of the Ways and Means Committee who are cosponsoring this legislation, and it was able to move quickly.

Unlike what often happens with things we pass in the House that linger in the Senate, it looks like the Senate is poised to be able to act quickly in response to our action here today.

So I hope we come together. I hope we have a unanimous vote that would suspend this 27 percent additional cost on families struggling to meet the needs of their children. I hope that we can continue to look at areas where we need to refine tools to make sure that things like this don't happen again and we work together to try to hit the right balance.

In the meantime, I think we have hit the right balance with this legislation. I appreciate the partnership, and I look forward to its passage today.

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I am finished, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 8351.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT OF 2022

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1224, I call up the bill (H.R. 8296) to protect a person's ability to determine whether to continue or end a pregnancy, and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide abortion services, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1224, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 8296

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Women's Health Protection Act of 2022''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) On June 24, 2022, in its decision in Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization, the Supreme Court overruled Roe v. Wade, reversing decades of precedent recognizing the constitutional right to terminate a pregnancy before fetal viability, and to terminate a pregnancy after fetal viability where it is necessary, in the good-faith medical judgment of the treating health care professional, for the preservation of the life or health of the person who is pregnant.

(2) In their joint dissent, Justices Breyer, Sotomayor, and Kagan write, ''[The majority] says that from the very moment of fertilization, a woman has no rights to speak of. A State can force her to bring a pregnancy to term, even at the steepest personal and familial costs.''.

(3) The dissenting Justices continue, ''The Mississippi law at issue here bars abortions after the 15th week of pregnancy. Under the majority's ruling, though, another State's law could do so after ten weeks, or five or three or one—or, again, from the moment of fertilization. States have already passed such laws, in anticipation of today's ruling. More will follow.''.

(4) The dissenting Justices also stated, ''one result of [the] decision is certain; the curtailment of women's rights, and of their status as free and equal citizens.''.

(5) Indeed, some States acted to ban abortion outright in the immediate aftermath of the Dobbs decision, with half the States in the country expected to ban abortion entirely in the days and weeks to come.

(6) Even before Roe was overturned, access to abortion services had been obstructed across the United States in various ways, including blockades of health care facilities

and associated violence, prohibitions of, and restrictions on, insurance coverage; parental involvement laws (notification and consent); restrictions that shame and stigmatize people seeking abortion services; and medically unnecessary regulations that neither confer any health benefit nor further the safety of abortion services, but which harm people by delaying, complicating access to, and reducing the availability of, abortion services.

(7) Abortion services are essential to health care, and access to those services is central to people's ability to participate equally in the economic and social life of the United States. Abortion access allows people who are pregnant to make their own decisions about their pregnancies, their families, and their lives.

(8) Reproductive justice requires every individual to have the right to make their own decisions about having children regardless of their circumstances and without interference and discrimination. Reproductive Justice is a human right that can and will be achieved when all people, regardless of actual or perceived race, color, national origin, immigration status, sex (including gender identity, sex stereotyping, or sexual orientation), age, or disability status have the economic, social, and political power and resources to define and make decisions about their bodies, health, sexuality, families, and communities in all areas of their lives, with dignity and self-determination.

(9) Reproductive justice seeks to address restrictions on reproductive health, including abortion, that perpetuate systems of oppression, lack of bodily autonomy, white supremacy, and anti-Black racism. This violent legacy has manifested in policies including enslavement, rape, and experimentation on Black women; forced sterilizations; medical experimentation on low-income women's reproductive systems; and the forcible removal of Indigenous children. Access to equitable reproductive health care, including abortion services, has always been deficient in the United States for Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color (BIPOC) and their families.

(10) The legacy of restrictions on reproductive health, rights, and justice is not a dated vestige of a dark history. Presently, the harms of abortion-specific restrictions fall especially heavily on people with low incomes, BIPOC, immigrants, young people, people with disabilities, and those living in rural and other medically underserved areas. Abortion-specific restrictions are even more compounded by the ongoing criminalization of people who are pregnant, including those who are incarcerated, living with HIV, or with substance-use disorders. These communities already experience health disparities due to social, political, and environmental inequities, and restrictions on abortion services exacerbate these harms. Removing medically unjustified restrictions on abortion services would constitute one important step on the path toward realizing Reproductive Justice by ensuring that the full range of reproductive health care is accessible to all who need it.

(11) Abortion-specific restrictions are a tool of gender oppression, as they target health care services that are used primarily by women. These paternalistic restrictions rely on and reinforce harmful stereotypes about gender roles, women's decision-making, and women's need for protection instead of support, undermining their ability to control their own lives and well-being. These restrictions harm the basic autonomy, dignity, and equality of women, and their ability to participate in the social and economic life of the Nation.

(12) The terms ''woman'' and ''women'' are used in this bill to reflect the identity of the majority of people targeted and affected by restrictions on abortion services, and to address squarely the targeted restrictions on abortion, which are rooted in misogyny. However, access to abortion services is critical to the health of every person capable of becoming pregnant. This Act is intended to protect all people with the capacity for pregnancy—cisgender women, transgender men, non-binary individuals, those who identify with a different gender, and others—who are unjustly harmed by restrictions on abortion services.

(13) Since 2011, States and local governments have passed nearly 500 restrictions singling out health care providers who offer abortion services, interfering with their ability to provide those services and the patients' ability to obtain those services.

(14) Many State and local governments have imposed restrictions on the provision of abortion services that are neither evidence-based nor generally applicable to the medical profession or to other medically comparable outpatient gynecological procedures, such as endometrial ablations, dilation and curettage for reasons other than abortion, hysteroscopies, loop electrosurgical excision procedures, or other analogous non-gynecological procedures performed in similar outpatient settings including vasectomy, sigmoidoscopy, and colonoscopy.

(15) Abortion is essential health care and one of the safest medical procedures in the United States. An independent, comprehensive review of the state of science on the safety and quality of abortion services, published by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine in 2018, found that abortion in the United States is safe and effective and that the biggest threats to the quality of abortion services in the United States are State regulations that create barriers to care. These abortion-specific restrictions conflict with medical standards and are not supported by the recommendations and guidelines issued by leading reproductive health care professional organizations including the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the Society of Family Planning, the National Abortion Federation, the World Health Organization, and others.

(16) Many abortion-specific restrictions do not confer any health or safety benefits on the patient. Instead, these restrictions have the purpose and effect of unduly burdening people's personal and private medical decisions to end their pregnancies by making access to abortion services more difficult, invasive, and costly, often forcing people to travel significant distances and make multiple unnecessary visits to the provider, and in some cases, foreclosing the option altogether. For example, a 2018 report from the University of California San Francisco's Advancing New Standards in Reproductive Health research group found that in 27 cities across the United States, people have to travel more than 100 miles in any direction to reach an abortion provider.

(17) An overwhelming majority of abortions in the United States are provided in clinics, not hospitals, but the large majority of counties throughout the United States have no clinics that provide abortion.

(18) These restrictions additionally harm people's health by reducing access not only to abortion services but also to other essential health care services offered by many of the providers targeted by the restrictions, including—

(A) screenings and preventive services, including contraceptive services;

(B) testing and treatment for sexually transmitted infections;

(C) LGBTQ health services; and

(D) referrals for primary care, intimate partner violence prevention, prenatal care and adoption services.

(19) The cumulative effect of these numerous restrictions has been to severely limit, and now eliminate entirely, the availability of abortion services in some areas, creating a patchwork system where the provision of abortion services is legal in some States and illegal in others. A 2019 report from the Government Accountability Office examining State Medicaid compliance with abortion coverage requirements analyzed seven key challenges (identified both by health care providers and research literature) and their effect on abortion access, and found that access to abortion services varied across the States and even within a State.

(20) International human rights law recognizes that access to abortion is intrinsically linked to the rights to life, health, equality and non-discrimination, privacy, and freedom from ill-treatment. United Nations (UN) human rights treaty monitoring bodies have found that legal abortion services, like other reproductive health care services, must be available, accessible, affordable, acceptable, and of good quality. UN human rights treaty bodies have likewise condemned medically unnecessary barriers to abortion services, including mandatory waiting periods, biased counseling requirements, and third-party authorization requirements.

(21) Core human rights treaties ratified by the United States protect access to abortion. For example, in 2018, the UN Human Rights Committee, which oversees implementation of the ICCPR, made clear that the right to life, enshrined in Article 6 of the ICCPR, at a minimum requires governments to provide safe, legal, and effective access to abortion where a person's life and health is at risk, or when carrying a pregnancy to term would cause substantial pain or suffering. The Committee stated that governments must not impose restrictions on abortion which subject women and girls to physical or mental pain or suffering, discriminate against them, arbitrarily interfere with their privacy, or place them at risk of undertaking unsafe abortions. Furthermore, the Committee stated that governments should remove existing barriers that deny effective access to safe and legal abortion, refrain from introducing new barriers to abortion, and prevent the stigmatization of those seeking abortion.

(22) UN independent human rights experts have expressed particular concern about barriers to abortion services in the United States. For example, at the conclusion of his 2017 visit to the United States, the UN Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights noted concern that low-income women face legal and practical obstacles to exercising their constitutional right to access abortion services, trapping many women in cycles of poverty. Similarly, in May 2020, the UN Working Group on discrimination against women and girls, along with other human rights experts, expressed concern that some states had manipulated the COVID–19 crisis to restrict access to abortion, which the experts recognized as ''the latest example illustrating a pattern of restrictions and retrogressions in access to legal abortion care across the country'' and reminded U.S. authorities that abortion care constitutes essential health care that must remain available during and after the pandemic. They noted that barriers to abortion access exacerbate systemic inequalities and cause particular harm to marginalized communities, including low-income people, people of color, immigrants, people with disabilities, and LGBTQ people.

(23) Abortion-specific restrictions affect the cost and availability of abortion services, and the settings in which abortion services are delivered. People travel across State lines and otherwise engage in interstate commerce to access this essential medical care, and more would be forced to do so absent this Act. Likewise, health care providers travel across State lines and otherwise engage in interstate commerce in order to provide abortion services to patients, and more would be forced to do so absent this Act.

(24) Health care providers engage in a form of economic and commercial activity when they provide abortion services, and there is an interstate market for abortion services.

(25) Abortion restrictions substantially affect interstate commerce in numerous ways. For example, to provide abortion services, health care providers engage in interstate commerce to purchase medicine, medical equipment, and other necessary goods and services. To provide and assist others in providing abortion services, health care providers engage in interstate commerce to obtain and provide training. To provide abortion services, health care providers employ and obtain commercial services from doctors, nurses, and other personnel who engage in interstate commerce and travel across State lines.

(26) It is difficult and time and resource-consuming for clinics to challenge State laws that burden or impede abortion services. Litigation that blocks one abortion restriction may not prevent a State from adopting other similarly burdensome abortion restrictions or using different methods to burden or impede abortion services. There is a history and pattern of States passing successive and different laws that unduly burden abortion services.

(27) When a health care provider ceases providing abortion services as a result of burdensome and medically unnecessary regulations, it is often difficult or impossible for that health care provider to recommence providing those abortion services, and difficult or impossible for other health care providers to provide abortion services that restore or replace the ceased abortion services.

(28) Health care providers are subject to license laws in various jurisdictions, which are not affected by this Act except as provided in this Act.

(29) Congress has the authority to enact this Act to protect abortion services pursuant to—

(A) its powers under the commerce clause of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States;

(B) its powers under section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States to enforce the provisions of section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment; and

(C) its powers under the necessary and proper clause of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

(30) Congress has used its authority in the past to protect access to abortion services and health care providers' ability to provide abortion services. In the early 1990s, protests and blockades at health care facilities where abortion services were provided, and associated violence, increased dramatically and reached crisis level, requiring Congressional action. Congress passed the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act (Public Law 103–259; 108 Stat. 694) to address that situation and protect physical access to abortion services.

(31) Congressional action is necessary to put an end to harmful restrictions, to federally protect access to abortion services for everyone regardless of where they live, and to protect the ability of health care providers to provide these services in a safe and accessible manner.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this Act—

(1) to permit health care providers to provide abortion services without limitations or requirements that single out the provision of abortion services for restrictions that are more burdensome than those restrictions imposed on medically comparable procedures, do not significantly advance reproductive health or the safety of abortion services, and make abortion services more difficult to access;

(2) to promote access to abortion services and women's ability to participate equally in the economic and social life of the United States; and

(3) to invoke Congressional authority, including the powers of Congress under the commerce clause of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States, its powers under section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States to enforce the provisions of section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment, and its powers under the necessary and proper clause of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ABORTION SERVICES.—The term ''abortion services'' means an abortion and any medical or non-medical services related to and provided in conjunction with an abortion (whether or not provided at the same time or on the same day as the abortion).

(2) GOVERNMENT.—The term ''government'' includes each branch, department, agency, instrumentality, and official of the United States or a State.

(3) HEALTH CARE PROVIDER.—The term ''health care provider'' means any entity or individual (including any physician, certified nurse-midwife, nurse practitioner, and physician assistant) that—

(A) is engaged or seeks to engage in the delivery of health care services, including abortion services; and

(B) if required by law or regulation to be licensed or certified to engage in the delivery of such services—

(i) is so licensed or certified; or

(ii) would be so licensed or certified but for their past, present, or potential provision of abortion services permitted by section 4.

(4) MEDICALLY COMPARABLE PROCEDURE.—The term ''medically comparable procedures'' means medical procedures that are similar in terms of health and safety risks to the patient, complexity, or the clinical setting that is indicated.

(5) PREGNANCY.—The term ''pregnancy'' refers to the period of the human reproductive process beginning with the implantation of a fertilized egg.

(6) STATE.—The term ''State'' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and each territory and possession of the United States, and any subdivision of any of the foregoing, including any unit of local government, such as a county, city, town, village, or other general purpose political subdivision of a State.

(7) VIABILITY.—The term ''viability'' means the point in a pregnancy at which, in the good-faith medical judgment of the treating health care provider, based on the particular facts of the case before the health care provider, there is a reasonable likelihood of sustained fetal survival outside the uterus with or without artificial support.

SEC. 4. PERMITTED SERVICES.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—A health care provider has a statutory right under this Act to provide abortion services, and may provide abortion services, and that provider's patient has a corresponding right to receive such services, without any of the following limitations or requirements:

(1) A requirement that a health care provider perform specific tests or medical procedures in connection with the provision of abortion services, unless generally required for the provision of medically comparable procedures.

(2) A requirement that the same health care provider who provides abortion services also perform specified tests, services, or procedures prior to or subsequent to the abortion.

(3) A requirement that a health care provider offer or provide the patient seeking abortion services medically inaccurate information in advance of or during abortion services.

(4) A limitation on a health care provider's ability to prescribe or dispense drugs based on current evidence-based regimens or the provider's good-faith medical judgment, other than a limitation generally applicable to the medical profession.

(5) A limitation on a health care provider's ability to provide abortion services via telemedicine, other than a limitation generally applicable to the provision of medical services via telemedicine.

(6) A requirement or limitation concerning the physical plant, equipment, staffing, or hospital transfer arrangements of facilities where abortion services are provided, or the credentials or hospital privileges or status of personnel at such facilities, that is not imposed on facilities or the personnel of facilities where medically comparable procedures are performed.

(7) A requirement that, prior to obtaining an abortion, a patient make one or more medically unnecessary in-person visits to the provider of abortion services or to any individual or entity that does not provide abortion services.

(8) A prohibition on abortion at any point or points in time prior to fetal viability, including a prohibition or restriction on a particular abortion procedure.

(9) A prohibition on abortion after fetal viability when, in the good-faith medical judgment of the treating health care provider, continuation of the pregnancy would pose a risk to the pregnant patient's life or health.

(10) A limitation on a health care provider's ability to provide immediate abortion services when that health care provider believes, based on the good-faith medical judgment of the provider, that delay would pose a risk to the patient's health.

(11) A requirement that a patient seeking abortion services at any point or points in time prior to fetal viability disclose the patient's reason or reasons for seeking abortion services, or a limitation on the provision or obtaining of abortion services at any point or points in time prior to fetal viability based on any actual, perceived, or potential reason or reasons of the patient for obtaining abortion services, regardless of whether the limitation is based on a health care provider's degree of actual or constructive knowledge of such reason or reasons.

(b) OTHER LIMITATIONS OR REQUIREMENTS.—The statutory right specified in subsection (a) shall not be limited or otherwise infringed through, in addition to the limitations and requirements specified in paragraphs (1) through (11) of subsection (a), any limitation or requirement that—

(1) is the same as or similar to one or more of the limitations or requirements described in subsection (a); or

(2) both—

(A) expressly, effectively, implicitly, or as implemented singles out the provision of abortion services, health care providers who

provide abortion services, or facilities in which abortion services are provided; and

(B) impedes access to abortion services.

(c) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—Factors a court may consider in determining whether a limitation or requirement impedes access to abortion services for purposes of subsection (b)(2)(B) include the following:

(1) Whether the limitation or requirement, in a provider's good-faith medical judgment, interferes with a health care provider's ability to provide care and render services, or poses a risk to the patient's health or safety.

(2) Whether the limitation or requirement is reasonably likely to delay or deter some patients in accessing abortion services.

(3) Whether the limitation or requirement is reasonably likely to directly or indirectly increase the cost of providing abortion services or the cost for obtaining abortion services (including costs associated with travel, childcare, or time off work).

(4) Whether the limitation or requirement is reasonably likely to have the effect of necessitating a trip to the offices of a health care provider that would not otherwise be required.

(5) Whether the limitation or requirement is reasonably likely to result in a decrease in the availability of abortion services in a given State or geographic region.

(6) Whether the limitation or requirement imposes penalties that are not imposed on other health care providers for comparable conduct or failure to act, or that are more severe than penalties imposed on other health care providers for comparable conduct or failure to act.

(7) The cumulative impact of the limitation or requirement combined with other new or existing limitations or requirements.

(d) EXCEPTION.—To defend against a claim that a limitation or requirement violates a health care provider's or patient's statutory rights under subsection (b), a party must establish, by clear and convincing evidence, that—

(1) the limitation or requirement significantly advances the safety of abortion services or the health of patients; and

(2) the safety of abortion services or the health of patients cannot be advanced by a less restrictive alternative measure or action.

SEC. 5. APPLICABILITY AND PREEMPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) Except as stated under subsection (b), this Act supersedes and applies to the law of the Federal Government and each State government, and the implementation of such law, whether statutory, common law, or otherwise, and whether adopted before or after the date of enactment of this Act, and neither the Federal Government nor any State government shall administer, implement, or enforce any law, rule, regulation, standard, or other provision having the force and effect of law that conflicts with any provision of this Act, notwithstanding any other provision of Federal law, including the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 2000bb et seq.).

(2) Federal statutory law adopted after the date of the enactment of this Act is subject to this Act unless such law explicitly excludes such application by reference to this Act.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The provisions of this Act shall not supersede or apply to—

(1) laws regulating physical access to clinic entrances;

(2) insurance or medical assistance coverage of abortion services;

(3) the procedure described in section 1531(b)(1) of title 18, United States Code; or

(4) generally applicable State contract law.

(c) DEFENSE.—In any cause of action against an individual or entity who is subject to a limitation or requirement that violates this Act, in addition to the remedies specified in section 8, this Act shall also apply to, and may be raised as a defense by, such an individual or entity.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect immediately upon the date of enactment of this Act. This Act shall apply to all restrictions on the provision of, or access to, abortion services whether the restrictions are enacted or imposed prior to or after the date of enactment of this Act, except as otherwise provided in this Act.

SEC. 7. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In interpreting the provisions of this Act, a court shall liberally construe such provisions to effectuate the purposes of the Act.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize any government to interfere with, diminish, or negatively affect a person's ability to obtain or provide abortion services.

(c) OTHER INDIVIDUALS CONSIDERED AS GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS.—Any person who, by operation of a provision of Federal or State law, is permitted to implement or enforce a limitation or requirement that violates section 4 of this Act shall be considered a government official for purposes of this Act.

SEC. 8. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General may commence a civil action on behalf of the United States against any State that violates, or against any government official (including a person described in section 7(c)) that implements or enforces a limitation or requirement that violates, section 4. The court shall hold unlawful and set aside the limitation or requirement if it is in violation of this Act.

(b) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any individual or entity, including any health care provider or patient, adversely affected by an alleged violation of this Act, may commence a civil action against any State that violates, or against any government official (including a person described in section 7(c)) that implements or enforces a limitation or requirement that violates, section 4. The court shall hold unlawful and set aside the limitation or requirement if it is in violation of this Act.

(2) HEALTH CARE PROVIDER.—A health care provider may commence an action for relief on its own behalf, on behalf of the provider's staff, and on behalf of the provider's patients who are or may be adversely affected by an alleged violation of this Act.

(c) EQUITABLE RELIEF.—In any action under this section, the court may award appropriate equitable relief, including temporary, preliminary, or permanent injunctive relief.

(d) COSTS.—In any action under this section, the court shall award costs of litigation, as well as reasonable attorney's fees, to any prevailing plaintiff. A plaintiff shall not be liable to a defendant for costs or attorney's fees in any non-frivolous action under this section.

(e) JURISDICTION.—The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction over proceedings under this Act and shall exercise the same without regard to whether the party aggrieved shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided for by law.

(f) ABROGATION OF STATE IMMUNITY.—Neither a State that enforces or maintains, nor a government official (including a person described in section 7(c)) who is permitted to implement or enforce any limitation or requirement that violates section 4 shall be immune under the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the Eleventh Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, or any other source of law, from an action in a Federal or State court of competent jurisdiction challenging that limitation or requirement.

SEC. 9. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person, entity, government, or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, or the application of such provision to all other persons, entities, governments, or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and add extraneous material on H.R. 8296, the Women's Health Protection Act of 2022.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 8296, the Women's Health Protection Act.

This bill is necessary now more than ever following the Republican-controlled Supreme Court's extreme decision ripping away a woman's right to abortion. The Court's ideological decision ignored nearly 50 years of precedent and is the culmination of decades of unrelenting efforts by Republican politicians to control women and their bodies.

The consequences of last month's decision have been swift and severe. Already, abortion bans are in effect in nine States, and more than a dozen more are expected to either ban or severely limit abortion soon.

As a result, women are being forced to travel long distances to States where abortion remains lawful or, for those who lack logistical or financial support to travel, continue pregnancies against their wishes. There have been devastating stories of patients being denied care and doctors hesitating to provide lifesaving healthcare services out of fear of criminalization.

States have enacted dangerous laws banning abortion without any exceptions, inciting citizens to track and report women in need of an abortion and criminalizing providers or those assisting someone in obtaining care.

These laws turn back the clock on the health, well-being, and equality of women across the Nation. Republicans have made it clear: This is just the beginning. Congressional Republicans are

already pushing a nationwide abortion ban that would criminalize abortion in all 50 States.

That is why this House is acting today on the Women's Health Protection Act to restore the right to abortion nationwide. This legislation ensures that no matter where you live, you have a right to comprehensive healthcare that is free from unnecessary restrictions that are intended only to impede access.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation to protect the right to abortion and ensure that all Americans are entitled to make their own healthcare decisions.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, to protect the helpless, most powerless, most innocent among us, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 8296, the abortion on demand until birth act.

This is not about codifying Roe v. Wade. Why? Because it nationalizes abortion for all 9 months of pregnancy—all 9 months. This would make America as radical as China and North Korea.

The abortion on demand until birth act would legalize discriminatory abortion based upon sex, race, and disability, including Down syndrome. It overrides State laws that protect women from coercion. It would weaken conscience protections to force pro-life doctors to perform abortions and end a life.

This is especially frightening for pregnancy centers, faith-based providers, and medical professionals who are using amazing medical achievements in treating both mothers and their babies in the wombs as patients. We are doing prenatal heart surgery today in the United States of America.

The abortion on demand until birth act has nothing to do with protecting the health of women. It has everything to do with forcing an extreme agenda on the American people.

Rather than prey on women's vulnerabilities and fears and nationalize abortion for all 9 months, we should be coming together to support women and their families at every stage of pregnancy and beyond.

Every mother matters. Seventy-six percent of women seeking abortions say they would choose life if their circumstances were different. The focus should be on how to change their circumstances, help them access the care and support that they need, and improve their lives.

Presenting abortion up until birth as a woman's only option is a false choice. There are nearly 3,000 pregnancy centers in all 50 States. They outnumber Planned Parenthood by more than 2,000 facilities. These pregnancy centers, which are right now under violent attack by pro-abortion groups, provide medical care, resources, education, and mentoring to women. They must be protected, not undermined and threatened by an extreme abortion agenda.

The Supreme Court has affirmed the American people's rights to speak through their elected officials and enact laws that protect unborn children. The question upon us today is: How are we going to respond? How is this body going to respond to the greatest human rights issue of our generation? That is the question. This is the human rights issue of our generation.

Do not close your ears. Do not close your eyes. Do not close your heart.

Is it by dehumanizing life and promoting a culture that destroys the weakest among us? Is that how we are going to do it? Or is it by making abortion unthinkable by leading a new era where every person's God-given, unalienable human right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for all be the way we will define ourselves?

Let's come together. Let's protect the human rights of the unborn. We cannot deny life to the most disadvantaged and marginalized among us. They have no voice to defend themselves.

Madam Speaker, abortion for all 9 months is not the will of the American people.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to H.R. 8296, the abortion on demand until birth act because all lives are worth living, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0945

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU), the sponsor of this legislation.

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my bill, the Women's Health Protection Act, or WHPA.

WHPA is the bill that will protect the right to access abortion after the tragic fall of Roe v. Wade. It ensures in Federal law the right to abortion care for every woman in every State and ensures States may not erode that right.

You will hear Republicans say our bill goes too far, but that is simply not true. Our bill preserves the protections of Roe that we have lived with for 50 years, affirmed through decades of subsequent court decisions. WHPA prohibits the bans and restrictions that violate the spirit of Roe, from outright bans to laws forcing women to undergo invasive ultrasounds, unnecessary waiting periods, or forcing doctors to give patients medically inaccurate information.

You will hear Republicans repeat over and over again that Democrats are voting for abortion up until the moment of birth. Actually, for 50 years the Court had the provision of an exception for late-term abortion in Roe to preserve the life or the health of the mother. It is because they valued the life of the mother.

Do Republicans actually believe the mother's life is expendable?

Apparently so.

What you will not hear is Republicans say that the vast majority of Americans do not want Roe to be overturned.

You will not hear an apology to the 10-year-old who was raped and had to travel to Indiana for an abortion because it was prohibited in her home State.

You will not hear an acknowledgment that women are capable of deciding for themselves whether to terminate a pregnancy.

This bill respects our right to make our own decisions about our bodies. It is time to put control of our bodies back in our hands. Now is the time to pass the Women's Health Protection Act.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR).

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Speaker, it has been 22 days since the Supreme Court overturned Roe v. Wade, taking away women's ability to make choices about their own future, setting us back nearly 50 years. But even that is not enough for Republicans.

In the last 24 hours alone, we have gotten a glimpse into the dark future Republicans have in store for women, doctors, and vulnerable children:

The Indiana attorney general says he is investigating the doctor who treated a 10-year-old rape victim.

Texas sues the Biden administration for requiring abortions in medical emergencies so that women's lives could be saved.

And the National Right to Life official who said the 10-year-old should have had her baby.

Yes, according to Republicans, even a little girl impregnated by a brutal rape should be denied an abortion and have to endure a government-mandated birth.

Remember, this is the same party that has voted against:

Paid family and medical leave for parents of that baby.

Childcare for babies.

Universal pre-K for babies.

The Child Tax Credit, which helps babies.

School lunch programs that help babies.

Commonsense gun violence prevention measures that keep those babies safe in school, and much more.

The Republicans' war on women has never been more dangerous. Today, we will vote on the Women's Health Protection Act to ensure that women across this country have access to abortion and the freedom to make their own decisions about their bodies and their futures.

America, Democrats have your back.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK), a dynamic example of life in her own testimony.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD some articles that I feel are relevant to this debate.

[From the New York Times, July 3, 2022]

ABORTION LAWS AROUND THE WORLD

The U.S. Supreme Court's ruling on abortion quickly led to bans in at least eight states, a shift toward criminalization that runs counter to recent easings in countries that had longstanding bans.

The Supreme Court's elimination of the constitutional right to abortion, after nearly a half-century, has made the United States one of the few countries actively strengthening abortion restrictions.

Abortion is now banned in at least eight states, a shift toward criminalization that runs counter to the longstanding policies of some close allies, like Canada, and to recent easings in several nations that had long imposed bans, like Ireland, Mexico and South Korea.

But no nations share the same history regarding abortion, nor does any part of the world have uniform laws: Women seeking abortions everywhere must navigate distinct rules, in a variety of health care systems, if access is available at all. The following examples, while not comprehensive, illustrate the diversity of those laws—and how they're changing.

CANADA

No laws restrict abortion in Canada, where it is covered by provincial and territorial public health care systems as an essential medical procedure within 20 weeks of conception and, under some circumstances, after that point, such as when a pregnancy threatens the mother's life. Access and exceptions vary by province, and sometimes by hospital.

Until 1988, criminal laws allowed abortions only if approved by committees of physicians. That year, the Supreme Court struck down the laws in a landmark case. Most legal scholars agree that if the issue were to reach the court again, it would make the right to abortion explicit.—Ian Austen

MEXICO

Before a court ruling last year, abortion was largely restricted, with Mexico City and only three of 31 states permitting the procedure up to 12 weeks of fetal gestation. But the Supreme Court ruled unanimously in the fall that penalizing women who undergo abortions was unconstitutional, and in the months since, five more states have moved to legalize abortions.

The justices did not specify how far into a pregnancy abortion was permitted, leaving the details to the states. For the states that still ban abortion, legislatures will need to change laws to permit the procedure.—Maria Abi-Habib

NICARAGUA

Abortion is completely illegal and punishable by jail for the woman and the doctors.

The Legislature eliminated all exceptions in 2006, ending a century of law that allowed abortions in cases of life-threatening complications or pregnancies caused by rape. President Daniel Ortega, a strong supporter of criminalizing abortion, has received support from Evangelical leaders in Nicaragua and the United States.—Yubelka Mendoza and Maria Abi-Habib

BRITAIN

Abortions have been legal in England, Scotland and Wales for more than 50 years, protected by the Abortion Act of 1967. Abortions can be legally performed up to the 24th week of pregnancy and must be medically approved by two doctors.

The 1967 law allows some exceptions for later-term abortions, including when the pregnancy endangers the woman's health or if a prenatal scan reveals a fetus abnormality. A provision of the law allowing abortion if the fetus carries significant risk of serious disability was at the center of a court case last year.

In rare circumstances, such as when a woman, without doctors' consent, takes medicine intended to terminate a pregnancy, an abortion could be prosecuted as a criminal act.

The 1967 law did not cover Northern Ireland, which for decades prohibited almost all abortions.

British lawmakers overturned that ban in 2019, legalizing ''unconditional termination'' of pregnancy within the first 12 weeks. But with resistance coming from anti-abortion and church groups, abortion services remain limited.—Saskia Solomon

IRELAND

A 1983 constitutional amendment banned nearly all abortion, reflecting the Roman Catholic Church's deep influence in the country. That influence had waned by 2018, when a referendum to end the ban was approved by 66 percent of voters.

Lawmakers then legalized abortion in the Health Act of 2018, allowing abortion for any reason up to the end of the first trimester. The law provides exceptions beyond 12 weeks in cases of fetal abnormalities considered fatal after birth or a potential risk to the woman's health.—Saskia Solomon

POLAND

Soviet-era Poland offered some of Europe's broadest abortion access, and it became a destination for women seeking abortions. But after the Soviet Union's collapse, and under the influence of the Catholic Church, the Polish Parliament in 1993 passed one of Europe's strictest bans, asserting that ''every human being shall have an inherent right to life from the moment of conception.''

It allowed three categories of exception: danger to the mother's health or life; rape or incest; severe fetal abnormalities.

Despite mass protests, the ban was tightened last year by the nationalist Law and Justice Party, eliminating the most-used exception—fetal abnormalities—which accounted for almost all of the roughly 1,000 legal abortions a year. An estimated 100,000 to 150,000 illegal abortions take place very year in the country, activists say.

The remaining exceptions are problematic for abortion seekers. Rape victims face a deadline of the 12th week of pregnancy, and they require a certificate from a prosecutor, which takes a long time to acquire. And the definition of what constitutes a ''serious'' risk to a woman's health is too vague for doctors to always act decisively. In a small number of cases, women have died of sepsis after doctors refused to intervene while the fetus's heart was still beating.

Women cannot be punished for taking an abortion pill or undergoing an abortion abroad.

Anyone deemed to have aided or abetted an illegal abortion faces up to eight years in prison.—Katrin Bennhold

INDIA

A total ban was eased in 1971 with the Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act, which made some abortions legal.

But activists continued to seek further easing, to include abortion in cases of fetal anomaly or pregnancy caused by rape. In 2021, the federal government amended the law, expanding the criteria for legal abortions and adding a privacy clause to protect women who went to clinics.

The law allows women to terminate pregnancies until 20 weeks. Between 20 and 24 weeks, a woman needs two doctors to approve an abortion, and after 24 weeks, abortions are allowed only when the woman's health is at risk. Women can now terminate unwanted pregnancies caused by contraceptive failure regardless of marital status; before the amendment, only a married couple could do that.

Still, abortions done in violation of the law are punishable by up to seven years in prison for the woman and medical personnel.—Sameer Yasir

CHINA

Abortion has been legal in some form since 1953. By the 1970s, as the ruling Chinese Communist Party grew increasingly worried about overpopulation, abortion became more widely accessible, and the one-child policy led to some forced abortions.

Sex-selective abortions are illegal, meant to counter the widespread preference for boys over girls. In response to recent concerns over declining birthrates and an aging population, families may now have three children without penalty. Given the government's invasive family planning policies, some women fear it will restrict abortion access. The authorities last year said they intended to reduce ''medically unnecessary abortions,'' without explaining how.

Access to abortion services varies by region, with some requiring women to produce certificates of medical necessity. In Jiangxi Province, women who are more than 14 weeks pregnant need three signatures from medical personnel.

Scholars, activists and some foreign governments have accused the authorities of using family planning policies to suppress ethnic minorities, which the government denies.—Vivian Wang

KENYA

Under the 2010 Constitution, abortion is permitted if a trained health professional determines a need for emergency treatment, or if the pregnancy endangers the life or health of the mother. In other circumstances, abortion providers can face up to 14 years in prison under Kenya's penal code.

In practice, many women who could obtain a legal abortion cannot because of poverty, lack of access to health services or a lack of information about their rights.—Matthew Mpoke Bigg

BENIN

Last fall, Benin joined South Africa and Mozambique as one of the few African countries to broadly legalize abortion within 12 weeks.

Under the new law, abortion will be allowed ''when the pregnancy is likely to aggravate or cause a situation of material, educational, professional or moral distress incompatible with the interest of the woman and/or the unborn child.'' In doing so, Benin became the third country in Africa, along with Ethiopia and Zambia, to allow abortion based on the social or economic needs of the woman.

The previous law authorized abortion only if the pregnancy endangered the woman's life or was the result of rape or incest, or if the fetus was malformed. The new law will take effect after the authorities detail how it will be applied, which could take months.—Elian Peltier

EGYPT

A strict anti-abortion law has been on the books for 85 years, derived from the French Penal Code of the colonial era that bans the procedure under nearly any circumstances. The woman and doctor face imprisonment if convicted.

It does have one loophole, which is based on the medical code of ethics: Doctors are allowed—but not legally obligated—to terminate a pregnancy if it puts the woman's life

at risk and she signs a document saying the procedure was lifesaving.

Though convictions are uncommon, the law and social stigma have pushed abortion practices out of public sight, where the woman's safety cannot be protected and the procedure can be prohibitively expensive.—Nada Rashwan

TURKEY

Since 1983, abortion has been legal up to 10 weeks after conception. Married women need spousal consent. The law allows exceptions after 10 weeks when the pregnancy threatens the life of the woman, if the doctor concludes the fetus has a grave disability, and in cases of rape.

Violators face prosecution and prison—for both the woman and the doctor.

Abortion remains a divisive issue. In 2012, Recep Tayyip Erdogan, now the president and then prime minister, called abortion murder and urged more restrictions. After popular outrage, the law was never amended, but in practice, abortion services are unavailable in many state hospitals—Safak Timur

---

[From CATHOLICVOTE, June 9, 2022]

SUMMER OF RAGE: TRACKING ATTACKS ON PREGNANCY CENTERS AND PRO-LIFE GROUPS

ATTACKS SINCE SUPREME COURT LEAK

CV News Feed—More than 50 pregnancy resource centers and offices of pro-life groups have been attacked and vandalized since a draft Supreme Court opinon overturning Roe v. Wade was leaked in early May. Pro-abortion domestic terrorists have claimed responsibility—and are promising more attacks in a ''summer of rage''.

Pregnancy centers are bracing for more attacks and acts of vandalism after the Supreme Court issued its final ruling overturning Roe v. Wade on June 24, 2022. The Department of Homeland Security issued a memo the same day warning that ''domestic violent extremists'' would exploit the decision to commit acts of violence against various targets, specifically naming Jane's Revenge. Various terror groups have issued threats against them on social media since the decision was made, with one group urging its followers to ''mask up, stay dangerous''.

Some attacks are going unreported because pregnancy resource centers want to protect their clients. This post covers attacks which have been reported in the news media, sent as tips directly to CatholicVote, or uncovered from terrorist groups online. If you know of an attack which is not covered here, please email info@catholicvote.org. All tips are anonymous and your identity will not be revealed.

The map and this post will be updated as the new develops.

This list covers attacks on pregnancy centers and offices of pro-life organizations. Attacks on Catholic churches are covered here.

List of attacks:

Austin, Texas—Trotter House (May 3, 2022).

Frederick, Maryland—CareNet Frederick (May 4, 2022).

Portland, Oregon—Southeast Portland Pregnancy Resource Center (May 5, 2022).

Concord, California—Options Health (June 25, 2022).

Iowa City, Iowa—Informed Choices Clinic (June 25, 2022).

Portland, Oregon—First Image (June 26, 2022).

Winter Haven Florida—LifeChoice Pregnancy Center (June 26, 2022).

Burlington. Vermont—BirthRight (June 26, 2022).

Everett, Washington—Two Hearts Pregnancy Aid (June 27, 2022).

Dayton, Ohio—Women's Centers of Ohio (June 27, 2022).

Littleton. New Hampshire—Pathways Pregnancy Center (June 28, 2022).

Nashville, Tennessee—Hope Clinic for Women (June 29, 2022).

Yuba City, California—A Woman's Friend Pregnancy Resource Clinic (June 29, 2022).

Hialeah, Florida—Pregnancy Help Medical Clinic (July 3, 2022).

St. Paul, Minnesota—BirthRight of St. Paul (July 5, 2022).

Kenmore, Washington—Care Net Pregnancy & Family Services of Puget Sound (July 5. 2022).

Moab, Utah—Arches New Hope Pregnancy Center (July 5, 2022).

Oreland, Pennsylvania—Pro-Life Union of Greater Philadelphia (July 6, 2022).

Worcester, Massachusetts—Problem Pregnancy Resource Center (July 6, 2022).

Worcester, Massachusetts—Clearway Clinic (July 6, 2022).

Akron, Ohio—Northeast Ohio Right to Life (July 8, 2022).

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to fight for life and in strong opposition to H.R. 8296, the abortion on demand until birth act. You know, I never thought that I would have to stand here on the House floor and debate the fact that killing someone for their gender, their sex, their race—but here we are.

We are debating a bill that is being pushed by my colleagues on the other side that would legalize abortions based on a baby's sex, race, or potential disability. I am going to say that again because I think that is perhaps the most outrageous, horrific, regressive, sexist, and racist part of this legislation.

This bill allows for abortions up until the day of natural delivery because the child maybe isn't the right sex or the right race, according to the mother, who is a woman, by the way. We need to stop this lie that suddenly abortion is healthcare—it is not.

I have heard repeatedly talk about this 10-year-old girl who was brutally raped—this is a heartbreaking situation—yet, not a single peep about the man who did this. He was an illegal who crossed our border, who never should have been in our country in the first place, who committed this crime. Not one peep.

In our country, we are based really, quite frankly, on a simple notion that we are of equal opportunity, not equal outcome. Abortion, that is equal outcome. We know the outcome.

All I am asking today is that my colleagues think a little bit critically about what they are doing and what they are saying, the message that they are sending—that they believe in equal outcome, not opportunity because they are, quite frankly, denying the right for every single one of these children the opportunity to live.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LOIS FRANKEL).

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, my, my, my, here we go again—or should I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—lie, lie, lie.

The United States Supreme Court has dismantled access to legal abortion giving the very, very personal decision concerning a person's reproductive health, their life and future to strange politicians.

Now, Republicans across the country and in Congress are moving full steam ahead toward their dark and extreme goal of a nationwide abortion ban that will throw doctors into jail, force children to bear children, lead to tragic deaths, and life-changing hardships for people in our country.

That is why I rise in support of the Women's Health Protection Act that will facilitate access to legal abortion care regardless of a person's ZIP Code.

Let me warn everyone that the Republican agenda includes even more drastic intrusions into our personal lives—banning legal abortion is just the start. We will fight back.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), the chairwoman of Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, the horror of a 10-year-old girl, the victim of rape, re-victimized when her parents were forced to take her out of State because of Ohio's abortion law.

A woman who was having a miscarriage, whose doctor refused to give her the medical procedure she needed because of fear of being prosecuted.

A woman trying to get long-acting birth control, whose pharmacist refused to prescribe the necessary medication for the procedure.

The chaos in the wake of the terrible Dobbs decision is only going to get worse from here.

The Supreme Court and the Republican Party have declared a war on Americans' healthcare rights. Every single American has the right and the freedom to make the healthcare decisions that they need, including abortion.

We passed this bill last September. We passed it in September after the first decision in the Supreme Court. We are going to pass this bill today in the U.S. House of Representatives. We are going to pass this bill, which codifies Roe v. Wade, every time we need to, to protect Americans' rights to healthcare and to protect everybody's equality.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I don't know of any State laws that prevent birth control. Miscarriages are obviously a tragedy.

The question before us today is on the legislation that would allow for abortion up until birth, 9 months. It is not the will of the American people; it is the extreme agenda of those that are promoting abortion.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), the leader on the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the abortion on demand until birth act.

This Supreme Court ruled each individual State can decide the rights for the unborn. This bill would override State laws to nationalize abortion for any reason at any stage of pregnancy up until birth.

This does not merely ban pre-viability restrictions on abortion, as supporters say that it does. This bill allows the person doing the abortion to decide what qualifies as pre-viability. This is unacceptable.

The majority of Americans do not support abortions with no limits. In fact, 80 percent of the Americans say abortions should be illegal in the third trimester. This is a radical bill, and I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), who chairs our Environment and Climate Change Subcommittee.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I rise in resounding support of the Women's Health Protection Act.

This bill will restore a fundamental constitutional right that has been simply stripped away by a rogue rightwing Supreme Court.

While my Republican colleagues celebrate this injustice and cook up plans for a nationwide abortion ban, Americans across the country are already feeling the devastating effects of the decision to overturn Roe v. Wade.

Stories of a 10-year-old child having to travel to neighboring States to receive care, or women bleeding from ectopic pregnancies have shocked the world—as red States, many with some of the highest maternal mortality rates in the country, have rolled back abortion access.

None of the courts, nor States, nor politicians should have a say in women's ability to make their own decisions about their health, their well-being, and their future. That rests with their loved ones, their doctor, and their God.

If we claim to love freedom—to be a free and just society—we must ensure that this basic human right is finally enshrined into law.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), a health provider saving lives every day and a champion for life.

□ 1000

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD two articles of attacks on churches and pro-life pregnancy centers.

[From the National Catholic Register]

ATTACKS ON CHURCHES, PRO-LIFE PREGNANCY CENTERS CONTINUE

A pro-life sign at St. Teresa of Avila Catholic Church in Hutchinson, Kansas, about 50 miles northwest of Wichita, was vandalized over the weekend.

Since the Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization decision on Friday, attacks on Catholic churches and pro-life pregnancy centers have been reported in West Virginia, Washington, Virginia, Louisiana, Colorado, California, Texas, Florida, New York, and Indiana.

Below are the latest recorded attacks since the decision.

Matt Vainer, a spokesperson for the Diocese of Wichita, said that the perpetrator was followed by a witness who called the police. The perpetrator was arrested, he said.

The pastor of St. Teresa of Avila, Father Aaron Spexarth, placed the sign underneath a crucifix in the church, as he believed it was most appropriate to place it at Christ's feet, Vainer confirmed to CNA.

All Saints Catholic Church in Portland, Oregon had its sign defaced with pro-abortion graffiti June 25.

A photo of the vandalism shows the words ''If abortions aren't safe, neither are you!—XOXO Jane.'' The FBI is investigating, Barbara Custer, a parish secretary at the church, told CNA.

A Woman's Friend Pregnancy Resource Clinic in Yuba City, California was vandalized June 27.

The clinic had one of its windows smashed by what seems to be one perpetrator according to video footage, the clinic's executive director Kristen Bird told CNA.

Video shows the perpetrator throwing three rocks at the window until it broke. Repairs will cost anywhere between $700 and $900. The FBI is investigating, Bird said.

[From the Daily Caller, July 12, 2022]

ELIZABETH WARREN CALLS TO 'SHUT DOWN' CRISIS PREGNANCY CENTERS AMID PRO-ABORTION ATTACKS

(By Nicole Silverio)

Democratic Massachusetts Sen. Elizabeth Warren called on crisis pregnancy centers to be ''shut down'' across the country Tuesday as pro-abortion groups vandalize and commit arson on centers throughout the nation.

The senator claimed the centers ''fool'' and ''torture'' women into carrying their pregnancies to term as they seek abortion access. She lamented that the centers outnumber abortion clinics in Massachusetts by 3 to 1.

''In Massachusetts right now, those crisis pregnancy centers that are there to fool people who are looking for pregnancy termination help outnumber true abortion clinics by 3 to 1, she said. ''We need to shut them down here in Massachusetts and we need to shut them down all around the country,'' she told NBC 10 Boston. ''You should not be able to torture a pregnant person like that,''

Warren's criticisms of crisis pregnancy centers follow multiple attacks on the centers facilitated by pro-abortion activists since the Supreme Court draft majority opinion leaked in May.

Surveillance footage showed a suspect spray painted the words ''If Abortions Aren't Safe, You Aren't Either'' and broke the windows of the Next Step Pregnancy Center in Lynwood, Washington, in late May. An unknown pro-abortion group splattered the Capitol Hill Crisis Pregnancy Center with red paint and marked the words ''Jane Says Revenge'' in graffiti.

Police arrested 10 pro-abortion protesters for allegedly throwing smoke bombs at an Oregon pregnancy center on June 27. The activist group Jane's Revenge allegedly firebombed crisis pregnancy center in Amherst, New York, overnight on June 7, while arsonists attacked Wisconsin Family Action in Madison. The Oregon Right to Life offices in Keizer, Oregon, were also firebombed with Molotov cocktails.

The centers offer free or low-cost pregnancy testing, education on adoption services, ultrasounds, STD testing and treatment, prenatal and parenting lessons, after abortion recovery counseling and sexual risk avoidance education, according to the Charlotte Lozier Institute.

The Massachusetts senator has repeatedly called for the construction of abortion clinics on federal lands and national parks since the Supreme Court overturned Roe v. Wade, handing states the right to regulate abortion. She suggested that tents and trained medical personnel be set up on federally funded property to allow women to access abortion.

In a New York Times op-ed, she and Democratic Minnesota Sen. Tina Smith advocated the use of ''federal property and resources to protect people seeking abortion services locally.''

Warren and several prominent Democratic lawmakers signed a letter urging President Joe Biden increase access to medication abortion and establish a medical ombudsman at the Department of Human Health and Services and Department of Justice to analyze data on the types of reproductive services needed and provide that on federal lands.

''The Department of Justice and all relevant agencies could analyze the types of reproductive health services that could be provided on federal property, especially in states where such services are limited by state law or regulation,'' the letter stated.

The senator's push for clinics on federal lands is currently prevented by the Hyde Amendment, which prohibits federal funding toward abortions except in cases endangering the mother's life. Many activists estimate that the Hyde Amendment prevents at least 60,000 abortion per year.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to oppose the unconscionable abortion on demand until birth act.

This bill creates a national standard to allow for abortions of unborn children for any reason and at any stage of pregnancy up until birth. As a father and grandfather of six precious grandchildren, I am sickened by the attempt to allow abortion on demand until birth.

Now, Madam Speaker, I will speak for just a second about something that was brought up by one of my colleagues across the aisle about pharmacists dispensing prescriptions for abortion.

Also, Madam Speaker, if you could, do me a favor and get a message to the President who is trying to sign an executive order to force pharmacists to fill prescriptions against their will for abortion. Let me assure you, you can pass all the legislation you want, and you can sign every executive order that you want to sign, but if you think you are going to force a pharmacist to go against their moral obligation to take care of patients and to take care of babies and dispense a prescription that is going to be used for abortion, good luck with that.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE), who is a member of our committee.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to stand against the vile war for reproductive rights of the women in America.

Just under 50 years ago, Roe v. Wade established that every woman holds autonomy over her own body and her reproductive choices. To reject this critical ruling one-half century later at a time when America's maternal healthcare standards are so disgracefully abysmal, particularly for Black and Brown women, is as hateful as it is cruel.

We will not stand for this blatant and brazen attempt to control women. We will not stand for yet another assault that diminishes women by taking away their autonomy of their bodies. We will not stand by and watch extremists erase us from our Constitutional protections.

No. We will not stand for it today. I and my Democratic colleagues will pass the Women's Health Protection Act of 2022 and the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act of 2022.

Madam Speaker, I urge our Senators to find the compassion, courage, and their humanity for the women of America by doing the same.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I would ask what about the marginalized Black and Hispanic babies who are more likely to be aborted?

Abortion has had a disproportionate impact on minorities and individuals with disabilities.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS), who is also a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Women's Health Protection Act and lend my voice to the chorus of calls across the country for urgent action on abortion rights.

When I first heard the news of the Dobbs decision, I felt as if I were thrown into another country—a country without our Constitution.

How is it that such a fundamental right to our autonomy over one's body, over one's life, and over one's future can be stripped away so callously?

We are talking about far-right Justices telling women that they cannot get the care that they need and telling doctors that they cannot treat their patients to the best of their ability. Yes, these five Justices with no medical expertise stole the fundamental freedom of controlling the health of one's own body and opened the floodgates to criminalize doctors for doing their job.

Make no mistake, Madam Speaker: this is a stain on our healthcare system and a flat-out assault on health equity, and it is a self-inflicted wound.

This resolution will leave women—especially women of color and low-income women, including White women—in the lurch. So in the absence of any respect or compassion for reproductive health in this country, we, as a body, must show our leadership. It is incumbent upon us elected officials to ensure that the basic right is restored and finally written into law.

The Women's Health Protection Act will do that. It would restore 50 years of precedent and right a deeply invasive wrong. History has its eyes on us.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS), who is another healthcare provider. Dr. MARIANNETTE MILLER-MEEKS has worked hard to improve the lives of many throughout her career.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, the Honorable Representative RODGERS, for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 8296. The Supreme Court recently took the important and correct step to return the power to regulate abortion back to State legislators and voters within the individual States while recognizing the sanctity of life.

This concept is so novel and repugnant to the Democrats that they would put forward a radical and extreme abortion bill that would permit abortion even up until birth for any reason. Only seven countries, including China and North Korea, are this extreme.

As a doctor, I am knowledgeable that mid- to late-term abortion is a barbaric procedure which can include dismemberment of the baby and crushing of the skull. This is far more cruel than many of the laws of States that define prisoner abuse of convicted felons and what constitutes animal cruelty. It is a procedure done when the mother is given anesthesia, but the baby can feel pain. Madam Speaker, even though you cannot hear it scream, it can respond to music and respond to touch and the voice of its mother.

We wouldn't allow animals to be treated this cruelly.

Do Democrats think that this elevates women and is compassionate?

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from the Charlotte Lozier Institute.

[From the Charlotte Lozier Institute, Feb. 2014]

GESTATIONAL LIMITS ON ABORTION IN THE UNITED STATES COMPARED TO INTERNATIONAL NORMS

(By Angelina Baglini, J.D.)

Abstract: The United States is one of only seven countries in the world that permit elective abortion past 20 weeks. Upholding laws restricting abortion on demand after 20 weeks would situate the United States closer to the international mainstream, instead of leaving it as an outlying country with ultra-permissive abortion policies.

This report compares gestational limits in United States abortion law with gestational limits in the abortion law of the international community. The goal is to determine where the United States stands in comparison to international norms, with its federal policy enshrined in Roe v. Wade, which allows abortion past 20 weeks and without restriction until fetal viability.

The sample group for this project included a total of 198 countries, independent states, and semi-autonomous regions with populations exceeding 1 million. Of these 198 countries, independent states, and regions worldwide, 59 allow abortion without restriction as to reason, otherwise known as elective abortion or abortion on demand. The remaining 139 countries require some reason to obtain an abortion ranging from most restrictive (to save the life of the mother or completely prohibited) to least restrictive (socioeconomic grounds) with various reasons in between (e.g., physical health, mental health).

Currently, the United States permits abortion on demand through viability, which is usually marked around 24 weeks. For this report, it is appropriate to compare the United States with the other 58 countries that allow abortion on demand up to some point in pregnancy. The remaining 139 countries require some reason to obtain an abortion (that is to say, they do not permit abortion on demand) and are, by definition, more restrictive than the United States on the issue of gestational limits. To require some reason before obtaining an abortion is inherently more restrictive than not requiring any reason at all.

This report finds that the United States is one of only seven countries in the world that permit elective abortion past 20 weeks. This finding suggests that current proposals in the United States to restrict elective abortions past 20 weeks would move the United States from the fringe, ultra-permissive end of the spectrum to a position closer to international norms.

TERMINOLOGY AND METHOD OF COMPARISON

Not all countries or statutes use the same terminology when drafting restrictions on late-term elective abortion. When drafting a restriction on elective abortion past 20 weeks of pregnancy, the most common measurement of ''weeks of pregnancy'' is gestational age, or in short form ''gestation.'' Gestational age marks the duration of pregnancy, which is most commonly and medically measured from the date of the woman's last menstrual period. The woman's last menstrual period is the most identifiable date by which to measure the duration of pregnancy, and occurs approximately two weeks before conception or fertilization.

The vast majority of countries in this international survey of abortion laws use gestational age to measure duration of pregnancy. Over 80 percent of countries maintaining some restriction on elective abortion use gestational age as the method of calculating duration of pregnancy. However, a minority of countries measures duration of pregnancy from ''conception'' or ''fertilization.'' One country measures from the time of ''implantation,'' which occurs approximately one week after conception or fertilization. Some statutes do not even specify a method of measurement, simply using the vague term ''weeks of pregnancy'' without indicating a precise method measuring the duration of pregnancy.

Conception or fertilization is the moment when an ovum and sperm unite, which creates a unique human organism. The date of conception or fertilization is often difficult to determine, as few women know the exact date they conceived. Because the last menstrual period is a more ascertainable date, in many cases doctors add two weeks to the woman's last menstrual period to approximate the date of conception or fertilization.

This report uses gestation to compare restrictions based on duration of pregnancy. More than 80 percent of countries already use gestation in establishing duration of pregnancy restrictions on elective abortion

and measuring the age of the unborn child using gestation is in line with common medical practice.

For those countries that use a different measurement of age, such as conception or fertilization or pregnancy, this study converts the measurement of age into gestation by adding two weeks to date back to the woman's last menstrual period. Using gestation as a common method of measuring duration of pregnancy restrictions on elective abortion produces a more meaningful comparison.

INTERNATIONAL GESTATIONAL LIMITATIONS ON ELECTIVE ABORTION

The sample group of countries for this project included a total of 198 countries, independent states, and semi-autonomous regions with populations exceeding 1 million.

Of these 198 countries, independent states, and regions worldwide, 59 allow abortion without restriction as to reason, otherwise known as elective abortion or abortion on demand.

The remaining 139 countries require some reason to obtain an abortion ranging from most restrictive (to save the life of the mother or completely prohibited) to least restrictive (socioeconomic grounds) with various reasons in between (e.g., physical health, mental health).

Of the 59 countries permitting elective abortion:

9 countries limit elective abortion before the 12th week of gestation,

36 countries limit elective abortion at 12 weeks gestation,

6 countries limit elective abortion between 12 and 20 weeks gestation,

7 countries permit elective abortion past 20 weeks or have no gestational limit.

1 country maintains a federal system where abortion policy is determined at the state/territory level, and at least two of those states permit elective abortion past 20 weeks

Australia is the one country where a federal system is in place, but abortion policy is determined on the state or territory level. Three states or territories within Australia permit elective abortion, and two allow elective abortion past 20 weeks. However, other states and territories of Australia maintain more restrictive abortion policies and some do not permit elective abortion at all. Due to the diverse range of abortion policy in Australia, from restrictive to ultra-permissive, this study does not include Australia, as a whole, as a country that permits elective abortion past 20 weeks.

More than 75 percent of the countries permitting abortion without restriction as to reason do not permit elective abortions past 12 weeks gestation.

Only 12 percent (7 out of 59) of the countries permitting abortion without restriction as to reason permit elective abortion past 20 weeks gestation.

The U.S. is among these 7 countries that permit elective abortion past 20 weeks. This is true whether 20 weeks is measured from the last menstrual period (gestational age), conception, or implantation. No matter how duration of pregnancy is measured, whether by gestational age or conception or fertilization, or implantation, all countries in this category pass the 20-week threshold. These countries/territories are:

Canada (no restriction in law)
China (no restriction in law)
Netherlands (24 weeks)
North Korea (no restriction in law)
Singapore (24 weeks)
United States (viability)
Vietnam (no restriction in law)

The United States is within the top 4 of most permissive abortion policies in the world (7 out of 198) when analyzing restrictions on elective abortion based on duration of pregnancy.

IMPLICATIONS FOR CURRENT POLICY IN THE UNITED STATES

Under U.S. law, abortion on demand is permitted without restriction through viability. Viability can vary, and is decreasing in terms of weeks of gestation as perinatal medicine advances, but normally occurs no earlier than 24 weeks.

Recently, in the United States there has been great interest in restricting abortion on demand after 20 weeks. Two states have had 20-week laws on the books since before Roe v. Wade. Eleven more states have enacted 20-week laws in recent years. A proposed 20-week law in Albuquerque, New Mexico failed to gain majority support in 2013 but was notable for the engaged citizen activism that resulted in the proposal being put on a municipal ballot for a direct vote.

There is also interest at the federal level in restricting elective abortion after 20 weeks. In 2013, the U.S. House of Representatives passed a 20-week law. A similar law has been introduced in the U.S. Senate.

Permitting abortion on demand past 20 weeks places the United States among the top 4 percent of most-permissive countries in the world based on duration of pregnancy restrictions on abortion. If the United States adopts a federal policy restricting elective abortion past 20 weeks, or if more states adopt such policies, the U.S. will more closely align itself with the international norm that limits elective abortion past 12 weeks. Policies imposing gestational limits on elective abortion have been overwhelmingly adopted by countries permitting abortion on demand, indicating policies that encourage woman's safety in limiting abortion to early pregnancy and policies that protect unborn children from pain and prolonged exposure to the risk of-abortion.

CONCLUSIONS

In terms of gestational limits, the United States ranks among 7 countries with the most permissive abortion policies. The clear norm among countries that permit elective abortion is to limit abortion to before 20 weeks gestation, and elective abortion is more commonly limited to 12 weeks (the first trimester).

Twenty-week abortion laws in the United States are neither extreme nor unreasonable. Rather, they move the United States closer to international norms of legislating what is safe and healthy for the mother and what grants unborn children more protection in the womb.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I ask all my colleagues on every seat in every aisle of this Chamber to vote against this extreme, radical, and cruel abortion bill, H.R. 8296.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. CRAIG), who is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. CRAIG. Madam Speaker, exactly 3 weeks ago, five Justices on an activist, extremist Supreme Court handed down a decision that upended nearly 50 years of precedent and rolled back fundamental rights for millions of Americans.

In the weeks since, I have watched in horror as State after State has triggered laws that now prevent a woman or a girl from accessing an abortion even in the case of rape and incest. These events have been shocking to Americans, not only for millions of women across the country but for the country as a whole.

You call yourselves conservative. We are talking about 50 years of precedent in our Nation.

Because no Government has a place interfering in the decisions between a woman and her doctor, criminalizing abortion, or restricting women's healthcare options.

This is not a controversial position to the American people. A strong majority of my constituents believe that the right to an abortion should be protected by law. This is a freedom and a privacy issue, and the government—not politicians in this room and not politicians in any State in our Nation—should not have any part in this conversation at all. This is a very personal decision between a woman, her family, her doctor, and her faith.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in voting ''yes'' to protect Roe today.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the State of Washington (Ms. SCHRIER). Dr. Schrier is also a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I will tell you, my constituents are up in arms. They are emailing me, and they are calling my office outraged that the freedoms that they have had for 50 years are being stripped away from women in one-half of the States in this country. They are furious when they hear about victims of rape not being able to end a pregnancy and when they see a 10-year-old girl who has to flee to a neighboring State so she won't be forced to carry a pregnancy to term—a 10-year old.

This is barbaric. My constituents are worried about what might come next in our home State of Washington.

I am the only pro-choice woman doctor in all of Congress. In fact, I am a pediatrician. And I have been in the exam room with teens facing unplanned pregnancies and with mothers who find out that the pregnancy they are so excited about is not a viable one. These are deeply personal circumstances. Frankly, when, whether, and under what circumstances to become a mother is the single most important decision a woman will ever make, and that must be hers to make. The government has no place in the exam room.

Today I am voting to make sure that every woman—no matter where she lives—can access abortion, to plan their pregnancies, protect their health, and chart the course of their lives. I want my constituents to know I will fight every day to protect their rights.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) who spent his life defending the voiceless.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend, CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, the ranking member, for her eloquent defense of the unborn child and their mothers because there are two co-victims in every abortion: mother and baby. I thank her for her leadership. It is extraordinary.

Madam Speaker, according to the January 2022 Marist Poll, only 17 percent of Americans believe that ''abortion should be available to a woman any time she wants one during her entire pregnancy.''

When Americans were asked in late June—June 28 to 29—in a Harvard/Harris Poll, a nationwide poll supervised by Mark Penn—and many of us know him; he is a very effective pollster—and the question was put: ''Do you think your State should allow abortions up to 9 months'' only 10 percent said ''yes.''

H.R. 8296 would legally authorize and enable the violent death of unborn baby girls and boys by dismemberment, beheading, forced expulsion from the womb, deadly poisons, or other methods at any time and for any reason until birth.

Don't believe it?

Read section 4 of the bill. It couldn't be clearer.

This bill is far outside the American mainstream and goes far beyond Roe v. Wade.

As a matter of fact, when the Harvard/Harris Poll asked whether or not we should be doing what we are doing today in Congress, they found—and I was a little bit astonished by this—that less than one-third of voters—31 percent—say that abortion laws should be federally set by a congressional vote.

Let me point out to my colleagues because mention was made of this earlier in the debate. Let me be clear, abortion is not healthcare unless one construes the precious life of an unborn child to be analogous to a tumor to be excised or a disease to be vanquished.

This legislation constitutes an existential threat to unborn children. Since Roe v. Wade, approximately 63½ million babies have been killed by dismemberment, chemical poisoning, and beheading—a number that equates with the entire population of everyone living in the country of Italy.

If enacted, this bill would nullify almost every pro-life restriction ever enacted by the States, including parental involvement laws in 37 States and pain-capable unborn child protection laws in 19 States.

I remember when a woman from Virginia formed a group called Mothers Against Minors' Abortion. That mom found out about her daughter's abortion when she was hemorrhaging in her bed. She came and testified before Congress and said: Please, we need to know. We love our daughters. Parental notification laws do work.

Sadly, these will be nullified by this bill.

For decades abortion advocates have gone through extraordinary lengths to ignore, trivialize, or cover up the battered baby victim. But today, thanks to ultrasound, unborn babies are more visible than ever before. Today science informs us that birth is an event—albeit, an important one—but only an event in the life of a child. Life is a continuum.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to oppose this bill. The youngest patients and their mothers need protection.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER), who is a member of our committee.

Ms. KUSTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Women's Health Protection Act and to speak for the generation of women who have lost their freedom to make healthcare decisions for themselves. The government has no place inserting itself into people's personal healthcare decisions.

I never expected to be on the floor of the House talking about miscarriage, ectopic pregnancy, or fertility treatments, but here we are.

For many, pregnancy is not an easy path. One in eight pregnancies end in miscarriage, and 1 in 50 women experience ectopic pregnancies—an outcome that always leads to pregnancy loss and poses serious risk of life to the mother.

□ 1015

For countless others, getting pregnant requires costly, exhausting, and complex procedures such as IVF.

Regardless of the circumstances, reproductive health is private.

Pregnancy can be unpredictable. The government has no place in deciding what care patients can receive and doctors can administer. Like all healthcare, decisions surrounding reproductive health should be between a patient and their doctor.

As an adoption attorney, I worked with hundreds of birth mothers making the most personal, consequential decisions of their lives, and not one of those women looked to the government to make that decision for them.

I support the Women's Health Protection Act, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 13 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Washington has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), the chairwoman of our Health Subcommittee.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I rise in the strongest support possible of the Women's Health Protection Act.

In February 2020, I held the first legislative hearing in two decades to protect access to reproductive health. Since then, we have seen the steady rollback of abortion rights in Republican-controlled States. This means that low-income women and minorities have been living in a post-Roe reality for years now.

Now, the Supreme Court has fully revoked the constitutional right to abortion, leaving States to outlaw and criminalize abortion if they choose to. This devastating decision has created a patchwork of States with differing laws and restrictions, causing societal chaos and confusion across our country.

It is a huntdown of women. It is a huntdown of women.

The Women's Health Protection Act makes sure that every American has equal access to reproductive healthcare, no matter where they live. I am eager to vote for this legislation, once again, and I call on my Senate counterparts to codify these vital protections into law.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and another medical provider.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise today in opposition to this legislation that would legalize abortion on demand up until the moment of birth.

As a physician, I first swore an oath to do no harm. As legislators, we cannot, in good conscience, vote to pass legislation that would claim the lives of unborn children in late-term abortions.

This poorly written legislation would put our Nation alongside countries like China and North Korea by allowing discriminatory abortions based on sex, based on race, even based on disability. This is unacceptable, and it is gut-wrenching that Congress would even consider passing such legislation.

This abortion on demand act would override pro-life laws passed in our States and prohibit State-level elected officials from passing legislation to protect unborn children in our communities.

It is time for all Members of Congress to vote against this poorly written bill.

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. It is time for all Members of Congress to vote against this poorly written bill. I urge a ''no'' vote.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD two articles, ''Democrats Launch Ads in Lifestyle Mags in All Out Push for Abortion'' from the Daily Caller and ''Ohio Right to Life Says Offices Targeted Twice by Pro-Abortion Vandals with Rocks, Spray Paint'' from FOX News.

[From the Daily Caller, July 13, 2022]

DEMOCRATS LAUNCH ADS IN LIFESTYLE MAGS IN ALL OUT PUSH FOR ABORTION

(By Mary Rooke)

The Democratic National Committee (DNC) launched a digital ad campaign Tuesday in several lifestyle magazines telling readers that Republicans want to outlaw abortion nationwide.

The DNC purchased at least $10,000 in digital ads in over 20 lifestyle publications to focus on abortion rights issues as the midterms approach, the Associated Press reported.

Magazines like Teen Vouge, Elle, Refinery29, Essence, GQ, Esquire, Men's Health, Cosmopolitan and Glamour, hosted the DNC's ads, reported the AP.

The ad showed Republican Kentucky Sen. Mitch McConnell next to blue, pink, and white lettering that read: ''Republicans are pushing to ban abortion nationally. Join us in fighting back,'' according to the report.

The DNC is looking to launch a separate abortion-centered ad campaign with plans to spend six figures, reported the AP.

The DNC's ads promoting a ''week of action'' to defend abortion are in response to the U.S. Supreme Court's decision to overturn Roe v. Wade, sending abortion law-making back to the state legislatures.

''With this Defend Choice Week of Action, we're giving people across the country a chance to turn their anger into action by holding anti-choice Republicans accountable and helping to elect Democrats,'' DNC chair Jaime Harrison said, according to the AP.

The DNC held a virtual launch for its ''all-hands-on-deck effort to defend choice'' on Tuesday night, according to the DNC website.

''This fight isn't over and we need all hands on deck. This event will serve as the kickoff for our Week of Action, which we'll highlight how to get involved with on the call,'' The DNC event description stated.

The latest Associated Press-NORC poll released Friday showed that only 16% of Americans feel abortion is the biggest issue facing the U.S. In comparison, 40% of U.S. adults said they were more worried about inflation and 33% said gas prices, according to the poll.

The survey polled, 1,053 adults nationwide from June 23–27 with a margin of error of +/−4.0%.

[From Fox News, July 13, 2022]

OHIO RIGHT TO LIFE SAYS OFFICES TARGETED TWICE BY PRO-ABORTION VANDALS WITH ROCKS, SPRAY PAINT

(By Emma Colton)

Dozens of pro-life centers have been targeted across the country since a leaked Supreme Court draft opinion signaled Roe V. Wade would be overturned In May, followed by the nation's highest court ultimately ruling as such in June.

For one pro-life organization in Ohio, it has been targeted twice since last month.

''As pro-lifers, we know that our work might cost us something and that very well could be our physical safety,'' the executive director of the Right to Life of Northeast Ohio Allie Frazier told Fox News Digital. ''I think that it's important in moments like this for the pro-life movement to be really clear that we're not going to be intimidated. We will save babies. We will protect women. And we're not going to let threats of violence stop us from doing that.''

Offices for the Right to Life of Northeast Ohio were most recently targeted on July 8, Frazier said, when al least one suspect was caught on camera lobbing rocks at the building, breaking windows and spray-painting menacing messages.

''If abortion isn't safe, neither are you,'' the suspect, who was seen wearing a face mask, scrawled on the sidewalk of the offices. The phrase has been spray-painted at similar offices across the country, often by members of pro-abortion extremist group Jane's Revenge.

Frazier said it's likely that Jane's Revenge is behind this attack, noting that among other spray-painted messages, the name ''Jane'' was written on the ground.

''I think It would be easy for a situation like this to be a copycat scenario. But as far as I'm concerned, if any pro-abortion individual decides to take that next step, to take that bad step, and use violence against pro-lifers, that is something that I am going to work hard to protect my staff against,'' she said.

The incident was reported to the Akron Police Department, Frazier said. The Akron Police Department has not responded to multiple Fox News inquiry requests on the matter.

Frazier said that the damage caused by the vandalism was ''significant,'' but ''undoable,'' noting that repairs were being made to the broken windows as she spoke to Fox News Digital.

''I know that the intention of this attack was to stop us. It was to stop our peaceful activism. It was to stop the ways that we are impacting women and babies in this community for a positive. And they didn't even stop that. I was already back to work in my office within a few hours,'' she said.

It was the second time the offices were targeted, Frazier said. Activists posted pro-abortion posters at the office on June 24, the day Roe was officially overturned, hung a coat hanger on an office door knob, and rang a Ring security camera before flashing a middle finger to the camera, according to Frazier.

She said that the attacks pro-life centers have recently faced should ''100%'' be investigated as hate crimes.

''(Pro-abortion vandals] are not afraid of using violence to get what they want. This is absolutely a threat against the peaceful pro-life movement. And we do ask that law enforcement and local, state, and federal leaders continue to lead the way and say, 'Hey, violence is never okay,' '' she said.

Pro-life activists have repeatedly called on Presiden1 Biden to forcefully condemn the attacks on pregnancy centers and churches, including Frazier who called on the president to not ''be complicit in this violence.''

''Regardless of how people feel on the issue of abortion, everybody should be able to condemn acts of violence against peaceful nonprofits. Whether that's an advocacy organization like Right to Life of Northeast Ohio, or a pro-life pregnancy center that are literally meeting the needs of women and babies in crisis,'' she told Fox News Digital.

The White House has previously condemned the violence at pro-life centers but has come under scrutiny for not doing more.

''Instead of supporting and defending more pro-life pregnancy centers that provide health care and support to women at every stage of life, President Joe Biden and the Left are working to dismantle the work of these amazing centers. They won't strongly condemn the violence and threats pregnancy centers are facing,'' the Republican House Energy and Commerce Committee posted on Tuesday, demanding Biden ''MUST condemn the violence and threats.''

Dozens of pro-life centers have faced attack since May, including a pro-life Christian pregnancy center in Buffalo, New York, that was allegedly ''firebombed,'' and a pregnancy center in Dearborn, Michigan, that saw every ''window and door along the front face of our building'' smashed.

Jane's Revenge has taken responsibility for a handful of the attacks and declared ''open season'' on pro-life pregnancy crisis centers in a letter published last month.

''We offered an honourable way out,'' the letter read. ''You could have walked away. Now the leash is off. And we will make it as hard as possible for your campaign of oppression to continue.''

But to Frazier, the pro-life movement will remain unchanged and committed to protecting women and babies.

''We must be willing to do what it takes to protect women and babies and be ready to take any backlash from that . . . Don't be afraid. We got this,'' she said of her message to pro-life Americans, adding that pro-lifers can also reach out to their local pregnancy centers to check in on staff and see if they need any additional resources.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who is co-chair of the Pro-Choice Caucus.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, for his work, and for bringing this bill to the floor.

Let me also take a moment to thank our good friend, a great leader, Congresswoman JUDY CHU, for her vision and her persistent leadership, and Chairman PALLONE for bringing this to the floor, once again.

Last month's Supreme Court decision is having devastating impacts across the country. Now, I remember the days before Roe, and now that the Court has ended Roe, we are truly in a state of a national health emergency.

Abortion bans affect everyone, but their impact falls hardest on folks who face serious barriers to care and already have these barriers presented because of the lack of equity in our healthcare system—women of color, people working to make ends meet, rural people, young people.

It is terrifying now that people could be criminalized for exercising their own personal healthcare decisions. That is wrong. It is morally wrong.

Already, across this country, people are unable to get care and are denied the freedom to make their own decisions about their health and about their futures. Our personal liberties and our freedoms are being taken away. This is just another step in the erosion of our democracy.

It has never been more critical than now that we pass legislation to protect the right to access abortion and ensure that abortion and comprehensive reproductive healthcare are accessible and available for all.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN).

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, Roe became law when I was 13. For my entire adult life, the right to abortion care—to privacy and the freedom to make my own family planning and healthcare decisions—was guaranteed in all 50 States. It sickens me that it is not the case today. My daughters-in-law, my

granddaughters, and all women and girls have been stripped of human rights and relegated to second-class citizens.

After a decades-long effort, Republicans have fixed the Supreme Court with a few Justices corruptly seated by an autocratic President, and they now behave not as constitutional lawyers but as theocrats.

In overturning Roe and sending a woman's reproductive freedom to State politicians—largely White, male—these Justices have decided their faith should determine everyone else's rights, not the Constitution.

This is a call to the Chamber, to this Chamber, to the Senate, to the administration. We must restore, expand, and protect rights. We must pass laws that combat this regressive, shrinking Court. No excuses.

That is why we are here, yet again, with legislation to codify the right to abortion care.

Last September, the House passed the Women's Health Protection Act, and the Senate sat on its hands. Today, we must pass it again.

I will return to the floor every session, with Representative CHU and many others, until we protect and expand rights. I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), a doctor who understands what amazing technology is doing to save lives.

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 8296.

First, I would like to say, as a physician, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle need to focus on what their bill really does. Stop talking about ectopic pregnancies, which are a surgical emergency; fetal demise, where, for unknown reasons, the fetus has passed away; and miscarriages, which, clearly, in many cases, are surgical emergencies and are tragic. That is not what this bill is about.

I have heard claims the bill only codifies provisions of the now-overturned Roe v. Wade decision. That is simply not true. H.R. 8296 would create a national standard to allow abortions at any time up until birth.

As a practicing heart surgeon for 15 years prior to coming to Congress, I operated on children in the neonatal intensive care unit as young as 23 weeks gestation. Even at 650 grams, or 1.4 pounds, and about 6 inches long, I saw life in my tiny patients' little bodies.

This abortion on demand until birth act bill doesn't only allow abortions at any point in the pregnancy. It would also preempt and repeal State laws that require informed consent, ultrasounds, or other testing and counseling before undertaking an elective abortion.

The American people deserve to know the facts about what is really in this bill. I find it troubling the supporters of this bill, most of whom have never taken care of a patient, continue to mislead the American people about what constitutes healthcare.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I want to begin to acknowledge the pain that people have experienced in the wake of being stripped of their rights and being thrust into legal limbo.

We have already seen the impact this horrific decision has had on increased wait times in clinics, and doctors forced to consult with lawyers because of State restrictions, while patients may be dying on operating tables.

The barbaric treatment of the 10-year-old child, a victim of rape, made into a media circus, and the prospect of the doctor who provided her care being subjected to legal action.

We know the Supreme Court has put us all on the wrong side of history. These appalling stories reinforce the fact that denying fundamental healthcare has dire and unforeseen circumstances far beyond the slogans that have been bandied around.

I believe it is our duty to take responsibility to make progress in even these difficult circumstances to provide a path forward. This legislation does that.

We owe it to American families to make progress, to protect them and improve access to this right, and spare them government intrusion into the most sensitive and personal matters. Our rage must be productive.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), another defender of life.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, my heart breaks today. I say that sincerely. My heart breaks to hear the words of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who I respect highly for many reasons, who disregard the fact that we are talking about life.

On this floor, we have talked about the need for formula this morning for the same babies we are talking about. We have heard our Speaker many times imploring us to do it for the children. Who are we talking about today?

It breaks my heart to think that my colleagues don't trust women to make decisions about life before life is conceived. It breaks my heart to think that we don't hold men accountable to make decisions to love our girls and women.

It breaks my heart that we would say this is a human right to take life when our Declaration of Independence brought us into being with unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We are better than this. We have had 50 years of death. Think about the over 100 years before that we applauded life.

Madam Speaker, it is time for us to stand for individuals taking responsibilities that God has made us capable of, to decide for the best interests of others, including those little children.

Why is the safest place on Earth today the maternity ward nursery in a hospital, but not the womb?

We must change. H.R. 8296 is a bill of death, and it is a bill that takes away responsibility for us, as adults, to do what we must do.

□ 1030

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), the chairman of our Democratic Caucus.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman, Chairman PALLONE, for his leadership in this critically important area, as well as Representative FLETCHER for leading the charge in an area that is significantly important and consistent with the values of this great country; a country that embraces life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, land of the free, and home of the brave, liberty and justice for all.

But liberty, justice, and freedom are under assault right now because of a radical, rightwing, illegitimate Supreme Court majority and their extreme co-conspirators here in the House of Representatives attacking freedom.

But this legislation and House Democrats are going to do everything in our power to defend a woman's freedom to make her own reproductive healthcare decisions, a woman's freedom to make a deeply personal decision that should be between a woman and her doctor, not extremists trying to intervene, and her freedom to make the decision to travel to seek abortion care whenever and wherever is necessary.

Those are the stakes. That is why this legislation is so important, and we will always defend these freedoms.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. HERN), a defender of freedom, a defender of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for all.

Mr. HERN. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding the time.

Last month, our Constitution was upheld at the Supreme Court, and States like Oklahoma took immediate action to protect the lives of the unborn.

This shouldn't be a hard vote. It is the right for children, fully formed in the womb, to be born.

Our allies and like-minded nations around the world do not allow abortions up to the moment of birth, as this bill would do. It is simply barbaric. My colleagues know it is an unpopular position, which is why they have resorted to lies and deceptions about lifesaving care for pregnant women.

Madam Speaker, I urge every Member of this Chamber to vote ''no'' on H.R. 8296 and protect the right of our future generations to be born.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS).

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his extraordinary support.

Madam Speaker, I rise today because I am pretty damn angry. You know the Supreme Court's decision overturning the right to abortion care is fundamentally wrong. The Supreme Court greenlit forced pregnancy, taking away the right to bodily autonomy for women.

Abortion is still healthcare. People will still need to access it, and that is why I am supporting the Women's Health Protection Act.

In the wake of the Dobbs decision, we have a State-by-State patchwork that denies women equal protection under the law.

While abortion is still legal in my home State of North Carolina, the State of Texas is suing the government to compel women to carry pregnancies to term, even if it kills the mother.

The attorney general of Indiana wants to force rape victims—even 10-year-old girls—to carry pregnancies to term.

We have a responsibility to stop this draconian overreach by State governments, and we have got to make reproductive freedom—reproductive freedom—the law of the land.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining in this debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Washington has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a defender of life.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding time.

You know, as we hold this debate, I remember back to a morning as a young resident at Parkland Hospital starting out in a residency in OB/GYN and our major professor, our department chairman, Jack Pritchard, addressing us and telling us that starting into a career in OB/GYN, we were in a unique position in medicine.

Every time we took a case, either as a primary doctor or consultant, we would have the unique opportunity to be taking care of two patients who had a combined life expectancy of over 100 years.

He said nowhere else in medicine are you going to be able to affect the future to the degree that you can as an OB/GYN.

In nearly 30 years of practice back in Texas, I have taken care of women with ectopic pregnancies. We did it before. We will continue to do it. It is a surgical emergency, and you don't shy away from it.

Unfortunately, some pregnancies do conclude in a miscarriage, and some of those do require the attention of a physician. I would not hesitate to do that, then or now.

But what I would not do and could not do was disrupt a viable pregnancy where a child could issue from that care. None of that changes, either before or after the Supreme Court decision.

Look, there have been times when I have had to step in when someone had care at another facility and sought refuge in my emergency room because of severe complications they were having from an abortion done elsewhere.

I would have to step in and correct the problems from the abortionist. I didn't hesitate to do that and will continue to do it in the future, but what I will not do is end a life in a pregnancy.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Women's Health Protection Act which will provide—in law—the right for people to make their own reproductive healthcare decisions.

The Supreme Court's Dobbs opinion overturning abortion rights is infuriating, it is heartbreaking, and it is dangerous.

For almost 50 years, the intensely personal decision about whether to bear a child or have an abortion was where it belongs—with the person who is pregnant.

I remember the days before Roe v. Wade when abortions done without medical care could, and often did, have tragic consequences.

Colleagues, make no mistake: Overturning Roe will not end abortions.

Make no mistake: Taking away the right to abortion care will disproportionately hurt families and individuals who are already struggling, and disproportionately hurt people in rural areas who will struggle to get the care they need.

My colleagues, if you believe life begins at conception, don't get an abortion. But that is a belief, it is not science, and others do not share it.

I don't think anyone over here would ever force someone with your beliefs to get an abortion, but you are forcing your beliefs on others, and that is wrong.

We need to restore personal freedom and put the decision about whether or when to bear a child back where it belongs.

Today, I will enthusiastically vote for the Women's Health Protection Act.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE), another defender of life.

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time.

''We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.'' Life.

Abortion is a termination of that life and a grave human rights abuse, and it must end. No one has the right to end the life of an innocent human being. The government has a duty to protect that right to life.

Since 1973, more than 63 million unborn babies have had their lives cut short. That is a tragedy and simply unacceptable, and I stand here for the sake of millions of children, for the sake of the integrity of our Nation.

Let's follow the science. Preborn humans are, in fact, humans and deserving of life. But, unfortunately, the pro-abortion left has decided that ''human'' doesn't automatically grant that right and that humans should only be accorded human rights depending on their location, level of dependency, or size.

That mindset is a travesty, and the practice of abortion will go down in history as a great stain on this Nation.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER), a defender of life.

Mr. PFLUGER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Washington for yielding time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Democrats' extreme pro-abortion agenda.

Today, I am voting against two bills that go far beyond Roe v. Wade, which is the decision to move these types of unenumerated decisions to the State level, as the Constitution clearly says, backed up by the Supreme Court.

But what my Democrat colleagues are pushing would permit elective abortions, up to and including a baby's due date, an extreme position legalizing abortion based on the child's race, sex, or disability. Tragic.

Another of their initiatives opens up dangerous loopholes for child traffickers to cover up their crimes by forcing victims to receive abortions across State lines, and it criminalizes those who might encourage delaying an abortion, including parents or healthcare providers. Parents.

Since the overturn of Roe v. Wade, Democrats at all levels, including the White House, have spread misinformation and fear surrounding the decision. Presenting the killing of a child as a woman's only avenue to success in her career or life is inhumane and wrong.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to vote against these bills.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank all of the leaders who recognize that reproductive freedom is a constitutional right.

I rise today, and I stand in the name of a 10-year-old rape victim who was denied an abortion and had to run to another State.

I stand in the name of the young woman who induced an abortion and became criminalized.

I stand in the name of rape victims.

I stand in the name of incest victims.

I stand for reproductive freedom.

And I stand in the name of the Constitution and the Ninth Amendment and the right of women with their faith leaders, their families, their extended knowledge, to be able to make their own decision about reproductive freedom.

I stand for the Women's Health Protection Act because it prohibits a State, local, or Tribal Government from telling abortion providers that they should perform medically unnecessary procedures like ultrasounds and provide patients with medically inaccurate information. This would be prohibited by this particular legislation and, as well, to ensure that they would comply with credentialing or other conditions that do not apply to providers who offer medically comparable services.

I stand in order for the Women's Health Protection Act to cover this United States and to ensure that the Constitution and Ninth Amendment prevails.

I stand because the Supreme Court Justices who swore that they believe in precedent for 50 years of Roe v. Wade did, under oath, misrepresent to those who they were speaking to that they would adhere to stare decisis and the precedent.

I stand because in Texas, the bounty hunters are seeking to criminalize and arrest persons. I stand for H.R. 5710 that will criminalize that activity.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise in strong support of H.R. 8296, the Women's Health Protection Act of 2022.

H.R. 8296, the "Women's Health Protection Act of 2022" of which I have been a long-time supporter, would prohibit certain government restrictions on access to abortion.

The bill would ensure physicians' ability to prescribe certain drugs, offer abortion services via telemedicine, and provide immediate abortion services when the mother's health is at risk.

Furthermore, the "Women's Health Protection Act of 2022" would put an end to the hurdles some states have placed in the way of women accessing abortion care.

This bill would prohibit state, local, or tribal governments from requiring abortion providers to:

Perform medically unnecessary procedures like ultrasounds;

Provide patients with medically inaccurate information or;

Comply with credentialing or other conditions that do not apply to providers who offer medically comparable services.

It would also safeguard all abortions before fetal viability, and after fetal viability when a physician determines the continuation of pregnancy puts the mother's life at risk.

Under this bill, patients would not be required to disclose the reasoning behind their decision to receive an abortion, nor would they be forced to attend medically unnecessary health visits before their procedure appointment.

In the wake of the U.S. Supreme Court's decision to revoke the reproductive rights that women have enjoyed for half a century, Congress must act now to enshrine what is left of women's liberties into law.

I stand in proud support of both H.R. 8296, the "Women's Health Protection Act of 2022."

I urge my colleagues to stand up for women and girls and the providers who meet their medical needs every day.

We cannot let those who wish to relegate women to second-class citizens turn back the clock any further.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), a strong defender of life, who is on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 8296 because Republicans care about women and babies.

My colleagues across the aisle are unfortunately, once again, attempting to push their abortion on demand agenda, which most Americans find appalling.

This bill is beyond extreme. It permits abortions on demand for any—any reason, up until the moment of birth.

Eighty percent of Americans say that abortion should be illegal in the third trimester, and for good reason. The methods used in late-term abortions to end the life of the preborn baby are truly reprehensible.

□ 1045

The bill before us today almost completely undermines the numerous pro-life laws that States have enacted since the U.S. Supreme Court overturned Roe v. Wade by imposing a national standard for abortion on demand.

As a mother and grandmother, I can tell you that preborn babies are unquestionably human lives, and they are lives worth defending.

I find it ironic that the party that tells us to follow the science denies basic science that says life begins at conception, that the first signs of a heartbeat can be detected after just 22 days, and that preborn babies can feel pain as early as 12 weeks inside the womb.

Passing this legislation would be a stain on Congress. Women deserve better than this, and so do their preborn babies. Preborn babies are truly the most vulnerable and defenseless amongst us. We were elected to defend Americans' rights, and yet this Congress seeks to deny vulnerable persons', babies, the most basic right, the right to life.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I have no additional speakers, so I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH), another defender of life.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, a great defender of life, for yielding me this time, and I stand for life today.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 8296, the so-called Women's Health Protection Act, is proof that the left wants to ensure limitless, taxpayer-funded abortion. This is truly outrageous, and the vast majority of Americans do not support abortion without limits.

It is stunning that Congress is wasting its time on legislation that is so out of touch with the people it represents. What we should be focusing on is helping women and protecting the innocent lives of babies.

For that reason, I rise today to offer a motion to recommit to instead consider H.R. 619, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

Across the country, abortion providers are denying care to infants born alive after attempted abortions. We are talking about children who have already been born. We are talking about infanticide.

Congress must act to protect innocent, defenseless babies who cannot protect themselves. The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act is compassionate legislation that does just that. This bill simply ensures that babies who survive attempted abortions receive the same standard of care that any newborn should receive.

It would require healthcare providers to exercise skill, care, and diligence to preserve the life and health of these children and then immediately transport and admit them to the hospital.

It would impose penalties on providers who purposefully fail to give medical care to these babies.

It would bar criminal prosecution of the mother.

But most importantly, it would save lives.

Coming to Congress, I knew there would be a lot of difficult conversations about the life of the unborn, but I am truly shocked and heartbroken that I have to stand here and defend lifesaving care for babies who have already been born.

Madam Speaker, we can, and we should make every effort to protect the lives of newborn babies.

To my colleagues, this is the simplest vote you will ever have to take. Either you support babies being denied lifesaving healthcare after they are born, or you do not.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the text of the amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Washington has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, abortion is the sharpest, most soul-searching question before us as a Nation. It pierces every heart. People have strongly held beliefs and stories, and both sides are guilty of dismissing one another.

For those of us who stand for the right to life, we must do a better job of listening and loving. Fear and despair lead to more arguments, anger, discord, and insecurity.

The abortion on demand bill, this bill before us today, though, is extreme. It is abortion for any reason, at any stage of pregnancy until birth. It is not the will of the American people.

I recently spoke with a doctor who shared with me what is possible today. It is American technology and medical technology that allows us now to do surgeries inside the womb.

I am a mom of three young kids, and anyone who has given birth knows that to be able, because of technology, to see the baby develop day by day is just amazing.

Doctors are performing prenatal surgeries and treatments to save lives. This doctor was telling me they can perform a prenatal surgery on 20 different organs. That wasn't possible in 1973 when Roe v. Wade was decided. In fact, the first successful fetal surgery wasn't until 1982.

Many decades later, look how far we have come. Science has evolved. It is my hope that we learn from this and that we reject abortion because it is unthinkable. It is not following the science. It doesn't reflect the latest research or modern medicine. Reject this legislation.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, the Supreme Court's extreme and dangerous decision in Dobbs turns back the clock and jeopardizes the health, well-being, and autonomy of women across the Nation. Access to comprehensive healthcare must include access to abortion, and the ability to access care should not depend on where you live.

The bill before us, the Women's Health Protection Act, restores a right to an abortion nationwide, ensuring that all Americans, regardless of where they live, can make their own decisions about their lives and their futures.

I urge my colleagues across the aisle to support this bill. While Republicans seek to punish and control women by criminalizing abortion nationwide, House Democrats will continue our fight to restore the right to abortion as the law of the land.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1224, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Michelle Fischback of Minnesota moves to recommit the bill H.R. 8296 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. FISCHBACH is as follows:

Strike all that follows the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act''.

(b) FINDINGS; CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds as follows:

(A) If an abortion results in the live birth of an infant, the infant is a legal person for all purposes under the laws of the United States, and entitled to all the protections of such laws.

(B) Any infant born alive after an abortion or within a hospital, clinic, or other facility has the same claim to the protection of the law that would arise for any newborn, or for any person who comes to a hospital, clinic, or other facility for screening and treatment or otherwise becomes a patient within its care.

(2) CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY.—In accordance with the above findings, Congress enacts the following pursuant to Congress' power under—

(A) section 5 of the 14th Amendment, including the power to enforce the prohibition on government action denying equal protection of the laws; and

(B) section 8 of article I to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution of the United States, including the power to regulate commerce under clause 3 of such section.

(c) BORN-ALIVE INFANTS PROTECTION.—

(1) REQUIREMENTS PERTAINING TO BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS.—Chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1531 the following:

''§ 1532. Requirements pertaining to born-alive abortion survivors

''(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR HEALTH CARE PRACTITIONERS.—In the case of an abortion or attempted abortion that results in a child born alive (as defined in section 8 of title 1, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Born-Alive Infants Protection Act')):

''(1) DEGREE OF CARE REQUIRED; IMMEDIATE ADMISSION TO A HOSPITAL.—Any health care practitioner present at the time the child is born alive shall—

''(A) exercise the same degree of professional skill, care, and diligence to preserve the life and health of the child as a reasonably diligent and conscientious health care practitioner would render to any other child born alive at the same gestational age; and

''(B) following the exercise of skill, care, and diligence required under subparagraph (A), ensure that the child born alive is immediately transported and admitted to a hospital.

''(2) MANDATORY REPORTING OF VIOLATIONS.—A health care practitioner or any employee of a hospital, a physician's office, or an abortion clinic who has knowledge of a failure to comply with the requirements of paragraph (1) shall immediately report the failure to an appropriate State or Federal law enforcement agency, or to both.

''(b) PENALTIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Whoever violates subsection (a) shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

''(2) INTENTIONAL KILLING OF CHILD BORN ALIVE.—Whoever intentionally performs or attempts to perform an overt act that kills a child born alive described under subsection (a), shall be punished as under section 1111 of this title for intentionally killing or attempting to kill a human being.

''(c) BAR TO PROSECUTION.—The mother of a child born alive described under subsection (a) may not be prosecuted under this section, for conspiracy to violate this section, or for an offense under section 3 or 4 of this title based on such a violation.

''(d) CIVIL REMEDIES.—

''(1) CIVIL ACTION BY A WOMAN ON WHOM AN ABORTION IS PERFORMED.—If a child is born alive and there is a violation of subsection (a), the woman upon whom the abortion was performed or attempted may, in a civil action against any person who committed the violation, obtain appropriate relief.

''(2) APPROPRIATE RELIEF.—Appropriate relief in a civil action under this subsection includes—

''(A) objectively verifiable money damage for all injuries, psychological and physical, occasioned by the violation of subsection (a);

''(B) statutory damages equal to 3 times the cost of the abortion or attempted abortion; and

''(C) punitive damages.

''(3) ATTORNEY'S FEE FOR PLAINTIFF.—The court shall award a reasonable attorney's fee to a prevailing plaintiff in a civil action under this subsection.

''(4) ATTORNEY'S FEE FOR DEFENDANT.—If a defendant in a civil action under this subsection prevails and the court finds that the plaintiff's suit was frivolous, the court shall award a reasonable attorney's fee in favor of the defendant against the plaintiff.

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section the following definitions apply:

''(1) ABORTION.—The term 'abortion' means the use or prescription of any instrument, medicine, drug, or any other substance or device—

''(A) to intentionally kill the unborn child of a woman known to be pregnant; or

''(B) to intentionally terminate the pregnancy of a woman known to be pregnant, with an intention other than—

''(i) after viability, to produce a live birth and preserve the life and health of the child born alive; or

''(ii) to remove a dead unborn child.

''(2) ATTEMPT.—The term 'attempt', with respect to an abortion, means conduct that, under the circumstances as the actor believes them to be, constitutes a substantial step in a course of conduct planned to culminate in performing an abortion.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item pertaining to section 1531 the following:

''1532. Requirements pertaining to born-alive abortion survivors.''.

(3) CHAPTER HEADING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) CHAPTER HEADING IN CHAPTER.—The chapter heading for chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''**Partial-Birth Abortions**'' and inserting ''**Abortions**''.

(B) TABLE OF CHAPTERS FOR PART I.—The item relating to chapter 74 in the table of

chapters at the beginning of part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Partial-Birth Abortions'' and inserting ''Abortions''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to section 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

ENSURING ACCESS TO ABORTION ACT OF 2022

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1224, I call up the bill (H.R. 8297) to prohibit the interference, under color of State law, with the provision of interstate abortion services, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1224, the amendment printed in part B of House Report 117–405 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 8297

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act''.

SEC. 2. INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE ABORTION SERVICES PROHIBITED.

(a) INTERFERENCE PROHIBITED.—No person acting under color of State law, including any person who, by operation of a provision of State law, is permitted to implement or enforce State law, may prevent, restrict, or impede, or retaliate against, in any manner—

(1) a health care provider's ability to provide, initiate, or otherwise enable an abortion service that is lawful in the State in which the service is to be provided to a patient who does not reside in that State;

(2) any person or entity's ability to assist a health care provider to provide, initiate, or otherwise enable an abortion service that is lawful in the State in which the service is to be provided to a patient who does not reside in that State, if such assistance does not violate the law of that State;

(3) any person's ability to travel across a State line for the purpose of obtaining an abortion service that is lawful in the State in which the service is to be provided;

(4) any person's or entity's ability to assist another person traveling across a State line for the purpose of obtaining an abortion service that is lawful in the State in which the service is to be provided; or

(5) the movement in interstate commerce, in accordance with Federal law or regulation, of any drug approved or licensed by the Food and Drug Administration for the termination of a pregnancy.

(b) ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General may bring a civil action in the appropriate United States district court against any person who violates subsection (a) for declaratory and injunctive relief.

(c) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—Any person who is harmed by a violation of subsection (a) may bring a civil action in the appropriate United States district court against the person who violated such subsection for declaratory and injunctive relief, and for such compensatory damages as the court determines appropriate, including for economic losses and for emotional pain and suffering. The court may, in addition, award reasonable attorney's fees and costs of the action to a prevailing plaintiff.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''abortion service'' means—

(A) an abortion, including the use of any drug approved or licensed by the Food and Drug Administration for the termination of a pregnancy; and

(B) any health care service related to or provided in conjunction with an abortion (whether or not provided at the same time or on the same day as the abortion).

(2) The term ''health care provider'' means any entity or individual (including any physician, certified nurse-midwife, nurse practitioner, physician's assistant, or pharmacist) that is—

(A) engaged or seeks to engage in the delivery of health care services, including abortion services; and

(B) licensed or certified to perform such service under applicable State law.

(3) The term ''drug'' has the meaning given such term in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(4) The term ''State'' includes the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, each Indian tribe, and each territory or possession of the United States.

(e) SEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person, entity, government, or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, or the application of such provision to all other persons, entities, governments, or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit the fundamental right to travel within the United States, including the District of Columbia, Tribal lands, and the territories of the United States, nor to limit any existing enforcement authority of the Attorney General or any existing remedies available to address a violation of such right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and add extraneous material on H.R. 8297, the Ensuring Access to Abortion Act of 2022.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 8297, the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act, introduced by Representative FLETCHER, a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Last month, when the Supreme Court overturned a woman's constitutional right to abortion, it also gave license to extreme Republican politicians to pass dangerous laws across the Nation. These State laws criminalize healthcare and create an environment of fear for healthcare providers or anyone else assisting someone who needs an abortion.

Already, abortion bans are in effect in 9 States, and more are expected soon. Republican politicians and anti-abortion extremists are also actively considering even more actions. They want to prevent private citizens from legally crossing State lines to obtain an abortion. They also want to deputize private citizens to track down anyone who might help a woman legally obtain an abortion in another State.

These actions clearly violate the Constitution and the right to travel freely, and this legislation will put those States on notice that their actions to limit their citizens from obtaining the healthcare they need cannot be enforced.

H.R. 8297 reaffirms the right to travel across State lines to obtain a lawful abortion. It protects healthcare providers who provide lawful abortion care to out-of-State residents, and it protects anyone who may assist a woman in crossing State lines to obtain a lawful abortion, such as a friend, partner, or volunteer.

Madam Speaker, the bill also prohibits individuals acting under State law from restricting or impeding access to medication abortions, which States are rushing to restrict despite the clear authority of the Federal Government.

Madam Speaker, while we need the Women's Health Protection Act to become law to restore access to abortion in all 50 States, we must also mitigate some of the extreme and dangerous laws Republicans are enacting now to prevent women from making their own healthcare decisions.

This legislation does that, which is why I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 8297, the Ensuring Access to Abortion Act.

Just like the Democrats' abortion on demand until birth act, this bill is part of an extreme agenda to nationalize abortion for all 9 months of pregnancy. Abortion is a false choice between taking care of a woman and taking care of a baby.

What a woman needs is support. Every life is meaningful, and our actions are significant. Seventy-six percent of women seeking an abortion say that they would choose life if their circumstances were different.

Instead of promoting ways to support women and children with better healthcare, education, financial stability, and changing their circumstances, Democrats, including President Biden, are spreading fear, anxiety, and misinformation. This is a blatant attempt to spread fear and present abortion at any stage of pregnancy as a woman's only option.

So I will be very clear:

It is already unconstitutional to prevent a woman from traveling between States.

The pro-life movement does not support and has always rejected criminalizing and punishing women, period.

State laws currently in effect have exceptions to save the life of the mother.

And pro-life laws do not prevent women from getting care they need in cases of miscarriages and ectopic pregnancies.

Regarding this legislation, the Ensuring Access to Abortion Act, I have many questions and concerns. Its vague language, designed to promote more abortions, undermines parental consent for minors, opens loopholes for abuse, and eliminates medical supervision for chemical abortions.

This bill does nothing to explicitly prevent an unrelated adult or a sexual abuser from taking a minor out of State for an abortion without parental consent. It would prevent healthcare professionals, social workers, and schools in every State from reporting instances of child abuse, sexual abuse, and neglect because they could be seen as delaying or hindering access to abortion.

□ 1100

It also undermines parent rights. Parents can be targeted by the Federal Government and sued for wanting to help their child just by asking them to delay traveling to get an abortion.

If their child is 16, for example, the parents lose power to protect their teenager from being coerced by an older man to get an abortion.

The Ensuring Access to Abortion Act undermines the health and safety of women by preempting State laws regulating the practice of medicine. It overrides the majority of States that have determined it is safest for doctors to prescribe pills for chemical abortions. This puts women and minors in danger if they experience complications.

Finally, these same provisions give sexual abusers and human traffickers more direct access to chemical abortions in all 50 States and ensures that doctors in States like California, where there is no parental consent, can effectively become pill mills by prescribing and mailing abortion drugs to children and minors and end lives all over the country.

This is extreme.

Again, I ask my colleagues to abandon this agenda for unlimited abortions with no restrictions. It only promotes more fear, pain, and dehumanization of the most vulnerable, the helpless among us.

Instead, let's come together. Let's come together around human rights of every person in this country, the born and unborn. Let's celebrate the dignity, the value, and the potential of every person. This is our chance to lead a new era of hope and healing in our country for every person, for moms and babies at every stage of life.

Every life is worth living.

Madam Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mrs. FLETCHER. Madam Speaker, in my beloved home State of Texas, we are in a crisis, a healthcare crisis, a humanitarian crisis.

Since last September, access to abortion has been severely limited. Since last month, it has been eliminated.

In response, Texans who can do so have been traveling out of State to obtain abortion care, first to Oklahoma, Louisiana, and New Mexico. As some of these States have banned abortion, they are now traveling even farther.

Now, in response to this exercise of their constitutional right to travel between the States, lawmakers in Texas and in other States across the country are threatening to take away that right, too.

This is not hypothetical, it is not hyperbole, and it is nothing like what we just heard from the minority in response to this bill.

Just last week, a group of lawmakers in Texas publicized a letter that they sent to at least one law firm in Texas threatening the firm and each of its partners with felony criminal prosecution and disbarment because of the firm's policy to reimburse employees for travel costs associated with out-of-State travel for abortion care.

It is not just Texas. Lawmakers in Missouri have already considered legislation to prohibit its residents from traveling outside of the State for abortion care to States where it is legal, and groups are working on model legislation to introduce in States across the country as we speak.

Not only do these threats fail to reflect the will of the majority of people in this country who favor a legislative framework that takes into account the complex circumstances of pregnancy that we have discussed this morning, these threats fail to reflect the fundamental rights guaranteed in our Constitution.

Congress has the authority and the responsibility to protect people from these unconstitutional efforts to prevent, restrict, impede, or otherwise punish a person traveling to another State to obtain a legal abortion and to protect those providers and others who are helping them.

This morning, we are doing exactly that in passing the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act.

I thank the chairman, the Speaker, original cosponsors Representative STRICKLAND and Representative RASKIN, and all of our cosponsors for, once again, responding with urgency to the cruel efforts to deprive my fellow Texans and our fellow Americans of their constitutional right to travel by bringing this bill to the floor today, and I urge everyone in this body to vote ''yes.''

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLORES), a new Member just elected from the great State of Texas, the first Member who was born in Mexico, and a great member of our Republican Conference.

Mrs. FLORES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address my strong opposition to H.R. 8297, the Ensuring Access to Abortion Act.

Protecting the voiceless ought to be a top priority in this House and in every corner of this land.

As a mother of four beautiful and strong children, I find it hard to believe there are those who think defending life is optional, even to the last month of pregnancy.

H.R. 8297 is the opposite of what brought me to Congress, and it is the opposite of the values of the people of my district, Texas 34.

Let's be clear what this bill does: Undermines the ability of States to hold sexual abusers accountable, stops States from preventing abortion pill mills, and it gives human traffickers and abusers more direct access to chemical abortions in all 50 States.

Protecting life shouldn't be political.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on H.R. 8297.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Eshoo), the chairwoman of our Subcommittee on Health.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman of our committee for his leadership.

I rise in strong support of this legislation. It is aptly named, Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act.

I have listened to the debate so far on this bill, and I really find it hard to believe what I am hearing. I think the people of this country need to know, before we get to the reproductive freedoms, that the Republicans are opposed to contraception. That is a fact around here.

Now, because of what the Supreme Court has unleashed with the Dobbs decision, we have a patchwork of States with different laws. Some States provide full healthcare for women; others don't.

Now, those living, as the author of this legislation stated, in Texas, they are fleeing Texas to go to other States; but those States want to stop women from traveling. That is what this is about. Stop women from traveling. What are they going to do? Put their Highway Patrol on the border to interview people to find out where they are going and why? This is extreme in terms of what these States want to do.

Today, the House, in its votes, makes it crystal clear to those States that they cannot take this freedom away. This bill establishes protections for women who travel for care and for healthcare professionals who provide that care.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, just to clarify, not a single legislature or Congress is debating making contraception illegal. Contraception is not abortion. It prevents conception. The scare tactic about making contraception illegal is another scare tactic by the Democrats to advance a radical abortion agenda to end life up until 9 months.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER), a member of our committee.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act. In the wake of the overturning of Roe v. Wade, this legislation is necessary to ensure that those in States that have restricted abortion care can travel across State lines to seek the care they need and not be criminalized for doing so.

I am proud that women in my home State of Delaware still have access to abortion care and that we can serve as a safe haven for those from other States.

But the reality for far too many people across the country is that they live in States where access to reproductive care has been so severely restricted that it is unavailable. While the bills we are voting on today are necessary, we must also confront the realities of what overturning Roe means.

Now, my middle name is Blunt, so let me be clear about who is going to be hit the hardest: poor women, young women, women in rural areas, and women of color, people who may not have the ability to travel hundreds of miles to get the care they need.

Madam Speaker, I was 10 years old when the landmark case of Roe was decided. Half a century later, I am standing on the floor of the House of Representatives, standing in the gap for doctors and healthcare providers, so that they don't have to consult with a lawyer before they decide to give good care to their patients, standing for those who stood before us and fought for us to have this right for reproductive rights in the first place. I am standing for our young people so that our daughters and granddaughters don't need a health passport to travel from State to State or need to worry about being criminalized for seeking care.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members of the House to support both the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act and the Women's Health Protection Act. The bottom line: There is no room for politicians in our wombs.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. HARSHBARGER), a strong defender of the right to life.

Mrs. HARSHBARGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share my concern for the extraordinary lengths that my colleagues across the aisle will go in order to rip away a chance at life from unborn children.

H.R. 8297, the Ensuring Access to Abortion Act, is a deceptive ploy to circumvent the authority of States to set their own laws about abortion procedures or, more plainly, the procedures that violently end an unborn child's life.

On June 24, the Nation received historical news from the highest court in the land that Roe v. Wade had been overturned. This decision was an answer to nearly 50 years of prayer and a decision that rights a wrong that was committed in the very same court almost half a century ago.

The Supreme Court ruling verified that our Constitution gives no protections for abortion procedures. Abortion was never a constitutional right, and that has been the big lie to millions of women for the past 50 years. It was determined that this decision should not be mandated by Washington but chosen by the people through their State legislatures.

The Ensuring Access to Abortion Act is not only a blatant attempt to undermine State sovereignty; it also opens the door to incredibly dangerous consequences.

For one, the bill would restrict enforcement of State laws that require physicians to be present when chemical abortions are administered. This supervision is a safety measure to ensure that a patient does not have an ectopic pregnancy, which could lead to fatal consequences.

The primary pillar of the pro-life movement is that all life is precious. We must consider the health implications of women who receive an abortion or partial procedure across State lines and return to their home State in need of dire medical attention.

Women who have abortion procedures face a myriad of increased risks that can occur later. Sterilization, miscarriage, and tubal pregnancies are not uncommon.

Are we to assume that the responsibility for treatment of these subsequent health risks falls on the State whose laws were circumvented? Because that is what would ultimately happen.

And as a woman in Congress, I urge my colleagues to look at how this legislation puts at-risk minors and women in vulnerable positions. The language in this bill is so vague that it makes no consideration for abusers, those abusers that transport minors across State lines to receive abortions after their abuse.

We can't afford to be vague and allow blanket protection for anyone assisting in an abortion. We cannot be that naive, especially when these procedures have life and death consequences.

□ 1115

To be clear, not a single State has banned interstate travel for women seeking abortion. This bill isn't about protecting women from the State; it is about dramatically restricting States from protecting their citizens and forcing pro-life States to absorb the burden of safety complications that follow the superseding of their protective measures.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to think about the damaging consequences.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. UNDERWOOD). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. HARSHBARGER. Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to think about the damaging consequences of taking power from the States. Not only does it set a dangerous precedent of Federal overreach and taking power from the people, but it also has terrifying health implications for expectant mothers and at-risk youth, and the protection of bad actors.

I will always be a steadfast defender of an unborn child's right to live, and I will never back down from a fight to protect women and those unborn children. We cannot put both at risk with this damaging legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), who chairs our Consumer Protection and Commerce Subcommittee.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I lived the days before abortion was safe and legal in the United States of America, and I remember the desperation of women, some of them my friends, some of whom had to make really dangerous decisions about how they were going to be able to exercise control over their own bodies and make this most personal decision on their own. Some women died because they sought these dangerous methods on their own to end a pregnancy.

Let's be clear: Roe v. Wade wasn't the beginning of women having abortions; it was the end of women dying from abortions.

Abortion is healthcare. When Roe v. Wade finally became the law of the land, women were able finally to control their own bodies.

This bill is about freedom, and one of the most precious freedoms that we have is the freedom to travel from State to State in the United States of America.

What happens to the woman who is happily pregnant and who may be going to visit her family in Illinois, where, thank God, abortion is still legal? Are you going to check her out? Is she going to have to prove somehow that she is not going for an abortion? How are you going to enforce this without going into all the personal history of women who are traveling across State lines?

Enough is enough. In the United States of America, the right to travel is sacred. It is protected under the Commerce Clause, and we will not go back. Women will not go back.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), our whip and a strong defender of life.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, for leading on this issue.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this radical movement by our colleagues on the left to go way further than Roe, under the guise of codifying Roe, to push some of the most extreme packages of pro-abortion legislation that we have seen.

Where would this push us if they got their way? Under this package of bills that the House is taking up today, the United States would end up among just a handful of countries, including China and North Korea, in radical abortion on demand up until birth policy.

Now, there has been a lot of misinformation presented since the Supreme Court made their decision, a decision that I applaud because, Madam Speaker, it is a decision that finally said Roe was a flawed decision and that, in fact, elected leaders should be the ones debating this.

How much can we debate how to protect life? States have been having this debate. Roe didn't end the debate. It started a movement, a movement for almost 50 years. The March for Life. You see young people, tens and hundreds of thousands, coming up to Washington, just praying and marching for the opportunity to protect life. Now, those States and Congress can have that debate about how much more we can do to protect life.

In fact, we brought an amendment because whether it was before the Dobbs decision or even today, a State like New York has such a radical law that a baby can be born alive outside the womb, and they can murder that baby and call it abortion. That is still legal today in States like New York. It should not be. It is murder. If a baby is born alive outside the womb, how in America can that baby be murdered under the guise of abortion? Yet, that is what is allowed.

We had the motion to recommit we brought forward—we will have a vote on that shortly—to say that barbaric act can no longer happen again in America, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. Everybody should vote for that. People pro-choice have said they think it is radical that a baby can be born alive outside the womb and still be murdered under the name of abortion.

We will have the opportunity to right that wrong today on the House floor. I hope everybody votes for it. Unfortunately, so far, we haven't gotten any support from my Democratic colleagues.

I will end with this, Madam Speaker: Our Founding Fathers empowered us with three unalienable rights, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The first among those is life. Let's do all we can to protect life, not have this radical, extreme agenda pushed forward today.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER).

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, this new post-Roe reality that we are living with is still sinking in for most of us, but if you are a woman who is pregnant now and needs to end that pregnancy, and you are in one of the States that has outlawed abortion, every day is filled with panic and horror, trying to figure out how to get the care you need. This is a crisis.

Now, politicians in some of those States are threatening to criminalize travel to another State for abortion care and to criminalize doctors and anyone else who might help, for example, with transportation. This is outrageous.

Such extreme laws are nothing less than an attack on women—on our autonomy, on our freedom, on our health, and on our privacy. These are backward positions. They are extreme and draconian.

The decision to have an abortion is one for a woman to make in consultation with her doctor—no one else, definitely not politicians.

As a doctor, I have been in the room with women making the extremely difficult and personal decision about whether to end a pregnancy. Politics has no place there. I have been in the room with a woman with an ectopic pregnancy for whom abortion is the standard of care.

Let's be clear, State laws that criminalize abortion and also criminalize travel across State lines for abortion put doctors in an impossible situation and put women at risk.

As a doctor, I took the Hippocratic Oath to ''first, do no harm,'' and I want you to think for a moment about the harm of a delayed or more complicated abortion, or that ectopic pregnancy, or the harm of having a rape victim carry a pregnancy to term, or the rates of maternal mortality in this country.

Make no mistake. These bans are draconian. Banning travel is extreme, controlling, and dangerous. Women will die because a bunch of politicians decided that they should be in charge of women's bodies. This is reprehensible.

I will keep doing everything I can to protect women's access to abortion no matter where they live, and I implore my House and Senate colleagues to pass these bills.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEUBE) to continue our fight for human rights for all.

Mr. STEUBE. Madam Speaker, let me address the complete misrepresentations of fact that we have been hearing from Democrats since Roe has been overturned.

There has never been a constitutional right to end the life of an innocent, unborn child—never. It doesn't exist in the Constitution, and Congress has never passed a law allowing for the murder of the unborn. In fact, the opposite exists.

In the Fifth and 14th Amendments to the Constitution, there is a constitutional right for any person to not be deprived of life, liberty, or property.

Certainly, an unborn child is a person. What else could it be? Therefore, that person shall not be deprived of life pursuant to the Constitution, period.

Finally, the U.S. Supreme Court got it right and made it clear that ''the Constitution does not confer a right to abortion.''

Over 63 million children have been murdered since Roe was decided. That is not freedom. That is genocide.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his extraordinary leadership on this subject not only as we face the Court decision but, over time, his chairmanship of the Energy and Commerce Committee in terms of health in general, women's health in particular, reproductive health as we gather today. I thank members of the committee, and I thank the authors of this legislation as I proceed.

I rise on this momentous day as our pro-choice, pro-women Democratic majority proudly takes further action to defend the fundamental right of health freedom.

As extremist Republicans continue their assault on reproductive rights, our Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act will ensure that the fundamental right to travel and obtain needed healthcare remains in the hands of the American people.

Our Women's Health Protection Act will once again make the protections of Roe v. Wade the law of the land.

Let us salute the patriotic and persistent leadership not only of our distinguished chairman, Mr. PALLONE, but also Congresswoman LIZZIE FLETCHER and Congresswoman MARILYN STRICKLAND, who are leading the charge on the right-to-travel bill, working with JAMIE RASKIN, who is a member of the Judiciary Committee and who has been part of this.

I also salute Congresswoman JUDY CHU, who will have now twice secured House passage of the Women's Health Protection Act; Pro-Choice Caucus co-chairs DIANA DEGETTE and BARBARA LEE; and Energy and Commerce Chairman FRANK PALLONE.

Three weeks ago, the Republican Party finally achieved its dark, dangerous, long-held goal to rip away a woman's freedom over her most fundamental decisions about her body, her health, and her life.

Since the Republican-captured Supreme Court eviscerated Roe v. Wade, at least nine Republican-controlled States have already banned abortion. More have enacted draconian restrictions so that exercising this fundamental right is practically impossible.

In doing so, these extreme measures have forced countless women to seek reproductive care in nearby States. But now, Republican lawmakers across the country are advancing proposals to block women from crossing State lines to get the care they need and punish those who, in their words, ''aid or abet'' them.

Is this the United States of America, where Republicans in these States can say to women, ''You cannot cross State lines for your own good health?''

This has been especially devastating for women who do not have the means to access care, often women of color and women from low-income communities.

This reality is sickening. It is despicable. It demands action.

With our Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act, we will prevent Republicans from punishing women for exercising their right to travel and receive the healthcare they need, and it will protect healthcare providers who deliver reproductive services and all those who help women make the journey to receive those services. This means no criminal charges, no lawsuits, no fees or fines, no threats of retaliation.

Importantly, this legislation also reaffirms the right to travel, a freedom we often take for granted but is fundamental to liberty and privacy.

Republicans supposedly once stood for these values, but today, they are seeking to restrict where you can go and who you can see and to stand between you, your family, your doctor, and your God in making intimate health decisions.

This is not only anti-women; it is anti-American. House Democrats are fighting back.

Madam Speaker, today, our majority will also pass the Women's Health Protection Act, which protects the right to an abortion found in Roe v. Wade, ensuring the Federal right of healthcare providers to provide reproductive care and the Federal right for patients to receive that care.

By passing this legislation, we will preempt and prevent State-level bans and restrictions put forth by extremist, anti-women State legislators.

□ 1130

We will ensure that all Americans enjoy the same fundamental rights to reproductive care—regardless of background or ZIP Code.

We offer help to the American people who treasure our freedoms and who are overwhelmingly with us in our mission to defend them.

What do Republicans have in store next?

You can't travel to buy a book?

You can't travel to see a concert or a play—if it doesn't meet their, shall we say—I wouldn't use the word standards—their what?

Today, we must pass this legislation for a second time. We first passed this bill last September after Texas severely restricted the ability of women to access reproductive care with SB8, an outrageous bounty hunter bill. We do so again today, in the wake of the outrageous Supreme Court ruling that erased the vital protections of Roe v. Wade.

The Court's disgraceful decision has already unleashed catastrophe: women denied care after experiencing the heartbreak of miscarriage; survivors of sexual assault facing the possibility of forced birth; doctors under threat of persecution for offering reproductive services.

Many of these situations are well-known and are publicized—they are in the public domain. There are many more than are just in the public domain. Make no mistake, eviscerating the protections of Roe was only the opening act of the cruel Republican crusade to criminalize women.

In recent days, we have heard again of the tragic story of a young girl who was a survivor of sexual assault and had to travel to a neighboring State to receive the reproductive healthcare she needed. Now, the State attorney general—a Republican who served here in the House—is now investigating the doctor who legally provided her services. She is 10 years old. This move is intended to intimidate healthcare providers and produce a chilling effect on access to reproductive care.

The Republican agenda is not just a threat to families in red States. House Republicans' overwhelming opposition to our legislation make clear that they do not want anyone to access reproductive care anywhere. Indeed, their endgame is a barbaric ban on abortion in all 50 States.

As the Associate Justice Clarence Thomas said, they have only just begun in terms of their restrictions in terms of contraception and the rest. They will not stop there. These extremists are even threatening to criminalize birth control, in vitro fertilization, and post-miscarriage care.

Democrats will never stop fighting back against this extreme assault because we know that every woman everywhere has the basic right to reproductive healthcare.

Right now, the rights of women and every American are on the line, Madam Speaker.

House Democrats are ferociously defending freedom with these two important bills. We need two more Democratic pro-choice Senators so that we can eliminate the filibuster and make this legislation the law of the land.

Madam Speaker, as the radical Republican Party seeks to wind back the clock of 50 years of hard-fought progress, I am reminded of an extemporaneous debate in which I participated as a high school student.

A young woman, a friend of mine, drew a question from a bowl on a slip of paper that read: Do women think?

Today, it seems that some wish to debate that same question: the extremist Republican assault on women's rights harkens back to this darker time.

Do women think?

Indeed, because of Donald Trump, MITCH MCCONNELL, and a radical right-wing Republican Party, and their supermajority in the Supreme Court, right now American women have less freedom than their mothers.

By passing this legislation, the Democratic House is standing on the side of freedom for women and for every American.

The young lady who drew the insulting question answered that question with grace and strength, and she won the debate.

Just as Democrats intend to win on the question of women's health and freedom, not only here in the Halls of Congress, but with the American people in November.

Madam Speaker, I urge a very strong vote for the Women's Health Protection Act and the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act. I hope we have a strong vote and I hope a bipartisan vote.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, as we celebrate a record number of pro-life women serving in the United States House of Representatives today and an army of pro-life women all across this country from every corner, we are fighting for the human rights of all, especially the unborn.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK), one of those mighty warriors.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to stop lying. Stop lying. Roe did not make abortion illegal, it returned the issue to the

States. Now we see that you all want to take those rights away from the States—strip them, in fact.

Under this bill that we are considering here today, you want to take this issue further than Roe ever did and take away the rights of children, those most vulnerable. The notion that women will somehow be stopped at checkpoints, in some 1984 scenario, this is insane and political fear-mongering at its best. You know that. You know that.

I hear constantly about these ''extreme positions'' that conservatives and those in the pro-life movement are taking, but what is extreme is not taking a stand for the child that survives an abortion attempt. That is extreme. Denying medical care for that child, that is the extreme.

Madam Speaker, I always say—and bless your heart, 36 years of service, that is incredible, 2 years longer than I have been alive.

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, in that 36 years of service, Madam Speaker, 60 million children have been murdered, with over 30 percent of them being minorities, African Americans and Hispanics.

It is curious logic that we murder these children to empower them.

Where were the rights of those young, little girls that were murdered? They didn't have a voice.

Yet here we are debating the fact that this is a right. A right?

No, no, no. This is an issue that has gone back to the States. Not an issue for us here in this Chamber to be deciding, when we know that this Nation is based on life: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It starts at life.

The extreme positions, they are being held on that side of the aisle. We are a Nation of equal opportunity, not equal outcome. We know that abortion is equal outcome. Give those children the opportunity to live.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this ridiculous bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. STRICKLAND), who is the chief cosponsor of this bill.

Ms. STRICKLAND. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act, which my colleagues and I wrote to support reproductive choice.

Simply put, this bill codifies the constitutional right to travel, which includes the ability to cross State lines to get safe and legal access to abortion.

The reality is that an increasing number of women are now forced to either carry an unwanted pregnancy against their will, even in cases of rape and incest, or travel hundreds of miles just to safely receive reproductive healthcare.

This is especially dangerous for indigenous women, who are 2½ times more at risk for rape and sexual assault. We cannot force women to give birth. Worse, those forced to carry out an unwanted pregnancy are giving birth in a Nation with one of the worst maternal mortality rates in the developed world.

When compared to Canada, United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, France, Germany, Switzerland, Australia, and New Zealand, the United States' maternal death rate is more than twice the rate of these countries.

What is more, Black and indigenous women will be among the most at risk because they are more likely to die from pregnancy or childbirth. They are also two to three times more likely to experience a pregnancy death than their White counterparts.

If access to safe and legal abortion becomes more restricted and inaccessible, the Black maternal mortality rates are expected to jump by a whopping 30 percent or more.

All told, taking away Federal protections for abortion hits Black women, indigenous women, women of color, low-income women, LGBTQ+ women, and women with disabilities the hardest.

This is about healthcare justice. This is about social justice. This is about economic justice. Taking away our right to safe and legal abortion is yet another way to try and control us.

Please listen carefully. Black women will not be stopped. Indigenous women will not be stopped. Women of color will not be stopped. LGBTQ+ will not be stopped. Women will not be stopped.

This bill ensures our right to reproductive freedom by reaffirming the constitutional right to travel. Those who hold the literal words of the Constitution and so-called States' rights as the absolute standard, you must do one thing: you must recognize the constitutional right to travel guaranteed by the 14th Amendment and vote ''yes'' on this bill.

We know you won't because for you this isn't about the Constitution or States' rights, it is about control. It is about controlling women's bodies and forcing people to give birth against their will.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), another defender of the right to life.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for the opportunity to come and talk about this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition. It has been noted this morning, the legislation that we are considering today doesn't just reverse the Supreme Court's recent ruling of Roe v. Wade, it goes much further.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have assembled this bundle of policies in an effort to undermine the enforcement of pro-life State laws.

As the Republican whip just pointed out a little earlier, in combination with what is called the so-called Women's Health Protection Act, it seeks to undermine the will of the people, and places the U.S. on a short list with North Korea and China as countries with the most extreme abortion policies in the world. We don't want to be on a list with those two countries.

Instead of undermining State law, we should be enabling States that have chosen to extend the responsibility of protecting its citizens to also include the unborn.

The Alabama legislature enacted the Human Life Protection Act in 2019, reflecting the will of the citizens of the State. I cannot allow those voices to be silenced by radical Federal abortion bills.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure that we are voting on this morning, and all of the extreme measures yet to come attacking the most vulnerable among us.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I would ask how much time is remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 14 minutes remaining and the gentlewoman from Washington has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 8297, the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act.

The Supreme Court's disastrous decision in Dobbs to overturn Roe v. Wade has exacerbated what was an already dire crisis in abortion care access—one that threatens to undermine women's equality and health.

In the wake of the Dobbs decision, State legislatures across the country are moving to ban abortion outright. As if that wasn't draconian enough, some States are also passing laws targeting people who help others obtain an abortion. This includes the notorious Texas law, SB8, which permits any person to collect a $10,000 bounty by suing someone who ''aids or abets an abortion.''

Not content to strip women of their bodily autonomy and equality in their own States, some State legislatures are now contemplating efforts to inhibit the ability of women to travel out-of-state to obtain lawful healthcare, including by threatening their friends, families, or even employers with legal action.

H.R. 8297 would put State legislatures considering such laws on notice by providing additional Federal legal protections that reaffirm and enhance enforcement of the constitutional right to interstate travel, which includes travel to obtain legal healthcare services like an abortion.

This legislation is not enough. Many people, a disproportionate number from

communities of color, do not have the option of traveling across State lines because they lack the resources to bear the costs of out-of-state travel, which include the related costs of childcare, lodging, or time off from work.

□ 1145

That is why it is essential that we also pass H.R. 8296, the Women's Health Protection Act of 2022, which would protect the right to abortion nationwide. The House has already passed this bill, but the Senate Republicans have twice blocked its passage. This is unacceptable. We must do everything we can to ensure protection of abortion access in a post-Roe world.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on both H.R. 8297 and H.R. 8296.

But this is not enough either. We face a radical Supreme Court deliberately packed with extremists by a plot by the Federalist Society, by MITCH MCCONNELL, and by Donald Trump to pack the Supreme Court with extremists who have no regard for our liberties and who will destroy every liberty we have if we don't do something about it. That is why Congressman JOHNSON, Congressman JONES, Senator MARKEY, and I have introduced legislation to unpack the Supreme Court by increasing the number of Justices by four.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE), who is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee. Dr. JOHN JOYCE is continuing our fight for the right to life.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

When I was in medical school, I learned about the development and the journey of a child in the womb of the mother.

Madam Speaker, let me review that journey with you today. At 6 weeks, a child is developing a mouth, nose, ears, and—most important—a heartbeat of their own. At 12 weeks, a baby has fingers and toes.

Continue on this journey with me. At 15 weeks, a baby can sense light and even has taste buds. At 19 weeks, a child can hear and knows the voice of their mother.

These lives are precious, and they must be protected.

By 22 weeks, many babies can survive outside the womb if they are born prematurely.

Clearly, these are human lives. Clearly, we in Congress have an obligation to protect these human lives.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this bill and support all human life. It is time for us to stand up for the American people and to stand up for all human life.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I was horrified when I heard about the plight of a desperate Houston woman. She was 1 week pregnant beyond Texas' 6-week abortion ban, and with four children already, she knew she was not in a position to have another. So she packed her husband and four children in a car and drove over 22 hours and over 1,500 miles to my district in Pasadena, California, for her abortion.

Texas' law forced her into a situation no family should ever have to face, and the Supreme Court's overturning of Roe has made conditions far worse.

H.R. 8297, the Ensuring Access to Abortion Act of 2022, will ensure that every American has the right to travel to seek abortion care.

Madam Speaker, we will not give up in this fight. We will not go back.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), who is a great member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding time.

In the 1970s it was misleading, but pregnancy was described as a clump of cells and a lump of tissues.

How many people listened to that and didn't ascribe the agency to the young life that was developing?

Then medical sonography was just coming into its own at the same time that Roe was decided; and for two generations of Americans since then, the first picture in their baby book is their sonogram picture.

Is it any surprise that two generations of Americans now ascribe agency to the unborn child because they see from whence they came?

Having an abortion is not a simple fix to a problem; it is not a simple procedure; and it is not birth control. An abortion is highly complex, and it is a deeply emotional procedure. Obviously, it is going to affect the baby, and obviously, it is going to affect the woman.

Do you know what, Madam Speaker?

It even affects the provider.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlemen for yielding.

Madam Speaker, as the doctor has just said, this is an extraordinarily complex and difficult issue for all.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill and the Women's Health Protection Act that we are also considering today.

Three weeks ago today, the United States Supreme Court's unprecedented decision reversed nearly 50 years of established precedent overturning Roe v. Wade and paving the way for trigger laws across the country to criminalize access to abortion instantly. With this ruling, women in 2022 will now have fewer rights than their mothers or grandmothers and less control over their own bodies and their own healthcare.

Today, the House of Representatives is responding to protect the women of our country. Today, this House will vote to stand with women and affirm their freedom to make their own healthcare decisions.

It is not an easy decision, and it is not made lightly, but it ought to be free from interference from politicians. We must do everything, in my view, in our power to ensure that women are free to travel wherever they need in order to access reproductive care safely, legally, and without fear of punishment.

That is why I brought to the floor this bill, the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act. This legislation would prohibit States from preventing, impeding, or obstructing women from traveling to other States for reproductive care or retaliating against them for doing so.

Over a century and one-half ago it was legal to own people because of the color of their skin. They could escape, as Harriet Tubman did and as Frederick Douglass did, from their slavery on the Eastern Shore of our State and go to a so-called free State. But then, tragically, the Congress enacted a bill which allowed people to go and reimpose slavery on those folks. Let's none of us do the same.

This legislation would prohibit States from preventing, impeding, or obstructing women from traveling to other States for reproductive care where it is legal or retaliating against them for doing so. These draconian and authoritarian laws that States are talking about are going to criminalize behavior no matter whether it is legal in the State to which you went.

One of the first bills I voted on in 1967 when I first went to the State senate—at that point in time I was about 8 months out of law school—was to repeal the miscegenation statutes which said that a Black person could not marry a White person or a person of Japanese extraction or Chinese extraction. The Supreme Court held that unconstitutional.

It would be like saying: You can go to a State where that certainly is legal for an African American and a Caucasian to marry, but if you come back here, you are going to be a criminal.

That is draconian, authoritarian, and almost Communist-like. It is dictatorship that China tried to pursue and did.

This bill would also extend the same protections to healthcare providers who perform abortions for out-of-state patients and to anyone who helps them with transportation. Let us not set up a society where people are watching their neighbor, reporting on their neighbor, and criminalizing behavior which has, for one-half century, been the decision of a woman. Yes, she could consult her doctor and she could consult others, but it was her body that was at stake. It is her decision.

Additionally, this bill would protect the movement in interstate commerce of prescription drugs approved by the FDA to end pregnancies safely at home.

I am grateful to Representatives LIZZIE FLETCHER, MARILYN STRICKLAND, and JAMIE RASKIN for introducing this legislation and to Chairman PALLONE for advancing it through the Energy and Commerce Committee so speedily. I also want to thank DIANA DEGETTE and BARBARA LEE for their leadership on this issue as co-chairs of the Congressional Pro-Choice Caucus.

While protecting interstate travel is an important step, Congress must do much more to ensure that every woman in our country can access healthcare and reproductive choice safely, legally, and affordably. That is why we are also considering an updated version of the Women's Health Protection Act today.

I thank JUDY CHU, again, for her leadership on this effort.

Make no mistake, Madam Speaker, until we codify Roe v. Wade's 49-year precedent in Federal statute, women in many parts of our country will not be safe or have access to the healthcare they need. I am old enough to remember when it wasn't legal and when people died in back alleys going to charlatans and did not have proper medical care. Let's not return to those dark and tragic days.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, to support freedom, and to support the women of our country. That is the right thing to do.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD), who is a great defender of the human right to life.

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Speaker, the pro-life issue used to be a bipartisan issue in this Chamber even as we recognized that our essential liberties of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness were inalienable rights given to us not by government but by God, and the claim that the left is making that our attempts to protect life are somehow criminalizing women could be nothing further from the truth.

Setting aside the fact that the left can't even define for the moment what a woman is, 50 years of scientific evidence have unveiled to us the mystery and the amazing thing that is happening in the development of a child. We know so much more—even the fact that a child feels the pain of abortion. We will always stand with life.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS), who is a member of our committee.

Mr. PETERS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act.

After the Supreme Court eliminated the Federal right to abortion, only 20 States continue to protect a woman's right to choose. Even before Roe fell, States across the country were working to pass laws banning abortion even in cases of rape, incest, and when the life of the mother is at stake. That is not pro-family, and that is not pro-life. That is barbaric.

Republican efforts to criminalize abortion will pit neighbors against neighbors, punish women for exercising their bodily autonomy, and imprison doctors who took an oath to protect their patients. That is happening right here in what is supposed to be the freest country in the world. That is why I am standing here, today, to protect a woman's right to travel in search of legal healthcare.

Madam Speaker, if the Supreme Court won't protect Americans, then we in Congress must do everything in our power to stand up for our basic freedoms. That starts with this bill, and I urge my colleagues to pass it.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON), who is continuing our fight for life.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Washington State.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle's efforts to create a national policy that allows for terminating a pregnancy at any stage, for any reason is not only extreme and outside of the mainstream of America, it is wholly inconsistent with our values and the founding principles of our great Nation.

This abortion on demand legislation taken together will put us in the dubious company of the likes of China, North Korea, and only five other countries that I guarantee you, Madam Speaker, do not have America's values.

I commend the Supreme Court for restoring the integrity of the Constitution and returning power back to the States and We the People.

God bless America, and God bless our fellow Americans both born and unborn.

□ 1200

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who co-chairs the Pro-Choice Caucus.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 8297.

Yes, as co-chair of the Pro-Choice Caucus, along with my colleague, Congresswoman DIANA DEGETTE, I thank our colleagues, Representatives FLETCHER, STRICKLAND, and RASKIN, for introducing this very important bill, and also Chairman PALLONE and Speaker PELOSI for bringing it to the floor.

Everyone deserves the freedom to make personal decisions about their health, their bodies, their futures, as well as the right to travel. Yet, the Supreme Court's decision has stripped this fundamental right to reproductive freedom from millions of people in this country.

Now, I remember the days before Roe, and we aren't going back.

Not only are some States moving to enact extreme abortion bans, but some anti-abortion State legislators are working to prohibit people from traveling across State lines to access care and are targeting people who assist those in need.

What in the world is happening to our democracy?

First of all, you are trying to take away our own healthcare decisions, the ability to make our reproductive healthcare decisions. You are trying to criminalize people for making their own reproductive healthcare decisions.

You are trying to set up an environment for people to spy on each other when they are trying to exercise their reproductive healthcare decisions and freedoms.

You are trying to take away people's right to travel.

What in the world is this? Is this America?

You all talk about other countries. I don't even recognize what you are trying to do in this country.

Please, just know that this is a slippery slope. They come for me today; they are coming for you tomorrow.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' and to reaffirm the right to travel and seek care, not further erode our reproductive freedoms and personal liberties.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, we are working on a privacy bill, but that is a separate bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER), a great defender of life.

Mr. FULCHER. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the proposed Federal authorization of what amounts to be abortion on demand.

There are reasons the life issue is so polarizing. How we prioritize life, from before birth to the end of life, often defines our value systems. I believe life is the very character of God, that, indeed, we all have inalienable rights, the most important of which is the right to live.

I will close my comments by pointing out three relevant position statements my friends on the other side of the aisle struggle with.

All too often, they will support taking of life of the pre-born by abortion, but not taking of life of convicted murderers by capital punishment.

All too often, they will support the statement ''my body, my choice,'' but not when it comes to vaccines.

And all too often, they will support so-called reproductive health, but not if it is reproductive or healthy.

Debates and decisions like these belong to the people, not the Federal Government.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LOIS FRANKEL).

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, a Supreme Court, out of touch with the American people,

says that State legislatures can ban abortions and give our most important personal decisions to politicians, and Republicans are on a mission to do just that.

Madam Speaker, my, my, my, their plans are getting crazier and more extreme by the minute. Listen to this: National anti-abortion groups and their allies, Republican allies in State legislatures, are scheming to stop people in States where abortions are banned from seeking the procedure elsewhere.

As we speak, there is a proposal in Missouri, a State that bans abortion, that would allow private citizens to sue anyone that helps a Missouri resident have an abortion in another State.

They are going to punish doctors, Uber drivers, spouses, and the rest just for helping a woman who is getting the healthcare that she needs. We stop that today.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST), a leader defending life.

Mr. MAST. As all remarks are supposed to be directed to the Chair, Madam Speaker, when is a life a life?

Madam Speaker, when is a life a life?

I will open it up for the rest of my colleagues over there. I would wager none of my colleagues on the other side will tell us when life begins. I have a $20 bill here. It is not worth as much as it used to be worth. I will put it down here on the table. Any one of you or your colleagues wants to speak up and tell us when life begins, it is sitting here for you.

Madam Speaker, when is a life a life? When does it begin?

That is the most extreme idea to come out of this body, that you won't acknowledge when a life is a life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MAST. Madam Speaker, point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his point of order.

Mr. MAST. Madam Speaker, did I address my remarks to you?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a point of order.

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA).

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 8297 by my colleague and friend from Houston, Congresswoman FLETCHER.

First, let me be clear. There seems to be some fixation from the other side that this decision should be left up to the States because the Supreme Court said that. They need to re-read the opinion. It simply says that it is returned to the people and their elected Representatives. Last time I looked, I was an elected Representative, and we all are elected Representatives.

So, we can pass these two bills today and put them in statute and make it the law of the land because, I can tell you, if we leave it to the States, things will be more extreme.

In my home State of Texas, extremist Republicans have created a patchwork that is scary, discriminatory, and oppressive, and they are doing that to limit our right to make our own deeply personal, private healthcare decisions about our own bodies together with our families and our providers.

This bill would restore women's rights in Texas and across the country. It would stop Republicans from criminalizing, fining, or suing women who exercise their constitutional right to travel across State lines to obtain an abortion.

This is important since many companies have announced policies that cover travel expenses for employees seeking abortion care who are not able to get them in their own home State. They are threatening businesses in Texas that they will throw them out of Texas.

This bill is necessary. We are the elected Representatives. We get to decide.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), a defender of life fighting for the right to life.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 8297.

I heard my Democrat colleagues passionately state that women will not be stopped and that we should support freedom. Yet, sadly, these same people fail to realize that their own radical abortion legislation will, indeed, stop women's rights because their radical agenda stops a future woman's right and freedom forever by ending her life.

If this bill were to become law, healthcare professionals would be seen as obstructing victims' access to abortion if they delay the abortion to report this case of child abuse. That is not protecting women and girls.

To make this bill even worse, this legislation eliminates medical supervision requirements for chemical abortion pills. The FDA deems these pills as high-risk drugs that can cause intense pain, excessive bleeding, infections, and, in some cases, death. This means a woman or a little girl could literally bleed out without a doctor even knowing or being there to help.

Abortion is not healthcare. This is a lie from the abortion industry that has, time and time again, placed its agenda over the health and safety of women and girls.

Healthcare is meant to help patients. Yet, a successful abortion results in the death of a baby 100 percent of the time, except, of course, for those born alive, which my Democrat colleagues don't even want to save them.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation.

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER), a real champion for women, for health, and for families.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, it gets more painful every single day. When you think about it, you have an AG in Indiana who has smeared a healthcare professional in that State who did exactly what she was supposed to do in providing an abortion to a 10-year-old. But he was going to bring charges against her.

We have a colleague on the other side of the aisle who is now putting down $20 bills as if we are going to race over there to get that $20 bill to answer his question.

I mean, what are we doing here? Have we lost it?

This bill simply codifies what is interpreted in the Constitution in the Fifth Amendment.

Now, we have a Justice, Kavanaugh, who was asked the question: May a State bar a resident of the State from traveling to another State? The answer is no. But, interestingly enough, the right to travel, those words, are not in the Fifth Amendment.

So, if we have an originalist Court, we do have to pass this bill, which has been introduced by Congresswomen FLETCHER and STRICKLAND and other Members, because women should be able to travel. Right now, we cannot even guarantee that to a woman who wants to get an abortion.

I have had an abortion. I have had miscarriages. I have had to live with a dead fetus in my body. I know what that experience is like. Not everyone over there does. I would say most Members over there don't.

But it is my personal right. It is every woman's personal right.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON), who is on the leadership team in the House and a great defender for life.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for leading and for all of her courageous leadership on this important issue.

Madam Speaker, I have to say, we have been stunned here in the last hour of this debate by a lot of what we have heard, not the least of which is when one of our Democrat colleagues actually exclaimed on this floor in the last hour: ''Thank God abortion is still legal.''

I just sat here and said wow. Thank God? Thank God for what? That innocent, unborn children can still be killed in many States? Thank God?

The other side in this debate has not only abandoned reverence, all reverence, all morality, all reason, but they defied medical technology.

They have also completely abandoned the first self-evident truth boldly proclaimed in our Nation's birth certificate, the Declaration of Independence, that all men are created equal—not born equal—created equal by God, and it is He who gives our inalienable rights, beginning, obviously, with the right to life.

I mean, seriously, please don't come on this floor and thank our creator for

your zeal to terminate the innocent lives that He has created. God have mercy on us.

Madam Speaker, today, the Democrats have brought two bills to this floor. The first is a complete overhaul of all pro-life protections, which will allow for taxpayer-funded abortion on demand through all three trimesters of pregnancy.

The second bill, the so-called Ensuring Access to Abortion Act, creates an open door for women to be preyed upon by traffickers and does nothing to protect minors who are transported by predators across State lines to obtain abortions.

In order to prohibit these heinous acts, I introduced the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act, which, by the way, I should note, passed this House by a wide margin in 2005 in the 109th Congress. How far the other side has devolved since then. Because of that, now more than ever, we have to highlight why this bill is so important in protecting the lives of minors and their unborn children.

The Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act will help cut down on predators and traffickers taking advantage of minors by making it a crime to knowingly transport a minor across State lines to obtain an abortion without first satisfying State-level parental involvement laws.

□ 1215

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, it is simple. A parent should be involved in the life of their child, and State laws should never be circumvented to benefit those seeking to take advantage of minors.

When a State says a guardian or parent should be notified that their minor is seeking an abortion, that law ought to be respected and followed. Our States' parental involvement laws are well-written and reasonable, and there are exceptions built into the statutes for extreme circumstances.

We also know that forced coercion to abort an unborn child is real, and it must be addressed. Predators, traffickers, and their accomplices must be held accountable for the damage they have done to minors.

I am so glad that our side is offering tangible solutions to real problems; but it is unfortunate that it is in response to such terrible pieces of legislation that only further endanger the lives of minors and their unborn children.

I urge opposition to the other side's callous and barbaric agenda and their bill, and I support our motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the text of the amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), where this is top of mind.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friends, LIZZIE FLETCHER and MARILYN STRICKLAND and JAMIE RASKIN, for understanding the Constitution.

Patricia Hughes and Jeremy Donahue threw a Molotov cocktail in a clinic, an abortion clinic, in Shreveport, Louisiana. David McMenemy of Rochester crashed his car into the Edgerton Women's Care Center. A package left at a woman's health center in Austin, Texas, contained an explosive device. It goes on and on and on.

A Texas woman has been charged with murder after a so-called, self-induced abortion. It is clear that our friends are trying to criminalize the right to reproductive freedom.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from NPR and a document entitled ''Violence Against Abortion Providers.''

VIOLENCE AGAINST ABORTION PROVIDERS, CLINICS, AND ACTIVISTS

December 12, 2005: Patricia Hughes and Jeremy Dunahoe threw a Molotov cocktail at a clinic in Shreveport, Louisiana. The device missed the building and no damage was caused. In August 2006, Hughes was sentenced to six years in prison, and Dunahoe to one year. Hughes claimed the bomb was a ''memorial lamp'' for an abortion she had had there.

September 11, 2006: David McMenemy of Rochester Hills, Michigan, crashed his car into the Edgerton Women's Care Center in Davenport, Iowa. He then doused the lobby in gasoline and started a fire. McMenemy committed these acts in the belief that the center was performing abortions; however, Edgerton is not an abortion clinic. Time magazine listed the incident in a ''Top 10 Inept Terrorist Plots'' list.

April 25, 2007: A package left at a women's health clinic in Austin, Texas, contained an explosive device capable of inflicting serious injury or death. A bomb squad detonated the device after evacuating the building. Paul Ross Evans (who had a criminal record for armed robbery and theft) was found guilty of the crime.

May 9, 2007: An unidentified person deliberately set fire to a Planned Parenthood clinic in Virginia Beach, Virginia.

December 6, 2007: Chad Altman and Sergio Baca were arrested for the arson of Curtis Boyd's clinic in Albuquerque. Baca's girlfriend had scheduled an appointment for an abortion at the clinic.

January 22, 2009: Matthew L. Derosia, 32, who was reported to have had a history of mental illness, rammed an SUV into the front entrance of a Planned Parenthood clinic in Saint Paul, Minnesota, causing between $2,500 and $5,000 in damage. Derosia, who told police that Jesus told him to ''stop the murderers,'' was ruled competent to stand trial. He pleaded guilty in March 2009 to one count of criminal damage to property.

August 29, 2009: Two days after a nearby anti-abortion protest, an unknown arsonist threw a molotov cocktail at a Planned Parenthood in Lincoln, Nebraska. The bomb fell short of the building, leaving no property damage or casualties.

January 1, 2012: Bobby Joe Rogers, 41, firebombed the American Family Planning Clinic in Pensacola, Florida, with a Molotov cocktail; the fire gutted the building. Rogers told investigators that he was motivated to commit the crime by his opposition to abortion, and that what more directly prompted the act was seeing a patient enter the clinic during one of the frequent antiabortion protests there. The clinic had previously been bombed at Christmas in 1984 and was the site of the murder of John Britton and James Barrett in 1994.

April 1, 2012: A bomb exploded on the windowsill of a Planned Parenthood clinic in Grand Chute, Wisconsin, resulting in a fire that caused minimal damage.

April 11, 2013: Benjamin David Curell, 27, caused extensive damage to a Planned Parenthood clinic in Bloomington, Indiana, vandalizing it with an axe: Curell was convicted in state court of felony burglary, and pleaded guilty in federal court to one count of violating the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act. In the federal case, he was sentenced to three years of probation and ordered to pay restitution.

October 3–4, 2013: 32–year-old Jebediah Stout attempted to set a Planned Parenthood clinic in Joplin, Missouri on fire two days in a row. Stout previously set a fire at a Joplin mosque.

September 4, 2015: A Planned Parenthood clinic in Pullman, Washington was intentionally set on fire. No injuries were reported due to the time of day, but the FBI was involved because of a history of domestic terrorism against the clinic. The crime was never solved. The clinic reopened six months later.

October 22, 2015: A Planned Parenthood clinic in Claremont, New Hampshire was vandalized by a juvenile intruder. Damaged in the attack were computers, furniture, plumbing fixtures, office equipment, medical equipment, phone lines, windows, and walls. The flooding that resulted from the vandalism also damaged an adjacent business)

February 24–25, 2016: Travis Reynolds, 21, vandalized a Baltimore-area women's health care clinic with antiabortion graffiti. After being arrested, Reynolds ''admitted to police that he defaced the clinic's doors, walls and windows because he thought that it would deter women from using the clinic.'' Reynolds pleaded guilty in federal court to one count of violating the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act in October 2016.

March 7, 2016: Rachel Ann Jackson, 71, vandalized a Planned Parenthood clinic in Columbus, Ohio, with the message ''Satan den of baby killers . . .'' She pleaded guilty to felony counts of breaking and entering and vandalism and a misdemeanor count of aggravated trespass. Jackson was sentenced to probation, with the judge citing her struggle with serious mental illness as a mitigating factor.

February 10, 2019: Wesley Brian Kaster, 43, threw a Molotov cocktail at a Planned Parenthood clinic in Columbia, Missouri. Kaster admitted to setting the fire because Planned Parenthood provided abortions, although Planned Parenthood stated that the clinic was not providing abortions at the time due to a state law. Kaster was sentenced to five years in prison.

January 3, 2020: A high school student, Samuel Gulick, spray-painted ''Deus Vult'' on a clinic in Newark, Delaware before throwing a Molotov Cocktail at the front window. Gulick was sentenced to 26 months in prison by a federal judge.

October 10, 2020: A man threw multiple Molotovs at a Planned Parenthood clinic in Fort Myers, Florida.

January 23, 2021: An unknown individual fired a shotgun at a Tennessee Planned Parenthood clinic; no one was injured. News outlets noted that the attack took place on the anniversary of the Roe v. Wade decision and at a time when Tennessee's governor, Bill Lee, was involved in a heated online debate regarding abortion and health care.

December 31, 2021: On New Year's Eve, a fire destroyed a Planned Parenthood in Knoxville, Tennessee. The building was closed at the time for renovations. The Knoxville Fire Department and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives ruled the fire arson. The clinic had previously been shot at in January of the same year.

May 25, 2022: A masked woman set a fire at a planned abortion clinic in Casper, Wyoming. The ATF offered a $5,000 reward for information leading to her arrest.

[From NPR, April 10, 2022]

A TEXAS WOMAN HAS BEEN CHARGED WITH MURDER AFTER A SO-CALLED 'SELF-INDUCED ABORTION'

(By Carolina Cuellar)

A Texas woman has been charged with murder for a what authorities are calling a self-induced abortion.

Ayesha Rascoe, Host:

In South Texas, 26-year-old Lizelle Herrera is being charged with murder because of a, quote, ''self-induced abortion.'' She's been arrested and will be arraigned Wednesday. The Starr County District Attorney's Office has yet to comment on the case. Here's Texas Public Radio's Carolina Cuellar with what we know.

Unidentified Person: (Chanting in Spanish).

Unidentified People: (Chanting in Spanish).

Carolina Cuellar, Byline: On Saturday, across the street from the Starr County Jail, a sparse crowd of pro-abortion rights activists chanted for Herrera's release.

Unidentified Person: (Chanting in Spanish).

Unidentified People: (Chanting in Spanish).

Cuellar: At the protest, Cathy Torres, the organizing manager for Frontera Fund, said based on what she knows about Herrera's case, it isn't likely to be unique.

Cathy Torres: This is only setting a precedent for other cases. She's not the first. She won't be the last.

Cuellar: She said many women in Texas are having to choose self-administered abortions because of the state's restrictive abortion legislation, like Senate Bill 8. While SB8 explicitly exempts pregnant women who get an abortion from criminal repercussions, it makes it nearly impossible to access abortion services in Texas, and many people are left with little to no legal options to terminate their pregnancy.

Steve Vladeck, who is a law professor at the University of Texas School of Law, said that based on current information, the murder charge doesn't make sense.

Steve Vladeck: The Texas murder statute does apply to the killing of an unborn fetus, but it specifically exempts cases where the person who terminated the fetus is the pregnant woman.

Cuellar: It's unclear whether Herrera induced her own abortion or assisted someone else's self-induced abortion. He said details like which statutes were used to charge her will help paint a clear picture of how prosecutors avoided the exemption if Herrera performed her own abortion. But right now, this information is unavailable. Nonetheless, Vladeck said Herrera's situation shows what will happen as legal protections around abortion crumble.

Vladeck: You know, I think what this case really is is an ominous portent of what things are going to look like on the ground in states that have aggressive abortion restrictions.

Cuellar: Jessica Brand agrees. She's a former prosecutor and founder of The Wren Collective, a criminal justice nonprofit organization.

Jessica Brand: We've had a lot of wake-up calls in Texas for how far people are willing to go to prosecute women, to strip women of their rights.

Cuellar: According to Brand, while legal ground for the case is shaky, it shows how legislation like SB8 emboldens people to push legal boundaries around abortion. She adds that as restrictions continue to grow, they will disproportionately affect marginalized communities, like those along the Texas-Mexico border. This is because they often lack the resources that would allow them to travel out of state and obtain safe medical abortion services.

Brand: It's very, very dangerous. If they decide that a self-induced and termination of pregnancy is, in fact—qualifies as murder, you can imagine the horrific precedent that sets.

Cuellar: Shortly after the protest, a legal defense fund covered Herrera's $500,000 bail. I'm Carolina Cuellar in Rio Grande City.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I stand, as I said earlier, with a 10-year-old victim who had to run to be able to secure an abortion after being raped.

I stand on the Constitution where the Fifth Amendment says that we are due life and liberty. I stand in front of ''In God We Trust,'' and I tell my friend from Louisiana that the Constitution says that we have a right to freedom of religion.

We speak what we believe. That is what this legislation does, and that is what reproductive freedom is. It is to ensure that the GOP does not criminalize abortion in all 50 States.

It is to ensure that Republicans are not plotting a nationwide ban to criminalize. This Constitutional expose, and explanation, indicates that we have the right to travel and the right to be constitutionally secure in that.

Further, we need to go a step further and criminalize anyone who is a bounty hunter and hold them accountable and put them in jail.

Specifically, this bill provides and makes sure that we prohibit any person or healthcare providers who provide legal abortion or services, that we don't stop that, that we don't stop any person or any entity for helping healthcare providers. Let me thank you and ask support of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise in strong support of H.R. 8297, the Ensuring Access to Abortion Act of 2022.

H.R. 8297, the ''Ensuring Access to Abortion Act of 2022'' will protect women and girls from others preventing or interfering with a person's ability to access abortion care across state lines.

H.R. 8297 prohibits anyone acting under state law from interfering with a person's ability to access abortifacient drugs, abortion counseling, or abortion services out-of-state.

When I cosponsored this bill, I was specifically thinking of the women in my hometown of Houston, who now must travel 12 hours to reach the nearest abortion clinic in New Mexico.

I fear that Texas women and girls will because of the state's antiabortion laws will be living behind a new ''Iron Curtain.''

The harrowing stories of people escaping across the Berlin Wall to freedom will be replaced by women escaping Texas to save their own or a loved one's life.

I am concerned that there will be a new Underground Railroad with conductors ferrying women to New Mexico where they well have the freedom to make their own medical decisions.

It is the landmass of the state of Texas that makes this bill desperately needed.

Texas is the second-largest state in the US with an area of 268,597 square miles or 171,902,080 acres which is more than 7.4 percent of the United States total land mass.

In comparison, Texas is about 1.65 times larger than California, at 163,696 square miles.

Texas is not the largest state, however. Alaska, the largest state in the US is nearly 2.5 times larger than Texas at 663,300 square miles.

Texas has 29 million residents and the 13th highest GDP in the world at 1.78 trillion as of 2019.

If Texas were its own country, it would be the 40th largest out of 193 countries in the world, bigger than every country in Europe.

It is the quantitative, logistical, and legal challenge of driving to gain abortion services.

To the South is the country of Mexico with passport requirements which costs hundreds and often many weeks to obtain.

Those women living in regions of the state that border other states with prohibitions on reproduction options for women will make travel to New Mexico the only option.

To give some perspective on the size of Texas.

Austin is closer to New Orleans than it is to El Paso.

San Diego is closer to El Paso than it is to Houston.

The distance from Washington, D.C. to New York City is about 228 miles, or four hours driving.

The distance from Dallas to Houston, which is roughly 230 miles, or a little over four hours in a car.

To the north and northeast are Louisiana, Arkansas, and Oklahoma all of which have and made add to the hurdles of reaching a service provider by car.

It takes around 13 hours to drive the 805 miles from the northernmost point to southernmost Texas. You would start in Texhoma, a small town that sits on the border of Texas and Oklahoma then drive south through Lubbock, San Antonio, and all the way down to Brownsville, the southernmost city on the tip of Texas.

It takes 11 hours to drive 773 miles from easternmost to westernmost points across Texas.

Any drive of just a few hours may place women in the jurisdiction of unincorporated areas, rural towns, and counties where aggressive enforcement of a state law may be a priority.

Republican Texas lawmakers have already passed SB 8, one of the most barbaric and archaic anti-abortion laws in the country, that denies women the right to bodily autonomy after carrying a fetus for more than 6 weeks.

If left to their own devices, those lawmakers hope to prevent Texan women from seeking abortions not only in Texas, but elsewhere as well.

That is why I wholeheartedly support H.R. 8297, the ''Ensure Access to Abortion Act of 2022.''

This bill would prohibit any person acting under state law from preventing, restricting, impeding, or retaliating against:

health care providers who provide legal abortion services to out-of-state residents;

any person or entity who helps health care providers provide such services;

any person who travels to another state to obtain such services;

any person or entity who helps another person travel to another state to obtain such services; or

the movement in interstate commerce of drugs that are approved to terminate pregnancies.

Women in Texas and in other states with anti-abortion laws are already in crisis. They are already forced to flee their communities, incur undue financial costs, and combat social stigma to seek abortion care beyond their state boundaries.

We cannot allow these women to then be additionally prosecuted for exercising their right to abortion care in states where that right is still upheld.

The ''Ensuring Access to Abortion Act of 2022'' would protect women in need of abortions from litigation.

But it goes admirably beyond that by protecting those who support women in exercising their reproductive rights.

Many organizations and community networks have rallied around women since the Supreme Courts Dobbs decision.

Churches, non-profits, and private companies have all stepped up to the plate to support women carrying unwanted pregnancies whether it be through financial contributions, transportation assistance, housing options, or access to abortion drugs.

The ''Ensuring Access to Abortion Act of 2022'' would shield them from those who wish to make personal gains off the private medical decisions of women.

Just last week, a 10-year-old rape victim from Ohio was denied an abortion in her home state because she was six weeks and three days pregnant.

I will say it again: A 10-year-old girl. Six weeks and three days pregnant.

The anti-abortion trigger laws in her state forced this little girl to travel 175 miles to Indianapolis in order to have her rapists' fetus removed from her young body.

This little girl had to leave the comfort of her community, leave her state, and drive for hours in order to get the necessary medical care she undeniably needed.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would have preferred it if she could not have done even this.

Many conservative lawmakers would have preferred to see lawsuits filed against the family member who made her abortion appointment, the nurse who greeted her at the clinic, the parent who drove her home.

Maybe they would have even preferred to see lawsuits against the owner of the gas station where the family refueled their car, or the search engine that helped them locate the abortion clinic that saved their child from becoming a 10-year-old mother.

Imagine if lawmakers had decided that this little girl had to see a physician 24 hours in advance of her appointment. Imagine if they had mandated that she see an ultrasound of her fetus. Imagine if they had required the physician who cared for her to counsel this child on the benefits of adoption.

That is the reality many Republican lawmakers would like to see.

That is why these two bills are so important.

I stand in proud support of both H.R. 8296, the ''Women's Health Protection Act of 2022,'' and H.R. 8297, the ''Ensuring Access to Abortion Act of 2022.''

I urge my colleagues to stand up for women and girls and the providers who meet their medical needs every day.

We cannot let those who wish to relegate women to second-class citizens turn back the clock any further.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS) has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON).

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. This is just annoying to me that everyone on the Republican side is so concerned about the children before they are born, and once they are born, they want nothing to do with them.

So these children land in the hands of grandmama who is trying to raise them alone. The only time I see them is when they are on the floor fussing about grandmama's Social Security and her Medicare, trying to take away her food stamps while she is trying to take care of Nina's children, Jose's children, and all of these children. Shame on you. You have never carried a baby for 9 months. Shame, shame, shame.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, in the United States of America, we continue our search for a more perfect Union. We all get to be a part of that.

In our history, the Supreme Court has overruled 300 of its own cases, cases such as the Dred Scott decision, and now, Roe v. Wade.

Abortion is a false choice between taking care of a woman and taking care of a baby. What a woman needs is support.

Every life is meaningful, and our actions significant. Ending abortion is the human rights issue of our generation. Every life has value and dignity.

And to every person all across this country, may each one of us open our eyes and see one another. May each one of us open our ears and hear one another. May each one of us open our hearts to one another.

We are a Nation founded on the inalienable, God-given rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. As has been noted by others, life comes first. You can't have liberty without life. You can't have the pursuit of happiness without life.

That should guide us and be the bedrock for our moral authority so that abortion would become unthinkable in America.

Today before this House is a radical agenda. The Democrats' abortion agenda is much more radical than anything that was in Roe. This is extreme.

It nationalizes abortion for all 9 months, making America just as radical as China, North Korea. It legitimizes discriminatory abortions at any stage based upon baby's sex, race, or disability, including Down syndrome. It overrides State laws that protect women from coercion.

There is no part of this that celebrates the dignity, the value, or the potential of human life. Pew Research reports that in Washington, D.C., in the 29 States that provide racial and ethnic data on abortion to the CDC, 38 percent of women who underwent an abortion in 2019 were non-Hispanic or Black, though U.S. Census numbers indicate that Black people comprise 13.4 percent of the population.

CDC data from 2019 also indicates that Black women are five times more likely to have an abortion than White women.

Madam Speaker, we stand on the side of life. Let's defend life. It is the human rights issue of our generation. Reject this bill. I yield back the balance of the time.

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, once again, I speak as a woman, a mom, a doctor, and a pediatrician who has rescued many babies in the neonatal intensive care unit.

I tell you that we have heard a lot of statistics on the other side of the aisle, but one statistic that has not been said is that 100 percent of women who choose abortion make that decision on their own and for themselves, and that is the way that it needs to stay.

This is a healthcare decision that only a woman can make in consultation with her doctor. That is why we are here today, to protect women's autonomy over their own healthcare, over their own lives, over their own destinies, and that is a fundamental right.

When we talk about freedom, we want to talk and we need to talk about the freedom of a woman to control her destiny, to make her own decisions; and that is why these bills are so important, to protect a woman's right to choose and to make sure that if her State does not allow it, she can choose, freely, to travel to another State and get the care she needs.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1224, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Johnson of Louisiana moves to recommit the bill H.R. 8297 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The material previously referred to by Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana is as follows:

Add at the end of the bill the following:

SEC. 3. TRANSPORTATION OF MINORS IN CIRCUMVENTION OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO ABORTION.

Title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 117 the following:

"CHAPTER 117A—TRANSPORTATION OF MINORS IN CIRCUMVENTION OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO ABORTION

"Sec.
"2431. Transportation of minors in circumvention of certain laws relating to abortion.
"2432. Transportation of minors in circumvention of certain laws relating to abortion.

"§ 2431. Transportation of minors in circumvention of certain laws relating to abortion

"(a) OFFENSE.—

"(1) GENERALLY.—Except as provided in subsection (b), whoever knowingly transports a minor across a State line, with the intent that such minor obtain an abortion, and thereby in fact abridges the right of a parent under a law requiring parental involvement in a minor's abortion decision, in force in the State where the minor resides, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"(2) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this subsection, an abridgement of the right of a parent occurs if an abortion is performed or induced on the minor, in a State or a foreign nation other than the State where the minor resides, without the parental consent or notification, or the judicial authorization, that would have been required by that law had the abortion been performed in the State where the minor resides.

"(b) EXCEPTIONS.—

"(1) The prohibition of subsection (a) does not apply if the abortion was necessary to save the life of the minor because her life was endangered by a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness, including a life endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself.

"(2) A minor transported in violation of this section, and any parent of that minor, may not be prosecuted or sued for a violation of this section, a conspiracy to violate this section, or an offense under section 2 or 3 of this title based on a violation of this section.

"(c) AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE.—It is an affirmative defense to a prosecution for an offense, or to a civil action, based on a violation of this section that the defendant—

"(1) reasonably believed, based on information the defendant obtained directly from a parent of the minor, that before the minor obtained the abortion, the parental consent or notification took place that would have been required by the law requiring parental involvement in a minor's abortion decision, had the abortion been performed in the State where the minor resides; or

"(2) was presented with documentation showing with a reasonable degree of certainty that a court in the minor's State of residence waived any parental notification required by the laws of that State, or otherwise authorized that the minor be allowed to procure an abortion.

"(d) CIVIL ACTION.—Any parent who suffers harm from a violation of subsection (a) may obtain appropriate relief in a civil action unless the parent has committed an act of incest with the minor subject to subsection (a).

"(e) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'abortion' means the use or prescription of any instrument, medicine, drug, or any other substance or device—

"(A) to intentionally kill the unborn child of a woman known to be pregnant; or

"(B) to intentionally prematurely terminate the pregnancy of a woman known to be pregnant, with an intention other than to increase the probability of a live birth or of preserving the life or health of the child after live birth, or to remove a dead unborn child;

"(2) the term 'law requiring parental involvement in a minor's abortion decision' means a law—

"(A) requiring, before an abortion is performed on a minor, either—

"(i) the notification to, or consent of, a parent of that minor; or

"(ii) proceedings in a State court; and

"(B) that does not provide as an alternative to the requirements described in subparagraph (A) notification to or consent of any person or entity who is not described in that subparagraph;

"(3) the term 'minor' means an individual who is not older than the maximum age requiring parental notification or consent, or proceedings in a State court, under the law requiring parental involvement in a minor's abortion decision;

"(4) the term 'parent' means—

"(A) a parent or guardian;

"(B) a legal custodian; or

"(C) a person standing in loco parentis who has care and control of the minor, and with whom the minor regularly resides, who is designated by the law requiring parental involvement in the minor's abortion decision as a person to whom notification, or from whom consent, is required; and

"(5) the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia and any commonwealth, possession, or other territory of the United States, and any Indian tribe or reservation.

"§ 2432. Transportation of minors in circumvention of certain laws relating to abortion

"Notwithstanding section 2431(b)(2), whoever has committed an act of incest with a minor and knowingly transports the minor across a State line with the intent that such minor obtain an abortion, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both. For the purposes of this section, the terms 'State', 'minor', and 'abortion' have, respectively, the definitions given those terms in section 2435.".

SEC. 4. CHILD INTERSTATE ABORTION NOTIFICATION.

Title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 117A the following:

"CHAPTER 117B—CHILD INTERSTATE ABORTION NOTIFICATION

"Sec.
"2435. Child interstate abortion notification.

"§ 2435. Child interstate abortion notification

"(a) OFFENSE.—

"(1) GENERALLY.—A physician who knowingly performs or induces an abortion on a minor in violation of the requirements of this section shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"(2) PARENTAL NOTIFICATION.—A physician who performs or induces an abortion on a minor who is a resident of a State other than the State in which the abortion is performed must provide, or cause his or her agent to provide, at least 24 hours actual notice to a parent of the minor before performing the abortion. If actual notice to such parent is not accomplished after a reasonable effort has been made, at least 24 hours constructive notice must be given to a parent before the abortion is performed.

"(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The notification requirement of subsection (a)(2) does not apply if—

"(1) the abortion is performed or induced in a State that has, in force, a law requiring parental involvement in a minor's abortion decision and the physician complies with the requirements of that law;

"(2) the physician is presented with documentation showing with a reasonable degree of certainty that a court in the minor's State of residence has waived any parental notification required by the laws of that State, or has otherwise authorized that the minor be allowed to procure an abortion;

"(3) the minor declares in a signed written statement that she is the victim of sexual abuse, neglect, or physical abuse by a parent, and, before an abortion is performed on the minor, the physician notifies the authorities specified to receive reports of child abuse or neglect by the law of the State in which the minor resides of the known or suspected abuse or neglect;

"(4) the abortion is necessary to save the life of the minor because her life was endangered by a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness, including a life endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself, but an exception under this paragraph does not apply unless the attending physician or an agent of such physician, within 24 hours after completion of the abortion, notifies a parent in writing that an abortion was performed on the minor and of the circumstances that warranted invocation of this paragraph; or

"(5) the minor is physically accompanied by a person who presents the physician or his agent with documentation showing with a reasonable degree of certainty that he or she is in fact the parent of that minor.

"(c) CIVIL ACTION.—Any parent who suffers harm from a violation of subsection (a) may obtain appropriate relief in a civil action unless the parent has committed an act of incest with the minor subject to subsection (a).

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'abortion' means the use or prescription of any instrument, medicine, drug, or any other substance or device—

"(A) to intentionally kill the unborn child of a woman known to be pregnant; or

"(B) to intentionally prematurely terminate the pregnancy of a woman known to be pregnant, with an intention other than to increase the probability of a live birth or of preserving the life or health of the child after live birth, or to remove a dead unborn child;

"(2) the term 'actual notice' means the giving of written notice directly, in person, by the physician or any agent of the physician;

"(3) the term 'constructive notice' means notice that is given by certified mail, return receipt requested, restricted delivery to the last known address of the person being notified, with delivery deemed to have occurred 48 hours following noon on the next day subsequent to mailing on which regular mail delivery takes place, days on which mail is not delivered excluded;

"(4) the term 'law requiring parental involvement in a minor's abortion decision' means a law—

"(A) requiring, before an abortion is performed on a minor, either—

"(i) the notification to, or consent of, a parent of that minor; or

"(ii) proceedings in a State court; and

"(B) that does not provide as an alternative to the requirements described in subparagraph (A) notification to or consent of

any person or entity who is not described in that subparagraph;

''(5) the term 'minor' means an individual who has not attained the age of 18 years and who is not emancipated under the law of the State in which the minor resides;

''(6) the term 'parent' means—

''(A) a parent or guardian;

''(B) a legal custodian; or

''(C) a person standing in loco parentis who has care and control of the minor, and with whom the minor regularly resides,

as determined by State law;

''(7) the term 'physician' means a doctor of medicine legally authorized to practice medicine by the State in which such doctor practices medicine, or any other person legally empowered under State law to perform an abortion; and

''(8) the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia and any commonwealth, possession, or other territory of the United States, and any Indian tribe or reservation.''.

SEC. 5. CLERICAL AMENDMENT.

The table of chapters at the beginning of part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 117 the following new items:

''117A. Transportation of minors in circumvention of certain laws relating to abortion 2431

''117B. Child interstate abortion notification ..... 2435''.

SEC. 6. SEVERABILITY AND EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) The provisions of this Act shall be severable. If any provision of this Act, or any application thereof, is found unconstitutional, that finding shall not affect any provision or application of the Act not so adjudicated.

(b) This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to section 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motion to recommit, H.R. 8296;

Passage of H.R. 8296, if ordered;

Motion to recommit H.R. 8297;

Passage of H.R. 8297, if ordered; and,

Motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 8351.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT OF 2022

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 8296) to protect a person's ability to determine whether to continue or end a pregnancy, and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide abortion services, offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 209, nays 218, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 359]

YEAS—209

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Conway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Flores
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Zeldin

NAYS—218

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—3

Cheney
Gonzalez (OH)
Huffman

□ 1302

Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Messrs. COURTNEY, CARSON, PHILLIPS, LARSON of Connecticut, KILMER, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Messrs. HOYER, RUSH, FOSTER, and SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. NORMAN and BABIN changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Neguse)
Armstrong (Johnson (SD))
Barragán (Correa)
Bass (Correa)
Bentz (Obernolte)
Bergman (McClain)
Brown (MD) (Trone)
Buchanan (Waltz)
Carter (TX) (Nehls)
Castro (TX) (Neguse)
Cohen (Beyer)
Comer (Fleischmann)
Crist (Stevens)
Curtis (Owens)
Davis, Danny K. (Neguse)
Deutch (Stevens)
Dingell (Kuster)
Doggett (Beyer)
Doyle, Michael F. (Pallone)
Dunn (Cammack)
Evans (Neguse)
Fallon (Carl)
Gibbs (Bucshon)
Hartzler (Bacon)
Hern (Bice (OK))
Herrera Beutler (Moore (UT))
Jackson (Carl)
Jackson Lee (Cicilline)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Kahele (Correa)
Katko (Meijer)
Kelly (IL) (Kuster)
Khanna (Kim (NJ))
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
LaHood (Miller (WV))
Lawrence (Stevens)
Lawson (FL) (Soto)
Leger Fernandez (Kuster)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lynch (Langevin)
McEachin (Jeffries)
Meeks (Jeffries)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Stevens)
Newman (Beyer)
Panetta (Beyer)
Pappas (Kuster)
Pascrell (Pallone)
Payne (Pallone)
Pingree (Kuster)
Porter (Neguse)
Pressley (Neguse)
Rice (SC) (Meijer)
Ryan (Beyer)
Salazar (Cammack)
Sewell (Cicilline)
Sires (Pallone)
Smucker (Joyce (PA))
Stauber (Bacon)
Stewart (Owens)
Suozzi (Correa)
Swalwell (Correa)
Taylor (McHenry)
Timmons (Mace)
Trahan (Stevens)
Upton (Meijer)
Veasey (Neguse)
Wagner (McHenry)
Walorski (Baird)
Wasserman Schultz (Stevens)
Wilson (SC) (Lamborn)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 210, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 360]

YEAS—219

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—210

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Conway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Flores
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—2

Cheney
Gonzalez (OH)

□ 1313

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Neguse)
Armstrong (Johnson (SD))
Barragán (Correa)
Bass (Correa)
Bentz (Obernolte)
Bergman (McClain)
Brown (MD) (Trone)
Buchanan (Waltz)
Carter (TX) (Nehls)
Castro (TX) (Neguse)
Cohen (Beyer)
Comer (Fleischmann)
Crist (Stevens)
Curtis (Owens)
Davis, Danny K. (Neguse)
Deutch (Stevens)
Dingell (Kuster)
Doggett (Beyer)
Doyle, Michael F. (Pallone)
Dunn (Cammack)
Evans (Neguse)
Fallon (Carl)
Gibbs (Bucshon)
Hartzler (Bacon)
Hern (Bice (OK))
Herrera Beutler (Moore (UT))
Jackson (Carl)
Jackson Lee (Cicilline)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Kahele (Correa)
Katko (Meijer)
Kelly (IL) (Kuster)
Khanna (Kim (NJ))
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
LaHood (Miller (WV))
Lawrence (Stevens)
Lawson (FL) (Soto)
Leger Fernandez (Kuster)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lynch (Langevin)
McEachin (Jeffries)
Meeks (Jeffries)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Stevens)
Newman (Beyer)
Panetta (Beyer)
Pappas (Kuster)
Pascrell (Pallone)
Payne (Pallone)
Pingree (Kuster)
Porter (Neguse)
Pressley (Neguse)
Rice (SC) (Meijer)
Ryan (Beyer)
Salazar (Cammack)
Sewell (Cicilline)
Sires (Pallone)
Smucker (Joyce (PA))
Stauber (Bacon)
Stewart (Owens)
Suozzi (Correa)
Swalwell (Correa)
Taylor (McHenry)
Timmons (Mace)
Trahan (Stevens)
Upton (Meijer)
Veasey (Neguse)
Wagner (McHenry)
Walorski (Baird)
Wasserman Schultz (Stevens)
Wilson (SC) (Lamborn)

ENSURING ACCESS TO ABORTION ACT OF 2022

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 8297) to prohibit the interference, under color of State law, with the provision of interstate abortion services, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 209, nays 219, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 361]

YEAS—209

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Conway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Flores
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Zeldin

NAYS—219

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—2

Cheney
Gonzalez (OH)

□ 1326

Mr. STANTON changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. WALORSKI changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Neguse)
Armstrong (Johnson (SD))
Barragán (Correa)
Bass (Correa)
Bentz (Obernolte)
Bergman (McClain)
Brown (MD) (Trone)
Buchanan (Waltz)
Carter (TX) (Nehls)
Castro (TX) (Neguse)
Cohen (Beyer)
Comer (Fleischmann)
Crist (Stevens)
Curtis (Owens)
Davis, Danny K. (Neguse)
Deutch (Stevens)
Dingell (Kuster)
Doggett (Beyer)
Doyle, Michael F. (Pallone)
Dunn (Cammack)
Evans (Neguse)
Fallon (Carl)
Gibbs (Bucshon)
Hartzler (Bacon)
Hern (Bice (OK))
Herrera Beutler (Moore (UT))
Jackson (Carl)
Jackson Lee (Cicilline)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Kahele (Correa)
Katko (Meijer)
Kelly (IL) (Kuster)
Khanna (Kim (NJ))
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
LaHood (Miller (WV))
Lawrence (Stevens)
Lawson (FL) (Soto)
Leger Fernandez (Kuster)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lynch (Langevin)
McEachin (Jeffries)
Meeks (Jeffries)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Stevens)
Newman (Beyer)
Panetta (Beyer)
Pappas (Kuster)
Pascrell (Pallone)
Payne (Pallone)
Pingree (Kuster)
Porter (Neguse)
Pressley (Neguse)
Rice (SC) (Meijer)
Ryan (Beyer)
Salazar (Cammack)
Sewell (Cicilline)
Smucker (Joyce (PA))
Stauber (Bacon)
Stewart (Owens)
Suozzi (Correa)
Swalwell (Correa)
Taylor (McHenry)
Timmons (Mace)
Trahan (Stevens)
Upton (Meijer)
Veasey (Neguse)
Wagner (McHenry)
Walorski (Baird)
Wasserman Schultz (Stevens)
Wilson (SC) (Lamborn)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 205, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 362]

YEAS—223

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens

Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—205

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Conway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Flood
Flores
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—3

Cheney
Gonzalez (OH)
Mace

□ 1338

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Neguse)
Armstrong (Johnson (SD))
Barragán (Correa)
Bass (Correa)
Bentz
Bergman (McClain)
Brown (MD) (Trone)
Buchanan (Waltz)
Carter (TX) (Nehls)
Castro (TX) (Neguse)
Cohen (Beyer)
Comer (Fleischmann)
Crist (Stevens)
Curtis (Owens)
Davis, Danny K. (Neguse)
Deutch (Stevens)
Dingell (Kuster)
Doggett (Beyer)
Doyle, Michael F. (Pallone)
Dunn (Cammack)
Evans (Neguse)
Fallon (Carl)
Gibbs (Bucshon)
Hartzler (Bacon)
Hern (Bice (OK))
Herrera Beutler (Moore (UT))
Jackson (Carl)
Jackson Lee (Cicilline)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Kahele (Correa)
Katko (Meijer)
Kelly (IL) (Kuster)
Khanna (Kim (NJ))
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
LaHood (Miller (WV))
Lawrence (Stevens)
Lawson (FL) (Soto)
Leger Fernandez (Kuster)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lynch (Langevin)
McEachin (Jeffries)
Meeks (Jeffries)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Stevens)
Newman (Beyer)
Panetta (Beyer)
Pappas (Kuster)
Pascrell (Pallone)
Payne (Pallone)
Pingree (Kuster)
Porter (Neguse)
Pressley (Neguse)
Rice (SC) (Meijer)
Ryan (Beyer)
Salazar (Cammack)
Sewell (Cicilline)
Sires (Pallone)
Smucker (Joyce (PA))
Stauber (Bacon)
Stewart (Owens)
Suozzi (Correa)
Swalwell (Correa)
Taylor (McHenry)
Timmons (Mace)
Trahan (Stevens)
Upton (Meijer)
Veasey (Neguse)
Wagner (McHenry)
Walorski (Baird)
Wasserman Schultz (Stevens)
Wilson (SC) (Lamborn)

FORMULA ACT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8351) to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to suspend temporarily rates of duty on imports of certain infant formula products, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 2, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 363]

YEAS—421

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Auchincloss
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Boebert
Bonamici
Bost
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brooks
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carey
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Clyde
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Conway
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Doyle, Michael F.
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flood
Flores
Foster
Foxx
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Golden
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez, Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hayes
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Lesko
Letlow
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mann
Manning
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Newman
Norcross
Norman
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Ross
Rouzer
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone

Turner
Underwood
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Zeldin

NAYS—2

Allen
Gohmert

NOT VOTING—7

Cheney
Duncan
Gonzalez (OH)
Higgins (LA)
Loudermilk
McCarthy
Raskin

□ 1350

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 363, I mistakenly voted "no" when I intended to vote "yes".

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 363.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Neguse)
Armstrong (Johnson (SD))
Barr (McHenry)
Barragán (Correa)
Bass (Correa)
Bentz (Obernolte)
Bergman (McClain)
Brown (MD) (Trone)
Buchanan (Waltz)
Carter (TX) (Nehls)
Castro (TX) (Neguse)
Cohen (Beyer)
Comer (Fleischmann)
Crist (Stevens)
Curtis (Owens)
Davis, Danny K. (Neguse)
Deutch (Stevens)
Dingell (Kuster)
Doggett (Beyer)
Doyle, Michael F. (Pallone)
Dunn (Cammack)
Evans (Neguse)
Fallon (Carl)
Gibbs (Bucshon)
Hartzler (Bacon)
Hern (Bice (OK))
Herrera Beutler (Moore (UT))
Jackson (Carl)
Jackson Lee (Cicilline)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Kahele (Correa)
Katko (Meijer)
Kelly (IL) (Kuster)
Khanna (Kim (NJ))
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
LaHood (Miller (WV))
Lawrence (Stevens)
Lawson (FL) (Soto)
Leger Fernandez (Kuster)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lynch (Langevin)
McEachin (Jeffries)
Meeks (Jeffries)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Stevens)
Neal (Beyer)
Newman (Beyer)
Panetta (Beyer)
Pappas (Kuster)
Pascrell (Pallone)
Payne (Pallone)
Pingree (Kuster)
Porter (Neguse)
Pressley (Neguse)
Rice (SC) (Meijer)
Ryan (Beyer)
Salazar (Cammack)
Sewell (Cicilline)
Sires (Pallone)
Smucker (Joyce (PA))
Stauber (Bacon)
Stewart (Owens)
Suozzi (Correa)
Swalwell (Correa)
Taylor (McHenry)
Timmons (Mace)
Trahan (Stevens)
Upton (Meijer)
Veasey (Neguse)
Wagner (McHenry)
Walorski (Baird)
Wasserman Schultz (Stevens)
Wilson (SC) (Lamborn)

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 8167

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I hereby remove my name as cosponsor of H.R. 8167.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. STANSBURY). The gentleman's request is accepted.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JODY HICE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JODY HICE, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 14, 2022.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I am writing today in compliance with Rule VIII, Paragraph 2(a) of the Rules of the House of Representatives. Upholding my responsibilities as a member of this legislative body, I am communicating to you that I have been requested to testify before the Fulton County, Georgia special purpose grand jury on July 19, 2022. Additionally, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1442(a)(l), I will be asking for removal to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia.

Nothing in this notice should be ''construed to deprive, condition, or waive the constitutional or legal privileges or rights applicable or available at any time to a Member[.]'' (See Paragraph 4 of Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.) Any additional questions you have can be submitted to my attorneys, Chris Gober (cg@gobergroup.com or 512–354–1783), Loree Anne Paradise (lap@gobergroup.com or 912–245–0212), or Josh Howard (jhoward@ghz-law.com or 919–599–2168).

Sincerely,

JODY HICE,
Member of Congress.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring to the House majority whip the schedule for next week.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the majority whip of the House.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

On Monday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

Next week, the House will begin our work to advance appropriations bills to fund the government for fiscal year 2023 and consider H.R. 8294, a minibus package of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development; Agriculture and Rural Development; Energy and Water Development; Financial Services and General Government; Interior and Environment; and Military Construction and Veterans Affairs.

The House will also consider Representative KATHY MANNING's H.R. 8373, the Right to Contraception Act, which will protect in Federal statute the rights enshrined in Griswold v. Connecticut and Eisenstadt v. Baird.

American women deserve to be able to make decisions about their own bodies and their own lives, including whether to become pregnant and have children.

The House will consider bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business today.

Additional legislative matters are possible.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I know this is a conversation I have had for months with the majority leader as we have talked about the concern over high gas prices, and I notice that, on the agenda that was listed, there are no bills that would deal with the high price of gasoline that families are struggling under due to President Biden's many different actions he has taken to shut down American energy.

Of course, as we know, the President today is in Saudi Arabia, begging the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to produce more oil, when we have been asking the President to work with us to open up American energy, which is abundant, available, but, unfortunately, closed for business.

Of course, we know during the campaign, President Biden bragged that he was going to shut down drilling, that he was going to make it hard for the energy companies to produce in America, and he has done that. The problem is it has had devastating impacts on families.

So, we brought forward a number of bills, again, months ago. I have presented some of these to the majority leader. He said he would look at them and consider bringing some of them up. I want to present a few of these to the gentleman from South Carolina to see if we can get consideration of some of these bills next week at a time when we just saw a report with 9.1 percent inflation, the worst numbers in 40 years, in large part driven by the high price of gasoline.

□ 1400

We have bills to alleviate that problem that families are facing.

I will start with H.R. 7285, by Mr. CARL. This is the Unleashing American Energy Act that requires the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a minimum number of oil and gas lease sales so that we can get back to producing more energy here.

H.R. 7292, by GARRET GRAVES, the Securing American Energy and Investing in Resiliency Act: This requires the Secretary of the Interior to conduct all oil and gas lease sales that, under current law, he is supposed to be doing. The President is not in compliance with existing law on that.

H.R. 7293, the Energy Permitting Certainty Act, by Ms. HERRELL: This requires the Secretary of the Interior to process applications for a permit to drill. It doesn't tell the Secretary what determination they have to give, but it gives them a shot clock, just like they give to businesses. When they tell a business that they have to give an answer on something, it is by a certain date. Yet, when the applications are submitted, the agency just ignores it, just doesn't do their job. Let's get an

answer, yes or no. Let's get an answer and back it up with facts. That is what this bill requires.

H.R. 7298, the Promoting Energy Independence and Transparency Act, by Mr. MOORE from Utah: This requires the Secretary of the Interior to submit a report on expressions of interest in applications of permits to drill and requires the publication of data on expressions of interest in applications of permits to drill.

H.R. 7304, the Restore Onshore Energy Production Act, by Mr. ROSENDALE: This requires the Secretary of the Interior to immediately resume onshore oil and gas lease sales. Let us have an opportunity to utilize our natural resources to lower the price of gas.

H.R. 751, the Protecting American Energy Production Act, by Mr. DUNCAN: This prohibits any declaration of a moratorium on the use of hydraulic fracturing, which, again, has been a threat by this administration on a very efficient, clean source of energy that America could produce but, right now, is being dramatically limited.

Finally, H.R. 1616, the Promoting Interagency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act, by Mr. BURGESS: This provides for Federal and State agency coordination in the approval of certain authorizations under the Natural Gas Act for the critical infrastructure of pipelines to move energy throughout America so we don't have to get it from tankers, from foreign countries, many of them hostile to America.

I would be happy to yield to see if we could get some consideration next week of some of those bills, if not all.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I assure you that we will get to discuss and debate and hopefully pass all of these bills at the appropriate time.

However, I am sure the gentleman is aware that Russia's war against Ukraine is driving up prices all over the world—Putin's price hike.

Three weeks ago, the price of crude oil was trading at $115.25 per barrel. It closed yesterday at $96.47 a barrel, a decrease of $18.78 per barrel, or a decrease of 16 percent in almost a month.

The average price for gasoline, a gallon of gas, last month was $5.01. It is now $4.57. It decreased 44 cents, or a decrease of 8 percent, in a month. Funny how that works.

Cuts at the pump are half that of the price of crude, and we are shocked to know that major oil companies are raking in record profits.

The House passed the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act, which will help ease inflation, which the gentleman voted against and quipped against. This bill helps Americans save money at the gas pump by promoting local, renewable energy production, and it also expands access to E15.

The House also passed the Consumer Fuel Price Gouging Prevention Act to prevent all corporations from prioritizing profits instead of increasing supply. It empowers the FTC to crack down on oil companies that excessively overcharge their consumers for gas just to boost their bottom line.

The President has released historic amounts from our Strategic Petroleum Reserve, a million gallons a day, and expanded access to cheaper E15 gas across the Midwest, among other steps to bring down energy prices.

The Biden administration has approved more drilling permits on public lands in 2021 than the previous administration did each year during the first 3 years in office, 2017, 2018, and 2019.

The Biden administration is also working with our allies and partners around the world to implement a price cap on Russian oil so that we can continue to inflict pain on Putin while minimizing the pain at the pump.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman is interested in inflicting pain on Putin, then pass these bills. These bills will take away all of Putin's leverage. The only reason Vladimir Putin has any leverage over America and Europe is because President Biden shut down American energy.

Again, each of these bills addresses different components of President Biden's attack on American energy. It has been a very direct assault on American energy on many different fronts. These lay out all of those things.

You can have all the leases in the world, but if the administration won't give permits to actually execute the lease to do seismic, to build pipelines so you can actually move the resource, to drill in new areas while the resource is being depleted in other areas, then you don't have an ability to secure America's future. It results in the President going hat in hand to foreign countries like Saudi Arabia.

I would just point out that I know the President likes talking about carbon emissions a lot. It is a 5,700-mile trek to Saudi Arabia, and I would imagine he is going to come back home. That is more than 11,000 miles on Air Force One. If you notice the picture, there are no solar panels on the wings of Air Force One. It is jet fuel that actually gets it from here to there and back with the President and his staff. You could save all 11,000 miles and the entire carbon footprint of that trip by staying here in America. I recommend going to a place like Port Fourchon in south Louisiana where they produce energy cleaner, cheaper, and with American jobs.

By the way, as States drill, they get revenue sharing. They would actually be able to use that investment to lower prices at the pump and to help American families.

If you think about where the price is today, whether it is $5.20 or $4.80—of course, it continues to go back and forth in a very high range—it is all double, more than double, what it was 2 years ago.

What that means is that people who are filling up are looking at the bottom line. They are looking at the fact that it is costing them over $150 to fill their car today when it cost them maybe $70 2 years ago if they can afford to fill it up all the way.

We are seeing a trend right now where many families can't even get it to full. They might have to go only halfway because they can't afford the full price. Their credit cards get maxed out before then because if they are filling up to go to the grocery store, they are also paying double-digit increases for everything they are buying there because of the spending-induced inflation.

I suggest if we want to send a message to Putin, no better way to do it than to cut him off at the knees in his ability to hold leverage over America and Europe by producing more here in America.

If we produce it in America, cartels can't control the price. Putin can't control the price. We can meet all of our needs and help our allies around the world so that Putin has no leverage over anybody.

The only person giving Putin leverage today is President Biden by allowing all these limitations on American energy production that these bills will remove. These bills will help America get back to energy independence by unleashing all of those different leverages, those different inhibitions, the prohibitions that President Biden has put on our energy.

Again, if he was against all fossil fuels, maybe there would be a consistency in policy, but he is only against American fossil fuels. He will travel 5,700 miles to beg Saudi to produce oil that he won't allow our own producers here in America to produce. I think that is what has Americans irate the most.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think the gentleman is well aware that the President has certain authorities that he can use, and he is using them. The oil companies have certain responsibilities, and the question is whether or not they are living up to their responsibilities.

I know the gentleman is as aware as I am of all the permits out there that are not being utilized. Of course, we are at the mercy of those corporate decisions. Hopefully, they will be made in due course and in such a way that would bring relief to the American people.

I suspect the consideration of all those bills that you are discussing will be taken up by the leader at the time that he considers to be appropriate. I, along with the gentleman, will continue to consult, and hopefully, we can address all these issues in the very—let's just say shortly.

Mr. SCALISE. I appreciate that. Hopefully, as I continue to have these conversations with the leader, maybe you and I could be whipping these bills together. You would see an overwhelming result and a quick reduction

in the price at the pump that is hurting families.

One final question I want to raise to the gentleman, and this came up yesterday or 2 days ago as we were having a series of votes on the National Defense Authorization Act, as the gentleman pointed out. Next week, we will be bringing up some of the appropriations bills, with still more to come over the next few weeks. As we have large numbers of amendments on NDAA and appropriations, which is typical for the process, to be able to go back to 2-minute voting where we can do our business not in 4 hours until 11 at night, but where we can actually be more efficient at processing all the requests that Members have to get a vote on different issues.

We have continued to push to end proxy voting. Again, you have seen most of the country already get there. Most of the country is getting back to work.

Airplanes, finally, you don't have to wear masks anymore. People are traveling internationally again. People are opening up their offices again to get workers in the office.

Congress, frankly, should be leading, not lagging, on this. But if we got rid of proxy voting, we could get back next week to 2-minute votes and be much more effective and efficient in doing our jobs here in Congress.

Is that something that the majority would consider, especially looking at six different appropriations bills, which I am sure will yield hundreds of amendments that would be debated and voted on, on this floor?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLYBURN. Thank you for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, proxy voting has been utilized by both sides of the aisle. I admit it can be a very cumbersome process here on the floor, but we all utilize it. It is done because it serves a very valuable purpose for this institution.

We have made great strides in mitigating the harm of the coronavirus pandemic through vaccines and treatments, but as we both know, the disease continues to spread in both of our home States.

We are hearing numbers that are very concerning. In just this week of this session alone, I know of several Members who have tested positive for COVID and are, therefore, isolating.

These Members can still participate in the process and represent their constituents by using the proxy vote. Of course, having the proxy vote and having 2-minute votes doesn't seem a pretty efficient process to me. We are having a hard time getting it done during 5 minutes.

We just had several 5-minute votes, and I saw on my friend's side of the aisle about 15 people still lined up after the time has expired.

Both of us are being disadvantaged and inconvenienced by this process, but I think it is something that we have to do. I don't know how we could be efficient in this operation with 2-minute voting.

I will pass that along to the leader and hope that he will keep in mind that coronavirus is still here with us, as the gentleman knows.

We serve together on the coronavirus select subcommittee, and we are confronted with issues that still concern the American people. I think that we have to keep all of that in mind as we try to carry out the people's business.

□ 1415

Mr. SCALISE. I appreciate that. I will share—and if the gentleman wanted to share as well with the majority leader—our side stands ready and strongly encourages the complete elimination of proxy voting. We could absolutely get back to 2-minute voting with that. It is not a partisan issue.

You can look across the Capitol, in the United States Senate they have never utilized proxy voting. They continue to do their work. It is, of course, controlled by Democrats over there. They represent the same States that we represent. They managed to do their business without proxy voting so that everybody has to show up to do their job.

This time is no different than any other time in our Nation's history. There are some people who get ill; there are some people who have surgeries; there are some people who just have other things maybe with their family that takes them away. That is something that we all accommodate, we all recognize as a condition of doing a job that actually requires interaction with other people. The Senate has managed to do it without proxy voting; we would just urge that the House embrace that same approach. We will continue to push for that, which would allow us to do things like 2-minute voting.

Unless the gentleman has anything else, I am prepared to yield back.

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

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF VINCENT RANGEL

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

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the life of a friend and an outstanding Chicagoan, Vincent ''Vince'' Rangel.

Vince was an immigrant from Mexico who proudly chose to serve his country during the Vietnam war as a member of the U.S. Army, accumulating a long list of decorations, including a Purple Heart, a Bronze Star Medal, the Vietnam Service Medal, and many more.

Vince later served in numerous veterans' organizations in Illinois, becoming a leading advocate for enhanced behavioral health services for veterans.

His service to our community included his work in support of small business as president of the Mexican-American Chamber of Commerce of Illinois and as board member of the U.S.-Hispanic Chamber.

Vince never forgot his roots, serving as president of the Mexican Civic Society of Illinois, helping to promote Mexican history and culture.

My wife, Evelyn, and I send his daughters, Veronica and Jennifer, and his beloved grandchildren, Juan Diego and Victoria, our most sincere condolences.

CONGRATULATING KIRKLEY THOMAS ON HIS RETIREMENT

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I rise to wish a happy retirement to Kirkley Thomas, the vice president of government affairs for Arkansas Electric Cooperatives, Inc.

Early in his career, Kirkley served as a professional staff member in the United States Senate and subsequently worked for the Arkansas Economic Development Commission. Mr. Thomas accepted his leadership post at Arkansas Electric Cooperatives and served for 8½ years.

His service to our State and his contributions to the important progress in building badly needed infrastructure for power and broadband services is deeply appreciated. Our families have benefited by his leadership.

Madam Speaker, I thank Kirkley Thomas for his years of service, and I wish him a very happy retirement.

FIGHTING FOR REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS

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

Ms. BROWNLEY. Madam Speaker, recently the Supreme Court took an unprecedented, deeply disappointing, and ideologically driven action to overturn Roe v. Wade.

This is a targeted attack on Americans' rights to make decisions for their bodies, their lives, and their future.

This decision sets a very dangerous precedent for our Nation's highest court and is the result of a premeditated agenda from radical conservatives to dismantle access to comprehensive reproductive care.

The decision to have an abortion is a deeply personal one, one that should be made between a patient and their doctor, not by politically motivated judges or politicians.

Roe offered Americans protections from the unsolicited belief systems and the ideologies of others being imposed on them and their personal healthcare decisions.

I am committed to continuing to work alongside House Democrats and President Biden in the fight for reproductive freedom and reproductive justice and the right to abortion across the United States.

WAR IN UKRAINE

(Mr. GROTHMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I would like to address the current situation in Ukraine.

Obviously, everyday people in Ukraine and Russia are dying, and I am concerned that the current administration has no particular plan, or at least we are not told of any plan or goal, as to where we want to wind up.

Ukraine has the second lowest birthrate of any country in a country of that size in the world. It is lower than all but South Korea. Russia also has a very low birthrate. Even before the war, a lot of Russians were leaving Russia, at least subjectively from what I have seen when I toured the southern border of the United States.

The combination of immigration and low birthrate means that the primary goal of the leaders of both these countries should be to make sure we get the number of Russians and Ukrainians up, not going the opposite direction.

In any event, I do not know. We have not met collectively since March to have a briefing for all the legislators as to what the opinions of the Biden administration are. So I am going to ask the press maybe to ask a few questions to find out whether they are working with anybody to try to reach some sort of end to this war or if they don't care if it goes on for another 6 months.

PURSUING COMMON GROUND

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I am hearing from Minnesotans who want their leaders to reach across the aisle and pursue common ground.

From fighting inflation to fighting crime, I work to build consensus on our biggest challenges as vice chair of the bipartisan Problem Solvers Caucus, and I am proud of everything that we have accomplished so far.

There is hard work ahead, but Minnesotans know that we are stronger when everyone is at the table, and that is why I created Common Ground Workshops and why I will continue to pursue commonsense solutions.

PREVENTING CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

(Mr. MRVAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MRVAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my support for research activities to prevent child sexual abuse under the CDC's National Center for Injury Prevention and Control.

Throughout my career, it has been a top priority of mine to protect the most vulnerable populations in our communities, including children impacted from sexual abuse.

For the second year in a row, I was proud to lead a letter to the House Appropriations Committee in support of these research activities. Thank you to all 30 Members who joined me in this initiative as well as the leaders of the Appropriations Committee for the increase in funding.

I appreciate the report language that recognizes the severe and often lifelong physical, cognitive, and emotional impact of child sexual abuse and the value of this research to increase the understanding of risk and factors that can improve prevention efforts.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to ensure that all children can thrive in a safe and healthy environment.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I am honored to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), former chair of the Appropriations Committee.

HONORING FALLEN HEROES IN FLOYD COUNTY, KENTUCKY

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I thank Judge Gohmert for very graciously allowing me to speak before his main subject.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the memory of three fallen heroes in eastern Kentucky. Last week we laid to rest three police officers and one service canine who were slain in the line of duty after enduring unexpected gunfire in Allen, Kentucky, on June 30, 2022.

Among the fallen were William Petry, a 31-year law enforcement veteran and the fire chief in Floyd County, Kentucky; Ralph Frasure, a 39-year law enforcement veteran and school resource officer; and Jacob Chaffins, was a 28-year-old police officer who just started his law enforcement career 3 years ago and an active sergeant in the Kentucky Army National Guard. Also among the deceased was a beloved canine named Drago, a well-trained service dog for the Floyd County Sheriff's Department.

Needless to say, the heartbreak and pain that have reverberated across eastern Kentucky at the loss of these brave men who dedicated their lives to serving and protecting our local people has been overwhelming.

President Theodore Roosevelt, who was a former New York City Police Commissioner, once said, ''No man is worth his salt who is not ready at all times to risk his body, to risk his well-being, to risk his life in a great cause.''

On Thursday, June 30, 2022, these officers, and many other responders risked their lives as they valiantly answered the call to protect the people of the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Their heroic deaths represent a powerful display of the selfless love described in John 15:13, ''Greater love has no one than this: to lay down one's life for one's friends.''

Even as we speak, several other first responders are also fighting for their lives, recovering from their injuries from that horrific day, and our prayers are with them and with their families.

In a Nation where police forces have been vilified in recent years by the actions of a few bad actors, may the lives of these brave men be a reminder of the outstanding integrity and sacrifice that the thin blue line represents. We must continue to support our law enforcement officers across the United States, ensuring they are fully equipped, adequately prepared, and never at the mercy of evildoers.

This Nation owes a great debt of gratitude for the life and service of Officers Petry, Frasure, and Chaffins. May their loved ones find abundant peace and confidence in Matthew 5:9, ''Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called the children of God.''

Madam Speaker, I request to recognize a moment of silence in memory of William Petry, Ralph Frasure, Jacob Chaffins, and K–9 Drago.

□ 1430

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, what a very fitting and appropriate tribute to such selfless servants.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

REMEMBERING R.D. KINSEY

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from East Texas, Judge Gohmert, with whom I have had such a great association over these past several years and thank him for his leadership in this people's House.

Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the life of a Vietnam veteran and leader in our Arkansas community, R.D. Kinsey, a great personal friend of mine, taken too suddenly last week.

Following Kinsey's honorable discharge from the United States Air Force, he worked to serve his fellow Vietnam-era veterans by working alongside them and the VA to ensure that those heroes could obtain the benefits they had earned during their time in service.

Over time, R.D.'s mission expanded, and he worked with local veterans and their families to ensure that they had the healthcare and benefits that they had rightfully earned. R.D. dedicated his life to his fellow service heroes.

In 2004, R.D. worked to establish the Michael Vann Johnson, Jr., American Legion Post 74 of North Little Rock, Arkansas, where he held the commander position for 14 years. Under his leadership, Post 74 became known for their tremendous work in assisting veterans across the State. Let me say personally, no one was more shipshape than Post 74.

In 2018, R.D. became the first African-American State commander in the history of the Department of Arkansas

when he assumed the leadership of the American Legion's command for that 1-year term.

While serving in this capacity, R.D. led nearly 15,000 Arkansas military veterans and their families in serving God and country.

Up until R.D.'s passing, he served the National Legislative Commission, presenting the National American Legion's agenda to the United States Congress on behalf of our Nation's beloved veterans.

R.D. dedicated his life to those veterans and to their families.

My sincerest condolences go out to his wife of 37 years, Dianna; his daughters, Meredith and Allison; and all who were honored to know him and call him a friend.

R.D. and his life of service had a profound impact on me, our veterans, our State, and I am honored to recognize him here today on the floor of the people's House.

CONGRATULATING COLONEL NATE TODD

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Colonel Nate Todd, who currently serves as the Secretary of the Arkansas Department of Veterans Affairs, on his recent appointment to the University of Arkansas Board of Trustees.

Todd's history of service began as a student at Pine Bluff High School, where Nate was a member of the Junior Air Force ROTC unit there.

He would go on to graduate from the University of Arkansas with a Bachelor of Science degree in industrial technology and a master's degree from Baylor University. Other achievements include a Chief Financial Officer Leadership Certification from the National Defense University and graduation from the Executive Medical Leadership Course at George Washington University.

Today, Todd is a 37-year veteran of the Army and Army Reserve where he has served as the director of Health Financial Policy with the U.S. Army Surgeon General and chief financial officer for Walter Reed Army Medical Center in Washington.

Those familiar with Colonel Todd's leadership know of his decades-long devotion to the service of Arkansas and our Nation. Most recently, he has served at the appointment of Governor Asa Hutchinson as our State's Veterans Affairs Department head since early 2017.

The students, faculty, and broader community of the University of Arkansas system will benefit from the knowledge, experience, and integrity that Colonel Todd brings in this new role.

Congratulations to Colonel Nate Todd. I congratulate him for his continued service to the people of Arkansas.

THE CONTINUING WAR IN UKRAINE

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, today is the 141st day since Putin commenced his illegal, brutal invasion of Ukraine. Vladimir Putin continues to direct his gang of thugs to target Ukrainian civilians.

We have seen this play from Czar Putin before, with the mass murder of 25,000 souls in Grozny and the leveling of biblical Aleppo.

To date, the United Nations High Commission has verified nearly 12,000 civilian casualties across Ukraine since February. This number is understated.

In the words of Nazar Havryliuk, a 17-year-old from Bucha: ''They were not able to defeat our Army, so they killed ordinary people.''

Both his uncle and father, innocent civilians, were murdered by Putin's invading Army.

Russian military strikes continue to target Ukrainian resources, including grain storehouses responsible for feeding over 400 million people worldwide. The World Food Programme estimates that 47 million people across the globe are suffering from acute hunger as a direct result of Putin's targeting of Ukrainian stores.

Since February, almost 2,300 schools, Madam Speaker, have been damaged or destroyed, and 290 healthcare facilities have been attacked. No place in Ukraine is safe for civilians.

Currently, 12.1 million people in Ukraine are estimated to need health assistance. That is 12 million individuals who are unable to get the help they need, the help they deserve, all due to Putin's invasion.

Madam Speaker, as my friend from Wisconsin just told this House, leadership from the United States is essential now more than ever. President Biden must step up and ensure that Ukraine has the lethal weapons and supplies to achieve a prompt and decisive victory over the invaders.

Only America's President can stand in the breach and lead. That leadership of our transatlantic partners and our critical allies, like Japan, are essential, essential in assisting the Europeans in crafting help for the people of Ukraine, including supporting humanitarian and critical and necessary and essential military support.

The United States can support Ukraine directly also by supporting the U.N. Secretary General's efforts to open the Black Sea. It is essential that safely exporting Ukrainian grain, currently trapped, is a must-do. The world is waiting for that grain. The world is starving without it. Helping alleviate that hunger crisis requires American leadership.

While Putin's puppets are in Istanbul sitting at a table talking about opening the Black Sea, his military is systematically bombing and burning all the fields of wheat across Ukraine.

America must also lead in planning for reconstruction in Ukraine once the invader has been ejected.

We must also hold Putin and his cronies accountable for the war crimes that they are committing daily in Ukraine. The targeting of schools, hospitals, places of worship, and civilians is unacceptable, illegal, and immoral. Russian leaders will be held accountable.

I was pleased to see the National Defense Authorization Act continued to set that out as a basic tenet of American foreign policy, that we will hold these war criminals accountable.

I will continue to voice my support for the brave people in Ukraine fighting against an illegal invasion to protect their homeland, their freedom, and their sovereignty.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in working to craft the right way to support those Ukrainians in the distribution of needed resources worldwide and holding the Russian leaders accountable for their crimes. This we must do, and this House must lead. Again, I must close, Madam Speaker, by saying it is American leadership that unites the world that can eject Putin from Ukraine.

Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas, and I am grateful for the time.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I am very grateful for the message from my friend from Arkansas, words of wisdom that are greatly appreciated.

One of the things we took up this afternoon on a vote here—and if I recall correctly, there were two of us voting no—but I know the people voting for the bill wanted to try to help with the issue of baby formula. But the bill was thrown upon Republicans last night, not exactly the best way to handle legislation with far-reaching effects, and then voted on today. Well, let's look at some of the facts.

Here is an article: ''Global infant formula products market: estimations and forecasts for production and consumption.'' This points out that in 2017, the EU was the biggest supplier of infant formula, with one-third of global volumes, with China and southeast Asia in second and third places respectively.

Chinese companies have invested in ingredient and infant formula production capacity in France and in the Netherlands and have strategic alliances in Denmark and Ireland. So that way, when they produce it, they don't have to say, ''made in China,'' which causes some people concern, especially when you have stories that exist, reports where Chinese formula has done great damage.

Here is a story from September of '08: ''China: Fourth baby dies from tainted formula.'' So Americans have reason to be concerned when we go buying baby formula that is manufactured by Chinese companies, no matter where it is actually produced.

Going back to this article, it says: ''China is the second largest infant formula producer'' and points out they do export some of their formula.

But with this report about opening plants in other countries, it may give the impression and the appearance that these are not like the formulas that were created in China.

So here is another line that says: ''A lot of the global growth in infant formula production will come from Chinese companies investing in production capacity outside China.''

So it is not enough to ask where was this produced; it is also important to ask: Who actually produced it; who is behind it?

It is also surprising that we would get that bill late at night before people are expected to vote on it the next day when—here is an article from the BBC in May of 2022, and it indicates that the FDA said sales of infant formula rose 13 percent in April compared to January before the recall, and some indicators suggested that the out-of-stock rates had been overstated. It says: ''Increased sales are a good indicator of formula available to the general population.''

□ 1445

Now, if you are in a place where you can't find formula, then it is not much of a comfort that people are finding more in other places in the United States. But here it is: This should have gone through a committee. This should have had an opportunity not just for debate but for more research. It should be under what we normally try to do. Leadership from the parties tries to give 72 hours' notice, but this bears looking at.

I understand that the vote is only going to go until the end of the year, but as Ronald Regan said, the closest thing to eternal life here on Earth is a Federal Government program. I have seen in my years in Congress things that are only going to be a matter of months, just 1 year, 2 years, 3 years, but they are still going on. It happens over and over.

We have been told, oh, this is going to sunset, and that will be the end of it. Then, we get pressure brought to bear on enough Members that those sunsets are reset to further years down the road.

When it comes to baby formula, American babies should have enough American formula produced to take care of them where we have—and obviously, the FDA has shown in the last few years that they can be totally incompetent in so many areas. They can have decisions appear to be totally based on money rather than the best interests of Americans. The FDA has shown that they don't care about it being your body, your choice. They would rather force you to have injected into your body what they tell you to inject, especially when it makes billions of dollars for pharmaceutical companies that are under an emergency use authorization so the companies have no liability for the death and injuries that they cause.

In the case of baby formula, we find out in an article that indicates that already the Abbott facility is at 95 percent of what it was before the FDA shut them down and created problems in doing that without proper regard.

It seems like this bill was a rush to get done without properly considering what this would mean. Whether it is intentional or not, what we keep seeing here are bills that pass through this House that end up making profits for Russia, China, Iran, OPEC, countries that hate us.

As I have said from years ago when I started pointing this out, whether it is paying countries that vote against us more than half the time in the U.N. or bills quickly passed like this that are going to provide profits to other countries, we don't have to pay people to hate us. They will do it for free.

Shouldn't we use profits strategically and quit helping those that want to destroy America for all time? If you just look at the Ukraine invasion by Russia, the policies, decisions, executive orders, things that have been pushed through by this White House, pushed through Congress by this White House, the Biden administration, Russia has made so much profit because of what this White House has done that they have been able to fund the war and the invasion in Ukraine.

On the other hand, we have had the same administration rush in and get Democrat leaders in the House and Senate to pass bills that would—well, we had $13 billion, $40 billion, we have had other bills that we have to pass this to help Ukraine. Well, I voted against the last one because there were simply not—I want to help Ukraine.

I have a special place in my heart for Ukraine, having been an exchange student in Ukraine back in the seventies. I grew to love so many of the people there. It is a good place. They are good people. Of course, they were corrupted by a Marxist system, as every country that attempts Marxist systems is. But as a farmer on a massive collective farm explained to me when I asked, in the best Russian I could muster, ''When do you work out in the field?'' because they were sitting there in the shade in the middle of the morning, he said, in Russian, ''I make the same number of rubles if I am out there in the sun as I make in the shade, so I stay in the shade.''

Well, the Soviet system was able to crush the amount of produce that could be generated in Ukraine and have done much better without the Marxist-Soviet system as far as production.

But I would like to be assured by the bills we pass that money is going to be utilized for what is intended. When you are giving tens of billions of dollars to an administration that just carelessly and callously leaves $85 billion of equipment in the hands of our enemies that killed 3,000 people on 9/11 and would like to kill all the Americans they can, then we need to be more careful in what we pass in this Chamber because this administration cannot be trusted.

I have never indicated that I believe the administration wanted American soldiers killed in Afghanistan because I don't believe that. I just believe their incompetence is at such a level, their lack of judgment is at such a level, that they made it possible that 13 soldiers could be killed on what should have been a peaceful exit if it had been properly done and if we had properly utilized the assistance of our allies, the former Northern Alliance that fought and originally defeated the Taliban with about 300 special operators from the U.S. There shouldn't have been any Americans who were killed in leaving Afghanistan. But then to leave that much equipment, that just cries out that this administration is incompetent, that the leaders in the Pentagon are incompetent.

They continue to say climate change is the biggest threat, but let me tell you, there was not a single military servicemember who was killed in Afghanistan by climate change. Those 13 who were killed, it wasn't climate change. It was incompetence by this administration, the poor judgment by this administration, that got our people killed.

There will be more Americans killed, as our former allies that initially defeated the Taliban by early 2002 told me in multiple visits. For years, they were saying: You can't stay here forever. You end up like occupiers. It is not good for you, and it is not good for us. But for heaven's sake, don't leave the country so that the Taliban is going to take over and kill off all of us who helped America. Don't do that because they will kill us off, and the Taliban will still want to destroy America. But next time they hit you and kill thousands of people and you want to come to take on the Taliban in Afghanistan, we will all be dead. Everybody that helped you will be dead. There will be nobody to help you here.

They were trying to warn us not to negotiate with the Taliban, just defeat the Taliban and leave, and leave them in a position in Afghanistan to defeat the Taliban when they tried to rise again.

This administration did exactly the opposite. They negotiated with the Taliban. They left them $85 billion of equipment to help kill Americans in the future and our allies in the future. It sent a message to China and Russia that if you want to invade another country, if you want to take over an area where the U.S. was once the prominent force to be reckoned with, do it now because the administration in charge of America is too incompetent to do anything about whatever imperialistic moves you want to make. That was the message this administration sent.

We need more safeguards. I think about a predecessor of mine, Charlie Wilson. As some constituents have said over the years, Charlie had a lot of personal issues, problems, but he was always honest about them. Charlie was on appropriations, and he knew how to leverage appropriations, as the Founders knew. They gave us the power of the purse, yet this Chamber doesn't use our leverage to get good governance out of a faulty administration. We just rush to give them sacks and sacks of tens and hundreds of billions of dollars so they can throw it around wherever they want it.

I was shocked to see that this administration, for the first time in the history of the United States of America, is promoting atheism and humanism. They are providing grants, as I understand it, through the State Department to groups in other countries that will encourage atheism in those countries. They will provide grants to other groups. To be providing funds, grants, to export atheism makes it clear that this administration is going to create chaos around the world.

As John Adams said, and it can't be said too often, this Constitution was intended for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate for the governance of any other. Unless we are going to get back to teaching moral absolutes, some things are just wrong, and some things are right. If you are not going to teach those moral imperatives that we have had throughout our country—the Supreme Court said, no, you have to stop with those. The Ten Commandments, no, don't be teaching that. Somebody might think it is improper to murder. You don't want to let that be taught in schools or brought up in public areas. Get rid of those.

John Adams knew. George Washington knew. He talked about the imperative nature of teaching morality and religion. Atheism is the absence of religion. It is not a religion. Yet, this administration, heavily funded by this body, is going around the world saying, yes, we want to give you money if you are going to spread atheism and humanism where we teach people to be as selfish as they possibly can be.

□ 1500

This country won't continue to go on as an experiment in self-government because you are going to have to get rid of the Second Amendment. You are going to have to get rid of the right to be protected from unreasonable search and seizure. You are going to have to get rid of the freedom of assembly. You will have to get rid of freedom of speech. You can't have freedom of religion. We are going to have to basically get rid of the Constitution.

I would prefer to do what the Founders talked about—sure, there has never been one perfect human being in all of history—none were perfect. The amazing thing about the Founders is they recognized their imperfection. They even put it in writing because they understood the importance of all people being equal and that all people were endowed with rights not from mankind, but from God.

When you fail to recognize that, then it is very easy to take away people's rights because, you know, who are they?

If you believe what the Bible taught and teaches, we are created in God's image—and I don't think it was in a physical image—but if created in the creator's image then people, every single person, is worthy of being free and worthy of having rights as pronounced in our Bill of Rights and our Constitution.

We are at a very precarious situation in our history. We have had those before. The Founders, like Thomas Jefferson—yeah, he had slaves, but go look at his original copy of the Declaration of Independence. He made clear that slavery was a scourge, it was an abomination, it was a harmful thing, it was a grievance that the Founders had against King George III because he should never have allowed slavery to get a foothold at all, and that it was going to help destroy the country.

He recognized this was a problem. It got taken out of the final draft. But you had Founders that recognized, yeah, they knew it was hypocritical to have slaves and talk about how wrong slavery was. They were trying to put together a government, a country, with freedoms that would last, but they understood how precarious that was. They understood that no government ever lasts forever. They tried to give us the best instruments they could.

I read, of course, that Jefferson was not there for the Constitutional Convention but sent a letter after he read it saying that if I could change one thing, I would make it a requirement that any bill had to be on file for a year before it could be voted on. Well, that would have kept us from voting on this bill that rushes in as formula production is getting back close to where it was in January. We rush in at the last minute, and say: No, no, we are going to allow people to buy more Chinese milk wherever they choose to make it.

Isn't it interesting, we keep doing things that end up profiting countries that hate us.

That brings me to the topic of fuel. It is rather ironic—there is an article from the Gateway Pundit. There is a Houston television station doing a story on the wind turbines in Texas as ERCOT was created to create policies and oversee our energy production in Texas.

We haven't really had problems with energy production until we got ERCOT. Of course, they were putting so much emphasis in green energy that we had a terrible power outage in winter. They were taking care of spending more and more on windmills and solar, but they didn't follow the advice of a study that said you need to winterize the natural gas connections—so they weren't winterized, and we had a failure.

In this story: ''Texas grid operator ERCOT was forced to take unprecedented emergency measures on Wednesday to avoid rolling blackouts amid a heat wave as wind turbines failed to produce energy due to low winds.''

Amazing. Those of us who have lived in Texas all our lives—well, I had 4 years in Fort Benning, Georgia—but otherwise, we know that often in the hottest part of the summer the wind doesn't blow and the turbines won't turn. We need air conditioning more than ever.

Yet, in my district and adjoining areas, they closed a couple of coal power plants. They had plenty of scrubbers on them to help have clean air. Cleaner production of power than any coal plant in other countries of the world. China is going to add another hundred to the hundred they just opened. They are not going to be near as clean as we had in east Texas. There are a couple more in my district that are scheduled to be closed.

We are creating a situation where people will die because that always happens when we don't have sufficient power, people don't have air conditioning, and the heat gets them.

The article says: ''ERCOT manages electric power to more than 26 million Texas customers and represents 90 percent of the State's electric load. . . .

''On Monday ERCOT asked customers to voluntarily raise thermostats a degree or two, turn off lights, avoid using ovens, washing machines and dryers. . . . ''

This is Texas. We create ERCOT and what happens?

They go nuts on green energy. Now we are going to have what Gray Davis used to have, called Gray-outs, in Texas. We got plenty of fuel. We have lost our minds. Maybe we would be better off without ERCOT.

Here is an article from Tucker Carlson. This is from July 12. I am going to read some of it.

He said: ''Voters, it turns out, are not into any of those things and so nothing that resembles the Green New Deal is going to pass the United States Congress in our lifetimes''—I am hoping not—''provided this remains an actual democracy, which is to say, provided the public has anything to say about how they're governed.

''That's a nonstarter here. It's never going to happen by democratic means, but that doesn't mean it can't happen. It doesn't mean that ideologues can't impose the Green New Deal on weaker countries that are too poor to refuse it, and over the past several years, that's exactly what they've done. So the Green New Deal is actually taking effect around the world. So, we don't have to guess what would happen if it took effect here. We can know. That's the science.

''Let's start with Ghana. Ghana's a pretty little country, peaceful place, actually, on the west coast of Africa. Three years ago, Ghana was in great shape. It had one of the fastest-growing economies in the world. In fact, it had so much energy over most of the last decade, it was exporting it to its neighbors in West Africa.

''Now, those energy exports from Ghana peaked in 2014. Why that year? Well, because the next year, the World Bank published this headline on its website, 'World Bank approves largest-ever guarantees for Ghana's Energy Transformation.' Oh, when they promise to transform your energy, slow down.

''But Ghana didn't slow down. They just kept going. The World Bank promised to provide, and we're quoting,

'technical assistance for energy sector reforms and the drafting of a new renewable energy law.' So, in return for all this help, Ghana agreed to limit its carbon emissions, and then they entered the Paris climate agreement. Oh, how virtuous.

''What happened next? This is the part you don't read that much about. Last year, Ghana experienced a complete shutdown of its national power supply. No more electricity, no emissions because we have no electricity, and blackouts have continued since then. Just yesterday, a news source in Ghana reported that, 'Residents in parts of the Ashanti region who have been hit with power cuts are without water as well,' because it turns out you need electricity to provide water also to grow food. Now, this is not a small thing. The Ashanti region has millions of people living in it. They're all now living in the Stone Age and it's not just the energy grid that's now compromised in Ghana.

''International observers say the country is now facing severe food shortages and hunger, starvation within a matter of months. Why is that? It's a fertile country, hardworking people. Now they're running out of fertilizer. Why? Well, because for years, Sandy Cortez's friends in the NGO community pushed Ghana toward less efficient, more expensive organic fertilizers and the government of Ghana, because it's not a rich government, caved. Last year, according to Ghana's news service, Ghana's agricultural minister 'urged local farmers to adopt an organic agriculture system to reduce the impact of climate change.'

''Oh, what happened then? Well, the good people of Ghana, while they feel good about their fight against climate change, are now starving and in June, last month, police in Ghana used water and tear gas to attack hundreds of demonstrators in Accra, which is the capital of Ghana.

''It's not just Ghana. The same thing just happened in Sri Lanka. In 2016, the World Economic Forum published an article by a Columbia professor called Joseph Stiglitz, one of the dumbest people on planet Earth, urging Ghana to transition to 'high productivity organic farming.' Now, what does Stiglitz know about farming? Ever farmed? No, but he felt strongly that Sri Lanka should try a new kind of farming and of course sold it to Sri Lankans as a pathway to prosperity.''

Again, this is Tucker Carlson.

''In 2015, the World Economic Forum published an article on its website entitled, and we are quoting, 'This is how we will make Sri Lanka rich by 2025.' You can search for that article, but it's gone now along with the government of Sri Lanka. So, they had an actual insurrection, not January 6, not a guy in horns, in a bearskin, running around on mushrooms, making weird noises. No, an actual insurrection where they like, come to your house and swim in your swimming pool, root through your sock drawer and make you leave. That's what they did to the people who run Sri Lanka. They, being the public.

''The turning point came in 2021 when the president of Sri Lanka, acting on advice from the World Economic Forum, banned the use and importation of chemical fertilizers. Now, the problem was virtually every farm in Sri Lanka uses those fertilizers to produce food, which it turns out people need every day in order to survive. As a result of that move, food prices in Sri Lanka nearly doubled. Millions more Sri Lankans now live in poverty, which is not a joke and because the economy has collapsed, Sri Lanka now cannot afford fuel imports. So, Sri Lankans are now waiting days for gasoline. Watch.''

□ 1515

Then he has the story there from Sri Lanka:

''What's so interesting is millions of people are now really suffering. The government just fell in Sri Lanka. Now, no one in Sri Lanka is White. They are what our Democratic Party would call people of color and yet the American intellectuals who pushed that disaster in Sri Lanka, who are responsible for the suffering there, have all escaped culpability. No one is saying a word about it.''

''The Netherlands, for example, which is a very rich country, the second-biggest food exporter in the world, tried to do, for reasons that are not clear but may have to do with Western guilt, the same thing that leaders in Sri Lanka tried to do. They just ordered farmers to cut virtually all of their nitrogen oxide emissions to 'save the environment.' Now, doing that would shutter most farms in the Netherlands and destroy the country's food supply and once again, that led to riots. So, everything that's happened in Sri Lanka and Ghana and the Netherlands is happening at the behest not simply of ideologues, but of some of the largest financial institutions in the world.

''They want more of this. It's why Ghana has achieved a near-perfect ESG environmental impact score of 97.7. According to World Economic Research, Sri Lanka has an ESG score of 98.1, the Netherlands 90.7. So, the poorer you get, the more human suffering there is, the higher your ESG score, and that is important because companies will not invest unless you have a high ESG score. Interesting. So, these countries have no choice and that's why South Africa, for example, works so hard to get an ESG score that now totals 91.

''Now, that effort began in 2015 when South Africa switched to renewables. Now, how did that work? Well, like everything in South Africa, no one in America really wants to know. It's their favorite country. It's a huge success. What's life like in South Africa for people of all colors?'' ''Well, the Guardian, of all places reported at the time, and we are quoting 'solar, biomass and wind energy systems are popping up all over the country and feeding the clean energy into this strained electrical grid.'

''So their grids have been falling apart since 1994, but no problem. The green energy geniuses are going to save South Africa. How did that work?

''Well, 7 years later, The Washington Post reports that South Africa regularly experiences 'rolling blackouts that last 8 hours or more, crippling economic activity and disrupting life in this nation of 60 million people,' . . .'' ''Ask anybody who lives there. It is falling apart. Doesn't work.

''Also join France. France is committed to renewable energy. How is that working? Well, France currently has an ESG environmental score of 92.6. Why? Because 10 years ago France pledged to drive a quarter of all of its energy from renewables in 2018. These policies led to riots.''

He goes on to talk about how much chaos it created for France.

In everyplace that it has been tried with this green energy, it has fallen apart—every single one—with no exceptions: Albania, Kenya, Argentina, Peru, Ecuador, Panama, Libya, and so on.

But it is not just a problem there, it is becoming a problem here.

United States' ESG scoring on environmental issues currently stands at 58. But Joe Biden—who buys into every stupid trend—wants to change that. It is very important to get our ESG score up.

Madam Speaker, you see in history, and you see around the world that when Marxists want to take over, they take advantage of weaknesses, and they exploit them. What they have seen America, exploit this green energy deal in the name of saving the world, and, yes, there will be riots.

For the morons that say I promote violence, I have never promoted violence. I have promoted using our institutions that were created to peacefully resolve them. As a historian, it is clear that Dr. King's peaceful methods worked best toward bringing about needed change. But as a historian, Madam Speaker, you have to note that when our institutions don't do their jobs, then you end up with violence. I don't want violence, but that is what happens.

It is happening in these countries that have gotten their ESG score up and people start starving and they see their families suffering. We can avoid all that. But we have got to stop the insanity.

What does it really come back to?

This: I saw it in the Soviet Union as a college student, and I am seeing it happening now. I thought socialism, Communism, and progressivism, whatever you want to call it, I thought it was dead because it fails every time it is tried.

There is a tiny, elite ruling class when you have Marxism, socialism, and progressivism—a tiny, little, elite ruling class. They will have power. They

will have electricity. They will have what they need. They will have food to eat. You might hear some of them behind closed doors say: Let them eat cake or bugs.

We are being told: Eat bugs. Because your countries are going broke because they are trying to get up their ESG scores. It is unnecessary.

We have people saying: You have to get rid of your car. You can't have a car. That gives you too much freedom. You are a peasant. We want to get back to the Middle Ages, these people say, who want to be part of the elite ruling class. Yes. Let's get back to Middle Age mentality where we have peasants, and they walk everywhere, and the elite ruling class gets to ride in style.

No. We had the greatest, freest, and most wonderful country. Sure, it had problems. Every country has problems. But it was the best that has ever been. Now we are destroying it, and we are going back to a time when elitists will fly around in their private jets and everybody else will have to walk.

Now, let's get back to freedom across the board. We cannot do it if we do not take notice and usage of the things with which this country has been blessed more than any other.

We had another bill to put off limits more uranium. Well, don't worry. When Hillary Clinton was Secretary of State we sold, I think, about 20 percent of our uranium available to Russia. Of course, she made a lot of money for the Clinton Foundation, and Bill Clinton got paid a lot of money. They were able to get that sale through.

Wasn't that great?

Continuing to put uranium off limits, we should have had rare-earth metals that we were able to get from Afghanistan, but this administration's incompetence left that in the hands of China that has most now of the rare-earth minerals. Every week it seems like—at least every month—we are putting more of our own blessed rare-earth metals and minerals of all kinds off limits because we are going to drive this country back to the Middle Ages, and people will be eating bugs as they are being encouraged to do around the world.

We need to have freedom and not have Congress push us back to the Middle Ages and push us back to the age of elitism or like it was in the Soviet Union.

We were told before the eight of us went over there that only the elite have cars in the Soviet Union. To them it is a game. Don't think for a minute pedestrians have the right-of-way because they looked at them as peasants, and they tried to hit them. Boy, did I see that. I couldn't believe it. So you had to be careful because somebody is in a car, and they are going to try to hit you. They did, a number of times.

That is where we are going back to. We are going to have Marxist peasants and Marxist elitists if we don't stop the insanity. It needs to stop now.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate what Tucker Carlson put together so we can share here, and I yield back the balance of my time.

HIGHLAND PARK VICTIMS AND HEROES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the brave men and women of Highland Park.

Independence Day in Highland Park, as it is in so many other places around our country, is a special day. Today families gather—whether it be at a barbecue or a park or wherever it might be—and they celebrate the birth of our country and the ideals of who we are as a nation and all that we aspire to be.

The Highland Park parade is a very, very important centerpiece of our community. Prior to COVID, families would gather, putting their chairs out sometimes the day of or even 2 days before planning exactly where they would sit to have the best view knowing that their kids or maybe grandkids, their classmates, and members of their church or synagogue or their service organization would be marching in the parade, and they would want to be able to look, wave, and say hello.

This year was different though. This year was the first parade since 2019 because in 2020 and 2021 the parade was canceled due to COVID.

There was a special excitement, and there was a special feeling in anticipation of the parade this year. Finally, we were back together as a community.

Highland Park is a special community. It is a city of roughly 30,000 people but with a small-town feel. Neighbors look after each other. People know each other. The restaurants in the community are frequented by the locals. Everyone has their favorite, and you are seeing old friends every time you go in.

This year the parade was going to be special. At 10 o'clock, the time the parade starts every year, the excitement swells. Groups start walking along the path up St. Johns Avenue and up the hill to Central where everyone takes a left turn. They walk across the train tracks, proceed past 1st Street, then 2nd, all the way through the downtown to Green Bay, and then down the hill toward the Post Office reaching Sunset, and turning into Sunset Park at the end of the parade.

The parade started on time at 10 o'clock. The first groups walked up the hill and made that left turn. People were cheering, celebrating, and smiling. The first groups made the left turn, crossed 1st, crossed 2nd. The second group passed, the third, and the fourth.

At 10:14 everything changed. What initially sounded like firecrackers—and sure, why not? it is the Fourth of July—people quickly realized it was a different sound altogether. Those who were right there at the corner of 2nd and Central looked and saw that people were falling and people were bleeding.

At 10:14 a.m. on July 4th, 2022, the Independence Day parade was shattered when a monster with a high-powered military-style assault weapon, having climbed a roof dressed as a woman to hide himself as he would leave, leaned over the edge and fired 83 shots in 1 minute. Eighty-three shots struck the parade goers below killing seven, wounding dozens, and changing a community forever.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor my community. I rise today to talk about those who were murdered, to talk about the survivors, and to share their stories. It is important to share their stories, and it is important that these stories are told and are heard.

Let me begin by talking about the seven wonderful people, the precious lives that we lost: Stephen Straus, Katherine Goldstein, Nicolas Toledo-Zaragoza, Jackie Sundheim, Eduardo Uvaldo, Irina McCarthy, and Kevin McCarthy.

Stephen Straus, an 88-year-old longtime resident of Highland Park, still commuted by train to work in downtown Chicago to his office 5 days a week working as a financial adviser. His niece described him as ''a big, big oak tree, an umbrella of well-being for all of us.''

□ 1530

Stephen is survived by his wife, Linda, with whom he had been married for almost 60 years, 60 wonderful years. He leaves his brother, his two sons, his four grandchildren.

On that tragic day, Stephen's son was in San Francisco. He had called to wish him a happy Fourth of July, but Stephen didn't answer the phone. Of course, as the news from Highland Park started coming out, his son soon realized that his father would not be calling him back.

Katherine Goldstein was the best mom in the world to her daughters. Neighbors described her as a welcoming and lovely person, bringing them baked goods during the holidays.

On July Fourth, Katherine and one of her two daughters decided to leave the house and have fun because Katherine had been mourning the recent passing of her mother.

As the bullets started raining down, her daughter turned and said to run. But Katherine fell to the ground. Her daughter Cassie shared this on the news in an interview. She turned to her mother, saw that her mother was gone. She knelt down beside her mother and said good-bye, but, Mom, I have to keep running, as the bullets continued to fly.

Nicolas Toledo-Zaragoza was a 76-year-old retiree from Morelos, Mexico. He spent many years in the Chicagoland area. He had returned to

the United States to spend time with his family before fulfilling his desire to rest in his beloved homeland of Morelos.

Nicolas was a loving father to eight children and 25 grandchildren.

On the day of the parade, Nicolas was smiling in his wheelchair as horses marched down the street when his family began to live a nightmare with sounds of gunshots. Nicolas was suddenly struck and killed. Members of his family were also wounded.

Now, Nicolas' family looks to him as a guardian angel as they work together to hold their family united in their grief.

Jackie Sundheim was 63 years old. She loved to rescue dogs and was a lifelong employee, member, and centerpiece of North Shore Congregation Israel. Her kindness and work touched everyone in her congregation and even those beyond.

She was the events coordinator. She worked with everyone in the congregation who celebrated bar and bat mitzvahs, weddings, events that were celebrations to bring family together. But she also worked with the caterers and the florists, many of whom came to her funeral.

Jackie never lacked a smile or a hug for anybody. In fact, she was there for everybody.

She is survived by her husband, her daughter, and an entire community devastated at the loss of such a caring person.

Eduardo Uvaldo is survived by his wife, Maria, 4 daughters, 12 grandchildren, and 6 great-grandchildren. Actually, I think he has 13 grandchildren.

He was born in Mexico and was loved as a jovial bowling champion. I talked to his kids about his love for bowling.

Eduardo happily attended the parade with his children and grandchildren. Later that day, after the shooting, his daughters were pleading with the entire community on social media to join them in prayer as Eduardo fought valiantly to survive. The family began to pray for strength. The community prayed with them.

Eduardo was incredibly affectionate with everyone in his family but especially his grandchildren. He loved seeing and spending time on these special occasions and would take a photo with his grandson every year. On that Monday, that fateful Monday, his daughter couldn't take a photo, and now she believes that God did not want her to have a reminder of that day.

Irina and Kevin McCarthy met while working together. They married about 5 years ago and moved to Highland Park in 2018. The couple had a 2-year-old son named Aiden, whom Irina and her husband, Kevin, were obsessed with.

On July Fourth, they joined together and went to the parade. They were right at the corner. When the gunshots started, Kevin and Irina did what all parents do; they covered Aiden's body to protect him. In defending their son, they sacrificed themselves.

Aiden was found wandering the area, covered in blood after the gunfire. The Ring family took Aiden to their home. He played with their 2-year-old daughter after they cleaned him up and watched TV with the Ring grandfather.

Eventually, Aiden was reunited with his grandfather, of course, because Aiden was now an orphan. His parents had been murdered. When Aiden's grandfather picked him up, Aiden had a single question: Are mommy and daddy coming soon?

Irina was 35 years old. Kevin was 37. They were deprived of the most precious thing, being parents to their child, being able to raise him, to celebrate his birthdays, his adulthood, wedding, and maybe children of his own.

The community is united behind Aiden. The community struggles to fathom how this is possible.

Aiden will now grow up having only the memory of his parents, not the hugs and not the love that he deserves.

Aiden is not the only innocent child whose life has been changed. Many have been injured and wounded. Among them, most grievously, is Cooper Roberts, a vibrant, beautiful 8-year-old boy who, as I speak, is fighting for his life in the hospital.

Cooper was at the parade with his family, his twin brother, his parents. His mother was also shot. His brother was wounded. When his mother learned, after her surgery, that Cooper's spinal cord had been severed, she demanded to be immediately released from the hospital so she could be by his side, as every mother would do.

Cooper's injuries, besides the severed spinal cord, continue. He has had a torn esophagus, infections, and a collapsed lung. Already, Cooper has had seven surgeries and is kept sedated because of the pain.

During a brief moment of consciousness, Cooper asked to see his twin brother and his dog. The family continues to keep the community updated, and our entire community and I are praying for Cooper's recovery.

Cooper's life and the lives of many others have been saved because of the work of emergency medics, police, firefighters, nurses, and doctors, who have gone to extraordinary lengths to meet the needs of our community. I would like to take some time to reflect on and celebrate some of those heroes.

I mentioned the parade had just started. Many groups had gone by. One of the groups that had just crossed over Second Street were the firefighters on the truck celebrating. Because in Highland Park, as I mentioned, we are, like everywhere around the country, a small town where it is home for so many people, the fire truck wasn't just the firefighters on the truck. It was their families, their wives, and their kids because they are all a part of our community.

As the shots rang out, firefighters realized what was going on. Concerned for their kids, they rushed the truck ahead to keep their kids safe. But those firefighters, without hesitation of a second, turned around and ran back to the corner into the fire to make sure that everyone was safe.

The Highland Park Fire Department transported 24 patients and administered CPR to many more. Highland Park Fire Chief Joe Schrage recalls one man, on his own, tied 15 tourniquets that day—one man, 15 tourniquets.

It is more than just the firefighters. I will come back to the police in a second. These are trained professionals. They behaved the way they were trained, and they were extraordinary.

There are also many people who may have been medically trained, but not for a situation like this. They responded as true American heroes do.

Bobby Shapiro is a tech salesman. In fact, he has no medical training. But suddenly, in the flash of a moment, he became a first responder and began doing whatever he could to help.

He found an elderly man with a gunshot wound to his thigh and abdomen. Bobby and another bystander gave the man chest compressions. They applied pressure to his wounds as Dr. Wendy Rush, an anesthesiologist at the parade, helped the man to breathe. After 30 minutes, Bobby boarded an ambulance with the elderly man and stayed by his side all the way to the hospital. The man Bobby stood by was Stephen Straus, one of the seven victims that day.

Bobby wasn't alone, though. Police Commander Gerry Cameron also attended to Stephen Straus. He made sure that Stephen Straus wouldn't be alone because, as I said, Highland Park is a community that many of us call home, and we treat each other as if they are family.

David Baum, Dr. David Baum, a fixture of Highland Park, who has been there so long—I shouldn't say ''so long.'' Dr. Baum delivered our two sons, nearly 30 years ago, our oldest son, and then less than 2 years later, our younger son.

I have seen Dr. Baum under pressure. I have seen Dr. Baum perform with care and compassion.

Dr. Baum, after the shooting, after sheltering initially behind a bench with David Saleck, rushed to treat bodies he could only describe as having wartime injuries. He didn't know where the shooter was. He didn't know if the shooting had finished. In fact, he didn't know that the shooter wouldn't be caught for 8 hours. But he knew he had to help, and that is what he did.

Lake County Sheriff John Idleburg was waiting to start the parade. I walk in many parades with John. I know him as a wonderful person. My group was in the same location, and as soon as the firing started, the people who were waiting all immediately cleared out of the area. Not John Idleburg.

John Idleburg, as he stepped onto the parade route, saw a group of people

running toward him in the wrong direction, shouting: Shots fired, shots fired. Instinctively, as the marine and longtime law enforcement officer that he is, he ran the other direction, toward the gunshots, unarmed.

Sheriff Idleburg remembers seeing a lot of blood on the sidewalks and street when they arrived at the corner of Central and Second. He immediately, with the assistance of another officer, ordered all available resources to the scene.

As he watched victims being attended to, he noticed a woman on her stomach with blood coming from her back. Sheriff Idleburg immediately began to apply pressure to her wound with gauze that was provided by an emergency worker. As he applied the pressure, the sheriff comforted the woman. ''I am here for you,'' he said. ''I am not going anywhere,'' he told her.

He stayed with that woman for 30 minutes as they waited for an ambulance while her husband coordinated care of her daughter who they had brought along.

These are the stories of my community, of my friends. I mentioned the police and fire departments. I mentioned that the police or the fire department transported 24 patients, administered CPR, and applied tourniquets. The police, who were also a part of the parade, were there in the blink of an eye. Without hesitation, relying on their training and instinct, they immediately responded to the needs of our community.

An incredible story is Highland Park Officer Ginger Stokes. Officer Stokes had been with the police department since 1997, working in the Juvenile Investigation Unit, the Patrol Division, the Crisis Intervention Team.

□ 1545

During the attack, Officer Stokes had in her car—in addition to her vest she wears every day that would not stop a rifle round, she grabbed her rifle-rated vest, a second vest.

As she saw the injured, she saw one in particular, an injured woman, she took off that rifle-rated vest and put it over the woman. Then, despite not having that protective vest, she ran back into the line of fire.

Officer Stokes' astounding heroism, Commander Gerry Cameron's astounding heroism, in fact, the heroism of all the first responders, police and fire, in Highland Park, is nothing short of amazing.

There are no words I or the community can fully express to convey the appreciation and gratitude we have for them. Without the immense work taken on by first responders that day, I fear that the tragedy could have been far, far worse.

The first responders and the civilians who went to help, I thank and praise all of these people and am grateful for them, and I pray for their well-being. I ask you to keep them in your prayers as well.

Our community is in pain as we think about the loss we have experienced, the members of our community who are gone. Our first responders share that grief with us.

The pace of their work doesn't slow down. In fact, for an entire week, the blocks around the shooting were cordoned off as a crime scene. The police were searching the area, collecting evidence. Other police officers were making sure that it stayed secure, protecting the area.

If you looked at the police cars or the names on the police cars, it didn't say Highland Park. It said Glencoe, Deerfield, Niles, Morton Grove, Prospect Heights, and so many more because first responders from the entire area around Highland Park came to help us.

It wasn't just in the days after, keeping the area safe and secure; it was at the immediate time of the event. First responders from around our community as well as the State Police and Federal agencies, FBI, ATF, all descended immediately onto Highland Park.

I had a chance later in the day to see the command center where they were focused. With incredible professionalism, incredible focus, and amazingly swift action, they identified the shooter, located the shooter, and apprehended him. If not for all these people, their work, their diligence, their professionalism, their excellence, I don't know that the shooter would be captured today.

Following the shooting, the community has united in an extraordinary way. Others have come to help.

This is my community. These were my neighbors. All of the people at the parade who experienced this shooting, who will be forever affected by this shooting, are the people I live with and I see every day.

I know their grief, their struggle, their anger, and that is one of the reasons why I am so grateful for all of the people from areas around who have come to support us.

One example is at the high school. They set up a response center to provide counseling services for anybody who might need it. I believe there are 800 counselors that have come already to the high school to talk to residents, anyone who stops by.

Already, in just a matter of 10 days, more than 3,000 people have received comfort and counsel, trying to get through a very difficult time.

There are other stories. After the shooting, as the police gathered and the first responders, food trucks started serving meals to the responders for free. Soon, customers made donations to cover the costs of those meals. A generous family called the owners of the food truck and said they would pay for every meal provided to first responders on Friday.

Highland Park is strong. Highland Park will get through this time, in no small part because of the care, love, and compassion expressed by our friends and neighbors.

We will lean on each other. We will lift each other up. We couldn't do it without the love that came into our community. But as Rabbi Wendi Geffen said at the funeral for Jacki Sundheim, we shouldn't have to be here. We shouldn't have to be here.

No one should be able to get a weapon of war, a gun designed for one purpose, to kill human beings with extreme efficiency, ultimate devastation, to kill others as quickly and rapidly as possible.

I hope that no one ever has to come back to this podium and share stories of a mass shooting in their community like I have today, like what we saw in Uvalde or in Buffalo. That is why I have called for a ban on assault weapons.

Gun violence is a scourge in our country that takes many forms. Every day, 111 people die from gun violence, whether from shootings in the street, gang violence, or domestic violence.

Two-thirds of the deaths by gun violence in this country are suicides. There are far too many accidental shootings, of guns left carelessly on a coffee table or some other accident that would be so easy to avoid.

I hope my colleagues will work to try to reduce the gun violence we have in this country, which is unlike anything in any other country in the world.

But today, today, I stand to honor the memories and lives of the loved ones we lost, people who truly were the center of the universe for their families and pillars of strength in their community; to honor people like Bobby Shapiro, Sheriff Idleburg, Officer Stokes, Commander Cameron, and it is moving to hear the stories of so many others.

I express my sincerest thanks to all those who played a role in saving lives on July 4, but also thanks to the many people who have spoken up and shared their stories, people at the vigils in churches and synagogues in Highland Park, at Sunset Park.

On Wednesday night, people gathered together in a moment of silence—as we did here in this very body at the same time—at City Hall in Highland Park.

The people who came to Washington with March Fourth, a group that, on Wednesday, rallied for changes in our gun laws to make a difference in lives and fight to make sure no other community experiences what we have in Highland Park, in Uvalde, Buffalo, El Paso, Las Vegas, Pittsburgh, Orlando, Denver. The list just goes on and on.

We can't wait any longer to take meaningful action on this violence. Our grandkids can't afford to wait. Our kids shouldn't be made to wait. Our entire country deserves better.

Madam Speaker, I close by saying this: The last 11 days have been incredibly painful for my community. Highland Park will recover. We have experienced something that no other community should ever experience and too many communities suffer from each and every day.

It breaks my heart to realize that in all likelihood, I will not be the last

Member of Congress giving this speech. It is possible—it is possible—that, in fact, this may not be the last time I have to give a speech like this.

Enough is enough. I hope the Members of this body will find the courage to take action and save lives. Let's start by getting the assault weapons ban in place, these military weapons of war designed to kill and devastate off our streets.

Let's always honor the memory of those who should be with us here today but were murdered in the primes of their lives. May their memories and the memories of all lost to gun violence forever be a blessing.

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

INFLATION IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am going to yield to my friend from Florida, the sheriff, such time as he may consume.

WAR ON AFFORDABLE ENERGY

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, this week's Consumer Price Index report indicates that we just reached a 40-year high in June. This kind of inflation is a tax on every American and a threat to our middle-class families.

As a result of Democrats' reckless, trillion-dollar inflationary spending, hardworking Americans are taking a pay cut, and failed relief plans have caused unprecedented financial challenges to the U.S. economy, hitting the American taxpayers the hardest.

Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle blame the inflation on the war in Ukraine, but Americans faced sharp, rising inflation long before Russia invaded Ukraine.

Now, additional price increases across the board continue to eat away at the paychecks of this Nation's workforce, making it even harder to achieve the American Dream for millions of Americans.

I am sure many of my colleagues can relate when I say I have conversations back home with folks who are struggling to afford everyday essentials, including baby formula and fuel, that continue to be in short supply.

President Biden and the Democrats' lack of concrete solutions are falling short. The President's first action upon taking office was to end construction of the Keystone XL pipeline and issue a moratorium on new oil and gas permits on Federal lands.

His most recent efforts to court oil deals with our hostile counterparts in Saudi Arabia are futile. In fact, it was embarrassing today.

Increasing America's energy independence is the best way to alleviate the pressure Americans feel at the gas pump. This means producing more American energy, not less. Restoring American energy production here at home will make our country more prosperous and secure while lowering the price at the gas pump.

I recently cosponsored the American Energy Independence from Russia Act which would reopen the Keystone XL pipeline, increase our natural gas production and exports, encourage energy and mineral development on foreign lands, and prevent needless regulation on domestic oil and gas production.

However, those across the aisle have consistently blocked this legislation for a total of seven times. Seven times.

This war on affordable energy production is the main culprit for both the high gas prices and skyrocketing food prices. Given the current economic climate, it is critical that Congress thoroughly consider how legislation will contribute to future inflation.

For this reason, I cosponsored the Informed Lawmaking to Combat Inflation Act. This would require the Congressional Budget Office to provide an inflation estimate for major pieces of legislation so that Members of Congress can be best informed about how these spending bills will impact inflation.

I also supported the implementation of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act which lowered tax rates for all Americans and simplified our tax code. We must continue efforts to lower taxes, not raise taxes, especially at a time like this.

□ 1600

We should take this opportunity to make the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act tax cuts permanent. The President's inflation crisis is already costing the American U.S. household $6,000 as they encounter the skyrocketing cost of goods.

The American people deserve commonsense solutions that will help ease the economic burden. Future generations of Americans depend on the financial decisions made today. I will keep fighting for real relief for hardworking Americans and am focused on legislation that supports the middle class and allows hardworking Floridians and others to keep more of their paychecks, allowing families to better save for college, invest in their retirement, and spend more time with their loved ones.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I thank my friend from Florida.

Madam Speaker, we are going to try to do the rapid boards and try to show some data of what is going on out there.

What I am going to do is going to be a little harsh, but I need to beg the majority to think about the information. The data we are going to show may just prove, please, you have got to stop what you are doing. You are hurting people. The cascade may already be built in. We may now have years of really ugly, really bad, hurtful, cruel built into the economy.

Now, look, part of my premise is that good policy is not only good for the United States, it is good for the world, it is good for growth, it is good for the future, it is good for poverty, it closes income inequality.

You actually go back to after the 2017 tax reform. The Democrats came to these mikes and said: Oh, the world is coming to an end; there is going to be a recession. None of it was true, and they knew it wasn't true even though an economist said it wasn't true. You had some of the greatest growth in U.S. history, some of the fastest closing of income inequality, the poor got dramatically less poor, but you also saw GDP around the world got better.

Look, when I am holding articles like this about how many may die this coming fall because of food shortages, that is not the Democrats, but the Democrats' inaction is their fault. They run this place. They run the House, they run the Senate, they run the White House. Instead, the White House, along with the Democrats here, decide hey, let's burn some more ethanol by taking our food, our grain supply, and instead of doing the rotation, saying we need to stop this, we need to turn that into animal feed, you know, there is a fertilizer shortage, let's grow soybeans, the things to get prepared. They were so worried about their next election. The idiocy of this place is they were willing to sacrifice people around the world. That is the cruelty that continues to be Democrat policy.

Let's actually sort of walk through what Democrats are doing to Americans. When I am holding boards with quotes from Jason Furman, something is wrong in the world.

''The decline in real average hourly earnings at this point is terrible, the fastest pace of decline in 40 years.''

What is Jason Furman saying?

He is basically saying people are getting poorer every single day.

The Democrats have owned this place now for, what, 16 months? You have got 16 months functionally of people being poorer every single day.

But what does that mean?

You have Republican after Republican. You notice the Democrats almost never want to talk about what they have set off. We bring boards like this, and we say: Hey, do you realize your eggs are 33 percent more expensive? Nondurable goods, if you take the whole category, there was a number a couple days ago, the inflation number that was almost in the 30s on nondurable goods for that monthly snapshot.

But I need you to think much more grand in understanding inflation. Inflation is a lot more than you are paying 21 percent more for your butter. I need you to understand what inflation means to you and your family's survival and the cruelty of this place not giving a damn, the cruelty of this place being unwilling to actually do real legislation that would help.

They basically have decided: Oh, we are going to pretend it is the Fed's fault, it is Russia's fault, and this place

isn't going to do anything. We are going to let the Federal Reserve jack up interest rates to the point where they put lots of people out of work, have that misery, and somehow Democrats think they are not going to be held responsible for what they have done?

I was trying to come up with a way to help someone understand what inflation really means to your life. Well, this is a snapshot of the Democrats' congressional calendar. I represent the Scottsdale-Phoenix area, highest inflation in the continental United States. If you are a worker in my area and you haven't had a pay raise, but you still actually do things like eat, drive, live in shelter, do you understand how many days you are now working for free?

You need to think this through. You work so many days, but take a look down here, you functionally have lost almost 2 months of labor just for the inflation from the last 16 months. Think about that. If I came to you right now and said, Hey, guess what? You are going to lose 41 days of your labor. You are going to work for the government. Actually, you are going to work for the government for free. Because what is the great scam? Where did this money actually go?

I need you to conceptualize the value of your time that has been stripped from you. It didn't just disappear. That value functionally went to debt. It lowered the value of debt by raising your own costs. So you have actually sort of transferred a bunch of your wealth to the U.S. sovereign debt. It is a little ethereal to process, but that is functionally what happened.

So the trillions and trillions and trillions and trillions of dollars of debt this place has piled up, the Democrats found a way to tax you. They basically set off inflation. They took away a couple months, a couple months of your labor, and then functionally transferred it so that will pay back these trillions and trillions and trillions of dollars of debt but will pay it back with dollars that are worth less.

Do you see the picture? Maybe that is the real reason the left here isn't on fire trying to save people from this misery.

And it is dead serious. You can do the June 2021 or since December. If you do December, particularly for my Phoenix area—and I am the highest inflation in the continental United States. For the entire country, apparently urban Alaska—who ever knew that was a subcategory economic zone?—is slightly higher than us.

But if you go back to since December 2020, you have lost 1.9 months of your labor. The reason I am trying to chart it this way is people go, Oh, eggs are only 20 percent more, how many eggs are you going to eat? I need you to think about this, of how many days you are working not to feed your family anymore, not to pay your mortgage or your rent. You are basically giving it away. It has been ripped; it has been stripped away from you. And you start to think about that.

If you go since June 2021, you have lost 40 days of work that has been stripped away from you, the value. You worked for 40 days for free now. If you go back to December 2020, you now worked for 57 days. If you live in the Phoenix area, our inflation has been so high you worked for 57 days for free. This is what Democrat policies did to you. Tell me this isn't cruel.

Do you understand what this does to the working poor? We get this great speechifying here; the virtue signaling is great. But somehow Democrats get judged on pretty words, and we get judged on what we accomplish.

Look at what we accomplished after refining, fixing, reforming the tax code.

Look what we did economically for the working poor when we fixed the regulatory code.

Look at the misery. Look at the misery you have set off.

How many presentations here, how many pieces of legislation have come to the floor? Those of us in the Ways and Means Committee, Republicans, we keep offering ideas and saying, We will do this in partnership with you. There are things we can do legislatively to help take on inflation. We could no more get one of our amendments heard around here because it is being controlled out of NANCY PELOSI's office.

If you start taking a look at what inflation has done to my community—and I know this chart is noisy and there is a lot of movement on it, but you start looking at the median price of a home. Remember, when we talk about housing, you get knifed in two different directions. The price of the house goes way up, but the value of your savings that you have been saving up to buy that house goes down, so you get it on both sides of the seesaw.

You wonder why housing insecurity is just skyrocketing in this country. Once again, great speeches. Maybe we will throw a bunch more government money at it, but those are their policies that have made people's lives miserable.

This chart, you see that line that just collapses? That is the value of your hourly earnings. You may be being paid more. Great. Hey, I got a 5 percent pay raise. But in the Phoenix area, CPI-U went up, what, 13.1? Traditional CPI went up 12.1. Great, you got a 5 percent pay raise. Where are the other 7 points? You functionally are 7 percent poorer every day.

These are more than just charts. These are people. These are people just trying to find a way to air-condition their house, pay for the gas to get to work, to feed the family.

I understand I often come behind this microphone and hold my boards up and sound like an accountant on steroids. But these are people, and your country is poorer, substantially poorer today. All the progress we made after the 2017 reforms on the tax code, which created the miracle of economic growth and closing income inequality. The poor got less poor. They succeeded in stripping it all away. It is all gone. The thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars of increased purchasing power for the working middle class, it is all gone.

The left's policies are basically arsonists to this country's prosperity. And yet the brilliant policies of what they did a year ago when they pushed out another $1.9 trillion and required no work, asked for no work, asked for no job training. They just gave away money. And now we can't figure out why we can't get the population back into the labor force.

How do you think we are going to get productivity back?

How do you think we are ever going to get inflation back under control?

If inflation is too many dollars chasing too few goods and services, guess what? You can do two things: you can have the Federal Reserve jack up interest rates and crash the economy, and that seems to be the Democrat playbook, just put people out of work, let's just push up misery.

Or we could get together in this place and find ways to help people, make our society, make business more productive. Help people have an incentive to take some of that cash and instead of going to buy a new television, put it aside for their future retirement. There are things we could do.

The policies that would get our brothers and sisters back in the labor force are absolutely key.

Do you think as Republicans we could ever get a Democrat to let us have a simple amendment, even though some of the ideas were ones we agreed upon a year ago?

It was a Republican-Democrat idea, but, today, oh God, we can't let the Republicans actually have something that might be good for society and actually may help knock down inflation because it encourages people back into the labor force, and therefore we could pump up productivity and therefore we have more goods and services to chew up the massive currency that the Democrats handed out from this place.

When I talk about the misery, it is not a snapshot, if I get one more idiot—and I am sorry, that is mean, and I probably broke decorum there. But if I get one more person who didn't show up at their basic economics class come behind these microphones and say, Well, it is transitory. No, it is not.

□ 1615

You have got to understand what is going on right now is these inflation numbers are becoming structural, meaning this misery is built into the next decade of your life.

When you see a chart like this, you start to understand the CPI and then the medical expenses. So you may be over here and then you come along, hit 2022, and you start to understand: How

are you going to afford your healthcare in the future?

Is the Democrats' goal: We will just subsidize it more?

I am going to show you a slide that the Democrats' approach is saying: Let's just give away more money. We will cover up our sins by giving away more money.

It turns out, we have now some great studies that say: As they pile up the debt, it also makes your life miserable and slows down your economic growth and slows down prosperity in society.

This is one we just came across, and it is a GAO study. You have got to understand what the left's policies are doing.

We need to create a whole new misery index. Forty years ago when Ronald Reagan was running against Jimmy Carter and they had high inflation and high unemployment, he created this misery index. It was just a way for people to understand the brutality the left's policies were doing to people's lives. Maybe we need to create new one.

Because this is a really weird cycle. We have high employment. We have a demographic bubble that goes against us. We are getting old very fast as a society. We have incentivized, we have financed people not to participate in the labor force, and we have handed out lots of free money that had no attachment to labor. Then you start to find out that GAO's own study basically was looking at homelessness.

Just a couple of weeks ago, we had a number of the Democrats that were giving beautiful speeches about how much they care about homelessness. I have ZIP Codes in my community where homelessness has doubled in the last year. There are some real problems in areas of Phoenix.

What happens if I come to you and say, a $100 increase in median rents was associated with a 9 percent increase in the estimated homelessness rate?

So what they are basically saying—and this is a GAO study—as rents go up, particularly in those sort of ''C apartments,'' or those basic living places—as those rents go up, for every $100, their study was finding another 9 percent increase in people displaced from housing.

Once again, the Democrats' solution will be, well, let's subsidize them, let's give out some more money, let's not do the things necessary to flatten out so we have economic stability in our society.

The homelessness, let alone what is going on on the border in my State and the fentanyl in my neighborhoods, also turns out our instinct was right—we found the study—that the inflation the left has set off is now making people displaced from their housing. They are living in alleys in my neighborhoods.

You start to look at the other misery index that they have brought to my community, the fentanyl. You have got to understand the amount of fentanyl that is pouring across my border. I have already done presentations on this. It is partially anecdotal because I don't think there is actually a public exchange. But when I have Phoenix police sergeants telling me that it is down to like $12 to get high for the day on fentanyl where a year ago it was over $100, does that tell you there is something really wrong on the border?

Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. STANSBURY). The gentleman has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, then you start to understand the other policies we are going to pay for, for decades.

Don't laugh. I have a little girl who is about to turn 7. Out of nowhere, my wife and I now have a little boy that is functionally 18 days old, one of the greatest gifts God has ever given us.

But I look at my little girl and I look at these other children that are first graders or second graders, and we are seeing some terrifying data on what the left's policy of locking down schools and—''you are going to do it through a computer screen''—are we prepared for the data we are already seeing on what is happening on standardized math scores around the country?

You do realize—this is, once again, like the inflation—it is a cascade effect that we will live with through the next decade, unless we sort of step in and fix this. This is a derivative of Democrat policies, when you start to see standardized math test scores suffering all across the country, particularly in those States and communities that engaged in the almost excessive lockdowns for theater. It was virtue signaling. The math never said it.

This is a fascinating one. Growing debt would result in a per-person income being lowered, functionally $9,000 lower, or a 10 percent reduction. What this study is trying to do is trying to understand—as the left basically says: Our solution is we are going to send someone money. What does it functionally do to future prosperity when you start to actually see what this does in future purchasing power for your income?

Now, it is a complicated formula. Part of it basically says you don't have as much capital revolving in the economy, so you don't have much investment in productivity, so the society doesn't get healthier, wealthier, better, or faster, because all of that cash is functionally financing U.S. sovereign debt. But are you prepared? Because this is what the left has brought you. As the debt skyrockets, you get to live about 10 percent poorer.

Now, stack that on the fact that you have lost a couple months of your labor. Tell me I am not wrong to be angry about the cruelty and the complete avoidance of the misery this place is creating across the country.

And then you start to look at where our future is. Remember, eventually the math wins. The pretty words here may get you reelected, but the math will always win.

This is where we are at. And you start to look at what is going on. The interest—because the piling up of debt, Social Security, Medicare, interest is now functionally crossing, in the next few years, across all defense spending and all Medicaid spending.

You understand, this is Social Security, this is Medicare, this is interest. A number of my friends on the left say: ''Well, if we cut defense.'' The green line is defense.

I know you may care more about this coming election, but we have got to stop the misery.

Just minutes ago, the Atlanta Fed's GDP calculator just announced that the second quarter looks like it wasn't 1.2 percent negative; it is 1½ percent negative. Remember your high school economic class? Even though it is not technically correct, congratulations, you brought us 2 months of negative GDP.

Please, to the majority, stop hurting people. Let some of us—I will give you the ideas. Put your own name on them.

We are better than this. It can't be all about the next election. If we don't stop this, we are about to get a decade of misery because of crappy decisions made in the last 16 months. That is just not fair.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until noon on Monday next for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 4 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 18, 2022, at noon for morning-hour debate.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Member executed the oath for access to classified information:

Mike Flood

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EC–4690. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation [Docket ID: DoD-2020-OS-0084] (RIN: 0790-AK99) received July 1, 2022, 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.

EC–4691. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Arnold W. Bunch, Jr., United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general

on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–4692. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Sam C. Barrett, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–4693. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michael L. Howard, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, 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.

EC–4694. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Ross A. Myers, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–4695. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Dennis A. Crall, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–4696. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report entitled, ''FY 2021 Superfund Five-Year Review Report to Congress''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–4697. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant transnational criminal organizations that was declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–4698. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Mali that was declared in Executive Order 13882 of July 26, 2019, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–4699. A letter from the Associate General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting two (2) actions on nomination, a nomination, and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–4700. A letter from the Senior Advisor, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting an action on nomination and a discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–4701. A letter from the Acting Principal Diversity Officer and Director, Office of Diversity, Inclusion and Civil Rights, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's 2021 No FEAR Act Report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–4702. A letter from the President and Chair of the Board of Directors, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting the Bank's strategic plan for fiscal years 2022 through 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 306(a); Public Law 103-62, Sec. 3 (as amended by Public Law 111-352, Sec. 2); (124 Stat. 3866); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–4703. A letter from the Director, Office of Equal Employment Opportunity Programs, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Administration's FY 2021 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–4704. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of the Class E Airspace; Watonga, OK [Docket No.: FAA-2021-1150; Airspace Docket No.: 21-ASW-28] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4705. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31421; Amdt. No. 4002] received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4706. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31420; Amdt. No. 4001] received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4707. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31422, Amdt. No. 4003] received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4708. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31423; Amdt. No. 4004] received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4709. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31426; Amdt. No. 565] received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4710. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Helicopteres Guimbal Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0020; Project Identifier MCAI-2021-00784-R; Amendment 39-22000; AD 2022-07-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4711. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; De Havilland Aircraft of Canada Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2021-1068; Project Identifier MCAI-2021-00383-T; Amendment 39-21981; AD 2022-06-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4712. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2021-1063; Project Identifier MCAI-2021-00826-T; Amendment 39-21987; AD 2022-06-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4713. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0383; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00264-T; Amendment 39-21998; AD 2022-07-10] received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4714. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0008; Project Identifier MCAI-2021-00882-R; Amendment 39-21985; AD 2022-06-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4715. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0018; Project Identifier MCAI-2021-00853-R; Amendment 39-21997; AD 2022-07-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4716. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Viking Air Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier Inc. and de Havilland, Inc.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0007; Project Identifier 2018-CE-048-AD; Amendment 39-22002; AD 2022-07-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4717. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2021-0957; Project Identifier AD-2021-00469-T; Amendment 39-21993; AD 2022-07-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4718. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Yabora Industria Aeronautica S.A.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0451; Project Identifier AD-2022-00265-T; Amendment 39-22010; AD 2022-08-07]

(RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4719. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Textron Aviation Inc. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Cessna Aircraft Company) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0014; Project Identifier AD-2021-00114-A; Amendment 39-22006; AD 2022-08-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4720. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0096; Project Identifier MCAI-2021-01092-R; Amendment 39-22004; AD 2022-08-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4721. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives: Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0097; Project Identifier MCAI-2021-01115-R; Amendment 39-22005; AD 2022-08-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4722. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0400; Project Identifier AD-2022-00179-E; Amendment 39-22009; AD 2022-08-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4723. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2021-1013; Project Identifier MCAI-2020-01530-T; Amendment 39-21980; AD 2022-06-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4724. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2021-0663; Project Identifier MCAI-2020-01618-T; Amendment 39-21996; AD 2022-07-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4725. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Division Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0386; Project Identifier AD-2022-00336-E; Amendment 39-22001; AD 2022-07-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4726. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2021-1169; Project Identifier AD-2021-01011-T; Amendment 39-22008; AD 2022-08-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4727. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0389; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00291-T; Amendment 39-22003; AD 2022-07-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4728. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-1022; Project Identifier AD-2020-01101-T; Amendment 39-21995; AD 2022-07-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4729. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0091; Project Identifier MCAI-2021-01123-T; Amendment 39-22011; AD 2022-08-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4730. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH (AHD) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0100; Project Identifier MCAI-2021-01128-R; Amendment 39-22018; AD 2022-08-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4731. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Hamilton Sundstrand Corporation Propellers [Docket No.: FAA-2021-0032; Project Identifier AD-2020-01314-P; Amendment 39-22013; AD 2022-08-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 7569. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish a program to provide financial assistance to graduate students and postdoctoral researchers pursuing certain courses of study relating to cybersecurity and energy infrastructure (Rept. 117–413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CONSENSUS CALENDAR

Under clause 7 of rule XV, the following motion was filed with the Clerk:

Motion No. 7, July 15, 2022 by Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois on H.R. 82.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 4374. Referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce extended for a period ending not later than July 29, 2022.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. HOYER):

H.R. 8393. A bill to enable the people of Puerto Rico to choose a permanent, nonterritorial, fully self-governing political status for Puerto Rico and to provide for a transition to and the implementation of that permanent, nonterritorial, fully self-governing political status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ:

H.R. 8394. A bill to protect the constitutional right to engage in private sexual conduct, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ:

H.R. 8395. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to allow the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in identifying the best system of emission reduction for purposes of a standard of performance, to include measures that apply beyond an individual stationary source or category of stationary sources; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ:

H.R. 8396. A bill to protect the constitutional right to marry a person of another race, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma (for herself, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. LUCAS):

H.R. 8397. A bill to authorize the National Mesonet Program of the National Weather Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. BROWNLEY (for herself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 8398. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the mileage rate offered by the Department of Veterans Affairs through their Beneficiary Travel program for health related travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CAWTHORN:

H.R. 8399. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the National Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FEENSTRA:

H.R. 8400. A bill to amend title IV of the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2017 to research the impact of obstructions on radar detection and prediction capabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. KAHELE (for himself and Mr. CASE):

H.R. 8401. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the low-income housing tax credit to incentivize affordable and transit-oriented development and development in certain difficult development

areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LESKO:

H.R. 8402. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing any new or amended energy conservation standard for a product that is not technologically feasible and economically justified, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SWALWELL:

H.R. 8403. A bill to encourage and improve Federal proactive cybersecurity initiatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 8393.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article. IV. Section. 3. Clause 2. ''The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all of the needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or the Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.''

By Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ:

H.R. 8394.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ:

H.R. 8395.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ:

H.R. 8396.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. BICE:

H.R. 8397.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 8398.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CAWTHORN:

H.R. 8399.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. FEENSTRA:

H.R. 8400.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. KAHELE:

H.R. 8401.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 (General Welfare Clause) and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause), Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 (Property)

By Mrs. LESKO:

H.R. 8402.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SWALWELL:

H.R. 8403.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 82: Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MACE, and Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.

H.R. 225: Mr. CLINE.

H.R. 481: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 623: Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 794: Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK.

H.R. 852: Mr. MOONEY.

H.R. 925: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 957: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1080: Mr. GOODEN of Texas.

H.R. 1179: Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. MOORE of Alabama.

H.R. 1229: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 1282: Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 1381: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 1729: Mr. KELLER, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. BOST, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 2193: Mr. BERA, Mr. GOMEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. BUSH.

H.R. 2256: Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 2573: Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. COMER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MRVAN, Ms. MANNING, Mr. JONES, Mr. LAMB, Mr. TRONE, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Ms. WEXTON.

H.R. 2586: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 2629: Mr. JONES and Ms. SEWELL.

H.R. 2752: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2814: Ms. DEAN, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. JACOBS of California.

H.R. 2827: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 2974: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 3115: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. CHU, and Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 3159: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CARSON, Ms. CHU, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. MANNING, and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 3215: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 3259: Mr. MANN.

H.R. 3553: Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 3586: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 3924: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 3962: Mr. TRONE and Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 4118: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 4146: Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. TITUS, Ms. ROSS, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. BERA, and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 4249: Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CHU, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 4277: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 4312: Mr. CLINE.

H.R. 4323: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 4366: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4377: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 4390: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 4407: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 4455: Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 4700: Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 4766: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 4951: Ms. DEAN.

H.R. 5008: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, and Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 5041: Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 5170: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 5227: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SWALWELL, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 5244: Mr. MOORE of Alabama and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 5508: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 5529: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 5606: Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 5743: Mr. MANN.

H.R. 5801: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 5987: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 6117: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 6148: Ms. SEWELL.

H.R. 6161: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 6461: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. AXNE, Ms. MENG, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. TITUS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. CHU, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H.R. 6567: Ms. VAN DUYNE.

H.R. 6641: Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. MANN, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 6699: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 6852: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. GIMENEZ, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 6898: Mr. GOLDEN.

H.R. 6964: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.

H.R. 7055: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 7082: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 7151: Mr. COMER, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. MOONEY.

H.R. 7223: Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 7300: Mr. SWALWELL and Mr. BACON.

H.R. 7382: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 7442: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 7510: Mr. TIFFANY and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 7534: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 7549: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 7624: Mr. BALDERSON.

H.R. 7647: Mr. CASTEN and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 7669: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 7744: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 7770: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 7814: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 7832: Ms. CONWAY.

H.R. 7837: Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 7892: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 7961: Ms. ESCOBAR and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 7991: Ms. SALAZAR.

H.R. 8061: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 8069: Mr. BUDD, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. COMER.

H.R. 8074: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. WELCH, Ms. DEAN, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 8097: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 8105: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 8111: Mr. TRONE and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 8160: Mrs. FISCHBACH.

H.R. 8168: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 8182: Mr. CARSON.

H.R. 8185: Mr. BACON and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H.R. 8212: Mr. MANN.

H.R. 8219: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 8223: Mrs. LESKO.

H.R. 8297: Mrs. LURIA and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 8318: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. NEAL, Ms. STEVENS,

Mr. KAHELE, Mr. CARSON, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MFUME, and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 8332: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 8351: Mr. ESTES, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 8354: Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. MANN, and Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 8355: Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 8356: Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 8360: Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 8362: Mr. BIGGS and Mr. CLINE.

H.R. 8364: Mr. STEUBE and Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 8369: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. DONALDS.

H.R. 8373: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 8382: Mr. STEUBE and Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 50: Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. PALMER, and Mr. VAN DREW.

H. Con. Res. 65: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H. Res. 404: Mr. GOODEN of Texas.

H. Res. 742: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H. Res. 1156: Ms. MENG.

H. Res. 1210: Mr. KAHELE and Mr. LIEU.

H. Res. 1226: Ms. DEAN, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. CLEAVER.

H. Res. 1227: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 8167: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 1 by Mrs. CAMMACK on House Resolution 274: Ms. Conway and Mr. Flood.

Petition 6 by Mr. BIGGS on House Resolution 673: Mr. Waltz and Ms. Malliotakis.

Petition 8 by Mr. LONG on H.R. 3860: Mr. Rose.

Petition 9 by Mr. BUCK on House Resolution 823: Mrs. Bice of Oklahoma.

Petition 12 by Mr. GOSAR on House Joint Resolution 46: Mr. Pence, Mr. Cole, Mr. Rogers of Kentucky, Mr. Chabot and Mr. Mann.

Petition 16 by Mr. GOOD of Virginia on House Resolution 1167: Mr. Wittman, Ms. Herrell, Mrs. Boebert, Mr. Carter of Georgia, Mr. Williams of Texas, Mr. Lamborn, Mrs. McClain, Mr. Fleischmann, Mr. Austin Scott of Georgia, Mr. Bilirakis, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Rouzer, Mr. Steube, Mr. Kelly of Mississippi, Mr. Carl, Mr. Estes, Mr. Jacobs of New York, Mr. Tiffany, Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania, Mr. Brady, Mr. Luetkemeyer, Mr. Westerman, Mrs. Flores, Mr. Schweikert, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Bost, Mr. Brooks, Mr. Nehls, Mr. LaMalfa, Mr. C. Scott Franklin of Florida, Mrs. Miller of West Virginia, Mr. Allen, Mr. Long, Mr. Stauber, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Mast, Mr. Guthrie, Mr. Mullin, Mr. Pfluger, Mr. Hice of Georgia, Mr. Meuser, Mr. Guest, Mr. Palazzo, Mr. Pence, Mr. Graves of Louisiana, Mr. Owens, Ms. Van Duyne, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Balderson, Mr. Huizenga, Mr. Issa, Mr. Gaetz, Mr. Murphy of North Carolina, Mr. Johnson of South Dakota, Mr. Kelly of Pennsylvania, Mr. Walberg, and Mr. Latta.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—REMOVAL

The following former Members' signatures were removed from the following discharge petition when the successor signed the petition:

Petition 1 by Mrs. CAMMACK on House Resolution 274: Mr. Nunes and Mr. Fortenberry.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF WILL WOODWORTH TO THE PEOPLE OF MAINE

HON. JARED F. GOLDEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 15, 2022

Mr. GOLDEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a member of my staff, Will Woodworth, as he prepares to depart Capitol Hill after nearly ten years of service to take a position at the Department of Homeland Security.

Will hails from Yarmouth, Maine and has been working on behalf of the people of our state for the better part of the last decade. He first entered Maine politics after graduating from college, joining the staff of then-Governor Angus King in his run for the U.S. Senate in 2012. He then joined Senator King's staff in Washington, handling constituent correspondence and advising the senator on issues like broadband and technology.

In 2019, my office was lucky enough to convince Will to abandon the comforts of the Senate for the more rough-and-tumble nature of the House. In joining my team, Will took on a senior policy role, advising me on a wide range of issues, from my work on the House Small Business Committee to healthcare and economic policy. Despite the often insurmountable volume of work, Will has been a steady, dedicated, and thoughtful staffer who has helped me execute on key legislative priorities while also doing the time-intensive work of directly helping constituents across Maine's Second District understand my positions on policy issues and helping solve the problems they have faced with federal agencies.

People like Will are what make this place run, and he represents the best of public service—quietly and steadily keeping the wheels of government working and never seeking attention or accolades for his efforts. Mainers have been fortunate to have had Will Woodworth on their side in Washington, as have I. We all wish him the very best on this next professional adventure and give him our profound thanks for his service to Maine and the country.

RECOGNIZING BILL HALE'S SERVICE TO TxDOT

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 15, 2022

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Bill Hale as he retires from public service. Throughout his nearly four decades with the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT), he has been highly regarded for his leadership and innovation on concession and design-build projects within the State of Texas. He oversaw many crucial initiatives, including the LBJ Express project and the Clear Lanes program.

After graduating from Samuel High School in south Dallas, Hale entered the University of Texas at Arlington. He earned both his bachelor's and master's degrees in civil engineering on that same campus. Hale began at TxDOT in the Ellis County Area Office in 1983. He went on to become the Ellis County assistant area engineer and was appointed the Southeast Dallas County Area Engineer (AE) in 1992. One of Hale's most significant milestones as the county's AE was the building of TxDOT's first movable barrier high-occupancy vehicle lane on Interstate 30. In 1999, Hale's work earned him the title of Abilene District Engineer (DE), and in late 2003, he was promoted to the post of Dallas DE. In late 2014, he was appointed Chief Engineer.

During his tenure as TxDOT's Chief Engineer, Hale has been responsible for the management and control of the Bridge, Construction, Design, Maintenance, Traffic Opps and Right of Way divisions as well as the Local Government Projects office. He has managed the construction of the Margaret Hunt Hill and Margaret McDermott bridges, two cable-stay structures that define the Dallas skyline. He also oversaw the building of Texas' first deck park and led TxDOT's evaluation of a private-sector proposal to expand State Highway 121. Hale's work on both the LBJ Express project and the Clear Lanes program led to significant congestion relief in North Texas' five largest neighborhoods. In addition to his construction efforts, Hale launched the TxDOT Connect web-based project information program, which became incredibly vital to the department's operation.

Hale is a "civil engineer's engineer": a hard-working professional. Those colleagues who worked with him on the projects he spearheaded both respect and admire him. He's been instrumental in how every major transportation project in the metropolitan areas in the State of Texas have taken shape. Hale's effective leadership and networking capabilities have been critical in bringing together public and private sectors and affected communities to move necessary transportation projects forward.

My office has been privileged to have a congenial working relationship with Hale over the past two decades, and his experienced input and support of our joint annual Transportation Summits contributed highly to our success in educating local elected officials on upcoming transportation projects affecting Denton, Tarrant and other North Texas counties. I am thankful for Bill Hale's 39-year career in public service, and I wish him all the best in his retirement.

RECOGNIZING JON JAY FOR HIS IMPECCABLE 12-YEAR MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL CAREER

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 15, 2022

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jon Jay, who recently retired after an impeccable 12-year Major League Baseball career. Jon's hard work and dedication led him to win a World Series Championship in 2011 with the St. Louis Cardinals.

Born in Miami, and a true product of the baseball fields of South Florida, Jon helped lead Christopher Columbus High School to its first baseball state title in 2003. He then went on to have a Hall of Fame career at the University of Miami. Jon finished his Major League Baseball career with an impressive .283 batting average, and—remarkably—with the highest fielding percentage among all outfielders in baseball history.

Jon has never lost sight of his roots as a proud Cuban-American, whose family history is engrained in public service and patriotism. His great-grandfather, Justo Salas, was the first Afro-Cuban mayor of Santiago de Cuba, and the first Afro-Cuban governor of Oriente Province. Jon's grandfather, Enrique Tulia Jay, was a political prisoner in Fidel Castro's dungeons for 19 long years.

After 12 years in Major League Baseball, Jon credits his loving family and their tireless support for all his success. I also want to congratulate Jon's wife, Nikki, and their beautiful children: Brooklyn, Berkley, and Jaxon, for this remarkable achievement. The life of a Major League wife and family is not always easy, and I applaud their steadfast devotion to Jon and his career.

Madam Speaker, it is a privilege to congratulate Jon Jay on an amazing baseball career and for his continuous dedication to representing his community—not just in South Florida, but across the country. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this outstanding individual.

EXCHANGE CLUB OF JONESBORO 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ERIC A. "RICK" CRAWFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 15, 2022

Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor The Exchange Club of Jonesboro, Arkansas. The Exchange Club of Jonesboro was founded on August 28, 1947. This year they will be celebrating their 75th anniversary.

The 70-member club is active with programs such as: honoring a Law Enforcement Office of the Year, handing out flags on Veterans

Day, presenting Citizenship Awards to local sixth graders, hosting an activity day and cookout for children with special needs, providing a scholarship to Arkansas State University to assist a local student, sponsoring a local boy and a girl so they can attend Boys State and Girls State each year, sponsoring Little League baseball teams, dressing as Santa to provide children in local hospitals with gifts at Christmas, and many more community events.

I am proud to have an organization like this in my District that makes an impact with a mission to inspire our communities to become better places to live.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. C. A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 15, 2022

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Speaker, due to my attendance at an unscheduled meeting, I was unable to make Roll Call vote No. 328. Had I been present, I would have voted YES on Roll Call No. 328, H.R. 7900, On Agreeing to the Amendment.

2022 NATIONAL CONVENTION OF LAMBDA THETA PHI IN TAMPA, FLORIDA

HON. CHARLIE CRIST

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 15, 2022

Mr. CRIST. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and extend my congratulations to Lambda Theta Phi on their 2022 National Convention, and I commend them on their decision to host this year's convention in the city of Tampa, which is just across the Bay from my home district of Pinellas County in the great state of Florida.

Since its founding in 1975, Lambda Theta Phi has undertaken many laudable initiatives, such as fundraising for victims of natural disasters and helping those struggling with homelessness get back on their feet. In doing so, they have demonstrated their enduring commitment to the lofty ideals laid out by the Fraternal Fathers, Dr. Cayetano Socarrás and Dr. José Quiles, including academic excellence, service, leadership, and Latino unity.

As a lifelong Florida resident, former Governor, and proud Representative of Florida's 13th Congressional District, I have seen the power of these ideals in action. From their close partnership with the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute, to the dozens of Lambda Theta Phi brothers in Washington, Tallahassee, and across Florida working tirelessly for a better future, Lambda Theta Phi brothers truly represent the best of our communities.

It is with great pleasure that I congratulate this historic organization on their continued national engagement through this convention, and extend my best wishes to them in all their future endeavors. Finally, I echo the chant that has united Latino brothers in fraternity and a shared mission for almost 50 years—Lambda Theta Phi, Lambda 'till the day we die.

TRIBUTE TO THE ROSE BOWL STADIUM

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 15, 2022

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the centennial anniversary of the Rose Bowl Stadium in Pasadena, California.

On January 1, 1890, in celebration of the balmy California winter weather, the Valley Hunt Club organized a parade with floats, flowers, and equestrian displays. This celebration would come to be known as the Rose Parade and would grow to such popularity that a separate organization, the Tournament of Roses Association, was created to facilitate its annual planning and operation. In 1902, a football game was created to finance the cost of the parade. It was called the ''Tournament East-West football game,'' with the University of Michigan defeating Stanford University 49–0. This would later be renamed the ''Rose Bowl Game,'' and nicknamed ''The Grandaddy of Them All''—the oldest currently operating bowl game.

By 1922, the parade had outgrown its former venue of Tournament Park and construction began on a new stadium, designed by notable architect Myron Hunt who had been inspired by the design of the Yale Bowl in Connecticut. Over the decades, many additions and refurbishments have been carried out ranging from an entire new southern wing of stands, which turned the stadium from a horseshoe into an actual bowl, to over seventy thousand new seat backs. The stadium is now recognized as a National Historic Landmark and a California Historic Civil Engineering Landmark.

The first game at the stadium was in 1922 between the University of California, Berkeley and the University of Southern California (USC), ending in a Berkeley victory. The stadium was officially dedicated on January 1, 1923, with a game between USC and Pennsylvania State University that ended in a USC victory. Since then, the Rose Bowl has been home to numerous historic achievements in the world of sports and entertainment, such as the first transcontinental radio broadcast of a sporting event in 1927 and the first national color telecast of a college football game in 1962.

Today, the Rose Bowl Stadium hosts the annual Rose Bowl Game. It also has hosted the University of California, Los Angeles Bruins home games since 1982 and five Super Bowls. Beyond football, the stadium has served as the venue for the 1994 FIFA World Cup Final, the 1999 FIFA Women's World Cup Final, and participated in two Olympic Games. It will host events for the 2028 Olympic and Paralympic Games, and this past Independence Day, hosted its 96th Annual Americafest Fireworks Show on July 4, 2022. Notable celebrities such as Whitney Houston, Beyoncé, Jennifer Lopez, Justin Timberlake and Taylor Swift have all performed at the venue, as well as many world-renowned bands, such as The Rolling Stones, Journey, The Eagles, Coldplay, and BTS.

I consider it a great privilege to recognize the Rose Bowl Stadium upon its one-hundredth anniversary, and I ask all Members to join me in congratulating this venerable, historic stadium.

SUPPORTING A WOMAN'S RIGHT TO CHOOSE

HON. BRENDA L. LAWRENCE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 15, 2022

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise in unwavering support of legislation that protects a woman's right to make her own decisions regarding her own body. This includes H.R. 8296, the Women's Health Protection Act of 2022, and H.R. 8297, the Ensuring Access to Abortion Act of 2022. Women should have the right to make their own health care decisions; a right that was stripped away with the Supreme Court's decision to ignore almost fifty years of precedent and overturn Roe v. Wade.

In my home state of Michigan, a draconian 1931 abortion ban—with no exceptions for rape or incest—is only held back by a preliminary injunction. If the ninety-one-year-old law goes into effect, millions of Michiganders will lose their reproductive freedom. I've said it once before, and I will say it again, abortion bans don't ban abortions, they ban safe abortions.

The right to bodily autonomy, privacy, and even travel is at stake. Passing these two pieces of legislation is a critical step toward protecting the constitutional rights of millions of Americans. Now more than ever, the Senate needs to pass both bills so that women can make the best healthcare decisions for themselves and their families.

RECOGNIZING THE SINGFIELD FAMILY OF ALBANY, GEORGIA

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 15, 2022

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the Singfield family and their distinguished contributions to the City of Albany, Georgia. On June 27, 2022, Glenn Singfield, Sr. and Tandra Singfield, along with their sons Glenn II and Gerard Singfield, received the Georgia Municipal Association's Renaissance Award, which recognizes those who have made significant contributions to the revitalization of downtown areas in the state of Georgia. The Singfield family became the first Albany-area recipients of the Renaissance Award, which they received in recognition of one of the Good Life City's favorite restaurants, The Flint.

The Singfield family cut their teeth in the Albany restaurant industry after Glenn II, known as ''Deuce,'' and Gerard witnessed a serious car accident on Thanksgiving eve of 2012, which led the Singfield brothers to reevaluate their career paths. Deuce expressed his desire to pursue his lifelong passion for cooking, and his family felt called to invest in his talents. Two years later, the Singfield family opened their first restaurant, The Albany Fish Company, an outstanding seafood restaurant that marked the family's first success in the restaurant industry.

After seeing the success of the Albany Fish Company, the City of Albany approached the Singfields and asked them to take part in the revitalization of downtown by opening a new

establishment. When the time came to build the new restaurant, Glenn Singfield, Sr., a building contractor, used a very special blueprint—a drawing Glenn II had made at age twelve illustrating his ''dream restaurant,'' The Flint, which had its grand opening on April 15, 2019. The Flint is located in the heart of downtown Albany in a 10,000 square foot building that was once a cotton factory. While Glenn Sr. and Tandra are the owners, Gerard, until recently, served as the General Manager, and Deuce serves as the Head Chef. Deuce's passion and talent have brought to life an acclaimed menu, including such unique items as the Shrimp and Gator Po Boy and Gavin's Flaming Burger, which bring people from all over Southwest Georgia to the restaurant.

Greater than the appeal of The Flint's menu is the impact the restaurant and the Singfield family have had on the Albany-area community and local economic development. The Flint displays over 200 pieces of art curated by local artists, giving its customers a unique dining and shopping experience, while allowing local artists a unique marketing opportunity to sell their art. Additionally, the Singfields have made huge investments into training their employees, known by The Flint as ''associates,'' and preparing them for success in their future endeavors. However, it is not just restaurant associates who receive support from the Singfields—every patron of The Flint is treated like family from the moment they walk through the door.

Mahatma Gandhi once said that ''the best way to find yourself is to lose yourself in the service of others.'' The Singfield family has done exactly that. Countless lives across Albany have been touched by the Singfield family, carrying the family's impact far beyond their original task of revitalizing the downtown Albany area.

Madam Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join my wife, Vivian, and me, along with the more than 730,000 people of Georgia's Second Congressional District, in commending the Singfield family for receipt of the well-deserved Renaissance Award in recognition of their outstanding contributions to the Albany, Georgia community.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF HORACE EDWIN CRUMP

HON. BARRY MOORE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 15, 2022

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to recognize and celebrate the life of Mr. Horace Edwin Crump of Montgomery, Alabama, who sadly passed away on Friday, June 10, 2022.

After graduating from Thomas A. Levy High School, Mr. Crump earned a bachelor's degree and an Education Specialist degree from Alabama State University and went on to be an Assistant Professor in Alabama State University's Department of Health and Physical Education.

Mr. Crump also served as Alabama State University's head track and field coach and was inducted into the Southwestern Athletic Conference Hall of Fame in 2009.

Coach Crump worked at Alabama State University beginning in 1977 and coached the Hornets for thirty-one seasons until his retirement in 2008. During those years, he guided his team to fourteen Southwestern Athletic Conference championships with at least one of his teams winning a conference title for six years straight.

Coach Crump took the program from what it had been to unthinkable heights. He threw the discus and shot put as a collegian. When he became the Hornets' coach, his goal was to have a balanced team that could score points in the field events and the running events.

Coach Crump was preceded in death by his parents, Charles and Gertrude Crump; his son, Damian Crump; his sister, Marion Davenport; and his brothers, Charles and Harrison Crump.

He leaves behind his beloved wife, Delores Crump; his son, Kenneth Crump; his daughter, Crystal Crump; his stepsons, CV and Rodney Hill; his brother, Donny Crump; and his sister, Yolanda McClinton—along with grandchildren, great-grandchildren, and nieces and nephews.

Coach Crump was an upstanding and respected citizen of Alabama's Second Congressional District that left lifelong impressions on his many students and athletes. I am proud to rise in honor of his life, and I am confident that he will be sorely missed by his family, his many friends, and the countless men and women he impacted throughout his lifetime of service.

PASSAGE OF THE PALLONE-PAPPAS AMENDMENT TO H.R. 7900 IN ORDER TO PREVENT THE SALE OF F–16S TO TURKEY

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 15, 2022

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today in great thanks for this House's passage of the Pallone-Pappas amendment to the Fiscal Year 2023 National Defense Authorization Act. I was pleased to co-lead this amendment alongside Representatives PAPPAS, PALLONE, my fellow Hellenic Caucus Co-Chair GUS BILIRAKIS, and many others.

This was the right thing to do. From consistent violations of Greek sovereignty using their F–16 fleet, to Turkey's ongoing and illegal occupation on Cyprus with 40,000 soldiers, and growing authoritarian tendencies by President Erdogan, Turkey is not the kind of ally that I believe should receive such a sale.

Further, Turkey still possesses Russian S–400 anti-air systems in violation of U.S. law, which led to their ejection from the F–35 program and the imposition of CAATSA sanctions. We did not go through with that sale because doing so could expose sensitive technologies in the F–35 to this Russian system, and possibly allow Russia to easily counter our improvements; that risk remains even when modernizing F–16s.

Selling Turkey more F–16s or providing them with the technology to modernize their current fleet would not be in the interest of the United States or our allies. I am proud to have worked with Representative PAPPAS, BILIRAKIS and all my colleagues on this important amendment to prevent this sale.

I now strongly urge the Senate to maintain this key provision in the final passage of the National Defense Authorization Act, and take special note of the wide bipartisan support for this measure in the House. We must continue to hold Erdogan accountable for violations of U.S. law, human rights, and the security of our ally Greece—not reward him.

CELEBRATING THE RETIREMENT OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL ROBERT SCOTT VOLKERT, USMC

HON. RONNY JACKSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 15, 2022

Mr. JACKSON. Madam Speaker, it is my distinct honor to recognize a true American Patriot, Lieutenant Colonel Robert Scott Volkert, USMC of Verona, New Jersey. This evening he will gather with friends, family, and fellow service members to celebrate his retirement after 27 years of distinguished service in the United States Marine Corps.

As the Executive Officer and Chief of Staff for the Presidential Helicopter Squadron, HMX–1, and during his long tenure at the White House, Lieutenant Colonel Volkert was entrusted with the lives and safety of four U.S. Presidents, including Presidents George W. Bush, Barack Obama, Donald J. Trump, and Joseph R. Biden as the pilot and eventually the Operational Test Director of Marine One and Marine Two.

When I started at the White House in 2006, Lieutenant Colonel Volkert was one of the first people I met, and he went out of his way to make sure that I felt at home and that I had the tools I needed for success. He has become a dear friend of mine over the last 17 years, and I can say with certainty that his successor has some big shoes to fill.

Lieutenant Colonel Volkert is an incredible leader with an unwavering commitment to his country, and I would be remiss if I did not also thank Lieutenant Colonel Volkert's wife, Kathy and his son, Jack, for their sacrifice and unwavering dedication to our country as well. I stand here today to thank Lieutenant Colonel Volkert for his service to our great nation and to wish him the best of luck in his next endeavor.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF COLONEL NATHAN MOONEY II FROM THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 15, 2022

Ms. SEWELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the exemplary service of Colonel Nathan Mooney II, the current chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the Dwight D. Eisenhower School of National Security, who is retiring from the military on July 15, 2022, after more than 30 years of faithful service to the United States Armed Forces. Colonel Mooney obtained two bachelor's degrees in management and business administration from Troy State University in 1989. He went to Squadron Officer School at Maxwell Air Force Base in Montgomery, AL where he earned a master's

degree in military operational arts and sciences at the Air Command and Staff College. Continuing to diversify his education, the Colonel received a master's in national resource strategy from the Industrial College of the Armed Forces at Fort Lesley J. McNair in Washington, D.C., and a master's in human relations from the University of Oklahoma.

Beginning his career in the military as a Second Lieutenant in 1989, Colonel Mooney quickly moved up the ranks, becoming a First Lieutenant by 1991 and a Captain by 1993. Assuming the positions of Major in 2001 and Lieutenant Colonel in 2006, he has dutifully served as Colonel for the past 11 years.

Throughout his extensive career, Colonel Mooney has held a variety of logistics positions at the wing level and has extensive staff experience at the major command level, Headquarters Air Force and Joint Staff Levels, including Assistant Director of Global Logistics Strategy at the Pentagon, Director of Operations and Logistics Alaskan Command Headquarters and Senior Operations Manager at Luke Air Force Base. Before assuming his current position as Department Chair and Assistant Professor at the National Defense University in Washington, D.C., Colonel Mooney served as the Vice President of Logistics and Engineering and Force Protection Air Force Space Command Headquarters at Peterson Air Force Base in Colorado. In this position, he led a 100-member logistics and engineering team and spearheaded the policy and guidance for a 9 billion space lift and satellite program, which supported 38,000 space professionals and 130 space systems located at over 100 sites worldwide.

Using his plethora of leadership experience from his previous roles, Colonel Mooney now serves our country in a different way in his role as an assistant professor at the National Defense University. He has remained dedicated to preparing his students for success following graduation teaching graduate-level courses to 300 high-performing senior military officers, international fellows, and Department of Defense and Agency civilians annually.

As the Deputy Director, he led military and civilian personnel responsible for the maintenance and lifecycle sustainment of 130 space and cyber systems through the executing a $1.5B Weapon System Sustainment budget. He oversaw the programming and policy implementation for the command's $23B physical plants, which includes 29 million square feet of facilities, seven major installations and two coastal Space launch ranges. In addition, he directed policy development for the command's integrated defense, resource protection and physical security activities in support of 2,100 security forces members and 20 high priority resources.

Colonel Mooney's extensive military career has earned him multiple awards and decorations throughout the years, including the Legion of Merit Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, Defense Meritorious Service Medal, National Defense Service Medal with bronze star, Southwest Asia Service Medal with bronze star, and the Humanitarian Service Medal.

On a personal note, Nathan is a childhood friend from Selma and a dear personal friend who grew up in the same neighborhood as me and my brothers. Nathan has always been a smart, focused, and purpose-driven individual. Through hard work, natural abilities, faith, and the loving support of his wife, Chevette, Nathan has been a valued member of our military and a tremendous patriot. Words cannot express how proud I am of Nathan and his meritorious service to this nation, and I wish him the very best in his future endeavors. We are a safer and more secure nation because of his exemplary service.

On behalf of Alabama's 7th Congressional District and a grateful Nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the extraordinary leadership and service of Colonel Nathan Mooney II and his contributions to this Nation as a distinguished member of the United States Air Force.

HONORING THE TERRELL COUNTY NAACP

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 15, 2022

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the Terrell County NAACP under the leadership of its President, The Reverend Ezekiel Holley as it prepares to celebrate its 27th Annual Freedom Fund Banquet on Saturday, July 16, 2022, at 5:00 pm at Terrell County High School in Dawson, Georgia.

The theme for the National NAACP Organization for this year is ''This is Power.'' For many years, the Terrell County Branch of the NAACP has asserted its power on behalf of freedom and justice in Southwest Georgia. This power has been asserted through voter registration, advocacy on behalf of minority groups and supporting young people as they have gone on to pursue their educational dreams at various colleges and universities across our Nation.

The Terrell County NAACP has long been at the forefront of voter education and mobilization. They truly understand that a ''voteless people is a hopeless people.'' Their voter efforts have helped to register thousands of voters in the Terrell County area who have exercised their power through the ballot.

The Terrell County Branch has also been a leader and an advocate on behalf of those who have been discriminated against by various entities in the surrounding communities. The Branch has held marches and demonstrations on behalf of the voiceless in their fight for justice and equality. Moreover, the organization has not been afraid to take on any entity that they believe has not been fair in its dealings with individuals or groups. The organization has exemplified the words articulated by Dr. King when he said that ''The time is always right to do what is right.''

Education has been at the forefront of the mission of this branch as well. The Branch is keenly aware that ''Education is the passport to the future; it belongs to those who prepare for it today.'' This organization knows that our young people are our future doctors, lawyers, scientists, engineers, mayors, governors, congress people and civil rights activists. The Branch understands that we must invest in our future. And that is why over the years, they have given out thousands of scholarships to deserving young people to pursue their dreams of improving the quality of life for themselves, their families, and our communities.

The Terrell County NAACP has served as a leader in the community and across the state in fighting for justice and equality. For decades it has been under the fearless and stellar leadership of Reverend Ezekiel Holley. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join my wife, Vivian, and me, along with the more than 730,000 people of the Second Congressional District in honoring and commending the Terrell County NAACP and its tireless president, Reverend Ezekiel Holley, on the occasion of their 27th Freedom Fund Banquet and for their achievements, service, and public distinction.

HONORING THE LIFE AND FAITHFUL SERVICE OF DR. PAUL CHINCHEN

HON. MICHAEL GUEST

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 15, 2022

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, the Lord calls us all for His purpose according to his plan. Some are called to heal, such as doctors and nurses; others are called to instruct, such as teachers and professors; and some are called by God to dedicate their lives to spread the Gospel to the world, such as ministers and missionaries. Each of us has a purpose in God's plan and that small role is monumentally important in our service to our Heavenly Father and our family in Christ.

When I met Paul Chinchen, I knew his role in God's plan was different. I met a man whose role was not simply as one who cared for others, as a missionary, or as a leader. His role in God's plan was bigger. God had chosen him to do all of these things and much more, and in our meeting I could see that the Lord worked through Paul to accomplish His mission. In working to expand the African Bible College to Malawi and Uganda, the Lord worked through Paul to develop a place for thousands to learn in order to better themselves and their communities. By developing the ABC Mission Hospital in Malawi, Paul built a facility where doctors and nurses could work to heal and comfort those who had fallen ill. As a missionary, Paul worked to spread the Word of God to Africa. I am inspired by Paul's words that exemplify his work so well. ''Do something you love, do something engaging, and do something now.''

1 Chronicles 16:24 calls us to ''declare His glory among the nations, His marvelous deeds among all peoples.'' Paul's life was a testimony to people across the world of the greatness of our Heavenly Father. In the New Testament, John encourages the Church not to love with words or speech but with actions. Paul's life is an example to everyone who knew him of how to serve through our actions.

The great state of Mississippi is proud to call Paul one of its own. I am honored to have known Paul. Although his mission on this earth is complete, I have faith that the Lord will continue to use Paul's life and his example as a part of His divine plan. I will continue to be humbled by his incredible service to our Lord and grateful for his life. Paul's life is an example of how to serve others, boldly sharing the Gospel of Jesus Christ to the nations, and of the great deeds that men can accomplish when the Lord works through those that He has chosen for His plan.

HONORING THE LEGACY OF HERSHEL ''WOODY'' WILLIAMS

HON. DAVID B. McKINLEY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 15, 2022

Mr. McKINLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the legacy of Hershel ''Woody'' Williams. Williams was born the youngest of 11 children on a dairy farm in 1923 in Quiet Dell, West Virginia. In 1943, Williams enlisted in the Marine Corps and was sent to train at Camp Elliott in San Diego, California as a demolition man in the use or flamethrowers.

He served at the Battle of Iwo Jima with the 21st Marines, 3d Marine Division. During the battle, Chief Warrant Officer 4 (Ret.) Williams displayed a ''valiant devotion to duty'' and service above self as he ''enabled his company to reach its objective'' by charging enemy fortifications 5 separate times with his flamethrower.

On October 5, 1945, President Truman awarded Williams with the Medal of Honor for his actions, stating in his citation ''Cpl. Williams' aggressive fighting spirit and valiant devotion to duty throughout this fiercely contested action sustain and enhance the highest traditions of the U.S. Naval Service.''

After World War II, he spent the rest of his life giving back to veterans and Gold Star Families, he worked for the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) for 33 years as a Veterans Service Representative, allowing him to continue serving veterans and their families.

Williams also established the Woody Williams Foundation to continue to serve Gold Star Families, and to date, the Woody Williams Foundation is responsible for establishing 104 Gold Star Families Memorial Monuments across the United States with more than 69 additional monuments underway in 50 states and 1 U.S. Territory.

Woody Williams' selfless sacrifice as a World War II veteran, champion of service to Gold Star families, and was the last surviving Marine from World War II to wear the Medal of Honor. The Nation mourns the passing of this proud son of West Virginia.

He is a true embodiment of ''The Greatest Generation.''

HONORING THE COURAGEOUS CUBAN PEOPLE ON THE FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE JULY 11TH PROTESTS ON THE ISLAND

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 15, 2022

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, I rise today in praise of the brave Cuban people who, one year ago, risked everything to demand freedom in every city and every province in Cuba. They did this knowing the consequences, and knowing that they were risking their lives, livelihoods, and would likely end up in prison. Much of the world remains in awe of their dedication and courage.

According to human rights groups such as CubaLex and Freedom House, more than 1,400 Cubans were detained, including approximately 45 children, in the wake of these protests. At least 700 remain in prison since the July 11 protests began. To date, more than 550 protesters have been sentenced to more than 4,000 combined years in prison. Some have been sentenced to forced labor. Many, including children, were handed multi-year prison sentences for 6 to 30 years, and remain in prison to this day. Some of those in prison today include:

Jose Daniel Ferrer of UNPACU; Luis Manuel Otero Alcantara and Maykel ''Osorbo'' Castillo of the San Isidro Movement; Jose Diaz Silva of the Opposition Movement for a New Republic; Arianna Lopez Roque of the Julio Machado Academy; 17-year-old Emiyosian Roman Rodriguez who shouted ''Patria Y Vida,'' and was sent to a forced labor camp for five years; Duannis Dabel Leon Taboada, a 22-year-old barber who was sentenced to 14 years; Young women such as Lisandra Gongora Espinosa, and the Garrido sisters; Loreto Hernandez and Donaida Perez; along with hundreds of others.

I have been appalled by the Biden Administration's lack of response to this historic upswell of support for democratic change inside totalitarian Cuba. Instead of unequivocal solidarity with the protesters, the Biden Administration instead has barreled ahead with failed policies to increase revenue to the regime. It has lifted restrictions on remittances, increased travel, and permitted support for ''independent'' and ''semi-independent'' businesses, which do not exist in closed Communist economies. For this reason, we know that weakened sanctions will only increase revenue to the Cuban military, which runs much of the Cuban economy including the tourism industry, and enrich the Cuban people's oppressors.

Shamefully, the Biden Administration has requested, and is in the process of implementing, draconian cuts to the Office of Cuba Broadcasting at a time when the Cuban people need access to outside, independent information more than ever. And the administration has yet to attempt to provide internet access, and expand democracy programs, to assist the Cuban people achieve freedom.

Nonetheless, the United States will continue to stand with the Cuban people, and find ways to cut off revenue to their oppressors. We must ensure that the broadcasts continue, and that critical support to political prisoners, their families, and the democratic opposition continues. Despite the Biden Administration's best efforts to appease and embolden the murderous regime in Cuba, the Cuban people will be free.

HONORING THE LIFE OF RODRIGO ''ROD'' GARCIA

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 15, 2022

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life, achievements, and legacy of Rodrigo ''Rod'' Garcia, a respected visionary, leader, and advocate, for his lifelong dedication to empowering the Hispanic community to achieve educational excellence, economic opportunity, and social equity.

Rodrigo ''Rod'' Garcia was born on March 29, 1943, in Los Angeles, California to Genevieve Hernandez and Rodrigo Garcia. He earned an Associate's Degree in Engineering from East Los Angeles College, and a Bachelor's Degree of Science in Engineering from California State University, Los Angeles.

Rod served as a civil engineer for the City of Los Angeles and worked in Public Works, Building and Safety, and at the Port of Los Angeles. Additionally, Rod Chaired the City of Monterey Park Planning Commission, and served on the Advisory Board for the Dean of Engineering at California State University.

Rod was one of the few Hispanic engineers amidst a tech boom in California in the early seventies. Despite being in the minority in the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) field, he gathered a cohort of fellow Hispanic engineers determined to contribute and diversify the STEM industry.

In 1974, Rod founded and incorporated the Society of Hispanic Professional Engineers (SHPE) with the mission of ensuring networking and education opportunities for Hispanic students and professionals in the Southern California region. Not too long after and with the collaboration of Administrators, professors, and students at California State University, East Los Angeles College, and the University of Southern California, the Society of Hispanic Professional Engineers established its first collegiate chapters.

The result of five decades of Rod's high-spirited and fearless leadership propelled the Society of Hispanic Professional Engineers to reach 13,000 members and 286 chapters nationwide. His unique ability of uniting community partners and leaders around the country will serve as evidence that closing the STEM education gap and increasing the number of Hispanics in STEM can and will be done.

Rod is remembered by his colleagues and thousands of current and former SHPE students and professionals for his devotion and service to expanding awareness, access, support, and development opportunities to Hispanics in STEM to realize their fullest potential and positively impact society. His legacy of empowering the Hispanic community to achieve educational excellence, economic opportunity, and social equity will guide many generations to come.

Mr. Garcia is survived by his wife, Cynthia Cathy Wong, and his children Marlene Tomasina Zamora, Marianne Pilar Garcia, and Rodrick Fitzgerald Garcia.

Madam Speaker, I extend my deepest sympathies to the family, colleagues, and friends of Rodrigo ''Rod'' Garcia, and I urge all my colleagues to join me in recognizing his incredibly life of service for others.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 15, 2022

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I missed one roll call vote. Had I been present, I would have voted YES on Roll Call No. 338, Speier of California Part A Amendment No. 395.

I was proud to vote for final passage of H.R. 7900, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023 that included Rep. Speier's Amendment No. 395.

HONORING ROBERT T. DOYLE

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 15, 2022

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the significant career and accomplishments of Robert T. Doyle on the occasion of his retirement as Marin County Sheriff following nearly 53 years of exemplary service at the Sheriff's Office.

A Bay Area native and Marin County resident for five decades, Sheriff Doyle has dedicated his life and career to the public good. In 1966, he enlisted in the United States Army, serving stateside in California and Oklahoma, and overseas in Germany and Vietnam. Three years later, he left the Army to settle in Marin, joining the Sheriff's Office in November 1969.

Since 1969, Sheriff Doyle has excelled in a variety of roles across the Patrol, Custody, and Court Divisions, rising from the rank of Deputy Sheriff to Captain. He commanded both the Southern Marin Patrol Station and the Marin County Jail before being appointed Undersheriff in December 1988. In March 1996, he was then appointed to be Sheriff of Marin County. He went on to win reelection to the role six successive times. Throughout his tenure, he has stood out as a true leader in the community, always focusing on doing what was best for Marin County and its residents.

Sheriff Doyle's stewardship of the law enforcement profession extended outside of his official role in government. He served as President of the California State Sheriffs' Association, two-term President of the Marin County Police Chiefs' Association, and Chair of the California State Sheriffs' Legislative Committee. He was appointed by Governor Schwarzenegger to serve as a member of the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training, and by Governor Wilson to represent the State Sheriffs on the State Task Force on Court Facilities. He has diligently supported other community causes, serving as the Novato Youth Soccer Association Treasurer and as a member of the Fight Crime: Invest in Kids California Executive Committee.

Madam Speaker, Sheriff Robert T. Doyle's career is a sterling example of public service and dedication to the law and community. Please join me in honoring Sheriff Doyle on his retirement, and in wishing him the best of luck in future endeavors.

HONORING THE LATE NELSON L. GROVATT, JR.

HON. ANDY KIM

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 15, 2022

Mr. KIM of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the late Nelson L. Grovatt Jr., a beloved member of our community who passed away on May 24, 2022 at the age of 93. Husband to the late Thelma and the father of the late Alan, Nelson is survived by his brother Clarence, his sons, Larry and Wayne, and his grandchildren, Travis, Kaitlin, Tyler, and Trever.

A true gentleman farmer, anyone who knew Nelson could speak to his heart and passion both for farming and giving back to his community. A lifelong resident of Rancocas in Westampton Township, and part of the third generation to farm on his family's land, he worked hard until he was 82, and was particularly known for his soybeans. Nelson always made time for people no matter how long the workday kept him out. He would often share his knowledge of farming with anyone eager to learn about the tractors, farming equipment, and what it takes to be successful. He loved his work and even after stepping out of the tractor for the last time, kept a small garden growing fruits and vegetables.

Nelson was also devoted to public service and was recognized as a Founding Father of Westampton Township. Extremely active in both is community and church, Nelson was dedicated to the growth of his hometown. A man of unwavering faith, Nelson served as a Deacon at various local churches while also taking on numerous roles within the community. From the beginnings of Westampton Township, he was a leader of the committee to develop its first police force and eventually served as the town's first Police Commissioner. He went on to serve on the Township Committee for 11 years and was elected Mayor for two years.

Outside his work, Nelson proudly worked to preserve the history of the township as it grew, often sharing his collection of Native American artifacts from the Ancocas Natives that had settled near the Rancocas Creek. He also loved recalling and sharing family stories alongside the robust history and knowledge of the Rancocas community.

Nelson was a kind soul that lived out his faith in all he did and never sought praise. We were lucky to live with Nelson as part of our community. My heart goes out to Nelson's entire family and for those that knew him, even for the most fleeting moments; he will be missed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 15, 2022

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, on the evening of Thursday, July 14, 2022, I was unavoidably detained and failed to record my vote on Roll Call No. 346, DEGETTE of Colorado Part A Amendment No. 456 to H.R. 7900; Roll Call No. 347, EVANS of Pennsylvania Part A Amendment No. 461 to H.R. 7900; and Roll Call No. 348, CONNOLLY of Virginia Part A Amendment No. 495 to H.R. 7900.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 346, YEA on Roll Call No. 347, and YEA on Roll Call No. 348.

RECOGNIZING THE 34TH ANNUAL ROBERTO CLEMENTE GALA HONOREES

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 15, 2022

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Assemblywoman Yvonne Lopez and Hispanic Federation as they are honored by the Puerto Rican Association for Human Development (PRAHD) at its 34th Annual Roberto Clemente Gala on July 22, 2022. It is my privilege to recognize the outstanding efforts of PRAHD and this year's gala honorees.

Former Executive Director/CEO of PRAHD, the Honorable Yvonne Lopez represents the 19th Legislative District of New Jersey and currently serves as Deputy Speaker of the Assembly. She is also Chair of the Housing Committee, a member of the Transportation and Independent Authorities committee, Financial Institutions and Insurance committee, and Joint Committee on Housing Affordability, as well as a member of the NJ Legislative Latino Caucus and National Hispanic Caucus of State Legislators. She also served on the Complete Counts Commission and the New Jersey Puerto Rico Commission and previously worked in the private sector as Vice President/Community Affairs Manager for Wachovia Banks. In her capacity at PRAHD, Assemblywoman Lopez oversaw the operations and management of the organization while cultivating community and public relations. Assemblywoman Lopez truly embodies the spirit of the Roberto Clemente Award and I join with PRAHD in applauding her leadership and service to the community.

Partner of the Year Award recipient, Hispanic Federation, echoes the mission of PRAHD. Its advocacy efforts, programs, and public education initiatives support community organizations and strengthen individuals and families. Its work assists individuals to obtain health insurance, citizenship and civics education, job training, childhood literacy skills, college preparation, and more. In response to the COVID–19 pandemic, Hispanic Federation provided relief and recovery grants to local organizations and small businesses and held a national outreach campaign to educate Latinos on COVID–19 vaccines. Hispanic Federation continues to promote Latino interests and uplift the Hispanic community and its efforts are to be commended.

For nearly 50 years, PRAHD has provided outstanding support to our local communities. Its comprehensive services and programs promote self-sufficiency and community involvement. I applaud PRAHD for its dedication to improving the well-being of our communities and the evening's honorees for their commitment to service and action.

Madam Speaker, I sincerely hope my colleagues will join me in honoring Assemblywoman Yvonne Lopez and Hispanic Federation for their contributions to the community and congratulating them on this well-deserved recognition by PRAHD.

NORTHWEST ORDINANCE

HON. GARY J. PALMER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 15, 2022

Mr. PALMER. Madam Speaker, Wednesday was the 235th anniversary of the passage of the Northwest Ordinance.

The Northwest Ordinance, passed on July 13, 1787 under the Articles of Confederation, created the Northwest Territory which would eventually become the states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin.

Two portions of the Ordinance capture important principles that are worth recovering 235 years later.

Section 13 of the Ordinance notes that the fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty form the basis upon which republics are erected and that they are the basis of all laws.

Article 3 affirms that religion, morality, and knowledge are necessary for good government and the happiness of mankind.

We've strayed far from these truths in the years since the Northwest Ordinance was passed.

However, it isn't too late to recover and encourage a robust respect for civil and religious liberty while acknowledging the fundamental truth that religion, morality, and knowledge are essential for America and her people to flourish.

TRIBUTE TO NORMAN LEAR

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 15, 2022

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor renowned television producer and screenwriter, Norman Lear of Beverly Hills, California upon his 100th birthday.

Norman Milton Lear was born on July 27, 1922 in New Haven, Connecticut. After attending Emerson College in Boston, he dropped out of college to enlist in the U.S. Army Air Force. During World War II, he served as a gunner and radio operator, and flew 52 combat missions over Europe, earning the Air Medal with four Oak Leaf Clusters.

Following his extraordinary military service, Mr. Lear worked in public relations before beginning a career as a freelance comedy writer, and eventually a television and film producer. Norman would go on to captivate over one hundred twenty million viewers weekly with his groundbreaking television shows of the 1970's and 1980's that dealt with consequential and critical issues such as race, social inequality, and sexuality. These iconic shows include All in the Family, which won many Emmy Awards, The Jeffersons, Good Times, and Maude.

Inspired by his uncle Jack and grandfather Shya's political involvement, ''that a citizen can matter,'' Norman had been politically active for years; however, in 1980, he wanted a more direct effect on social change, so he put his television career on hold to focus on political activism. In 1981, Mr. Lear cofounded People for the American Way, which sought to build a democratic society and defend constitutional values such as religious liberty, free expression, and equal justice from right-wing extremism. In 1997, Norman and his wife, Lyn Davis Lear, created the Lear Family Foundation, which supports a wide range of nonprofit organizations such as the Rainforest Alliance, American Civil Liberties Union, Ballet Hispanico and Planned Parenthood. In 2000, Mr. Lear provided an endowment for a public policy center that explored the intersection of commerce, entertainment, and society at the University of Southern California Annenberg School for Communication and Journalism—the center was later dedicated as the Norman Lear Center. A few years later, Norman founded a nonpartisan youth voter registration initiative called Declare Yourself. Additionally, in 2001, Norman and Lyn purchased one of the few surviving original copies of the Declaration of Independence and shared the nation's birth certificate with their fellow Americans by touring it in all 50 states during their Declaration of Independence Road Trip.

Mr. Lear has received many professional awards and acknowledgement for his humanitarian achievements. These include the National Medal for Arts from President Clinton, several Emmy Awards, two Peabody Awards, a Golden Globe Award, the Humanist Arts Award, Kennedy Center Honors, the Women in Film Lucy Award, and the National Hispanic Media Coalition's ''Media Icon'' Award. In addition, he was inducted into the Television Academy Hall of Fame and has a star on the Hollywood Walk of Fame.

It is my great pleasure to honor legendary television pioneer, and my dear friend, Norman Lear upon his centennial birthday. I ask all Members to join me in commending Mr. Lear for a lifetime of outstanding service to our community, country, and world.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session and stands adjourned until 3 p.m., on Monday, July 18, 2022.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 11 public bills, H.R. 8393–8403 were introduced.

Pages H6679–80

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H6680–81**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H.R. 7569, to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish a program to provide financial assistance to graduate students and postdoctoral researchers pursuing certain courses of study relating to cybersecurity and energy infrastructure (H. Rept. 117–413).

Page H6679

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Hayes to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H6627**

Suspension: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Amending the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to suspend temporarily rates of duty on imports of certain infant formula products: H.R. 8351, to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to suspend temporarily rates of duty on imports of certain infant formula products, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 421 yeas to 2 nays, Roll No. 363. **Pages H6629–31, H6663–64**

Women's Health Protection Act of 2022: The House passed H.R. 8296, to protect a person's ability to determine whether to continue or end a pregnancy, and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide abortion services, by a yea-and-nay vote of 219 yeas to 210 nays, Roll No. 360.

Pages H6631–47, H6660–61

Rejected the Fischbach motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, by a yea-and-nay vote of 209 yeas to 218 nays, Roll No. 359. **Pages H6646–47, H6660**

H. Res. 1224, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 7900), (S. 3373), (H.R. 8296), (H.R. 8297), and (H.R. 6538) was agreed to Wednesday, July 13th.

Ensuring Access to Abortion Act of 2022: The House passed H.R. 8297, to prohibit the interference, under color of State law, with the provision of interstate abortion services, by a yea-and-nay vote of 223 yeas to 205 nays, Roll No. 362.

Pages H6647–60, H6661–63

Rejected the Johnson (LA) motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, by a yea-and-nay vote of 209 yeas to 219 nays, Roll No. 361. **Pages H6658–60, H6661–62**

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment printed in part B of H. Rept. 117–405 shall be considered as adopted. **Page H6647**

H. Res. 1224, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 7900), (S. 3373), (H.R. 8296), (H.R. 8297), and (H.R. 6538) was agreed to Wednesday, July 13th.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6660, H6661, H6662, H6662–63, and H6663–64.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 4:24 p.m.

Committee Meetings

CLIMATE SMART FROM FARM TO FORK: BUILDING AN AFFORDABLE AND RESILIENT FOOD SUPPLY CHAIN

Select Committee on the Climate Crisis: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Climate Smart from Farm to Fork: Building an Affordable and Resilient Food Supply Chain''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY, JULY 18, 2022

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 8294, the ''Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2023'' [Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, Agriculture, Rural Development, Energy and Water Development, Financial Services and General Government, Interior, Environment, Military Construction, and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, 2023], 1 p.m., H–313 Capitol and Webex.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, July 18

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Nina Nin-Yuen Wang, of Colorado, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 noon, Monday, July 18

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E740, E742
Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E739
Crawford, Eric A. ''Rick'', Ark., E739
Crist, Charlie, Fla., E740
Diaz-Balart, Mario, Fla., E739, E743
Golden, Jared F., Me., E739
Guest, Michael, Miss., E742
Huffman, Jared, Calif., E744
Jackson, Ronny, Tex., E741
Kim, Andy, N.J., E744
Lawrence, Brenda L., Mich., E740
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E741
Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E744
McKinley, David B., W.Va., E743
Moore, Barry, Ala., E741
Napolitano, Grace F., Calif., E743
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E744
Palmer, Gary J., Ala., E744
Pascrell, Bill, Jr., N.J., E743
Ruppersberger, C.A. Dutch, Md., E740
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E740, E745
Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E741

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.