

bill that we pass, he will veto it. What he means is we have to send him his bill.

I just want to point out something because we do have solutions on this side of this aisle, and we have acted responsibly on behalf of that. In July, we passed a border security bill that put facilities closer to the border to keep those who enter illegally closer to the border.

We changed the policy to “last in, first out,” so if you get in, you don’t get to linger for years before you are returned if you don’t have a humanitarian claim that merits staying.

We also increased funding for judges, created tele-courtrooms so that we could more expeditiously process those who come here illegally—and rightfully so—and we should do so very responsibly. We are a loving nation made better for immigration, but we should show everybody the rule of law and how you responsibly immigrate here.

Mind you, we also passed a bill that provided for the health care of those who come here and while they are detained here, but I want to point out something very specific. In the coming weeks, this Congress is going to offer another bill—because that one was never accepted by the Senate or went to the President—to require operational control of our border.

That is a great urgency, to have operational control of our border, not to just address the traditional border security issue, but to address what we know is a growing concern about our domestic and homeland security.

We have seen the threats around the globe. Most certainly, that has to be an area where we can reach agreement with the White House, and I hope we can take up the President on his offer to put a bill on his desk and ask him to sign it, just as he has pledged to do so.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOLLY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to the gentleman for yielding, and you bring up a great point. This isn’t just a border security issue because of an immigration issue. This is a border security issue because of a homeland security issue.

We have to make our border secure. We are going to have what our vision for border security is in this institution pass now to the Senate, and the President will get his wish. We will put a bill on his desk. It may not be the bill he wants, but my message to the administration—to the White House—is: come work with us.

In my first 2 years here, I just haven’t seen that happen on a wide variety of issues. It seems like every idea that we come up with in this institution, even some that passed by huge bipartisan majorities, they threaten a veto. Well, that is okay, but that is not conducive to working together to find solutions, and that is what I think we are here for.

I think we, on this side, there are many of us who are out here to find solutions to the Nation’s problems, not to create more problems, and that is exactly the message I hope to send to the American people tonight, that we are willing to work with the President on border security, on education, on a wide variety of issues, but we also have to have some response back, and that is what I think we are lacking.

Mr. BYRNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOLLY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. I am on the Armed Services Committee, and I look at border security as national security.

Let me give you a story from a trip that several of us on the Armed Services Committee took to the Middle East back in August and September. We visited several countries over there. As you know, it is a very dangerous part of the world, clearly.

One of the countries we went to is Morocco. Morocco, if you think about where it is, should have lots of problems, but you don’t really hear much about Morocco having terrorist incidents. When we were over there, we asked a lot of questions. How is that so?

It is because they take their border security very seriously. They use a lot of the military aid that America provides to Morocco for their border security, and they keep the bad guys out, and so you don’t hear in this country that is in some of the most troubled parts of the world, you don’t hear about the problems there because they control their borders. They understand that their internal and national security is dependent upon that.

We had two brothers, the Tsarnaev brothers, who grew up in Boston. One of them was allowed to go back to where they were from and one of the satellite countries from Russia—obviously was trained by terrorists.

We allowed him to come back into this country, after we were warned by the Russians where he had gone, and he and his brother tragically ignited those bombs at the Boston Marathon, seriously wounding a lot of people and killing some.

Well, what sort of a security situation do we have that we allowed him back into this country? What sort of security situation do we have today?

This is not just about the southern border; it is about the northern border. It is about our security of the entire Nation, and if we will start looking at border security as national security, which is the way we on this side of the aisle understand this issue, then we can protect the American people.

It definitely does take us working with the President because he runs the Department of Homeland Security through his appointee to that Secretary’s position, and it is his policies through that Department that determine whether or not we are going to be protected, and protecting our borders

is a part of protecting Americans from international terrorism, including international Islamic terrorism.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. DAVIS, any more comments this evening?

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. If the gentleman would inquire how much time we have left.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOLLY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I am just excited to be able to talk about what happened at the State of the Union last night, our perspective. In closing, it kind of frustrates me that we didn’t see real solutions to the exploding cost of higher education.

If the solution is what the President laid out, which is going to actually put more of a burden on middle class families by taxing their savings plans that they have been saving for—for sometimes decades—that is a wrong approach to bringing down the cost of higher education to making Pell grants go further.

The President also mentioned another point last night about equal pay. Well, it would have been nice to have the President and the White House actually do that in the White House, where women make an average of 18 percent less than men, so it is not just enough to talk about it here in this Chamber. Do it when you have control over the opportunity to make things happen.

That is why I hope it is not just rhetoric on many issues, but I want to see action.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this time. I hope what the American people have seen and our colleagues have seen is a Congress with solutions.

We will be passing through this House border security solutions, a homeland security solution. Frankly, addressing the constitutional overreach we saw from the President, we will be passing energy independence solutions, education solutions, tax reform solutions. We are committed to doing that on behalf of the American people.

I look forward to working with our colleagues, and frankly, we remain hopeful that we will have the opportunity to work with the President on this as well.

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

WHY WE ARE REALLY HERE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is January 22, 2015. It

marks exactly 42 years to the day since the tragedy called *Roe v. Wade* was first handed down from the United States Supreme Court. Since then, every foundation of this Nation has been stained by the blood of more than 55 million of its own unborn children. Incomprehensibly, those who have profited from it most have hailed it as freedom.

We should all remember the words of President Abraham Lincoln when he said:

Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves and, under a just God, cannot long retain it.

Mr. Lincoln called upon all of us to remember America's Founding Fathers, and "their enlightened belief that nothing stamped with the divine image and likeness was sent into the world to be trodden on or degraded and imbruted by its fellows."

He reminded those he called posterity that when, in the distant future, some man, some factions, some interests should set up a doctrine that some were not entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, that "their posterity"—that is us, Mr. Speaker—that "their posterity might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their Fathers began."

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of all of those who founded this Nation and dreamed of what America could someday be and for the sake of all of those since then who have died in darkness so America could walk in the light of freedom, it is so very important that those of us who are privileged to be Members of the United States Congress pause from time to time and remind ourselves of why we are really all here.

Thomas Jefferson, whose words marked the beginning of this Nation said, "The care of human life and its happiness and not its destruction is the chief and only object of good government."

The phrase in the Fifth Amendment capsulizes our entire Constitution. It says that no person shall be "deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

The 14th Amendment says no State shall deny "to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

Mr. Speaker, protecting the lives of all Americans and their constitutional rights is why we are all here; yet, today, a great shadow looms over America. When authorities entered the clinic of Dr. Kermit Gosnell, they found a torture chamber for little babies that defies description within the constraints of the English language.

According to the grand jury report:

Dr. Kermit Gosnell had a simple solution for unwanted babies. He killed them. He didn't call it that. He called it "ensuring fetal demise." The way he ensured fetal demise was by sticking scissors in the back of the baby's neck and cutting the spinal cord. He called it "snipping." Over the years, there were hundreds of "snippings."

Ashley Baldwin, one of Dr. Gosnell's employees, said she saw babies breath-

ing, and she defined one as 2 feet long that no longer had eyes or a mouth but, in her words, was making like this "screaching" noise, and it "sounded like a little alien."

For God's sake, Mr. Speaker, is this who we truly are? Kermit Gosnell now rightfully sits in prison for killing a mother and murdering innocent children like the one I just described; yet, if he had killed these babies only 5 minutes earlier and before they had passed through the birth canal, it would have all been perfectly legal in much of the United States of America.

If there is one thing that we must not miss about this unspeakably evil episode, it is that Kermit Gosnell is not an anomaly; he is just the visible face of this lucrative enterprise of murdering pain-capable unborn children in America.

Mr. Speaker, more than 18,000 very late-term abortions are occurring in America every year, placing the mothers at exponentially greater risk and subjecting their pain-capable unborn babies to torture and death without anesthesia. It is the greatest atrocity in the United States.

According to the Bartlett study, a woman seeking an abortion at 20 weeks is 35 times more likely to die from an abortion than she was in the first trimester. At 21 weeks or more, she is 91 times more likely to die than she was in the first trimester.

Regardless of how supporters of abortion on demand might try to suppress it, it is undisputed and universally accepted by every credible expert that the risk to a mother's health from abortion increases as gestation increases.

There is no valid debate on that incontrovertible reality; yet supporters of abortion on demand try to suppress that.

□ 1730

They also have tried for decades, Mr. Speaker, to deny that unborn babies ever feel pain, even those at the beginning of the sixth month of pregnancy, as if somehow the ability to feel pain magically develops the very second the child is born.

Mr. Speaker, almost every other major civilized nation on this Earth protects pain-capable unborn babies at this age, and every credible poll of the American people shows that they are overwhelmingly in favor of protecting these children. Yet we have given these little babies less legal protection from unnecessary pain and cruelty than the protection we have given farm animals under the Federal Humane Slaughter Act. Mr. Speaker, it is a tragedy that beggars my ability to articulate.

But I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the winds of change are beginning to blow and that the tide of blindness and blood is finally turning in America. Because tomorrow we will vote on the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act in this Chamber, and it will be a vote that every one of us will

always remember and for which we shall be held accountable.

And no matter how it is shouted down or what distortions, deceptive what-ifs, distractions, diversions, gotchas, twisted words, changing the subject, or blatant falsehoods the abortion industry hurls at this bill and its supporters, it remains a deeply sincere effort, beginning at their sixth month of pregnancy, to protect both mothers and their pain-capable unborn babies from the atrocity of late-term abortion on demand; and ultimately, Mr. Speaker, it is one all humane Americans can support if they truly understand it for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, not long ago, I heard Barack Obama speak very noble and poignant words that, whether he realizes it or not, apply so profoundly to this subject. Let me quote, if you will, excerpted portions of his comments. He said: "This is our first task, caring for our children. It's our first job. If we don't get that right, we don't get anything right. That's how, as a society, we will be judged."

The President asked: "Are we really prepared to say that we're powerless in the face of such carnage, that the politics are too hard? Are we prepared to say that such violence visited on our children year after year after year is somehow the price of our freedom?"

The President also said: "Our journey is not complete until all our children are cared for and cherished and always safe from harm."

"That is our generation's task—to make these words, these rights, these values of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness real for every American."

Mr. Speaker, never have I so deeply agreed with any words ever spoken by President Obama as those I have just quoted. How I wish that somehow we could all open our hearts and our ears to these incontrovertible words and ask ourselves in the core of our souls why these words that should apply to all children cannot include the most helpless and vulnerable of all children. How does any child become more vulnerable than these little pain-capable unborn babies?

Mr. Speaker, it seems that we are never quite so eloquent as when we decry the crimes of a past generation, and we are never quite so staggeringly blind as when we assess an atrocity in our own time.

What we are doing to these babies is real, and all of us here know that in our hearts. Medical science regarding the development of unborn babies beginning at the sixth month of pregnancy now demonstrates irrefutably that they do, in fact, feel pain. Many of them cry and scream as they die, but because it is amniotic fluid going over the vocal cords instead of air, we can't hear them. It is, Mr. Speaker, the greatest human rights atrocity in the United States of America today.

I began and I close with the wise counsel from Abraham Lincoln to all of

us. He said: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the last generation."

Mr. Speaker, it is time to open our eyes and our souls and recognize that protecting pain-capable unborn children and their mothers is not a Republican issue or a Democrat issue. It is a test of our basic humanity and who we are as a human family. It is time to open our eyes and allow our consciences to catch up with our technology. It is time for Members of the United States Congress to open our eyes and recognize that protecting those who cannot protect themselves is why we are all here. And, Mr. Speaker, it is time for all Americans to open our eyes and our hearts to the humanity of these little unborn children of God and the inhumanity of what is being done to them.

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

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 416

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove all cosponsors from H.R. 416.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2150

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 9 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION AND ABORTION INSURANCE FULL DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2015

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-4) on the resolution (H. Res. 42) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HASTINGS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and January 22.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, as required by clause 2(a) of House rule XI, I respectfully submit for the RECORD the rules of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which were adopted earlier today at a public meeting of the Committee.

1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The Rules of the House of Representatives, and in particular, the committee rules enumerated in clause 2 of rule XI, are the rules of the Committee on Foreign Affairs (hereafter referred to as the "Committee"), to the extent applicable.

(b) A motion to recess and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are privileged non-debatable motions in Committee.

(c) The Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs shall consult the Ranking Minority Member to the extent possible with respect to the business of the Committee. Each subcommittee of the Committee is a part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules, to the extent applicable.

2. DATE OF MEETING

The regular meeting date of the Committee shall be the first Tuesday of every month when the House of Representatives is in session pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XI of the House of Representatives. Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman as the Chairman may deem necessary or at the request of a majority of the Members of the Committee in accordance with clause 2(c) of rule XI of the House of Representatives. The determination of the business to be considered at each meeting shall be made by the Chairman subject to clause 2(c) of rule XI of the House of Representatives. A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held if, in the judgment of the Chairman, there is no business to be considered.

3. QUORUM

For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two Members shall constitute a quorum, and the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee shall make every effort to ensure that the relevant Ranking Minority Member or another Minority Member is present at the time a hearing is convened. One-third of the Members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action, except: (1) reporting a measure or recommendation; (2) closing Committee meetings and hearings to the public; (3) authorizing the issuance of subpoenas; and (4) any other action for which an actual majority quorum is required by any rule of the House of Representatives or by law. No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House of Representatives unless a majority of the Committee is actually present. No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the full Committee by a subcommittee unless half of the subcommittee is actually present. A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the Members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one Member.

4. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

(a) Meetings

(1) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the Committee or a subcommittee shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public, because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person or otherwise violate any labor rule of the House of Representatives. No person other than Members of the Committee and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as the Committee or subcommittee may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public. This subsection does not apply to open Committee hearings which are provided for by subsection (b) of this rule.

(2) The Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter, or adopting an amendment. The relevant Chairman may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time. When exercising postponement authority, the relevant Chairman shall take all reasonable steps necessary to notify Members on the resumption of proceedings on any postponed record vote. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(b) Hearings

(1) Each hearing conducted by the Committee or a subcommittee shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day should be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the Committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony—

(A) may vote to close the hearing for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or violate paragraph (2) of this subsection; or

(B) may vote to close the hearing, as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(2) Whenever it is asserted by a Member of the Committee that the evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or it is asserted by a witness that the evidence or testimony that the witness would give at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate the witness—

(A) such testimony or evidence shall be presented in executive session, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, if by a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the Committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony, the Committee or subcommittee determines that such evidence or