



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 22, 2015

No. 11

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Thank You, God, for giving us another day.

Even before the first word is spoken this day, O Lord, guide our minds, thoughts, hearts, and desires. Breathe into the Members of this House a new spirit. Shape this Congress and our world according to Your design that all might fulfill Your holy will.

Bless the Members of this assembly with attentive hearts and open minds, that through the diversity of ideas they may sort out what is best for our Nation.

May all speech in this assembly be deliberately free of all prejudice so that others might listen wholeheartedly. Then all dialogue will be mutually respectful, surprising even us with unity and justice.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. BONAMICI 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

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

FACTS REVEAL PRESIDENT'S JOB FAILURE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the President's State of the Union speech was a disconnect with the American people who live and feel the failures of his policies. That is why the voters clearly spoke to stop tax increases destroying jobs in favor of the Republican bipartisan legislation to create jobs.

Big Government fails. The real facts threatening the middle class are: \$869.3 billion total taxes in ObamaCare, according to the Congressional Budget Office; 5.5 million Americans who have fallen into poverty since Obama became President, U.S. Census Bureau; 401,000 construction jobs lost since Obama became President, Bureau of Labor Statistics; \$2,484 decline in the median household income since Obama became President, U.S. Census Bureau.

Again, the President should stop, change course, and work with Republicans for legislation that promotes small business jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and the President, by his actions, must never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Welcome, right to life marchers, to Washington today.

CONGRESS SHOULD FOCUS ON AMERICA'S TOP PRIORITIES

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, just the night before last the President addressed this body and laid out an agenda that we all might not agree with certain elements, but there are elements that we could certainly act upon.

We could take up an infrastructure bill. We could take up legislation that would assure every young person the ability to go to community college. We could take up the big questions that the American people expect us to address that are important to growing our economy. But we are not doing that.

Instead, this morning, the leadership will present to this body legislation that will again seek to curtail the health care rights of women, not because you have some expectation that it will become law, but I believe because it is just another attempt to pander to the more extreme voices of the base.

The President and others have called to us to elevate the dialogue in Congress and elevate our aspirations for our country.

We have legislation before us that would put limitations on the choices that women have and even deny access to abortion services to save the life of a mother. This is the wrong direction. We need to reject it.

LAVONIA POLICE OFFICERS OF THE YEAR

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to rise in recognition of three police officers from the Lavonia, Georgia, Police Department.

Officers Harold McCroskey, Brandon Brown, and Blake Andrews are selfless public servants who have committed

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

their lives to protect ours. The Lavonia Police Department named Officers McCroskey, Andrews, and Brown their 2014 Officers of the Year.

Our corner of northeast Georgia is safe and peaceful thanks in part to the service of these three brave officers. On behalf of my family, Franklin County, and the Ninth Congressional District of Georgia, I offer my gratitude and respect.

The entire department deserves recognition in Congress because Chief Bruce Carlisle and his squad are proud, patriotic Americans. Not only do they keep their local community safe, but they give to charity. This month, they started a scholarship fund in honor of their friend Deputy Steven LaCruz, who died in pursuit of a traffic violator.

As the son of a Georgia State trooper, I am honored by their sacrifice, inspired by their courage, and remain committed to working on their behalf here in Congress.

CONGRESS SHOULD HELP WOMEN AND FAMILIES

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, in 1973, 42 years ago, the Supreme Court ruled in *Roe v. Wade* that women have the right to safe and legal abortion.

I remember the days before that landmark decision. Mr. Speaker, over the centuries it has been clear, when abortion is illegal, it does not go away but is very unsafe.

On this anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, we should commit to reducing unwanted pregnancies. We should commit to making family planning services more available.

To help women and families, we should be passing the Paycheck Fairness Act for equal pay and a robust infrastructure plan for jobs across this country.

To help women and families, let's stop trying to take away women's rights. Let's protect their health care. Let's pass the Women's Health Protection Act and say "no" to unconstitutional attempts to restrict the right of women to safe and legal abortion.

I AM DISAPPOINTED BUT HOPEFUL

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today sad and disappointed.

I am sad and disappointed that in a nation as great as this, lives of so many of our unborn children are ended through abortion.

I am disappointed that we have not moved past this blot on our Nation's history and forward into respecting the dignity of all humans, born and unborn.

I am disappointed that so many of my colleagues here continue to ignore the science that shows over and over the self-evident life in the womb.

Even so, I am more hopeful than ever before there is good news to celebrate. Abortion numbers are down, as are teen pregnancies. States have passed record numbers of laws to protect women's health and the lives of the unborn.

Today on The National Mall, I look forward to seeing the thousands of teenagers and young adults marching hand in hand to the Supreme Court. Their generation is our hope to bring about a culture of life.

LET'S KEEP OUR MARITIME INDUSTRY STRONG

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on Congress to oppose efforts that would undermine our domestic maritime industry and workforce.

Ninety-five years ago, Congress recognized the critical importance of maintaining a strong domestic maritime fleet by passing the Merchant Marine Act, also known as the Jones Act.

Congress is now considering unraveling a law that has played a key role in ensuring the development of a robust shipyard industrial base that supports our national economy, our military, and our homeland security.

The Jones Act has also guaranteed that the United States has highly trained and skilled mariners who can be called into service during times of national emergency so America can build ships for America.

We saw how commercial vessels flying the American flag played a major role in providing the mariners needed to operate sealift vessels activated from reserve status in support of Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom.

This is about American jobs. In 2012, the maritime industry employed more than 57,000 workers and supported \$15.2 billion in gross business income in Washington State alone. In the Pacific Northwest, we understand the importance of the Jones Act.

Why would Congress kill good American jobs?

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that Congress will reject efforts to undermine the Jones Act and I will continue working with my colleagues to show our strong support for our country's domestic maritime industry and its workers.

MAKING LNG EXPORTS EASIER BY CUTTING RED TAPE

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, too often good ideas get lost in bureaucratic red tape. Today we have the opportunity to start cutting that tape away.

H.R. 161, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act, requires a

timely decision to be made on liquefied natural gas projects around the country, projects that have been held back by unnecessary regulations.

This bill streamlines the review process, getting these projects off of paper and in place, and once these projects start, countless economic opportunities will begin as well.

More jobs, decreased dependency on foreign oil, and a modernized energy sector are waiting. All we need to do is cut the tape and let these opportunities flourish.

This is a commonsense economic step towards a healthier economy. I am proud to support H.R. 161 and the energizing opportunities that come with its passage.

POLITICIANS SHOULDN'T MAKE MEDICAL DECISIONS FOR WOMEN

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, if you thought the 114th Congress would be different, think again. If you thought Republicans were ready to put partisan politics behind them, think again. If you thought they had finally ended their war on women, think again.

Last night, thanks to Republican women and their supporters, the Republicans abandoned their effort to pass a 20-week abortion ban even for women who were victims of rape or incest.

But instead of respecting women this morning, the Republicans are coming back to the floor again, this time attempting to deny women access to their constitutionally protected right to safe and legal abortions by restricting coverage to abortions—including in private plans purchased with women's private dollars.

This is harmful to women and continues to ignore the American people, who believe that women and their doctors should make important medical decisions, not politicians.

Roe v. Wade wasn't the beginning of women having abortions. It was the end of women dying from abortions.

REMEMBERING STEVE J. BRATKA

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the loss of a dear friend, Steve Bratka, past president of the Tarrant County Stonewall Democrats.

Mr. Bratka was studying at the University of Nebraska, where he developed a passion to work in the railroad industry.

Over 40 years, Mr. Bratka held several leadership positions and was promoted into the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers in 1975.

In 1991, Steve relocated to Fort Worth, where he served as vice chairman until he retired.

He was very engaged in the community. As one of the founding members of the Texas Stonewall Democrats, Mr. Bratka inspired colleagues to run for local positions to improve our community.

Mr. Bratka left his mark on Fort Worth by standing up for those who had no voice and mentoring dozens of local chairmen to help them become qualified representatives.

Mr. Bratka is survived by his husband, Tim; sister, Connie Benjamin; brother, Lex Bratka, and his wife, Patty Burwell; four nieces; and eight great-nieces and -nephews.

Mr. Bratka's leadership and legacy in the Fort Worth community will be celebrated this Saturday at the Southside Preservation Hall.

Mr. Bratka was a great guy to everyone who knew him, and everyone is sad for his loss but remember him fondly for just being a great person.

□ 0915

NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION AND ABORTION INSURANCE FULL DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2015

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 42 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 42

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7) to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and Minority Leader or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 42 provides for a closed rule allowing consideration of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Since 1973, at least 52 million children's lives have been tragically taken

by abortion in the United States. It is unconscionable that in America, where we fight for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, we tolerate this systematic extermination of an entire generation of the most vulnerable among us.

In the midst of that darkness, there has been one area of consensus, Mr. Speaker: protecting taxpayers from paying for a practice they sincerely oppose. Since 1976, the Hyde amendment, which prohibits the Federal funding of abortions, has been included in relevant appropriations bills. Each year it has been consistently renewed and supported by congressional majorities and Presidents of both parties.

NARAL, an abortion advocacy group, has suggested that prohibiting public funds for abortion reduces abortion rates by roughly 50 percent. That means that half of the women who would have otherwise had a publicly funded abortion end up carrying their baby to term.

In 1993, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that the Hyde amendment prevented as many as 675,000 abortions every single year. That means that millions of Americans are alive today because of the Hyde amendment. After 38 years, it is time for this lifesaving amendment to become permanent law.

When Barack Obama was elected in 2008, a myriad of long-established laws, including the Hyde amendment, created a mostly uniform policy that Federal programs did not pay for abortion or subsidize health plans that included coverage of abortion, with only narrow exceptions.

Unfortunately, ObamaCare destroyed that longstanding policy, bypassing the Hyde amendment restriction and paving the way for publicly funded abortions. The President's health care law authorized massive Federal subsidies to assist millions of Americans to purchase private health plans that will cover abortions on demand. In other words, Mr. Speaker, hard-earned taxpayer dollars are now being used to pay for elective abortions. This is simply unacceptable.

H.R. 7 will codify the principles of the Hyde amendment on a permanent, governmentwide basis, which means that it will apply to longstanding Federal health programs such as Medicaid, SCHIP, and Federal employees' health benefits, as well as to new programs created by ObamaCare.

H.R. 7 prohibits the use of Federal funds for abortions. It does so by, one, prohibiting all Federal funding for abortions; two, prohibiting Federal subsidies for ACA health care plans that include coverage for abortion; three, prohibiting the use of Federal facilities for abortion; and four, prohibiting Federal employees from performing abortions.

This commonsense measure, which restores a longstanding bipartisan agreement, protects the unborn and prevents taxpayers from being forced to fund thousands of abortions.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote to respect our Nation's consensus on abortion funding and affirm life by voting in favor of this rule and H.R. 7.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, down the hall in the old House Chamber stands Clio, Muse of History. Perched atop the room, she is riding the Chariot of Time. She has watched silently over the proceedings of this House since 1807. And in the folio that rests in the crook of her arm, she records every move, large and small, for the benefit of all generations, past, present, and future. What she is recording today is, I am certain, a disappointment.

The proceedings playing out before us today show a blatant, overt disrespect for the time-honored rules of this House, first written by Thomas Jefferson in 1801.

The bill that was supposed to come to the floor today, a bill that would have stripped women of their right to constitutionally protected medical care, was so odious and destructive that some of the women of the Republican Conference rebelled against it. It was based on unsound and fictitious science and caused such a meltdown in the Republican Conference that the House majority pulled it from the floor for fear that it wouldn't pass. But something had to be done because visitors were coming to town for the 42nd anniversary of the landmark Supreme Court decision *Roe v. Wade*.

On this day, there are floods of visitors here in the Nation's Capital to fight against that ruling, to protest that decision, and to raise their clarion call against a woman's right to choose.

In this current Congress, this bill was not brought to us under regular order—as not many are. It had no committee action. It had no hearings, no markup, no witnesses testified in favor or against it, and it came out of the Rules Committee and to the floor today under a closed rule.

One of the ever-ready alternatives came to us late last night, and it is even worse than the one it replaced. It seems that the majority has an endless supply of bills attacking women's health. Can't pass this one? Grab another. Can't pass that one? Just take the next one. Their insistence on attacking women's health seemingly knows no bounds.

Because this bill has not seen any committee action in the current Congress, no one has been able to read it or to weigh in on it or amend it, and some of us would like a clarification on the sordid history of this bill.

In the earliest version of this bill, which was in the 112th Congress, there was a phrase that lit a firestorm across the Nation. It was "forcible rape." The bill was, indeed, the one that would have required women to prove that

their rape was “forcible” so it could be categorized as “legitimate.” Has nothing been learned here?

The next iteration of the bill, in the 113th Congress, included a provision—and listen to this, America—that would have required the IRS to audit women who had had abortions to ensure that the pregnancy that they terminated had been the result of rape or incest.

This extreme legislation, which is a dust-covered holdover from the last Congress, was originally sponsored by a man, originated from a subcommittee composed of 13 men, and was passed out of the Judiciary Committee with the votes of 21 Republican men. Remember those pictures, America, all of those men sitting there deciding what women’s health would be about? It is a perfect illustration of a problem we have had for a long time, that men in blue suits and red ties determine what women can and should do when it comes to their own health or bodies.

This bill is absolutely a solution in search of a problem. As Ms. FOXX pointed out, all this is taken care of. There is no tax money for abortions. The bill in its current form would permanently prohibit low-income women, civil servants, District of Columbia residents, and military women from accessing a full range of reproductive services by codifying the Hyde amendment, which unfortunately already requires no taxpayer funds be spent on abortions except in very limited services. It has been this way for decades. Congress should be repealing these unfair and discriminatory bans, not doubling down on them.

Are these provisions still in the current bill text before us? We have had no chance to check, and it has been awhile since we have seen this bill.

This display is a messaging opportunity and another attempt to dismantle the Affordable Care Act. This bill not only threatens women who buy their insurance on public exchanges with Federal tax credits but also threatens women who use their own private money to pay for their health insurance on the exchanges. Experts tell us this would jeopardize the availability of abortion coverage for all women, no matter where they buy their insurance.

When the House considered this bill in the previous Congress, it was attempt number 49. Today, it is attempt number 55. That is right, ladies and gentlemen, 55 votes the majority has held in this Chamber to take health care away from their own constituents. The House majority has wasted nearly \$80 million of taxpayer money to destroy the Affordable Care Act.

Infrastructure money, anyone?

Time and again, we see the House majority turn their backs on the people they represent and force an extreme agenda, one filled with poison pills that would take our country backward, backward to a time when women died from back-alley abortions; backward to a time of women in desperate

circumstances seeking illegal procedures performed by strangers with dirty hands in unspeakable conditions; backward to a time when medical choices were not the choice of the woman, but of the public; backward to a time when women who “got themselves into trouble” by getting pregnant could not work and could not go to school.

These choices are personal. They are not public. A woman’s actions regarding her own reproductive health should include anyone she deems appropriate, not politicians in Washington or State capitals scoring political points off her health care.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, as my colleague knows, this legislation is identical to H.R. 7, which passed the House last Congress after moving through regular order, including a full committee markup.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), one of the strongest champions of life in this House.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding and for her leadership, and for reminding us that this bill passed the House last year in identical form. The only thing changed are the dates, because obviously they had to be updated. It is a 12-page bill which can be very quickly read by any Member. And the only reason we have to be here is because the Senate wouldn’t provide a vote on it. So the Senate just shelved it, and we are now bringing it back up on the floor.

Madam Speaker, because abortion dismembers, decapitates, or chemically poisons unborn children to death—the part of abortion that my friends on the other side of this issue have a keen reluctance to not look at and to avoid, abortion methods—we know we will soon have the pain-capable legislation on the floor, and it will come to the floor. We know that children suffer excruciating pain from dismemberment. Piece by piece, a child is literally pulled apart—arms, legs, torso, and decapitation. That is the reality of abortion, Madam Speaker.

Because of all of this, Americans have consistently demanded—and now in ever-growing numbers—that public funds not pay for abortion. I would point out to my colleagues that yesterday the Marist Poll found that 68 percent of Americans oppose taxpayer funding for abortions, and that includes 69 percent of women; 71 percent of the next generation, the millennials, oppose taxpayer funding for abortion.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 7 will save lives. We know the Hyde amendment has probably saved at least 1 million lives, children who are on soccer fields today or in school, perhaps even getting married, people who live because the Hyde amendment has been in effect since the 1970s. Over a million children are alive because of that restriction of abortion from Medicaid funding.

□ 0930

H.R. 7 seeks to accomplish three goals. It makes the Hyde amendment and other current funding prohibitions permanent, so they don’t have to be included in the annual appropriations bills. It ensures that the Affordable Care Act faithfully conforms with the Hyde amendment, as promised by the President.

It provides full disclosure, transparency, and prominent display of the extent to which any health insurance plan on the exchange funds abortion. Now, that is all being done stealthily, hidden from the consumer. They have no idea when they are buying a plan that the plan is paying for abortion on demand.

Let me remind my colleagues that in the runup to passage of the Affordable Care Act, Americans were assured by President Obama himself, right there at the podium, and he said in September of 2009 that “under our plan, no Federal dollars will be used to fund abortion.” That is the President’s word.

He also said on March 24, 2010, in order to get a number of pro-life Democrats, he gave them his word and wrote that the Affordable Care Act “maintains current Hyde amendment restrictions governing abortion policy and extends those restrictions to newly created health insurance exchanges.” Nothing, Madam Speaker, could be further from the truth.

We asked the General Accountability Office last year to look into how many of these plans were paying for abortion. They came back and said well over 1,000 insurance plans on the exchange were funding abortion on demand, completely contrary to what our President told us would be the case in a speech to all of us in 2009 and then in an executive order that he issued.

Agree or disagree on the abortion issue, but let’s always be truthful. President Obama told us funding wouldn’t be in there, yet it is.

There is also problems with transparency. Senator Ben Nelson, in order to procure his vote, said there has to be two payments for abortion if it is included when the bill is on the Senate side.

He said: “If you are receiving Federal assistance to buy insurance and if that plan has any abortion coverage, the insurance company must bill you separately, and you must pay separately from your own personal funds—perhaps a credit card transaction, your separate personal check, or automatic withdrawal from your bank account—for that abortion coverage. Now, let me say that again. You have to write two checks: one for the basic policy and one for the additional coverage for abortion.”

That is not being implemented either, so the premium is all rolled into one. Again, conscientious pro-life Americans who do not want to be complicit in the wounding of women and the killing of babies are paying for

abortion, and many of them don't even know it.

I hope that Members will vote for the rule, and to those who think that there will be no debate and vote on the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, that will come to the floor; and, again, you defend dismemberment abortions at 20 weeks, 21 weeks, 23 weeks, where the child suffers excruciating pain.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say there is no scientific evidence at all. As a matter of fact, gynecologists have all written to us—and we have their statements—that there is no way of fetal pain at 20 weeks.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD, as a woman and as a Member of Congress and a citizen of the United States, that the House should vote for bigger paychecks, and they should vote for better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend for a moment.

The Chair would advise Members that although a unanimous consent request to insert remarks in debate may comprise a simple, declarative statement of the Member's attitude toward the pending measure, embellishments beyond that standard constitute debate and can become an imposition on the time of the Member who has yielded for that purpose.

The Chair will entertain as many requests to insert as may be necessary to

accommodate Members, but the Chair also must ask Members to cooperate by confining such remarks to the proper form.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Chair is correct, and we will do that.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. TSONGAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE) to speak as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill.

H.R. 7 is yet another direct attack on women and their families. It creates sweeping new restrictions on abortion coverage for women who purchase insurance under the Affordable Care Act, with no meaningful exception to protect a woman's health, and experts predict that it could cause many insurers to limit women's health options in their plans altogether.

This bill injects ideology into personal medical decisions and puts politicians, rather than doctors, in charge of women's health care. Instead of this extreme legislation, Congress should address the real challenges facing women and families today.

At a time when 42 million women are either living in poverty or on the brink of it, Congress must do more to help. We should be focused on expanding access to child care, providing workers with paid sick leave, and ensuring women equal pay for equal work. This bill does none of these. It fails women and their families.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on both the rule and H.R. 7.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Dr. BABIN.

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. It is plain wrong to use America's hard-earned tax dollars to pay for abortions.

On September 9, 2009, President Obama told the joint session of Congress:

One more misunderstanding I want to clear up—under our plan, no Federal dollars will be used to fund abortions,

and Federal conscience laws will remain in place.

Those of us in the pro-life community knew that this was simply not the case, and last September, the Government Accountability Office confirmed that, under ObamaCare, abortions are being paid for with taxpayer funds by more than 1,000 ObamaCare exchange plans across the country.

Our bill ends taxpayer funding for abortion, fulfilling one of the promises that this President has broken. Let's pass this bill and end the largest expansion of taxpayer-funded abortion in American history.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding.

I, too, rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill.

Today, on the 42nd anniversary of Roe v. Wade, we should be celebrating it, not dismantling it. I heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about pain.

Well, do you want to know about pain? Think back in horror to the perils for our mothers, our daughters, and our sisters in the days before the Supreme Court ruled that women have a constitutional right to make our own personal health care decisions.

Back then, our country faced a public health crisis as women were maimed, made sterile, and lost their lives as a result of self-inflicted or illegal abortions. I remember finding a friend who was near death as a result of a back alley procedure.

Since Roe v. Wade, State after State, including Florida, my home State, has passed onerous laws criminalizing doctors, requiring unnecessary tests, and other insidious obstructions to prevent access to abortion.

Today, Congress again piles on to the damage hurting the poorest of our citizens.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Here is a much better way to make lives better for our children, and that is to allow their mothers to live full, productive lives; and instead of this bill, pass the Women's Health Protection Act to ensure that no matter where a woman lives, she has access to the resources needed to make her own health care decisions.

We cannot and will not go back.

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

Mr. BENISHEK. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the rights of the unborn and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule.

I, along with many in northern Michigan, believe that life inside the womb is just as precious as life outside

the womb and must be protected. Both unborn and born children have a right to life.

The No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act will ensure that taxpayer dollars are not used to subsidize a practice that so many of my constituents cannot condone. Your hard-earned tax dollars should not be used to pay for abortions.

I served as a doctor for 30 years in northern Michigan, and I have had the awesome gift of witnessing the miracle of new life in the delivery room. I have also been blessed with the experience as a father and a grandfather, and I know how life-changing this event can be.

I want to commend the pro-life grassroots efforts led by passionate advocates in our local communities. Thank you for the hard work that you do to educate our communities on the value of life.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

□ 0945

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, despite the misleading title of this bill, the fact is that there is no Federal taxpayer funding of abortion right now except in very limited circumstances.

H.R. 7 would for the first time place restrictions on how women with private insurance can spend private dollars in purchasing health care. It would also likely result in the loss of access to comprehensive health care for millions of women who work for small businesses or who will be purchasing insurance in the Health Insurance Marketplaces. Politicians are not medical experts and should not be dictating health care decisions for women.

House Republicans are scrambling this morning to consider the rule for H.R. 7 at the last minute because it became clear that the overly restrictive and unconstitutional 20-week abortion ban would fail a floor vote. Why? Because Americans support comprehensive health care for all women. House Republicans should be bringing up bills to strengthen the economy, to guarantee women equal pay for equal work, to raise the minimum wage, to make child care affordable, and not limit a woman's access to health services in a desperate attempt to relitigate a very divisive issue.

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

H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, codifies many longstanding pro-life protections that have been passed under both Republican- and Democrat-controlled Congresses. The majority of taxpayers oppose Federal funding for abortion, as demonstrated in poll after poll:

A recent Marist poll showed that 58 percent of respondents oppose or strongly oppose using any tax dollars for abortions;

During the ObamaCare debate, a 2010 Zogby/O'Leary poll found that 76 percent of Americans said that Federal funds should never pay for an abortion or should pay only to save the life of the mother;

A January 2010 Quinnipiac University poll showed that 67 percent of respondents opposed the Federal funding of abortion;

An April 2011 CNN poll showed that 61 percent of respondents opposed public funding for abortion;

A November 2009 Washington Post poll showed that 61 percent of respondents opposed government subsidies for health insurance that include abortion;

A September 2009 International Communications Research poll showed that 67 percent of respondents opposed any measure that would "require people to pay for abortion coverage with their Federal taxes."

In other words, Madam Speaker, the American people do not want the government spending their hard-earned tax dollars to destroy innocent human life—period.

Like most taxpayers, employers also prefer plans that preclude abortion coverage. According to the insurance industry's trade association, "Most insurers offer plans that include abortion coverage, but most employers choose not to offer it as part of their benefits packages."

Even Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI has voted numerous times to prohibit taxpayer funding for abortion in the District of Columbia. President Obama voted against the taxpayer funding of abortion in the District of Columbia twice when he was in the Senate, and since being elected, he has signed appropriations legislation into law that prohibits this funding.

As you can see, Madam Speaker, opposition to taxpayer funding for abortion is bipartisan, bicameral, and is supported by the majority of the American people. It is time to restore the status quo on the government funding of abortion and make this widely supported policy permanent across the Federal Government. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and H.R. 7.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I will comment on the demerits of this terrible bill in the debate on the bill. I want to comment now on how this bill got before us.

This is, I think, the fifth bill we have considered in this Congress. Not one of those bills went through committee. Not one of those bills had a markup, a hearing, an opportunity for people to amend the bills in committee, and now the bills come to the floor for an hour

of debate with no opportunity to offer amendments. This is hardly the transparency and the due process that the GOP leaders promised us.

This bill is even worse because this bill was not on the calendar until late last night. Yesterday, when the Republican anti-choice women rebelled at the terrible rape provisions of the bill we were supposed to debate today and when they found they couldn't pass a bill today on the anniversary of Roe v. Wade, they brought another off-the-shelf bill, which is a terrible bill, with no hearing in committee, no debate in committee, no markup, no opportunity to offer amendments, no vote in committee, no opportunity to offer amendments on the floor.

This is not the way you run or should run the House of Representatives of the United States. It is a shameful procedure for a shameful bill.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I just want to remind my colleagues that H.R. 7 passed last year. It passed with an overwhelming majority. It is the same bill. It went through regular order. Hearings and a markup were held, and the legislation came through regular order in the House of Representatives. The problem has been the Senate, which has refused to take up this bill for well over a year, so we are back to take up a bill that has already been approved by the House in regular order.

Let me remind my colleagues as well that, next week, we will be taking up a number of bills that will combat human trafficking. Madam Speaker, I am the prime sponsor of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, Americans' landmark law to combat the hideous crime of sex trafficking and labor trafficking.

We have a number of important antihuman trafficking bills that passed the House but sat over on the Senate side for a year or more—some of them—including two of mine, and we are talking about bringing those bills up next week. Regular order was followed last year on those bills—just like H.R. 7. Those bills languished on the Senate side. Surely, we can come together to combat human trafficking. The flaw in the process was the Senate and its former leadership unwillingness to vote on House-passed legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. DEGETTE. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker, I am going to state this as simply as I can. There is no public funding for abortion. Whether you like it or not, the Hyde amendment, which has been the law of this land for decades now, says there is no public funding for abortion. That has not changed. There is no public funding

for abortion under the Affordable Care Act or any other government program.

This bill would vastly expand the current restrictions on a woman's right to get her own health care through her insurance, with her own private money, that she, her family, and her doctor think she needs. Let me say how this would work. Under H.R. 7, people who buy their insurance in exchanges—and their employers—now would not be able to spend their own private dollars to buy insurance that they need for themselves and their families.

This not only would be a radical expansion over current law, it would be a terrible wedge between patients and their doctors. I do not care how many polls there are that you might cite, because the vast majority of Americans think that a woman's private health care decisions should be made between herself, her family, and her doctor—certainly, not by politicians in Washington, D.C.

H.R. 7 is an idea that has been proposed time and again. It is not going anywhere. I am sure it will probably pass this House today, and it will go over to the other body, and it will die. If not, the President will veto it.

Here are my questions to my friends on the other side of the aisle: Why aren't we spending this week talking about how the women of America can get better paychecks? Why aren't we spending our time talking this week about how the women and men of America can get tax credits so that the children they do have can go to child care that is quality child care? Why aren't we spending our time this week talking about how women and men should be able to get paid the same amount for doing the very same job?

That is what I think this Congress should be spending its time doing, not passing these bills which are false statements about a woman's private decisions about her health care. I urge the body to defeat this bill.

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

I want to say as forcefully as I can that there is nothing in H.R. 7 that restricts the private sale of plans that include abortion. There is nothing in H.R. 7 that restricts the private sale of plans that include abortion. Consistent with the Hyde amendment, the bill ensures that Federal dollars—wherever those Federal dollars come from—do not subsidize plans that cover abortion.

What is important to explain is that the Hyde amendment has only in the past applied to annual appropriations bills. As we have done our best to explain to the American people, ObamaCare is not subject to annual appropriations bills but is funded under mandatory spending. Therefore, Madam Speaker, it is important that we codify that no Federal funds can be used for abortions. That is what this bill does.

If our colleagues believe it is unnecessary, then they should have no problem voting for it because, then, it is

not doing anything that violates what has been done in the past. However, this bill is necessary. Let me say again, Madam Speaker, that H.R. 7 simply codifies the longstanding bipartisan agreement that Federal taxpayer funding should not be used to destroy innocent life.

H.R. 7 does so by establishing a permanent, governmentwide prohibition on taxpayer subsidies for abortion and abortion coverage, including cutting off taxpayer funding for plans that include abortion under ObamaCare;

It prevents funding for abortion in government programs like Medicaid, the Federal Health Benefits Program, and the Children's Health Insurance Program;

The bill also ensures that subsidies made available in the form of refundable tax credits under the ACA are prevented from flowing to plans that include abortion;

H.R. 7 also explicitly states that private individuals may purchase separate abortion coverage or plans that include abortion as long as no Federal subsidies are used to pay for the abortion coverage. Similarly, H.R. 7 explicitly states that insurance companies may offer abortion coverage as long as the coverage is not paid for by using taxpayer dollars.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS).

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you to my colleague from North Carolina for, once again, being such a strong defender of life.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer my support for H.R. 7. I believe in the sanctity of human life and that life begins at conception and ends at death. My life's experiences as a mom, as a nurse, and as a Christian have helped me to form these core beliefs.

I have held the hands of newborn infants, and I have held the hands of elderly patients in the last moments of their lives. I have been blessed to have had such special moments, and because of them, I know that every life is precious and is a gift from God and that it is not for us to judge its worth.

Madam Speaker, the unborn need us to stand up for them and to be the voice that they do not have. I support this legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to do so as well.

□ 1000

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say that we have heard what is in this bill, but this bill was taken out of the used-bill freezer last night at 9 o'clock, against all the rules, and put on the floor today. We really don't know what is in this bill.

I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank my friend from Rochester for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, if at first you don't succeed, try again. That is clearly what my Republican colleagues are doing this morning.

The bill Republicans initially attempted to bring to the floor today would have required women to go to the police before they could even address their own health care needs. They abandoned that first line of attack on women's health because it was too extreme, even for members of their own party. But they weren't going to let something like that stop them from pandering to the rightwing flank. Fortunately for the Republicans, they have a long list of bills that attack health care and women's access to care. So it is easy for them to just swap it out for another extremist effort. Their partisan base will be happy—but at the expense of the health of many women and families in our country.

This bill will have a serious impact on families' ability to make their own health care decisions. It will raise taxes on hardworking Americans just if they happen to choose a health care plan that this majority doesn't like. And for what? So my Republican colleagues can score cheap political points.

This is not what the American people want. They want an agenda that lifts people up. They want us to be working on legislation that creates jobs, boosts paychecks in this country, and strengthens our economy. This bill will do none of these things. It is nothing but a cynical attempt to put politics where it doesn't belong.

Vote "no" on this rule and vote "no" on this blatant political gambit.

I understand how embarrassing this may be to the Republicans because of the little snafu within their own caucus, but please put aside this petty politics. Let's get on to the real business of creating more jobs in this country and boosting a person's pay in this land. That is what the American people want and need.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for her diligence and efforts on this issue.

Madam Speaker, I think we all are pleased to have so many of our constituents in town today who are supporting life and supporting that concept of life, liberty, and freedom.

It is such an honor today to come to the floor and talk about an issue that 68 percent of the American people agree on. Listening to my colleagues talking about how this is partisan and just for our base, I am glad that they think 68 percent of the American people are our base—because they do agree with us. Seventy-one percent of millennials agree with us on this issue. And the issue is simply this: there should not be taxpayer dollars used to pay for abortions.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) has done a tremendous amount of work on this bill. I thank him for his diligence, his attention, and for working to get H.R. 7 in the right form, ready to move forward and to bring this issue into the light.

We have got three things we want to focus on in this bill. Number one, there is enormous bipartisan support—I would say near unanimous bipartisan support—for the Hyde amendment language. Title I of this bill is going to make that permanent.

Madam Speaker, what that means is no longer do we have to revote this over and over and over. The Hyde amendment language will be the applied standard.

Title II of this bill will apply that to ObamaCare.

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

Ms. FOXX. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, what it will do is apply that to ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act.

Now the reason it is imperative, the President promised on numerous occasions, Madam Speaker, that there would be no taxpayer dollars, which become Federal funds, used for abortion. This was a big debate as we went through the Affordable Care Act.

What we have learned from not us but from the GAO is that we have in the marketplace 1,036 plans. We have over 1,000 plans that allow those dollars into those plans. What this bill will also do is bring transparency not only to the plans but to the money flow, so that hardworking American taxpayers who do not want their money used to pay for abortion—68 percent agree with us—will have clarity and certainty on the issue.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank the distinguished ranking member.

Madam Speaker, I am totally puzzled. I came to the floor thinking that we were going to be focused on creating jobs, putting people to work, helping our young people go to college, and reducing student loan debts. Where is the regular procedure that my friends on the other side of the aisle were going to bring to the House? Where did this bill come from? Did it come from the committee process? No.

Let me make this very, very clear. I knew Henry Hyde. I worked with Henry Hyde. The Hyde amendment is the law of the land. There is no public money for abortion.

This is a radical bill that restricts women paying for private insurance with their own dollars. Millions of women would lose comprehensive health care. I just don't understand it.

As an appropriator, we still have not brought the Homeland Security bill to the floor. As a resident of New York, I am concerned by possible attacks.

Let's do our work. Let's move on.

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

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

Mrs. LOWEY. To my friends on the other side of the aisle, this bill just came to the floor without serious discussion and when there is no public money for abortion today as a result of the Hyde amendment.

I look forward to bringing a Homeland Security bill to the floor. As I began to say, as a New Yorker, I am concerned about potential threats to our country.

Let's get to work. Let's create jobs. Let's do the work that our citizens—our constituents—brought us here to do. I don't understand this bill. And in closing, there is no public money for abortion.

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

The passage of H.R. 7 will be welcome news for the majority of Americans who do not want their tax dollars paying for the grisly business of abortion. This bill will make existing policies like the Hyde amendment permanent and will rid ObamaCare of its massive expansion of public funding for abortion insurance plans.

The President repeatedly assured Americans that ObamaCare would "maintain current Hyde amendment restrictions governing abortion policy and extend those restrictions to newly created health insurance exchanges." Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, that promise didn't pan out. It now joins "if you like your plan, you can keep it" in President Obama's panoply of broken promises.

Madam Speaker, today, hundreds of thousands of Americans are coming to Washington, D.C., to brave the cold and march for life. Participants hail from all 50 States, have various religions, and are from all different walks of life and ages. But the one thing they have in common is the shared dedication to protecting the unborn.

The March for Life gives a voice to the voiceless and sends a powerful message to the Representatives of the people assembled here in Congress. It is heartening that so many Americans of different backgrounds are willing to take a stand for life.

Madam Speaker, this is not a partisan issue and this is not a partisan bill. H.R. 7 reflects the bipartisan, bicameral agreement that our government should not be in the business of subsidizing abortions. This is not a radical idea. It is a commonsense proposal that codifies a longstanding compromise. Therefore, I again urge my colleagues to vote for this rule and H.R. 7.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentlewoman from

the great State of New York for her extraordinary leadership on the Rules Committee and in so many areas for this country and our State.

I rise today in strong opposition to yet another closed rule. Despite all the lectures from Republicans about how creating jobs and growing the economy should be the number one top priority for this Congress, here we are instead once again hammering away at a woman's right to make her own choices, control her own body, and make choices about her own health care.

It is insulting to women, and it does not create one single job. But what it does do is put government between a physician and its patient. That is what it does. The other side says they want freedom and they want the government off their back. Yet on the most personal health care decisions for women, they are putting government between a woman and her doctor.

This bill will not grow our economy, but it will make permanent such discriminatory bans that target women in both the public and private health insurance market.

Republicans claim on their Web site—you can look it up and see it on their Web site—that they want to “do something for the 8.7 million people in America who are still unemployed.” It is time to focus on creating jobs and improving the economy for Americans, yet the first bill the Republican majority puts on the floor does not create one single job but discriminates, hurts, and insults women.

I urge a strong, strong “no” vote on this rule and on the underlying bill.

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

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

Ms. LEE. Let me thank the gentlewoman for yielding and also for being very vigilant in protecting women, women's right to privacy, and alerting us as to the dangers in this very terrible rule and terrible bill.

Madam Speaker, first of all, once again, as I said yesterday, this is just downright wrong. This is a horrible bill. This takes away a woman's right to privacy. Again, I thought in our country we prided ourselves on the right to privacy.

Women have a right to determine their own health care decisions. They can make these decisions with whom ever they deem appropriate. There is no way that Members of Congress should intervene, direct, or superimpose views and government policies on women's health care and women's right to privacy.

□ 1015

Once again, the Hyde amendment was passed, I believe it was—what—in the seventies. We should be providing access to women's health care so low-income women would have the same opportunities to determine their own

health care decisions as other women who have the access, but Federal funds haven't been allowed for many, many years now.

I don't know why these bogus arguments are being made on this bill because we don't have Federal funding of abortions, and I think women know that and see this as a real sinister move to, once again, deny women their right to health care and their right to privacy.

Also, once again, we are seeing how another bill further undermines D.C.'s home rule. This bill prohibits the District of Columbia from using its own funds to provide abortions. Why would we do this?

D.C. has a right to determine how they want to provide health care for women and have their own ability to determine their own destiny; but, once again, for low-income women in Washington, D.C., they are under assault with this bill.

It is really a shame and disgrace that, once again, we have to get up here and debunk the argument that Federal funds are being used for abortions because they are not. Today, the 42nd anniversary of Roe v. Wade, we should really be talking about expanding access to a full range of reproductive health services for everyone, including low-income women.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WAGNER). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

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

Ms. LEE. We should be talking about expanding reproductive health services for all women, including low-income women. We should be talking about pay equity. We should be talking about child care. We should be talking about paid family medical leave. We should be talking about creating jobs.

But rather than that, here we go, once again, trying to get in the middle of a woman's decision to move forward with her own life based on the decisions that she and her physician and her family members make.

The right to privacy, once again, is being undermined by this bill. You can't have a right to privacy and keep government out of your private life on one hand and, on the other hand, say government has got to interfere with your personal and private business.

Health care is too important for women. Women need to be able to make their own health care decisions, and this bill would do the exact opposite. It would move our country backwards. It would move women's health care backwards.

I hope that Members will vote “no” on this rule and “no” on the bill. We need to be expanding access to women's health care.

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

While it is true that the Hyde amendment and its companion amendments have been renewed every year, recent implementation of the Affordable Care

Act, or ObamaCare, has ignored these restrictions. Rather than renewing various amendments each year, we should make the prohibition on Federal abortion funding permanent and governmentwide.

Additionally, provisions contained in the Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act have been included in H.R. 7. These provisions require the exchanges to prominently display, one, whether a plan provides for abortion coverage; and, two, if it does, the amount of the abortion surcharge that the consumer is required to pay.

Unfortunately, for most consumers, finding out if the plans on their State's exchange or the Federal marketplace covers abortion is nearly impossible because the information is not consistently available.

Knowing whether these plans cover abortion is absolutely critical to many consumers because plans that cover elective abortion are required by law to impose a mandatory monthly abortion surcharge.

These surcharges are not optional. Once you sign up for a plan with abortion coverage, you must pay the surcharge. This means that, potentially, many Americans who strongly oppose elective abortion could be unknowingly contributing to the practice financially.

Madam Speaker, that simply isn't right. H.R. 7 will stop funding for plans that cover elective abortion under ObamaCare and ensure that abortion coverage and the accompanying surcharge are made transparent to the American people.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and H.R. 7, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Let me first say something about the process that we are engaged in. We have heard just in the last few weeks—and even as we opened this Congress—the Speaker and others in the majority talk about how we will adhere to regular order and we will get back to the process of legislating the way it was intended to be conducted.

What happened to that? Why did we set that aside? What is the emergency that requires us to bring this highly ideological piece of legislation to the floor in just a few hours after it had been brought to the Rules Committee? What happened to the previous legislation that we were supposed to debate?

I mean, to me, this is a big problem, and it is one that I think begs the question of whether or not those offers of returning to the regular legislative process are sincere.

I urge a “no” vote on the rule for that reason, but also because this is yet just another ideological attack on the health care rights of women in this country who want—in some cases, we know that abortion services are already prohibited from being funded through Federal sources.

This is simply going so far as to say that women, with their own money, who seek to procure insurance coverage, can't seek that coverage if it includes these services. To me, it goes just far too far. It does not allow even exceptions for abortions that would be required to protect the health of the woman or serious medical concerns.

We can't continue to make this a political question and a political football. Forty-two years ago, this question was decided at the Supreme Court. It is a right that is protected.

Rather than continuing to just sort of pander to the base and satisfy the ideological extremists in our country, we ought to be thinking about the questions that people actually want us to take this precious time on the floor of the House to debate: How are we going to put America back to work? How are we going to rebuild our infrastructure? How are we going to make sure that kids who want to get a good college education the way the President outlined the other night are going to be able to afford that?

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I just want to say that it is clear some of our colleagues have not read the bill or have not listened to the debate. This bill does not prohibit women from purchasing abortion coverage with their own money.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I also want to thank Mr. SMITH and my colleagues and all who are in Washington, D.C., participating in the March for Life for their unwavering commitment and support to fight on behalf of those who have no voice.

Throughout my years in Congress, Madam Speaker, and as a devoted human rights advocate, I have fought tirelessly for the fundamental rights of the innocent unborn.

As pro-life Members of Congress, we have a commitment to stand up for life and to take the necessary steps to advance legislation to the floor, and that is exactly what the U.S. House of Representatives will be doing today.

While the vast majority of Americans can agree that we have a lot of work in front of us to reduce the number of abortions, few legislators have taken any meaningful action. In fact, pro-abortion Members of Congress have sought to eliminate Federal protections on the use of taxpayer funds for abortions, both here and abroad.

Federal funds should not be used to pay for abortions, Madam Speaker, and Congressman SMITH's bill would do exactly that by establishing a permanent prohibition on taxpayer subsidies for abortion and abortion coverage. This will help save lives.

In addition, this bill also protects the conscience and religious views of millions of Americans. The vast majority of Americans also do not want their tax dollars to be used to pay for abor-

tions. This bill would establish a permanent prohibition on taxpayer subsidies for abortion.

For many years, the Hyde amendment and other Federal prohibitions on public funding for abortion have been enacted as appropriation riders, but they are not permanent, Madam Speaker. We need to get rid of this patchwork approach and enact H.R. 7 to ensure that Federal funds are not used to pay for abortions.

I look forward to working with Mr. SMITH and Ms. FOXX and others in favor of this bill and to continue working with my fellow pro-life colleagues in the House and the Senate to promote legislation that upholds the sanctity of innocent human life.

We have a responsibility to protect the unborn, and we must remain vigilant and continue to do what is right for all Americans.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding me time.

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

Madam Speaker, we just heard that apparently none of us have read the bill. That is absolutely true. The bill, as I said, was dragged out of the "used bill freezer" at 9 last night.

If it is the same bill that we were talking about that has been through for several terms, it still has the idea of forcible rape being the only legitimate rape and that the IRS can audit to see if you were really raped when you had an abortion and to prove that—again, taking women back to the days when everybody said that they could not make decisions and that they had to be made for them.

If this is the same bill that was brought to us, as we pointed out, by a subcommittee of 13 men and voted through the House by a committee of 21 men, then we don't need to read it again, and my understanding is that this is the same bill. It was repugnant then, and it certainly is repugnant now.

On behalf of the men and women of the United States who feel that they have the right to make their own health decisions, I beg the House of Representatives to turn down all of this.

Now, we know that what they are doing, literally, is dismissive of not only 51 percent of the women population—we are the majority population, we women in the United States—but this is certainly, by any account, a misuse of the Chamber's attention, and we are talking taxpayer funds. Believe me, this is a misuse of taxpayer funds.

Now, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that would allow us to strike the 3-day layover waiver, the waiver that was given by the Rules Committee to not do the 3-day layover, but to have something to do on the floor today.

With 23 months left of the 114th Congress, we should be able to run the

House in the thoughtful manner that the rules of the House provide for.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Now, I am going to urge again for all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "no" on the previous question, vote "no" on the rule and, by all means, "no" on the intrusive, deceptive bill that has been talked about here for 40 years.

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

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

Madam Speaker, life is the most fundamental of all rights. It is sacred and God-given, but millions of babies have been robbed of that right in this, the freest country in the world. That is a tragedy beyond words and a betrayal of what we, as a nation, stand for.

One day, we hope it will be different. We hope life will cease to be valued on a sliding scale. We hope the era of elective abortions, ushered in by an unelected court, will be closed and collectively deemed one of the darkest chapters in American history, but until that day, it remains a solemn duty to stand up for life.

□ 1030

Regardless of the length of this journey, we will continue to speak for those who cannot, and we will continue to pray to the One who can change the hearts of those in desperation and those in power, who equally hold the lives of the innocent in their hands.

Madam Speaker, the commonsense measure before us restores an important, longstanding, bipartisan agreement that protects the unborn and prevents taxpayers from being forced to finance thousands of elective abortions. It reflects the will of the American people and is the product of what has historically been a bipartisan, bicameral consensus in Congress. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule and H.R. 7.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 42 OFFERED BY
Ms. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

On page 1, line 4 of the resolution, insert the following after the word "waived": "except those arising under clause 11 of rule XXI".

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on

the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker’s ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here’s how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 183, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 42]

YEAS—239

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith

NAYS—183

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerrera
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer

Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce

Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu (CA)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay

Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
DeSaulnier
Loebbeck
Loftgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallo
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)

NOT VOTING—11

Carter (TX)
Duckworth
Forbes
Hastings

□ 1056

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 179, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 43]

YEAS—242

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black

Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne

Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer

Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce

NAYS—179

Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratchliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)

Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Loebsock
Lofgren
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCullum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)

Carder (TX)
Duckworth
Forbes
Hastings
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Lowenthal
Marchant

NOT VOTING—12

Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)

Nunnelee
Perlmutter
Smith (WA)
Speier

TITLE I—PROHIBITING FEDERALLY FUNDED ABORTIONS

SEC. 101. PROHIBITING TAXPAYER FUNDED ABORTIONS.

Title 1, United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following new chapter:

“CHAPTER 4—PROHIBITING TAXPAYER FUNDED ABORTIONS

- “301. Prohibition on funding for abortions.
“302. Prohibition on funding for health benefits plans that cover abortion.
“303. Limitation on Federal facilities and employees.
“304. Construction relating to separate coverage.
“305. Construction relating to the use of non-Federal funds for health coverage.
“306. Non-preemption of other Federal laws.
“307. Construction relating to complications arising from abortion.
“308. Treatment of abortions related to rape, incest, or preserving the life of the mother.
“309. Application to District of Columbia.

“§ 301. Prohibition on funding for abortions

“No funds authorized or appropriated by Federal law, and none of the funds in any trust fund to which funds are authorized or appropriated by Federal law, shall be expended for any abortion.

“§ 302. Prohibition on funding for health benefits plans that cover abortion

“None of the funds authorized or appropriated by Federal law, and none of the funds in any trust fund to which funds are authorized or appropriated by Federal law, shall be expended for health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion.

“§ 303. Limitation on Federal facilities and employees

“No health care service furnished—
“(1) by or in a health care facility owned or operated by the Federal Government; or
“(2) by any physician or other individual employed by the Federal Government to provide health care services within the scope of the physician's or individual's employment, may include abortion.

“§ 304. Construction relating to separate coverage

“Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as prohibiting any individual, entity, or State or locality from purchasing separate abortion coverage or health benefits coverage that includes abortion so long as such coverage is paid for entirely using only funds not authorized or appropriated by Federal law and such coverage shall not be purchased using matching funds required for a federally subsidized program, including a State's or locality's contribution of Medicaid matching funds.

“§ 305. Construction relating to the use of non-Federal funds for health coverage

“Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as restricting the ability of any non-Federal health benefits coverage provider from offering abortion coverage, or the ability of a State or locality to contract separately with such a provider for such coverage, so long as only funds not authorized or appropriated by Federal law are used and such coverage shall not be purchased using matching funds required for a federally subsidized program, including a State's or locality's contribution of Medicaid matching funds.

“§ 306. Non-preemption of other Federal laws

“Nothing in this chapter shall repeal, amend, or have any effect on any other Federal law to the extent such law imposes any limitation on the use of funds for abortion or for health benefits coverage that includes

□ 1104

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 43, had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 42, I call up the bill (H.R. 7) to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). Pursuant to House Resolution 42, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act of 2015”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—PROHIBITING FEDERALLY FUNDED ABORTIONS

Sec. 101. Prohibiting taxpayer funded abortions.

Sec. 102. Amendment to table of chapters.

TITLE II—APPLICATION UNDER THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Sec. 201. Clarifying application of prohibition to premium credits and cost-sharing reductions under ACA.

Sec. 202. Revision of notice requirements regarding disclosure of extent of health plan coverage of abortion and abortion premium surcharges.

Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Esty
Kildee
Kilmer

coverage of abortion, beyond the limitations set forth in this chapter.

“§ 307. Construction relating to complications arising from abortion

“Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to apply to the treatment of any infection, injury, disease, or disorder that has been caused by or exacerbated by the performance of an abortion. This rule of construction shall be applicable without regard to whether the abortion was performed in accord with Federal or State law, and without regard to whether funding for the abortion is permissible under section 308.

“§ 308. Treatment of abortions related to rape, incest, or preserving the life of the mother

“The limitations established in sections 301, 302, and 303 shall not apply to an abortion—

“(1) if the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest; or

“(2) in the case where a woman suffers from a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness that would, as certified by a physician, place the woman in danger of death unless an abortion is performed, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself.

“§ 309. Application to District of Columbia

“In this chapter:

“(1) Any reference to funds appropriated by Federal law shall be treated as including any amounts within the budget of the District of Columbia that have been approved by Act of Congress pursuant to section 446 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (or any applicable successor Federal law).

“(2) The term ‘Federal Government’ includes the government of the District of Columbia.”.

SEC. 102. AMENDMENT TO TABLE OF CHAPTERS.

The table of chapters for title 1, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“4. Prohibiting taxpayer funded abortions 301”.

TITLE II—APPLICATION UNDER THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

SEC. 201. CLARIFYING APPLICATION OF PROHIBITION TO PREMIUM CREDITS AND COST-SHARING REDUCTIONS UNDER ACA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) DISALLOWANCE OF REFUNDABLE CREDIT AND COST-SHARING REDUCTIONS FOR COVERAGE UNDER QUALIFIED HEALTH PLAN WHICH PROVIDES COVERAGE FOR ABORTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 36B(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “or any health plan that includes coverage for abortions (other than any abortion or treatment described in section 307 or 308 of title 1, United States Code)”.

(B) OPTION TO PURCHASE OR OFFER SEPARATE COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Paragraph (3) of section 36B(c) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) SEPARATE ABORTION COVERAGE OR PLAN ALLOWED.—

“(i) OPTION TO PURCHASE SEPARATE COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed as prohibiting any individual from purchasing separate coverage for abortions described in such subparagraph, or a health plan that includes such abortions, so long as no credit is allowed under this section with respect to the premiums for such coverage or plan.

“(ii) OPTION TO OFFER COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall restrict

any non-Federal health insurance issuer offering a health plan from offering separate coverage for abortions described in such subparagraph, or a plan that includes such abortions, so long as premiums for such separate coverage or plan are not paid for with any amount attributable to the credit allowed under this section (or the amount of any advance payment of the credit under section 1412 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act).”.

(2) DISALLOWANCE OF SMALL EMPLOYER HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSE CREDIT FOR PLAN WHICH INCLUDES COVERAGE FOR ABORTION.—Subsection (h) of section 45R of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking “Any term” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any term”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) EXCLUSION OF HEALTH PLANS INCLUDING COVERAGE FOR ABORTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified health plan’ does not include any health plan that includes coverage for abortions (other than any abortion or treatment described in section 307 or 308 of title 1, United States Code).

“(B) SEPARATE ABORTION COVERAGE OR PLAN ALLOWED.—

“(i) OPTION TO PURCHASE SEPARATE COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed as prohibiting any employer from purchasing for its employees separate coverage for abortions described in such subparagraph, or a health plan that includes such abortions, so long as no credit is allowed under this section with respect to the employer contributions for such coverage or plan.

“(ii) OPTION TO OFFER COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall restrict any non-Federal health insurance issuer offering a health plan from offering separate coverage for abortions described in such subparagraph, or a plan that includes such abortions, so long as such separate coverage or plan is not paid for with any employer contribution eligible for the credit allowed under this section.”.

(3) CONFORMING ACA AMENDMENTS.—Section 1303(b) of Public Law 111-148 (42 U.S.C. 18023(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (2);

(B) by striking paragraph (3), as amended by section 202(a); and

(C) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (2).

(b) APPLICATION TO MULTI-STATE PLANS.—Paragraph (6) of section 1334(a) of Public Law 111-148 (42 U.S.C. 18054(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(6) COVERAGE CONSISTENT WITH FEDERAL ABORTION POLICY.—In entering into contracts under this subsection, the Director shall ensure that no multi-State qualified health plan offered in an Exchange provides health benefits coverage for which the expenditure of Federal funds is prohibited under chapter 4 of title 1, United States Code.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 2015, but only with respect to plan years beginning after such date, and the amendment made by subsection (b) shall apply to plan years beginning after such date.

SEC. 202. REVISION OF NOTICE REQUIREMENTS REGARDING DISCLOSURE OF EXTENT OF HEALTH PLAN COVERAGE OF ABORTION AND ABORTION PREMIUM SURCHARGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 1303(b) of Public Law 111-148 (42 U.S.C. 18023(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) RULES RELATING TO NOTICE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The extent of coverage (if any) of services described in paragraph

(1)(B)(i) or (1)(B)(ii) by a qualified health plan shall be disclosed to enrollees at the time of enrollment in the plan and shall be prominently displayed in any marketing or advertising materials, comparison tools, or summary of benefits and coverage explanation made available with respect to such plan by the issuer of the plan, by an Exchange, or by the Secretary, including information made available through an Internet portal or Exchange under sections 1311(c)(5) and 1311(d)(4)(C).

“(B) SEPARATE DISCLOSURE OF ABORTION SURCHARGES.—In the case of a qualified health plan that includes the services described in paragraph (1)(B)(i) and where the premium for the plan is disclosed, including in any marketing or advertising materials or any other information referred to in subparagraph (A), the surcharge described in paragraph (2)(B)(i)(II) that is attributable to such services shall also be disclosed and identified separately.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to materials, tools, or other information made available more than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 7.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today in strong support of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act, legislation that passed the House almost 1 year ago with bipartisan support.

This bill affirms what a majority of Americans believe, that no taxpayer dollars should be spent on abortions and abortion coverage.

H.R. 7 establishes a permanent governmentwide prohibition on taxpayer subsidies for abortion. This bill is all the more necessary because of the President’s health care law and its attack on this longstanding protection of taxpayer dollars.

The bill before us would simply codify the Hyde amendment, a longstanding provision that has ensured Federal dollars do not subsidize abortion over the past decade.

H.R. 7 also requires that information regarding abortion coverage as well as the amount of the abortion surcharge be displayed where consumers can easily identify which plans cover abortion. Consumers should have the right to know whether the plan they are selecting on an exchange includes abortion coverage.

While the Affordable Care Act included some notification provisions,

many of our constituents are simply unable to find out whether a plan is paying for abortions. In fact, this inability to find out whether exchange plans provide abortion coverage seems to extend to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, as former Secretary Sebelius failed to uphold her commitment after testifying twice before the Energy and Commerce Committee, promising to provide the Congress and the American people a full list of exchange plans providing abortion coverage.

Today, over a year has passed and this commitment is still left unfulfilled. The self-appointed “most transparent administration” in history is simply unwilling or unable to comply with this request. In fact, it took the Government Accountability Office months to find out that taxpayer dollars went to pay for over 1,000 health insurance plans that included abortion.

Even though the Affordable Care Act required, through law, that separate payments be made to pay for the abortion surcharge, the GAO also found that none of the insurers they interviewed actually collected a separate payment.

In fact, the report reveals that the administration informed insurance issuers that they didn’t need two separate payments. This bill is about protecting taxpayer dollars and protecting life. It also ensures we have at least some transparency under the President’s health care law.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, I have good news for my friends on the other side of the aisle. There is no taxpayer funding for abortion. Let me say that again. There is no taxpayer funding for abortions. There hasn’t been for many decades because of the Hyde amendment.

Under the Affordable Care Act, that prohibition did not change. Now, some of us might disagree with the Hyde amendment, but that is the law of the land, and it was a carefully constructed compromise under the Affordable Care Act.

□ 1115

This bill would be a vast expansion of the restriction of a woman’s right to choose what type of insurance she can purchase with the consultation of her doctor and her husband because it would prevent women from purchasing insurance with their own money on the exchanges, and that would be a restriction on their rights. So I am going to urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this ill-conceived piece of legislation, and let’s talk about some things that really matter, like jobs, child care, and pay equity.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today as a supporter and co-sponsor of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. I was a co-sponsor of this legislation in the previous two Congresses, and I continue to support it after hearing from my constituents time and time again that they do not want their tax dollars funding abortions. In fact, the majority of Americans and the vast majority of Kansans oppose their tax dollars being used towards abortion.

The specter of taxpayer-funded abortion has been exacerbated by the President’s health care law, which offers subsidies to taxpayers in order to offset its high cost. These subsidized plans, bought through the health care exchanges, could allow for taxpayer-funded abortions to occur.

Without this crucial legislation, we will continue to have a patchwork of provisions regarding Federal funding. This creates confusion, blocks transparency, and opens up additional loopholes. Longstanding provisions are re-established under H.R. 7, which would apply uniformly across Federal programs, including the President’s destructive health care law.

I urge passage of this bipartisan bill.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CAPPs. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my statement inserted in the RECORD of the House of Representatives that we should be considering bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women’s access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD of the House of Representatives that we should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women’s access to all health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women’s access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women’s access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking my daughter’s access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. VEASEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women’s health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should be voting on proposals that create jobs and accelerate economic growth. Instead, the only thing the Republicans have accelerated around here is their attacks on a woman’s constitutional rights and health care.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair advises Members that although a unanimous consent request to insert remarks in debate may comprise a simple, declarative statement of the Member’s attitude toward the pending measure, embellishments beyond that standard constitute debate and can become an imposition on the time of the Member who has yielded for that purpose.

The Chair will entertain as many requests to insert as may be necessary to accommodate Members, but the Chair also must ask Members to cooperate by confining such remarks to the proper form.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House, instead of attacking women's access to health care, should be voting on bigger paychecks and better infrastructure for our country.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House, instead of attacking women's access to health care, we should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of constantly attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that instead of attacking women's access to health care, this House should vote for bigger paychecks for women and better infrastructure for all.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of constantly attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that this House should be voting for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of these relentless attacks on women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), the Democratic Caucus chairman, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that this House should start to concentrate finally on bigger paychecks for our people who are working and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to decent health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of yet another attack on women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the ranking member on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 7, the so-called No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Today, on the 42nd anniversary of Roe v. Wade, the majority is launching yet another attack on women's health and constitutionally protected right to choose whether to carry a pregnancy to term.

Most importantly, this bill will make it virtually impossible for a woman to obtain abortion services even when paid for with purely private, non-Federal funds. Through its novel tax penalty provisions, H.R. 7 departs radically from existing law, taking away women's existing health care and placing their health and lives at risk.

And despite the claims of its sponsors, H.R. 7 does not codify current law, and it is not about the regulation of Federal funds. There is no Federal funding of abortion due to the Hyde amendment, and the Affordable Care Act maintains that policy and law.

For more than 30 years, Congress has prohibited Federal funding of abortion except in cases of rape, incest, or to save the life of the mother, through provisions like the Hyde amendment in annual appropriations bills. Nothing in the Affordable Care Act changes this.

Finally, H.R. 7 also eradicates the authority of the District of Columbia to make decisions about how appropriated funds are used for the health care of the District's citizens.

So what is H.R. 7 really about? Plain and simple, it is an assault on women's health and freedom. It permanently blocks abortion coverage for low-income women, civil servants, D.C. residents, and the military. No committee has considered this legislation. Text was not even available until last night, when the Rules Committee met in a so-called emergency meeting. But the only emergency was the majority didn't have the votes to pass another mean-spirited, anti-choice bill so they are rushing to the floor with this bill in time for the anniversary of Roe v. Wade.

Isn't it time to stop playing politics with women's lives and start governing? Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to oppose this egregious bill.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today because I believe all human life is worth protecting. Each one is worth saving and deserves respect and protection.

For years now, pro-life Americans have been forced to watch as their tax dollars subsidize abortion procedures that they are morally opposed to. The No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion legislation prohibits taxpayer funding of elective abortions no matter where in

the Federal system these may occur. This principle is supported by a majority of Americans. In fact, 56 percent of Americans are opposed to taxpayer funding of abortions.

Later today, I will join half a million people who believe that life is a gift at the annual March for Life rally, the largest ongoing march in American history. We have a responsibility, as the elected body representing our constituents, to protect the most vulnerable among us and ensure that women facing unwanted pregnancies do not face judgment or condemnation but have positive support structures and access to health care to help them through their pregnancies. This bill is an important step in the right direction to protecting life.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I would just ask my colleagues on the other side to please give me an example where Federal taxpayer dollars have been used to pay for an abortion, except with the Hyde amendment exceptions.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), the ranking Democrat on the Constitution Subcommittee.

□ 1130

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I, too, am against this bill for I am for a woman's right to choice. This bill is the second bill that has been brought in the last few days to show the Republican side's intent to repeal Roe v. Wade. That is what they would like to do: repeal Roe v. Wade.

What is most important is to understand the theater that this bill has shown that the majority party has made this historic hallowed hall of Congress today.

Today is the March for Life, lots of pro-lifers here. They wanted to give them something, so they scheduled a bill—we could be legislating on jobs, on minimum wage, on infrastructure. They wanted to give them something, so they came with a bill called “fetal pain” to get around the viability requirements of the Supreme Court.

Their caucus found that bill too extreme to get the votes—even their caucus. Now, the leadership wouldn't listen to the Democrats of the Rules Committee, and it wouldn't listen to the Democrats on the floor, and they didn't have the good sense to realize it would make them look as they are: antiwoman and out-of-step with reality.

It took some women and maybe a few men—but mostly women—in their caucus to finally go “no,” so they brought up a retread of a bill. That was a retread too, but they brought up another one, a substitute bill, because they had to have something to give as a gift for the March for Life pro-life caucus.

This is theater. This is drama. That is what this has become. A woman's right should not be theater; it shouldn't be drama. A woman's right should be preserved. If any case, if

there is any question about them, it should go through regular process, go through committees.

Let the Members know about the bill with notice, not have, within 72 hours, a bill brought to this floor. Regular order has been destroyed because of theater and messaging, and that is what you are going to see for the next 2 years.

The American people will be very disappointed in this Congress because it has become the theater of the absurd.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, however stark Americans' difference of opinion can be on the matter of abortion generally, there has been long, bipartisan agreement that Federal taxpayer funds should not be used to destroy innocent life.

The Hyde amendment, named for its chief sponsor, former House Judiciary Committee chairman Henry Hyde, has prohibited the Federal funding of abortions since 1976 when it passed a House and Senate that were composed overwhelmingly of Democrat Members.

It has been renewed each appropriations cycle with few changes for over 37 years, supported by Congresses, supported by both parties and Presidents from both parties. It is probably the most bipartisan pro-life proposal sustained over a longer period of time than any other. It is time the Hyde amendment was codified in the United States Code.

H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, sponsored by Representative CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey, would do just that. It would codify the two core principles of the Hyde amendment throughout the operations of the Federal Government: namely, a ban on Federal funding for abortions and a ban on the use of Federal funds for health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion.

As hundreds of thousands of people from across the country come to Washington to express their love of unborn children at the annual March for Life, it is a marvelous time to reflect on what could be accomplished if the bill we consider today were enacted into law.

During the time the Hyde amendment has been in place, probably millions and millions of innocent children and their mothers have been spared the horrors of abortion. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the Hyde amendment has led to as many as 675,000 fewer abortions each year. Let that sink in for a few precious moments.

The policy we will be discussing today has likely given America the gift of millions more children and, consequently, millions more mothers, millions more fathers, millions more lifetimes, and trillions more loving gestures and other human gifts in all their

diverse forms—what a stunningly wondrous legacy and the bill before us today would continue that legacy permanently.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this vitally important legislation.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the distinguished ranking member of Energy and Commerce.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, today is a sad day for this institution. Late last night, when Republicans failed to garner the votes for one extreme antiwomen bill, they flipped a switch and turned to another antiwomen bill.

This attempt to restrict women's access to abortion care is an unprecedented, radical assault on women's health care. Tens of thousands of women and their families will be harmed by this policy.

The bill's sponsors claim that this bill simply codifies the Hyde amendment, and that is inaccurate. This bill takes unprecedented steps far beyond the Hyde amendment.

This bill places restrictions on how women with private insurance can spend private dollars in purchasing health insurance, but the bill doesn't stop there. It also prohibits Washington, D.C., from using its own Medicaid funds to make health care coverage decisions.

The goal behind this bill is to effectively get rid of all comprehensive health care coverage in this country. Anti-choice Republicans want to turn back the clock on women's rights.

It is critical that we protect the right of every woman to make her own personal and private health care decisions. Women, in consultation with their doctors, should remain in control of these choices and not Congress.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote “no” on H.R. 7.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the pro-life leader in the House of Representatives for many years.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman PITTS so very much.

Madam Speaker, on September 9, 2009, President Obama stood 6 feet from where I stand now, right at that podium, and told lawmakers and the American public in a specially called joint session of Congress on health care reform that “under our plan, no Federal dollars will be used to fund abortion.”

In an eleventh hour ploy to garner a remnant of pro-life congressional Democrats—and they were convinced, and they were deceived—needed for passage of ObamaCare legislation, the President issued an executive order on March 24, 2010, and it said, in pertinent part: “The act maintains current Hyde amendment restrictions governing abortion policy and extends those restrictions to newly-created health insurance exchanges.” That is absolutely, I say to my friends, untrue.

Despite an appalling degree of non-transparency, we finally asked the Government Accountability Office to look into it. Last September, they came back and said 1,036 ObamaCare exchange plans covered abortion on demand. GAO also found that a separate billing of the abortion surcharge required by the act is not being enforced by the administration, and the abortion funding premium, again, in 2015 is being illegally rolled into the total plan costs.

Health care consumers are, therefore, unaware when they buy their health insurance whether or not they are paying for abortion on demand. If the Hyde amendment had been applied to ObamaCare, the number of ObamaCare plans covering abortion on demand would be zero.

At its core—I believe my colleagues should know this by now, some don't on this side of the aisle and some on that do—the Hyde amendment has two indisputable parts. It prohibits direct funding for abortion and funding for any insurance plan that includes abortion, except in the cases of rape, incest, or to save the life of the mother.

ObamaCare violates the Hyde amendment by funding insurance plans that pay for abortion on demand. H.R. 7 seeks to accomplish three goals: make the Hyde amendment and other current abortion funding prohibitions current—and that includes the D.C. rider permanent; ensure that the Affordable Care Act faithfully conforms with the Hyde amendment, as promised by the President of the United States; and provide full disclosure, transparency, and prominent display of the extent to which any health insurance plan funds abortion on the exchanges.

Last January, the House passed H.R. 7 by a vote of 227–188. It languished in the Senate for a year—never took it up. This is the same bill. It has been through regular order. Hearings have been held, as well as markup.

The American people, Madam Speaker, strongly oppose taxpayer funding for abortion. The Marist poll that was just released yesterday found that 68 percent of all respondents oppose using taxpayer funding for abortion, and a whopping 69 percent of women are against taxpayer funding for abortion, and 71 percent of the millennials are against taxpayer funding for abortion.

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend.

We live in an age of ultrasound imaging, the ultimate window to the womb and the child, that precious child, who resides there. We are in the midst of a fetal health care revolution, an explosion of benign interventions designed to diagnose, treat, and cure the precious lives of these children.

Abortion is antithetical to that. It dismembers, chemically poisons, shots to the heart, to stop the heart from

beating. As you know—and I know my friend from New York is next to speak—at testimony before your committee, Dr. Levantino said—and he is an abortionist—he said the baby can be in any position in the uterus.

You just reach in with a Sopher clamp and grasp whatever you can. You pull out an arm, he went on to say. You pull out and reach in again and again, and you tear out the spine, intestine, heart, and lungs.

These are gruesome procedures. That is what abortion is all about: the dismemberment and chemical poisoning of children.

H.R. 7 will save lives. There is no doubt about that. The Hyde amendment—I remember when Henry Hyde was told that 1 million, maybe even more than 1 million children have survived because of the Hyde amendment.

Tears came down his face, knowing that those kids are now in the world, going to school, having their own families, playing soccer, and doing other great things.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that they should direct their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the distinguished senior member of the Judiciary Committee.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 7, the so-called No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

The name of the bill is a lie. There is now no taxpayer funding for abortions. I wish there were. The right of a woman to decide whether to become pregnant, to decide to continue her pregnancy, or even to make the difficult decision to terminate her pregnancy is protected by the Constitution.

The Supreme Court has determined that neither Congress nor a State may place an undue burden on that right. Denial of Medicaid or other government funding that would be available for other medical procedures should be considered an undue burden, but that is not the law, unfortunately. Taxpayer funding of abortion is prohibited by the Hyde amendment.

This bill goes far beyond that. This bill for the first time ever denies tax deductions and credits for women who use their own money to pay for abortions or to purchase insurance that covers abortions. In so doing, the Republican majority increases taxes for women and families.

This bill for the first time denies the itemized medical tax deduction that is otherwise available for medical expenses if the medical expense is for an abortion.

This bill for the first time treats as taxable income any distribution from a flexible spending account or health savings account that is used to pay for abortion expenses.

This bill for the first time denies small employers the ability to use tax

credits to help them to provide health coverage for their employees if that coverage includes abortion.

This bill also denies income-eligible women the use of premium tax credits available under the Affordable Care Act if the insurance coverage they select includes abortion coverage.

In first opposing and then voting to repeal the Affordable Care Act 50 times, my Republican colleagues have complained that government should not meddle in the private insurance market or in private health care choices, but this legislation obviously is designed to do just that.

It seems that many Republicans believe in freedom, provided no one uses that freedom in the way they do not approve. That is a strange understanding of freedom.

Even more stunning, this bill increases taxes on families, businesses, and the self-employed if they spend their own money—let me repeat that—their own money on abortion coverage or services, and this tax increase is being championed by Republicans, all of whom have taken a pledge not to raise taxes on individuals or businesses.

The intent of the bill is clear. It is to end insurance coverage for abortions for all women, whether or not they obtain their insurance on an exchange, and even if they use their own money to purchase the insurance.

□ 1145

My colleagues in the majority believe that, if you like your insurance coverage, you should get to keep it unless it is for choices that they don't like. Then they have no qualms about taking your insurance coverage away. That is the intended and likely result of this bill.

Currently, the vast majority of insurance policies cover abortion services, but insurance companies will likely respond to the tax penalties this bill imposes by dropping the coverage of abortions from all of their plans. This will have a significant effect on all women, not just on lower income women, who have long felt the brunt of Federal restrictions on their health care choices.

H.R. 7 is a radical departure from the current tax treatment of medical expenses and insurance coverage, and it is neither justifiable nor necessary to prevent the Federal funding of abortion. It is a frontal assault on the liberty and dignity of all American women. It should be roundly rejected.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, the Hyde language does not apply to ObamaCare. There is not one sentence in this 2,700-page bill. Read the bill. It applies to Medicaid and to annually appropriated programs.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTS. I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, one of the things that people seem to forget here is that ObamaCare

both authorizes and appropriates the money so that it is outside the purview of the HHS appropriations bill. That is why this legislation is needed. The President promised he would apply the Hyde amendment, but he has not.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), another champion of life.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I rise in support of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act.

Madam Speaker, we know from science that everyone's life begins at conception. The right to life is God-given and is described in our Declaration of Independence as "unalienable," which means something that cannot be taken away. I defend, Madam Speaker, the right to life of everyone in this country and of everyone in this Chamber, even of those opposed to this legislation.

This bill helps promote a culture of life. It reflects the overwhelming opinion held by Americans that taxpayer dollars should not be used to pay for abortion. It also holds President Obama accountable for another one of his broken promises, when he assured us that his health care law would not allow taxpayer funds to be used for abortion.

We know, Madam Speaker, from a September 15, 2014, GAO report on health insurance exchanges that tax dollars are paying for more than 1,000 ObamaCare plans that cover elective abortions. This bill stops that. I insert the GAO report into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the U.S. Government Accountability Office, Sept. 15, 2014]

CONGRESSIONAL REQUESTERS—HEALTH INSURANCE EXCHANGES: COVERAGE OF NON-EXCEPTED ABORTION SERVICES BY QUALIFIED HEALTH PLANS

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA) requires the establishment in all states of health insurance exchanges—marketplaces where eligible individuals may compare and select among insurance plans offered by participating private issuers of health coverage. PPACA requires the insurance plans offered under an exchange, known as qualified health plans (QHP), to provide a package of essential health benefits—including coverage for specific service categories, such as ambulatory care, prescription drugs, and hospitalization. In addition to these categories states may require or restrict coverage of other benefits by QHPs. Consistent with federal and state law, QHPs may cover other benefits, such as abortion services.

PPACA prohibits the use of federal funds made available to offset the cost of QHP coverage—that is, income-based tax credits and subsidies—to pay for "non-accepted abortion services," which, based on the law applicable to the 2014 benefit year, are abortion services performed except where the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest, or the life of the pregnant woman would be endangered unless an abortion is performed. While QHPs may cover non-accepted abortion services, PPACA places requirements on the provision of such coverage. These include the requirement to estimate the cost of coverage of such services, at an amount of no less than

\$1 per enrollee, per month, and to collect from each enrollee an amount equal to the actuarial value of the coverage—segregated from any other premium amounts collected by the QHP—to be used to pay for the costs associated with providing non-accepted abortion services. In addition, PPACA directed the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) to contract with issuers to offer at least two multi-state QHPs in each state, at least one of which does not cover non-accepted abortion services.

There are 23 states with laws restricting the circumstances under which QHPs may provide non-accepted abortion services as a covered benefit in 2014, and 28 states with no such laws. Among the 23 states with restrictions, 17 have laws that do not permit the coverage of non-accepted abortion services by QHPs, and 6 states permit the coverage of non-accepted abortion services only in limited circumstances, such as to prevent substantial and irreversible impairment of a pregnant woman's major bodily function.

You asked that we provide a list of QHPs that do and that do not cover abortion services and for additional information on issues related to that coverage. This report describes whether non-accepted abortion services are covered by QHPs within the 28 states with no laws restricting such coverage for the 2014 benefit year, and provides additional information—such as the scope and the cost of non-accepted abortion services coverage—for selected QHPs that cover such services.

To obtain the information we present here, we contacted every state to determine whether states had laws restricting the circumstances under which abortion services may be provided as a covered benefit by QHPs in 2014. Based on our review of those laws and relevant federal laws and regulations, we determined that 23 states have laws restricting the circumstances under which non-accepted abortion services may be provided as a covered benefit by QHPs for the 2014 benefit year. In order to report on whether non-accepted abortion services are covered by QHPs within the 28 states with no laws restricting such coverage in 2014, we obtained data on QHPs' coverage of non-accepted abortion services from the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS), within the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), the agency responsible for overseeing the establishment of health insurance exchanges; private issuers of QHPs; state departments of insurance and state exchange organizations; and from officials at OPM. While these data sources have different characteristics and limitations, we have determined that, when taken together, they are reliable for the purpose of identifying which QHPs do and which do not provide non-accepted abortion services coverage in 2014 within the 28 states with no laws restricting such coverage. To provide additional information regarding non-accepted abortion services for selected QHPs that cover such services, we interviewed and collected documentation from a non-probability sample of 18 issuers about the QHPs they offer in 10 states. Our criteria for selecting these issuers included states with no laws restricting non-accepted abortion services coverage organized by CMS region, state uninsured population, and number of issuers covering non-accepted abortion services. These 18 issuers accounted for nearly one-quarter of QHPs that covered non-accepted abortion services and were offered within the 28 states.

We conducted our work from February 2014 to September 2014 in accordance with all sections of GAO's Quality Assurance Framework that are relevant to our objectives. The framework requires that we plan and perform the engagement to obtain sufficient

and appropriate evidence to meet our stated objectives and to discuss any limitations in our work. We believe that the information and data obtained, and the analysis conducted, provide a reasonable basis for any findings and conclusions in this product.

RESULTS

1. Which QHPs participating in health insurance exchanges provide non-accepted abortion services as a covered benefit, and which do not?

Within the 28 states with no laws restricting the circumstances under which QHPs may provide non-accepted abortion services as a covered benefit in 2014:

—in 5 states (Connecticut, Hawaii, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Vermont), all QHPs cover non-accepted abortion services;

—in 15 states (Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, the District of Columbia, Georgia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Montana, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Texas, and Washington), some QHPs cover non-accepted abortion services; and

—in 8 states (Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, West Virginia, and Wyoming), no QHPs cover non-accepted abortion services.

Nationally, 1,036 QHPs in these 28 states cover non-accepted abortion services and 1,062 QHPs do not.

2. For selected QHPs, what is the scope of the non-accepted abortion services benefits that are provided?

Of the 18 issuers offering QHPs that cover non-accepted abortion services from which we obtained information, all but three issuers indicated that the benefit is not subject to any restrictions, limitations, or exclusions. One issuer told us that it only covers services for a "therapeutic abortion," which a health care provider determines to be medically necessary. Two issuers that offered QHPs in New York indicated that, consistent with requirements set by the state-based exchange, they impose a limit of one non-accepted abortion treatment per year. However, one of these two issuers indicated they also offer QHPs that were not subject to this restriction. All 18 issuers also indicated that their abortion services benefit is subject to the same requirements as other benefits, such as enrollee out-of-pocket costs—including deductibles, copayments, and coinsurance—and prior authorization, all of which can vary depending on the location where the service is provided. For example, issuers indicated that if this service is provided in an outpatient setting—which one issuer noted is the typical location—enrollees are not required to request prior authorization, similar to any other service performed in an outpatient setting. Additionally, if performed in an inpatient setting, the service would require prior authorization, similar to any other service performed in such a setting. Issuers indicated that this benefit is described in member materials where other covered benefits are listed.

3. For selected QHPs, how do issuers estimate the cost of non-accepted abortion services coverage, what is this cost, and how are enrollees billed for this coverage?

To estimate the cost of covering non-accepted abortion services, issuers we contacted indicated that they generally reviewed historical costs for these procedures, similar to the approach used to estimate the actuarial value of the premium attributable to the cost of other covered benefits. All but one of the issuers from which we obtained information estimated the cost of the coverage of non-accepted abortion services to be less than \$1 per enrollee, per month. For example, officials from one issuer told us that their actuaries estimated that the cost for non-accepted abortion services ranged between 10 cents and 20 cents per enrollee, per

month, calculated across multiple states, while officials with another issuer said that the cost for these services ranged from 10 cents to 70 cents per enrollee, per month. All but two of the issuers that estimated the cost to be less than \$1 indicated they rounded the amount up to comply with PPACA's requirement that the cost of such coverage be estimated at no less than \$1 per enrollee, per month. The other two issuers noted that they did not round up the amount to the statutory minimum of \$1 and, therefore, were not using this statutory minimum as a basis for determining premium amounts to collect from enrollees for non-excepted abortion services. The highest cost estimated by the issuers we interviewed was \$1.10 per enrollee, per month. For several of the issuers we contacted, the premium amount associated with non-excepted abortion services coverage was reported to also be \$1; however, for other issuers the premium amount varied from the cost issuers estimated for this coverage. For example, the issuer that estimated the cost of coverage of non-excepted abortion services at \$1.10 per enrollee, per month, indicated that when adjusted to a paid cost based upon plan design and administrative expenses, the premium amount collected from enrollees ranged from 51 cents to \$1.46, depending on the specific QHP.

Fifteen issuers and the Washington Health Benefit Exchange—which bills enrollees on behalf of issuers offering QHPs in the state-based exchange, including for 2 of the 18 issuers from which we obtained information—did not itemize the premium amount associated with non-excepted abortion services coverage on enrollees' bills nor indicate that they send a separate bill for that premium amount. Officials from the remaining issuer from which we obtained information told us that their bills indicate that there is a \$1 charge "for coverage of services for which member subsidies may not be used."

4. For selected QHPs, how are consumers shopping for QHPs able to determine whether non-excepted abortion services are covered?

PPACA does not establish any requirements on whether or how information about non-excepted abortion services should be made available to consumers before they enroll in QHPs, though six of the issuers we contacted indicated that they made available such information about coverage for abortion services—which they stated includes both excepted and non-excepted abortion services—to consumers shopping for QHPs. These issuers indicated that there are various ways consumers may determine if their QHPs provide coverage for abortion services before they enroll. For example, issuers said that QHP materials—such as their summary of benefits and coverage or member policies, such as the Evidence of Coverage document—indicate that abortion services are covered, and these materials are available to consumers shopping for QHPs through the issuer's website or through the exchange's website. Specifically, officials with one issuer informed us that their Evidence of Coverage document, which provides details about the features of their QHPs, was available through the state-based exchange and the benefit—"voluntary termination of pregnancy"—is identified in that document under "Family Planning Services." Eleven issuers indicated that consumers shopping for QHPs do not have access to such information; some of these issuers indicated that consumers would need to call the issuer directly before enrolling to determine whether a QHP provides coverage for abortion services.

PPACA requires that QHP issuers providing non-excepted abortion services coverage notify enrollees at the time of enroll-

ment that those services are covered. While most issuers from which we collected information indicated they were notifying enrollees that abortion services were provided as a covered benefit, four issuers indicated they were not disclosing this information to enrollees. Officials with two of these four issuers told us they had only recently become aware of this requirement, and were in the process of updating their enrollee materials to come into compliance with the notification requirement. Officials with the other two issuers, both of which offered QHPs in the same state, told us that they are not providing enrollees with notification of the coverage of non-excepted abortion services at the time of enrollment. These officials said that they use model plan materials developed by the state that do not specifically indicate that non-excepted abortion services are a covered benefit, and that such information would only be provided upon enrollee request.

Mr. ROTHFUS. As hundreds of thousands march today on the anniversary of the Roe v. Wade decision, I urge my colleagues to join me in committing to defend the sanctity of life and vote "yes" on this bill.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the distinguished senior member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlewoman for her courage.

Madam Speaker, I stand here today, refusing to surrender on behalf of millions of women of all economic backgrounds, races, ethnicities, and religions who rely upon the Supreme Court of the United States, which, under the Ninth Amendment, has indicated that Roe v. Wade—the right to choose—is a viable and important law of the land. How can we undermine the Constitution in its premise and its articulation?

Today, very quickly, let me say that I know there are millions who are here to disagree with me. I respect that disagreement, but I am saddened that we would take advantage of this day to misrepresent the law and pass a law that will do damage to millions of Americans.

This is the face of Republican women, who, in essence, decided that H.R. 36 was too extreme. Even Republican men said that they could not vote on a bill that caused or asked women to report a rape before they would be able to benefit from an abortion. How sad, in the trauma of rape, that you must require someone to go to the police department before she could get assistance. That bill was pulled. That extreme bill was pulled.

In order not to leave us without dramatics, we come again to do what is hurting millions of women in Texas—where they cannot even get health services because of the laws passed in Texas, which completely shut down good health care clinics that deal in abortion and other women's services for health care—with this dastardly law about requiring those clinics to be within a certain mileage of hospitals, with their never having any problem before.

Now we come with another masquerade in H.R. 7, which prohibits Federal funds from being used for any health benefits coverage which includes the coverage of abortion, making permanent already existing Federal policies, prohibiting the inclusion of abortion in any health care service furnished by Federal or the District of Columbia health care—again, interfering with the women in the District of Columbia—and prohibiting individuals from receiving refundable Federal tax credits—individuals interfering with private health insurance.

Madam Speaker, this is a bad bill, and I ask my colleagues to vote against it. It undermines the Constitution and the Ninth Amendment.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise again in strong opposition to the rule for H.R. 7, the so-called "No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act," and the underlying bill.

I oppose this bill because it is unnecessary, puts the lives of women at risk, interferes with women's constitutionally guaranteed right of privacy, and diverts our attention from the real problems facing the American people.

A more accurate short title for this bill would be the "Violating the Rights of Women Act of 2015!"

Instead of resuming their annual War on Women, our colleagues across the aisle should be working with Democrats to build upon the "Middle-Class Economics" championed by the Obama Administration that have succeeded in ending the economic meltdown it inherited in 2009 and revived the economy to the point where today we have the highest rate of growth and lowest rate of unemployment since the boom years of the Clinton Administration.

We could and should instead be voting to raise the minimum wage to \$10.10 per hour so that people who work hard and play by the rules do not have raise their families in poverty.

A far better use of our time would be to provide help to unemployed job-hunters by making access to community college affordable to every person looking to make a new start in life.

Instead of voting to abridge the constitutional rights of women for the umpteenth time, we should bring to the floor for a first vote comprehensive immigration reform legislation or legislations repairing the harm to the Voting Rights Act of 1965 by the Supreme Court's decision in Shelby County v. Holder.

Madam Speaker, the one thing we should not be doing is debating irresponsible "messaging bills" that abridge the rights of women and have absolutely no chance of overriding a presidential veto.

The version of H.R. 7 before us now is as bad today as it was when the House Republican leadership insisted on bringing it to a vote a year ago.

The other draconian provisions of that terrible bill are retained in H.R. 7, which would:

1. Prohibit federal funds from being used for any health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion. (Thus making permanent existing federal policies.)

2. Prohibit the inclusion of abortion in any health care service furnished by a federal or District of Columbia health care facility or by any physician or other individual employed by the federal government or the District.

3. Apply such prohibitions to District of Columbia funds.

4. Prohibit individuals from receiving a refundable federal tax credit, or any cost-sharing reductions, for purchasing a qualified health plan that includes coverage for abortions.

5. Prohibit small employers from receiving the small-employer health insurance credit provided by the health care law if the health plans or benefits that are purchased provide abortion coverage.

If H.R. 7 were enacted, millions of families and small businesses with private health insurance plans that offer abortion coverage would be faced with tax increases, making the cost of health care insurance even more expensive.

Under the Affordable Care Act, insurers are able to offer abortion coverage and receive federal offsets for premiums as long as enrollees pay for the abortion coverage from separate, private funds.

If enacted, H.R. 7 would deny federal subsidies or credits to private health insurance plans that offer abortion coverage even if that coverage is paid for from private funds.

This would inevitably lead to private health insurance companies dropping abortion coverage leaving millions of women without access to affordable, comprehensive health care.

Currently, 87% of private insurance health care plans offered through employers cover abortion.

If H.R. 7 were to become law, consumer options for private health insurance plans would be unnecessarily restricted and the tax burden on these policy holders would increase significantly.

H.R. 7 would also deny tax credits to small businesses that offer their employees insurance plans that cover abortion, which would have a significant impact on millions of families across the nation who would no longer be able to take advantage of existing tax credits and deductions for the cost of their health care.

For example, small businesses that offer health plans that cover abortions would no longer be eligible for the Small Business Health Tax Credit—potentially worth 35%–50% of the cost of their premiums—threatening 4 million small businesses.

Self-employed Americans who are able to deduct the cost of their comprehensive health insurance from their taxable income will also be denied similar tax credits and face higher taxes.

H.R. 7 would also undermine the District of Columbia's home rule by restricting its use of funds for abortion care to low-income women.

The Hyde Amendment stipulates that no taxpayer dollars are to be used for abortion care, and has narrow exceptions for rape, incest, and health complications that arise from pregnancy which put the mother's life in danger.

H.R. 7 would restrict women's access to reproductive health care even further by narrowing the already stringent requirements set forth in the Hyde Amendment.

When the Affordable Care Act was signed into law, the President issued an Executive Order to "ensure that Federal funds are not used for abortion services."

This version of H.R. 7 goes far beyond the safeguards established under the Affordable Care Act, and sets a dangerous precedent for the future of women's reproductive health in

this country because it includes two new provisions that were added at the nth hour but have never received a hearing or a mark-up.

These new provisions would (1) ban abortion coverage in multi-state health plans available under the ACA; and (2) mandate that health plans mislead consumers about abortion coverage by requiring all plans in the health-insurance exchanges that include abortion coverage to display that fact prominently in all advertising, marketing materials, or information from the insurer but interestingly, does not require the same disclosure from plans that do not cover abortion.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 7 would also force health plans to mislead consumers about the law's treatment of abortion.

As a concession to anti-choice lawmakers, the ACA requires insurance plans participating in the new health system to segregate monies used for abortion services from all other funds.

In order to aid in identifying these funds and simplify the process of segregating general premium dollars from those used to cover abortion services, the ACA requires that health plans estimate the cost of abortion coverage at no less than \$1 per enrollee per month.

H.R. 7 would require plans covering abortion to misrepresent this practice as an "abortion surcharge," which is to be disclosed and identified as a portion of the consumer's premium.

By describing abortion coverage in this way, H.R. 7 makes it look as though it is an added, extra cost, available only at an additional fee, when in fact it is not.

Taken together, the provisions in H.R. 7 have the effect, and possibly the intent, of arbitrarily infringing women's reproductive freedoms and pose a nationwide threat to the health and wellbeing of American women and a direct challenge to the Supreme Court's ruling in *Roe v. Wade*.

Madam Speaker, one of the most detestable aspects of this bill is that it would curb access to care for women in the most desperate of circumstances.

Women like Danielle Deaver, who was 22 weeks pregnant when her water broke. Tests showed that Danielle had suffered anhydramnios, a premature rupture of the membranes before the fetus has achieved viability.

This condition meant that the fetus likely would be born with a shortening of muscle tissue that results in the inability to move limbs. In addition, Danielle's fetus likely would suffer deformities to the face and head, and the lungs were unlikely to develop beyond the 22-week point.

There was less than a 10% chance that, if born, Danielle's baby would be able to breathe on its own and only a 2% chance the baby would be able to eat on its own.

H.R. 7 hurts women like Vikki Stella, a diabetic, who discovered months into her pregnancy that the fetus she was carrying suffered from several major anomalies and had no chance of survival. Because of Vildri's diabetes, her doctor determined that induced labor and Caesarian section were both riskier procedures for Vidd than an abortion.

Every pregnancy is different. No politician knows, or has the right to assume he knows, what is best for a woman and her family.

These are decisions that properly must be left to women to make, in consultation with their partners, doctors, and their God.

H.R. 7 lacks the necessary exceptions to protect the health and life of the mother.

H.R. 7 is an unconstitutional infringement on the right to privacy, as interpreted by the Supreme Court in a long line of cases going back to *Griswold v. Connecticut* in 1965 and *Roe v. Wade* decided in 1973.

In *Roe v. Wade*, the Court held that a state could not prohibit a woman from exercising her right to terminate a pregnancy in order to protect her health prior to viability.

While many factors go into determining fetal viability, the consensus of the medical community is that viability is acknowledged as not occurring prior to 24 weeks gestation.

Supreme Court precedents make it clear that neither Congress nor a state legislature can declare any one element—"be it weeks of gestation or fetal weight or any other single factor—as the determinant" of viability. *Colautti v. Franklin*, 439 U.S. 379, 388–89 (1979).

The constitutionally protected right to privacy encompasses the right of women to choose to terminate a pregnancy before viability, and even later where continuing to term poses a threat to her health and safety.

This right of privacy was hard won and must be preserved inviolate.

The bill before us threatens this hard won right for women and must be defeated.

I urge all members to join me in opposing the rule and the underlying bill. H.R. 7 should be pulled off of this floor!

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 36, the "Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act." In the last Congress, I opposed this irresponsible and reckless legislation.

I opposed the bill, which arbitrarily bans a woman from exercising her constitutionally protect right to choose to terminate a pregnancy after 20 weeks, last year for the same reasons I do now. This purely partisan and divisive legislation:

1. Unduly burdens a woman's right to terminate a pregnancy and thus puts their lives at risk;
2. Does not contain exceptions for the health of the mother;
3. As introduced and considered in the Judiciary Committee, unfairly targeted the District of Columbia; and
4. Infringes upon women's right to privacy, which is guaranteed and protected by the U.S. Constitution.

Madam Speaker, in 2010, Nebraska passed a law banning abortion care after 20 weeks. Since then 10 more red states—Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, North Dakota, and Oklahoma—have enacted similar bans. None of these laws has an adequate health exception. Only one provides an exception for cases of rape or incest.

H.R. 36 seeks to take the misguided and mean-spirited policy of these states and make it the law of the land. In so doing, the bill poses a nationwide threat to the health and wellbeing of American women and a direct challenge to the Supreme Court's ruling in *Roe v. Wade*.

Madam Speaker, one of the most detestable aspects of this bill is that it would curb access to care for women in the most desperate of circumstances. It is these women who receive the 1.5 percent of abortions that occur after 20 weeks.

Women like Danielle Deaver, who was 22 weeks pregnant when her water broke. Tests showed that Danielle had suffered anhydramnios, a premature rupture of the membranes before the fetus has achieved viability. This condition meant that the fetus likely would be born with a shortening of muscle tissue that results in the inability to move limbs.

In addition, Danielle's fetus likely would suffer deformities to the face and head, and the lungs were unlikely to develop beyond the 22-week point. There was less than a 10% chance that, if born, Danielle's baby would be able to breathe on its own and only a 2% chance the baby would be able to eat on its own. Danielle and her husband decided to terminate the pregnancy but could not because of the Nebraska ban. Danielle had no recourse but to endure the pain and suffering that followed. Eight days later, Danielle gave birth to a daughter, Elizabeth, who died 15 minutes later.

H.R. 36 hurts women like Vikki Stella, a diabetic, who discovered months into her pregnancy that the fetus she was carrying suffered from several major anomalies and had no chance of survival. Because of Vikki's diabetes, her doctor determined that induced labor and Caesarian section were both riskier procedures for Vikki than an abortion. Because Vikki was able to terminate the pregnancy, she was protected from the immediate and serious medical risks to her health and her ability to have children in the future was preserved.

Madam Speaker, every pregnancy is different. No politician knows, or has the right to assume he knows, what is best for a woman and her family. These are decisions that properly must be left to women to make, in consultation with their partners, doctors, and their God.

That is why the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the nation's leading medical experts on women's health, strongly opposes 20-week bans, citing the threat these laws pose to women's health.

Madam Speaker, I also strongly oppose H.R. 36 because it lacks the necessary exceptions to protect the health and life of the mother. In fact, the majority Republicans rejected an amendment offered by our colleague, Congressman NADLER, which would have added a "health of the mother" exception to the bill.

Madam Speaker, this may come as news to some in this body, but each year approximately 25,000 women in the United States become pregnant as a result of rape. And about a third (30%) of these rapes involved women under age 18!

Madam Speaker, last and most important, I oppose H.R. 36 because it is an unconstitutional infringement on the right to privacy, as interpreted by the Supreme Court in a long line of cases going back to *Griswold v. Connecticut* in 1965 and *Roe v. Wade* decided in 1973. In *Roe v. Wade*, the Court held that a state could prohibit a woman from exercising her right to terminate a pregnancy in order to protect her health prior to viability. While many factors go into determining fetal viability, the consensus of the medical community is that viability is acknowledged as not occurring prior to 24 weeks gestation.

Late Wednesday night because of how absurd H.R. 36 was—it was pulled from the floor.

By prohibiting nearly all abortions beginning at "the probable post-fertilization age" of 20 weeks, H.R. 36 violates this clear and long standing constitutional rule.

In striking down Texas's pre-viability abortion prohibitions, the Supreme Court stated in *Roe v. Wade*:

With respect to the State's important and legitimate interest in potential life, the 'compelling' point is at viability. This is so because the fetus then presumably has the capability of meaningful life outside the mother's womb. State regulation protective of fetal life after viability thus has both logical and biological justification. If the State is interested in protecting fetal life after viability, it may go as far as to proscribe abortion during that period, except when it is necessary to preserve the life or health of the mother.

Supreme Court precedents make it clear that neither Congress nor a state legislature can declare any one element—"be it weeks of gestation or fetal weight or any other single factor—as the determinant" of viability. *Colautti v. Franklin*, 439 U.S. 379, 388–89 (1979). NOT can the government restrict a woman's autonomy by arbitrarily setting the number of weeks gestation so low as to effectively prohibit access to abortion services as is the case with the bill before us.

If this bill ever were to become law, it would not survive a constitutional challenge even to its facial validity. A similar 20-week provision enacted by the Utah legislature was struck down years ago as unconstitutional by the United States Court of Appeals for the 10th Circuit because it "unduly burden[ed] a woman's right to choose to abort a nonviable fetus." *Jane L. v. Bangerter*, 102 F.3d 1112, 1118 (10th Cir. 1996). And just last month, the Ninth Circuit struck down a 20 week ban on the ground that the U.S. Supreme Court has been "unalterably clear" that "a woman has a constitutional right to choose to terminate her pregnancy before the fetus is viable." *Isaacson v. Horne*, F.3d, No. 12–16670, 2013 WL 2160171, at *1 (9th Cir. May 21, 2013).

Madam Speaker, the constitutionally protected right to privacy encompasses the right of women to choose to terminate a pregnancy before viability, and even later where continuing to term poses a threat to her health and safety.

This right of privacy was hard won and must be preserved inviolate.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, STEVE CHABOT, another pro-life champion and the principal sponsor of the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, a little while ago, a number of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle came down and made, I believe, the ludicrous allegation that this bill is somehow an attack on women's health care, and, therefore, we ought to be spending

time on the infrastructure and on a whole range of issues.

If you want to talk about an attack on women's health care, it is called "ObamaCare." It is an attack on the health care of women and men and children in this country—deductibles up, premiums up, the quality of health care down. Most of the folks who came down to the mike—I can't say all of them. I think probably all of them if they were here—voted for ObamaCare, and the American people are having to live with the results of that. Now, that is an attack on the health care of American women.

This legislation simply says that there ought not to be taxpayer dollars going to pay for abortions in this country, that one person shouldn't have to pay for the abortion of another person whether it is on moral grounds, conscience, or one's religion. You shouldn't make one person pay for another person's abortion. It is pretty simple, and the American people overwhelmingly agree with that point of view. That is what this legislation is about. It is in ObamaCare as well. It is the same thing. Through insurance or otherwise, you shouldn't force one person to pay for another person's abortion because one is opposed to it.

Today happens to be a day that is important to me. It is the day I was born. It is my birthday. It also happens to be the date that, I would say, the infamous decision of *Roe v. Wade* came down. My birthday was in 1953, and this was in 1973 that *Roe* came down. On this day, I can't help but think of those millions and millions and millions of Americans who do not exist today because of that decision.

This, obviously, is related to that, but it is mostly about the choice that a person has to make; and if she makes that choice, should somebody else have to pay for it? The law says "no." I agree with the law. Support this bill.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, once again, women's rights are being attacked on the floor of the House. A decision about health that should be made by a woman and her doctor is, instead, being made by politicians with an agenda. Despite their claims of acting for the sake of women's health, this draconian bill would deny women access to medical care and drive out abortion coverage from private health plans once and for all.

What would be the effect?

Women would be denied access to abortion, especially low-income and minority women who are buying health insurance through the marketplace. For some, they will be sent back to the

days before *Roe v. Wade*, when women who were desperate for help were driven to unlicensed doctors and unsanitary conditions, often suffering infections, hemorrhages, and, at times, death.

We should not be in the business of endangering women's health and safety. This is why, yesterday, I introduced the Women's Health Protection Act. It would prevent States from restricting access to abortion if they cannot demonstrate an actual benefit to women's health. Personal medical decisions belong solely to the people they impact and to the medical professionals they trust. We must oppose this bill.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee, DIANE BLACK, another pro-life spokesperson.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, today is a somber occasion. On this 42nd anniversary of the Supreme Court's tragic decision in *Roe v. Wade*, our hearts ache for the 56 million unborn lives that have been lost due to this shameful practice of abortion.

But, today, there is hope because we have an opportunity to make a difference by passing the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. This commonsense, compassionate legislation will protect Americans' conscience rights by ensuring that their hard-earned tax dollars are not used to fund the destruction of a human life.

As a mother, a grandmother, and a nurse for over 40 years, this measure is especially meaningful to me. During my years in the health care industry, I saw the joy in young parents' eyes when they met their newborn children for the very first time; I held the hands of grieving spouses and children as they said their final good-byes to loved ones; and, sadly, I witnessed a young woman lose her life due to the effects of a botched abortion.

These experiences informed my view that all life is a precious gift from God, and I pray that, in time, this truth will be reflected in our Nation's laws; but, until then, can't we at least do this much?

I urge a "yes" vote on the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion, and I thank the sponsor for his work on this deeply important legislation.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, a bill falsely advertised as pro-family and supporting American values.

If they actually care about defending the values of our Nation and of the well-being of American families, I ask my colleagues across the aisle to offer legislation that reflects the priorities of American families instead of debating a bill that the Republican leadership just threw on the calendar at the last minute because their original

abortion bill was too extreme, even for them.

Today, we should be discussing ways to ensure every woman can put food on the table by raising the minimum wage, like 29 States have done, and by passing equal pay for women. We should be discussing how to ensure that every person who dreams of a higher education has access to it by working with President Obama on his community college proposal. We should be discussing legislation to allow 43 million workers to take time off when they are sick and to make sure parents can take time off with their new babies.

These are the family-centered priorities that reflect our values as a nation, and these are, certainly, the challenges that my constituents in south Florida sent me here to tackle. Instead, we are debating a bill with an underlying principle that has already been codified.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle know that a regressive policy of banning taxpayer funding for abortion, which only serves to punish our Nation's poor and most vulnerable women, already exists. As the President said Tuesday night, while we may not agree on choice, we can at least agree that the best people to make these decisions for women are not politicians. Building on the zeal to interfere in the health decisions of women, this bill goes even further by tying a woman's health options to her income.

A strong majority of Americans agree, including 62 percent who identify as Republicans, that abortion is the wrong issue for Congress to be spending its time on. I agree with them. When my colleagues are prepared to work on legislation that truly addresses the concerns of the American people, we stand ready to work with them.

Listen to your Members who sounded the alarm bell on the original bill that was pulled off this floor, and get your priorities straight.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California, Mr. KEVIN MCCARTHY, our distinguished majority leader in this Congress.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, we are here today, taking a step forward towards a simple goal—to save innocent lives from abortion and to make sure no woman ever has to make that decision to end the life of her child. We all know that this is more than just some debate or social disagreement. These are human beings we are talking about.

□ 1200

This is about pregnant mothers facing hardship and tough choices. It is about a culture of telling people that human life is expendable. But most importantly, this is about human beings—more than 56 million children since *Roe v. Wade*—who have been de-

nied a chance to live. We are here today for them, to make sure every person has the most fundamental right of all: the right to life.

Today, on the anniversary of *Roe v. Wade* and during the March for Life, the House will vote on a bill to stop all Federal funding from being used to pay for abortion. At the very least, the American people should never be forced to pay for abortions or abortion coverage with their tax dollars.

I urge my colleagues to stand with the hundreds of thousands of people out on The Mall right now by voting for this bill. Stand up and commit to creating an America that values every life, especially the lives of innocents who cannot stand up for themselves.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) for yielding and for her advocacy and work on this issue.

Today, on the anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, which changed history for women in America by allowing them to control their own bodies, I rise against the effort to roll back these rights.

Though we have come a long way in the last 42 years, some politicians want to undo this progress and restrict access to critical medical procedures women may need. Why have we been debating whether the government should seize control over women's health decisions when the American people want us to work together to create good-paying jobs, balance the budget, and raise the minimum wage? Instead, this Chamber is wasting time with a divisive argument about whether the government should jeopardize a woman's access to medically necessary procedures.

Politicians are not medical experts, and we should not deny a woman the ability to make her own decisions with those she trusts the most. I ask my colleagues to focus on the economy instead of spending time on bills that divide this House and this country.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership on this very, very important issue.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of life. Today is a very joyous and hopeful day on what is a very sad anniversary. Today is the 42nd anniversary of the Supreme Court decision *Roe v. Wade*. Hundreds of thousands of pro-life advocates from across the country, and many from my own hometown of St. Louis, Missouri, will be on The Mall as we march in honor of the over 56 million precious angels we have lost over the last 42 years.

Madam Speaker, I believe in the sanctity of life, I believe that life begins at conception, and that every life is a gift.

There is an area where most Americans agree and where elected officials should all come together, and that is on the Federal funding of abortion. The majority of Americans do not want their hard-earned tax dollars going to pay for abortions, and Congress has consistently worked together over the years by attaching the Hyde amendment to appropriations bills to prevent taxpayer funds from going towards abortions.

That is why I am proud to cosponsor and support H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act. There is no more appropriate day than today to consider such important legislation.

This bill does exactly what the name implies. It permanently ensures that no taxpayer dollars go to pay for abortion or abortion coverage. This bill codifies the Hyde amendment and also addresses taxpayer funding for abortion that, unfortunately, the Hyde amendment does not cover.

For example, ObamaCare expressly allows funding for plans that include abortion through taxpayer subsidies. During the health care debate, the President assured the American people that no Federal dollars would be used to fund abortions under ObamaCare. It was yet again another broken promise.

However, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act not only prevents taxpayer funding for abortion under ObamaCare, it also requires transparency to ensure the consumers are fully informed about which plans on the exchanges contain abortion coverage and surcharges.

Madam Speaker, throughout my life I have worked to draw attention to the pro-life movement—to change hearts and minds and to approach this issue with love and compassion. I will continue to work throughout my time in Congress towards the day when abortion is not only illegal but abortion is unthinkable.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this important legislation.

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

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Madam Speaker, I want to first say to the other side of the aisle that I am grateful that some members of your caucus recognized that indeed extremism on this issue has got to come to an end and that you took steps to roll back the ridiculous bill that you had intended to bring up today but didn't have the votes for because they spoke up. And I am grateful to them.

In some respects, you look around this room and you think, Is this a Chamber of Congress or is this a doctor's office? We might as well have stethoscopes, stirrups, and speculums here because that is what you are doing. You are trying to come between a woman and her physician.

There is a lot of hoopla today because this is the anniversary of Roe v. Wade, and this is a messaging bill, so we are here messaging. Roe v. Wade was a decision by the Supreme Court of the United States of America, and when each of us became Members of this body this month, we swore that we would uphold the Constitution of the United States. But my colleagues on the other side of the aisle spend hours and hours wringing hands, trying to somehow find ways to undo constitutional decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court.

So we are here having yet another debate when American women in this country are far more interested in equal pay for equal work, paid sick leave, a child care tax credit that has some resemblance to what reality is in this country. But rather, we will continue to act like doctors here.

And I might add there are even some hypocrites on the other side of the aisle who have counseled their own girlfriends to have abortions. It is legal, Members. We have a right to maintain this legality.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), another eloquent pro-life force.

Mr. LAMALFA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, today, I am glad to be a Californian who is in favor of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Indeed, we have heard some interesting debate on this today, deflecting issues like higher pay or building more infrastructure, which we desperately need in California, as well as the water supply, and even entering the word "child care" in when we are talking about paying for abortions. Interesting. Even words like "access." Well, abortion has been certainly accessible for 42 years, millions of times.

The central point is, Are the taxpayers going to be compelled to pay for it? Are the American people out there—those 68 percent, in the latest poll—going to be compelled to pay for something?

Jefferson said:

To compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical.

People who are pro-life, as well as many that are pro-choice, might agree with the idea that abortion should be available—on the pro-choice side. But many, many disagree, a supermajority. The number of people who disagree with this would override a veto in these two Houses in the Capitol.

Yet what we are finding in my own State of California is an interpretation of ObamaCare—which is one of those job-killing, non-infrastructure building items that is hurting our economy in California and in this country—where we are being compelled, whether you are a church or religious charity, employer or individual, to have included

in your insurance plans these provisions paying for abortions.

Where is the freedom in that? Where is the conscientious objection to that? Where is the freedom of expression that I hear a lot from the other side of the aisle—until recent years? Our First Amendment?

This bureaucratic mandate, which includes their opinion on what it would be under ObamaCare, largely done quietly, in the middle of the night, out of the public eye, is now being put on Californians. We need to send the message back that Californians should not be compelled to have to provide this in their coverage.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I feel compelled to point out, after listening to the debate and the hyperbole, the passionate thoughts of what a high priority this is for the Republican leadership to bring this bill to the floor—such a high priority that they didn't think about it until late last night. They didn't bring it to committee. They rushed it to the floor without having even thought of this legislation until late last night. Such a high priority. We know, the American people know, this is political theater.

In listening to the debate, it is also quite revealing in listening to some of the comments made that this is not about taxpayer funding for the health care choices that American women legally have and the Constitution supports and that the Supreme Court clarified 42 years ago, but it is about preventing women from making that choice in the first place. That is a choice that ought to be made by women, by themselves, in consultation with their health care provider, and not by Members of Congress.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, might I inquire of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Colorado has 10½ minutes remaining.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, Congresswoman ELLEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Is there any way to make an anti-women, anti-health, anti-choice bill worse? Sure there is. Add a provision that keeps a local jurisdiction—the District of Columbia—from spending its own local funds on abortion services for poor women, exactly as 17 States of the Union do. Americans will ask: How on Earth can you do that in this country? Laughably—by declaring the District of Columbia government to be a virtual Federal agency.

This bill hurts millions of women across the country who have a constitutional right to make choices about

their own health. It compounds that discrimination by violating the oldest American principle—local control of local funds.

The Senate has repeatedly rejected this bill, and I expect them to have the good sense to repeat that rejection.

□ 1215

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today on the 42nd anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision in *Roe v. Wade* in support of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. This vital bill establishes that no taxpayer funds be used for abortion, including plans that cover abortion under the President's health care law.

These restrictions will save lives. According to the research by the Guttmacher Institute, policies that cut taxpayer funds towards abortion will actually prevent 25 percent or more of the abortions that would otherwise take place.

Furthermore, recent polling has demonstrated that the American public is widely opposed to taxpayer funds for abortion. According to a Marist poll released in January of this year, 68 percent of the respondents opposed taxpayer funds for abortion. A CNN poll from last year shows that 56 percent of respondents oppose public funding for abortion.

As a mother of four, I know personally how precious the gift of human life is and how important it is to honor that gift. As legislators, it is both our job and responsibility to protect the innocent lives of the unborn and to serve as a voice for those who do not yet have one.

Today, the U.S. House has a historic opportunity to put an end to the use of taxpayer funding for abortion. In drafting the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, Thomas Jefferson so wisely penned: "To compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions in which he disbelieves and abhors is sinful and tyrannical."

Madam Speaker, I emphatically agree.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), one of our distinguished new Members.

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, absolutely outrageous, that is what Republicans' attempt to repeal *Roe v. Wade* on its 42nd anniversary is, absolutely outrageous.

A blatant attack on women and their families, their first attempt, H.R. 36, failed because women of both parties spoke out to let our male Republican colleagues know they have gone too far.

The women of this House know that a woman cannot call herself free who

does not own or control her own body. We are free, Madam Speaker.

Here we go again, H.R. 7, another attempt to attack women's rights. It especially impacts women of color—not on my watch.

Women of the House, let's do it again. Let's prevent this legislation from moving forward, and let's vote "no."

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

First of all, abortion is not health care. It is a brutal procedure that ends the lives of unborn children through suction, dismemberment, decapitation, or chemical poison. It is the most violent form of death known to mankind.

As Frederica Mathewes-Green, former chair of the Feminists for Life, said:

Abortion breaks a mother's heart.

She said:

There are always two victims in an abortion. One is the baby, and one is the mother; one is dead, one is wounded.

Madam Speaker, this human rights abuse should not be paid for or encouraged by government taxpayer money. The women in the Silent No More Awareness Campaign and the women in Operation Outcry point out that abortion not only takes the lives of the unborn child, it wounds all the mothers. We should keep this in mind.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank my good friend, DIANA, for her leadership on this issue and for so many other important issues and for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, despite the rhetoric we have heard from our Republican colleagues about their commitment to focusing, laserlike, on what the American people care about most—creating jobs and accelerating economic growth—the only thing that they have accelerated in this new Congress is their attacks on a woman's constitutional rights.

In just their first 7 days in office, our Republican colleagues have introduced six anti-choice bills and brought two of them to the floor for debate; so rather than focus on jobs, we have a bill that is not only an assault on women, it is pure political posturing that is guaranteed to be vetoed, even if it makes it through the Senate. The President has made that clear.

We need to focus on what the vast majority of the American people have asked us to do: create greater economic opportunity for all Americans.

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

The gentlelady said what the American people care about. Well, a Marist poll released this month found that 68 percent of the respondents oppose taxpayer funding for abortion. A February 2014 CNN poll showed that 56 percent of

the respondents opposed public funding of abortion. A January 2010 Quinnipiac University poll showed 67 percent of the respondents opposed Federal funding of abortions.

A November 2009 Washington Post poll showed 61 percent of the respondents opposed government subsidies for health insurance that includes abortion. A September 2009 International Communications Research poll showed that 67 percent of respondents opposed measures that would require people to pay for abortion coverage with their Federal taxes.

We know what the American people care about.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I just have to end with what I started with. There is no Federal taxpayer funding for abortion. There has not been for many decades.

Some people, like me, think that this is an ill-conceived public policy, but it is the law of the land, it is the law of the land every year in the appropriations bill, and it is part of the compromise that was negotiated with the Affordable Care Act, so we need to keep that in mind as we talk about what this legislation does.

What this legislation will do is it will take away the ability of women in the exchanges to buy comprehensive health care insurance with their own money.

Now, I heard many speakers on the other side of the aisle today talk about their deep concerns about abortion and unwanted pregnancies. Well, I will tell you something: if you want to reduce unwanted pregnancies—which all of us in this room do—what you need to do is give women quality health insurance with robust family planning and a full range of health care services.

The Guttmacher Institute, in a 2010 study, showed, happily, that teen pregnancy in this country was at the lowest rate in over 30 years. Do you know why? Two reasons: number one, birth control for these teenagers; and, number two, comprehensive health insurance.

This Congress which has passed, over and over again, restrictions on birth control access—not just for teens, but for all women—and restrictions on comprehensive family planning is actually passing legislation that is going to stop this decrease in unwanted teen pregnancies.

It is an ill-conceived policy. It is a wrongheaded policy. If we want to stop unwanted pregnancies, the way to do it is to have comprehensive health insurance for all American women.

Now, the majority, at the last minute, pulled the bill with the egregious provisions on rape that would have required rape victims to affirmatively go to the police before they could raise the exception, but don't make any mistake about it, this bill is just as egregious as that bill.

The reason it is is because, in an unprecedented move, it stops American women and their families from being able to get comprehensive health insurance with their own money.

What would happen is it would open up a significant divide between the coverage that large employers would give to families and small employers and individuals.

Now, the other thing this does is it reopens the debate and the compromise that we had in the Affordable Care Act. The compromise we made in that bill was that there would be no public funding for abortion under the Affordable Care Act.

It was negotiated, it was agreed upon, and as the other side admitted, the President issued an executive order saying he would enforce the current law on that, and, in fact, that is what happened.

The act required two separate premium payments for women and their families who receive premium tax credits and choose coverage that includes abortion services. The act is clear in its language. No portion of premium tax credits may be used to pay for the portion of comprehensive health coverage that is purchased in the marketplaces that relates to abortion services.

The compromise was agreed upon by pro-life groups like the Catholic Health Association and everybody else, and now, this compromise is being thrown out the window.

Well, our opponents say there was a GAO report last September that said that insurance companies were not segregating the funds, so they say that that means, somehow, Federal dollars are being used to pay for abortions.

Well, after that GAO study came out, Madam Speaker, the HHS promulgated a new rule clarifying the agreement under the Affordable Care Act that the funds had to be segregated, and they promulgated this rule on Wednesday, November 26.

Madam Speaker, I will insert that proposed rule into the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

So this compromise is being honored by the administration.

Now, early in this debate, I asked my opponents to please give me one example where Federal taxpayer dollars have been used to pay for abortions. I haven't heard that example, and it is because it is not happening. This is a false issue that is being raised.

I would submit to everybody here: let's stop talking about this false issue just because there are a whole bunch of people in town who want us to pass some legislation; let's talk about some real issues.

We just received a Statement of Administration Policy from the White House. Not surprisingly, the administration has said that the President would veto this bill. The bill is likely dead on arrival in the Senate, but even if it did pass, it would be vetoed.

I have a suggestion for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: let's take up

some issues that the women and families of America care about; let's take up the issue of how we are going to give women good jobs with comprehensive health insurance, so they can make their own decisions, along with their family and their doctor.

Let's talk about legislation that will allow women of America to get jobs that have equal pay for equal work to the men. Let's talk about a bill that will give tax credits for families who have to struggle every month to pay for child care for their little kids. Let's talk about that.

□ 1230

And finally, let's talk about parental leave, which virtually every other country in the world has, so that when families have children whom they love so much and want to take care of, they won't have to go back to work because their employer doesn't pay them for family leave. Let's talk about that because, Madam Speaker, that is what the women and families of America want us to talk about.

I urge us to reject this legislation. I urge a "no" vote.

g. Segregation of Funds for Abortion Services (§156.280)

Section 1303 of the Affordable Care Act and §156.280 specify accounting and other standards for issuers of QHPs through the Exchange in the individual market that cover abortion services for which public funding is prohibited (also referred to as non-excepted abortion services). The statute and regulations establish that unless otherwise prohibited by State law, a QHP issuer may elect to cover such services. If an issuer elects to cover such services under a QHP sold through the individual market Exchange, the issuer must take certain steps to ensure that no premium tax credit or cost-sharing reduction funds are used to pay claims for abortion services for which public funding may not be used.

We are providing guidance on an individual market Exchange issuer's responsibilities with respect to requirements related to QHP coverage of abortion services for which public funding is prohibited. HHS works with stakeholders, including States and issuers, to help them fully understand and follow the statutes and regulations governing the provision of health insurance coverage under a QHP through the Exchange. As is the case with many provisions in the Affordable Care Act, States and State insurance commissioners are the entities primarily responsible for implementing and enforcing the provisions in section 1303 of the Affordable Care Act related to individual market QHP coverage of nonexcepted abortion services. OPM may issue guidance related to these provisions for multi-State plan issuers.

Under section 1303(b)(2)(B) of the Affordable Care Act, as implemented in §156.280(e)(2)(i), individual market Exchange issuers must collect a separate payment from each enrollee, for an amount equal to the AV of the coverage for abortions for which public funding is prohibited. However, section 1303 of the Affordable Care Act and §156.280 do not specify the method an issuer must use to comply with the separate payment requirement. This provision may be satisfied in a number of ways. Several such ways include, but are not limited to: sending the enrollee a single monthly invoice or bill that separately itemizes the premium amount for nonexcepted abortion services;

sending a separate monthly bill for these services; or sending the enrollee a notice at or soon after the time of enrollment that the monthly invoice or bill will include a separate charge for such services and specify the charge. Section 1303 of the Affordable Care Act permits, but does not require a QHP issuer to separately identify the premium for non-excepted abortion services on the monthly premium bill in order to comply with the separate payment requirement. A consumer may pay the premium for non-excepted abortion services and for all other services in a single transaction, with the issuer depositing the funds into the issuer's separate allocation accounts as required by section 1301(b)(2)(C) of the Affordable Care Act, as implemented in §156.280(e)(2)(ii) and §156.280(e)(3).

Section 1303(b)(2)(D) of the Affordable Care Act, as implemented in §156.280(e)(4), establishes requirements for individual market Exchange issuers with respect to how much they must charge each QHP enrollee for coverage of abortions for which public funding is prohibited. A QHP issuer must estimate the basic per enrollee, per month cost, determined on an average actuarial basis, for including coverage of non-excepted abortion services. In making this estimate, a QHP issuer may not estimate the basic cost of coverage for non-excepted abortion services to be less than one dollar per enrollee, per month. This means that an issuer must charge each QHP enrollee a minimum premium of one dollar per month for coverage of non-excepted abortion services.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 7—NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

(Rep. Smith, R-New Jersey, and 20 cosponsors)

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 7. The legislation would intrude on women's reproductive freedom and access to health care; increase the financial burden on many Americans; unnecessarily restrict the private insurance choices that consumers have today; and restrict the District of Columbia's use of local funds, which undermines home rule. Longstanding Federal policy prohibits the use of Federal funds for abortions, except in cases of rape or incest, or when the life of the woman would be endangered. This prohibition is maintained in the Affordable Care Act and reinforced through the President's Executive Order 13535. H.R. 7 would go well beyond these safeguards by interfering with consumers' private health care choices. The Administration strongly opposes legislation that unnecessarily restricts women's reproductive freedoms and consumers' private insurance options.

If the President were presented with H.R. 7 his senior advisors would recommend that he veto this bill.

Ms. DEGETTE. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Again, on the so-called compromise, I offered the Hyde language in the committee, and we won in a bipartisan vote. Chairman Waxman recessed, changed the votes, stripped it out, and brought it to the floor without Hyde. I was involved in the negotiation.

I wrote the Stupak-Pitts amendment. I know what the compromise is with the so-called executive order. It is full of loopholes. The Hyde amendment does not apply to the Affordable Care Act.

I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from

Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), another pro-life champion.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, make no mistake about what this debate is about. H.R. 7 codifies that no taxpayer money would be given for abortions.

But the real debate on the floor today is about life. We are talking about life in the people's House, on the floor of the people's House. We are talking about a gift from God. We are talking about something that was so well put into our Declaration of Independence—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, the first of those being life. I understand that there is a serious debate about that.

There are times that people say: Listen, we are not really ready right now for this child. But expectant mothers and unborn children have got to be protected. My goodness, in a nation that recoils at the news around the world, at the loss of life, and says this is horrible what is happening in Syria, this is horrible what is happening in the Middle East, this is horrible that this is happening, then we want to go there, and we want to rush to help people because there is a loss of life, and then in our own country we have turned a blind eye and a deaf ear to the loss of 56 million unborn children. These are lives that were lost that did not have to be lost.

I know there is a law that says they have the right to make that decision. It may be legal, but I don't think it is right.

As far as giving a gift to the 500,000 or so people that are in Washington today in the pro-life march, this is not a gift from the Republican Party to these people. This is a gift from our Creator, Himself, on reproduction. How we have demeaned this and reduced it down to a political discussion is absolutely abhorrent.

Never, never has this country ever turned its back on the most vulnerable.

I have been there for the birth of my four children. I have 10 grandchildren now. I have also held the hands of my mother, my father, and my sister as they died. There is nothing more precious than life. There is just nothing more precious than that.

I ask all my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 7 to answer the American people who say we do not want to fund abortion, to end this debate, and let's move forward.

Mr. PITTS. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, this bill is simply outrageous. It was bad enough that the Majority brought to the floor H.R. 36 outside the regular order. But the Majority had to pull that bill when the women in their Conference informed their Leadership just how bad the bill was and that they could not vote for it. Undeterred at its 'war on women' the Majority pulled H.R. 36 and rushed to the floor an equally offensive bill, H.R. 7. This new bill, H.R. 7, the so-called No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Dislo-

sure Act of 2015 is simply an attempt to substitute one anti-family bill for another. Timed to coincide with the annual pro-life march in Washington, this is a blatant attempt at pandering to their base.

During the last elections, the Republicans made quite a show of how they would run the Congress by regular order and make Congress work for the American people. However, we have had mere hours notice that this bill would even be brought to the floor. The bill was introduced yesterday and has already been fast tracked by the leadership to be on the floor this morning! Needless to say, there was NO committee debate and NO opportunity to amend the bill in any way. No one has even had a chance to read the bill. Who says those in Congress can't get things done quickly when they want to?

Supporters of the bill argue that it will simply codify the Hyde amendment and permanently prohibit taxpayer funding of abortion. However, we all know that is false. H.R. 7 is actually much more nefarious than that. It seeks to restrict women's reproductive rights and access to health care; increase healthcare premiums for many Americans and small businesses; and, limit the private insurance choices of consumers. It will almost certainly guarantee that insurance companies will no longer offer abortion coverage to consumers.

The Republicans in the House are continuing the mission to completely eliminate women's reproductive rights and their access to healthcare. As with the previous version of this bill, H.R. 7 is nothing more than a statement bill.

In addition, this bill also undermines the D.C. home rule. H.R. 7 prohibits D.C. from using its own Medicaid funds to provide abortion, language that is already included in the annual appropriations bill. This is despite the fact that 17 states currently use their own state funds to provide abortion.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 7 is the antithesis of Republicans stated goal of "small government." How can the Majority be so hypocritical? The Republican Majority is using this bill to reach into the lives of millions of Americans and make their health care decisions for them.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, our Great Nation was founded upon the idea that ALL men are "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights." And the first right mentioned in our Declaration of Independence is that of Life. We must do all we can to uphold this most fundamental value.

Today is the anniversary of the tragic Roe v. Wade ruling. In response, thousands of people have come to Washington, DC to participate in the annual March for Life so that those who cannot speak for themselves do have a voice.

In solidarity, the House is also taking action to uphold our founding principles and protect our unborn by voting to reaffirm that no federal funding—including Obamacare subsidies—shall be used to pay for or subsidize abortions. At a time when our national debt is over \$18 trillion, to allow any federal funding for abortions would be a breach in the trust that the American public has placed in us to be good stewards of taxpayers' dollars—but more importantly, to protect our unborn.

I have consistently cosponsored and voted for legislation that continues the prohibition on federal funding for abortions, and I fully sup-

port H.R. 7. I am dedicated to protecting the sanctity of human life, which begins at conception. While today's vote is crucial to protecting the unborn, we cannot rest. Therefore I look forward to joining millions of Americans as we continue the important work of fully protecting our God-given right to Life for ALL, including our most innocent.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, goundhog Day isn't for a couple more weeks, but you wouldn't know that from looking at the Republican majority's agenda these past few weeks. They've brought up one partisan bill after another that already proved unsuccessful in previous years.

Today, we are revisiting the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, which is misleading and redundant to say the least and represents yet another attempt by Republicans to restrict a woman's reproductive rights and access to lifesaving health services. In fact, it's their second attempt this week after they had to pull a controversial and unconstitutional 20-week (abortion) ban due to lack of support on their side of the aisle.

The contradiction between this narrow, ideological agenda and the message Republicans attempted to convey in their response to the President's State of the Union address this week—in which they claimed they would be "working to change the direction in Washington" and passing "serious job-creation ideas"—is stark.

Aside from denying care to women in the most desperate of circumstances, this bill would go beyond the current Hyde Amendment to place restrictions on how women with private insurance can spend private dollars in purchasing health insurance. It is a prima facie infringement of women's constitutional rights.

Madam Speaker, as polarizing as these debates continue to be, I believe we should make decisions based on this country's founding principles of personal liberty that should always guide this body on the subject of women's reproductive health.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I join with women's rights advocates, health care stakeholders, and religious groups in opposing H.R. 7, the Unprecedented, Radical Assault on Women's Health Care Act. This piece of legislation is another attempt by politicians to control women's private health care choices.

As we emerge from one of the worst economic crises in our nation's history, Congressional leaders should focus on bills to increase Americans' paychecks, create jobs, improve education, and incentivize investment in America rather than jeopardize the health of American women and undermine longstanding Supreme Court precedence regarding women's reproductive health.

Politicians are not medical experts, yet this bill today allows politicians to control women's private health care decisions. Politics should not drive medical decisions.

I firmly believe that the American people wish to see their representatives focus on proactive policies that strengthen our economy and address their health care needs, such as by increasing access to affordable health care and reducing health disparities. Rather than imposing national restrictions on private medical decisions, policymakers should focus on keeping Americans healthy via comprehensive health care, healthy pregnancies, and healthy children. Rather than allowing the federal government to violate the basic constitutional

rights of women, we should increase our investment in research and development, help students afford and succeed in college, raise the minimum wage, strengthen our roads and bridges, and invest in our communities.

America needs policymakers who support our citizens, not who subordinate them. I cannot support this bill that allows politics to control women's medical choices, and I urge my colleagues to oppose.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Longstanding federal policy explicitly prohibits the use of federal funds for abortions, except for certain narrow circumstances of rape, incest, or severe health complications that threaten the life of the mother. The Affordable Care Act (ACA) maintains this ban and a federal appeals court confirmed that no federal dollars may be used to pay for abortion services under the law.

Far more sweeping in scope than the title implies, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act goes well beyond codifying the Hyde Amendment and protecting public funds. This bill intrudes on women's reproductive autonomy and access to health care, manipulates the tax code to put additional financial burdens on many women and small businesses, and unnecessarily restricts the private insurance choices available to consumers today.

The House of Representatives should be spending our time working to improve access to health care for all Americans, instead of deceptive legislation that interferes with a woman's ability to make personal, private medical decisions.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 42, 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

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. MOORE. Yes, Madam Speaker. I am opposed to it in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Moore moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end of the bill the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

TITLE III—RULE OF CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 301. PROTECTING THE MEDICAL PRIVACY OF WOMEN, INCLUDING VICTIMS OF RAPE AND INCEST.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize any party to violate, directly or indirectly, the medical privacy of any woman, including the victims of rape or incest, with respect to her choice or use of comprehensive health insurance coverage.

Mrs. BLACKBURN (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I reserve a point

of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, and it will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If this amendment is adopted, the bill, as amended, will immediately proceed to final passage.

As the Clerk has indicated, Madam Speaker, this motion to recommit would merely protect the medical privacy of millions of women, including those women who are victims of rape and incest. It would ensure that nothing in H.R. 7, the underlying legislation, could be construed to allow any entity to violate the medical privacy of any woman, including these victims, when it comes to her choice of comprehensive health care services.

Madam Speaker, we have heard a great debate here today, and we have heard, Madam Speaker, the majority party insist that we need to codify the 1976 Hyde amendment prohibiting poor women from having abortions.

I can assure you that, as we have looked over the past 42 years here on the anniversary of Roe v. Wade, we have seen that low-income women—particularly women of color—have been disproportionately impacted by the very successful implementation of the Hyde amendment. Women have been forced to choose between food and shelter. They have been forced to choose between the best interests of their health, and they have given birth, on many occasions, even despite their poor health status, their poor economic status, or their poor emotional status to children who are poor.

We have heard data and statistics about the number of unborn persons as a result of abortion. We have not heard one single statistic about the number of children who are born in dire poverty only, Madam Speaker, to be humiliated in this Chamber over and over again, being called “products of the culture of dependency,” who are killed by cuts, death by 1,000 cuts—cuts to food stamps, cuts to WIC, cuts to Head Start, cuts to educational opportunity. Death by 1,000 cuts. We have not heard anyone on the other side speak about that misalignment.

But with this legislation, it is not enough to stop low-income women, poor women, particularly women of color—African Americans, Asians, Native American women, Latinas—it is not enough to prevent them from abortions. Some of them have become pregnant because of rape and incest and forced trafficking who have diabetes and other underlying health problems. That is not enough.

This legislation is so nefarious as to try to prevent the women who have

been lucky enough to get a job in a small business, lucky enough to be able to afford to buy insurance and use their own money to buy insurance—they have been lucky enough to do that—to prevent them, by some extraneous nexus—supposedly health care-funded payments through the Affordable Care Act—from seeking this health care. This is really, really a backdoor approach to really trying to undermine the law of the land, Roe v. Wade.

Many women, Madam Speaker, know on a personal level the history of shame and stigma that come forward when they are trying to seek the best remedy for their life at that time, for whatever reason that they need to have an abortion.

I know personally, Madam Speaker, of young women who have been 13 years old and who have become victims of statutory rape, and the best solution for their lives at that time and for their health is an abortion because their life is truly in danger. This is the kind of bill that would prevent them from having that opportunity.

Madam Speaker, I hope that you will accept this motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my point of order, and I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, we have heard a lot of charges and accusations that were made by some of my colleagues as they have chosen to describe the bill before us today, H.R. 7, so I want to be clear about what the bill before us does do and does accomplish.

This bill follows a longstanding principle, as my colleague said, going back to 1976, the principle that the American people and Members from both sides of the aisle in both Chambers of Congress have supported for decades, and that is taxpayer dollars should not be spent on abortions and abortion coverage. The vast majority of my colleagues voted for this exact same principle in countless appropriations bills, including a bill that we passed out of this Chamber last month. Yet today, some Members are fighting the widely shared belief that taxpayer dollars should not be used to take an innocent life.

The bill before us today also provides much-needed transparency regarding which health plans on the exchange pay for abortions. The Obama administration promised to provide Congress and the American people a list of plans in ObamaCare that covered abortion, yet they refused to live up to that promise. They forced Congress to act. And, indeed, the GAO has informed us that 1,036 plans include abortion coverage. There is no excuse—no excuse—to hide information about abortion coverage from the American people.

Madam Speaker, 68 percent, a vast majority of the American people believe there should be no taxpayer money used for abortion and abortion coverage.

HHS has forced Congress to act on this issue. The commonsense transparency requirement that is in H.R. 7 is needed, and it is supported by all Members. So that is what this bill is about, following an established bipartisan principle and providing transparency.

I urge my colleagues, each and every one, to vote to protect life, to vote to protect taxpayer dollars, and to promote transparency by rejecting the motion to recommit and supporting the underlying bill. I urge a “no” vote on the recommitment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 177, nays 240, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 44]

YEAS—177

Adams	DeFazio	Kilmer
Aguilar	DeGette	Kind
Ashford	Delaney	Kirkpatrick
Bass	DeLauro	Kuster
Beatty	DelBene	Langevin
Becerra	DeSaulnier	Larsen (WA)
Bera	Dingell	Larson (CT)
Beyer	Doggett	Lawrence
Bishop (GA)	Doyle (PA)	Lee
Blumenauer	Edwards	Levin
Bonamici	Ellison	Lewis
Boyle (PA)	Engel	Lieu (CA)
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Lipinski
Brown (FL)	Esty	Loebsack
Brownley (CA)	Farr	Lofgren
Bustos	Fattah	Lowenthal
Butterfield	Foster	Lowe
Capps	Frankel (FL)	Lujan Grisham
Capuano	Fudge	(NM)
Cárdenas	Gabbard	Luján, Ben Ray
Carney	Gallego	(NM)
Carson (IN)	Garamendi	Lynch
Cartwright	Graham	Maloney
Castor (FL)	Grayson	Carolyn
Castro (TX)	Green, Al	Matsui
Chu (CA)	Grijalva	McCollum
Cicilline	Gutiérrez	McDermott
Clark (MA)	Hahn	McGovern
Clarke (NY)	Heck (WA)	McNerney
Clay	Higgins	Meng
Cleaver	Himes	Moore
Clyburn	Honda	Moulton
Cohen	Hoyer	Murphy (FL)
Connolly	Huffman	Nadler
Conyers	Israel	Napolitano
Cooper	Jackson Lee	Neal
Costa	Jeffries	Nolan
Courtney	Johnson (GA)	Norcross
Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	O'Rourke
Cuellar	Keating	Pallone
Cummings	Kelly (IL)	Pascarell
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Payne
Davis, Danny	Kildee	Pelosi

Peters	Schakowsky
Peterson	Schiff
Pingree	Schrader
Pocan	Scott (VA)
Polis	Scott, David
Price (NC)	Serrano
Quigley	Sewell (AL)
Rangel	Sherman
Rice (NY)	Sinema
Richmond	Sires
Roybal-Allard	Slaughter
Ruiz	Speier
Ruppersberger	Swalwell (CA)
Ryan (OH)	Takai
Sanchez, Linda T.	Takano
Sanchez, Loretta	Thompson (CA)
Sarbanes	Thompson (MS)
	Titus

NAYS—240

Abraham	Grothman
Aderholt	Guinta
Allen	Guthrie
Amash	Hanna
Amodei	Hardy
Babin	Harper
Barletta	Harris
Barr	Hartzler
Barton	Heck (NV)
Benishek	Hensarling
Bilirakis	Herrera Beutler
Bishop (MI)	Hice (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Hill
Black	Holding
Blackburn	Hudson
Blum	Huelskamp
Bost	Huizenga (MI)
Boustany	Hultgren
Brady (TX)	Hunter
Brat	Hurd (TX)
Bridenstine	Hurt (VA)
Brooks (AL)	Issa
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (KS)
Buchanan	Jenkins (WV)
Buck	Johnson (OH)
Bucshon	Jolly
Burgess	Jones
Byrne	Jordan
Calvert	Joyce
Carter (GA)	Kaptur
Chabot	Katko
Chaffetz	Kelly (PA)
Clawson (FL)	King (IA)
Coffman	King (NY)
Cole	Kinzinger (IL)
Collins (GA)	Kline
Collins (NY)	Knight
Comstock	Labrador
Conaway	LaMalfa
Cook	Lamborn
Costello (PA)	Lance
Cramer	Latta
Crawford	LoBiondo
Crenshaw	Long
Culberson	Loudermilk
Curbelo (FL)	Love
Davis, Rodney	Lucas
Denham	Luetkemeyer
Dent	Lummis
DeSantis	MacArthur
DesJarlais	Marino
Dold	Massie
Duffy	McCarthy
Duncan (SC)	McCaul
Duncan (TN)	McClintock
Ellmers	McHenry
Emmer	McKinley
Farenthold	McMorris
Fincher	Rodgers
Fitzpatrick	McSally
Fleischmann	Meadows
Fleming	Meehan
Flores	Messer
Fortenberry	Mica
Fox	Miller (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)
Franks (OH)	Moolenaar
Frelinghuysen	Mooney (WV)
Garrett	Mullin
Gibbs	Mulvaney
Gohmert	Murphy (PA)
Goodlatte	Neugebauer
Gosar	Newhouse
Gowdy	Noem
Granger	Nugent
Gibbs	Nunes
Graham	Olson
Gohmert	Palazzo
Goodlatte	Palmer
Gosar	
Neugebauer	
Newhouse	
Noem	
Nugent	
Nunes	
Olson	
Palazzo	
Palmer	

Tonko	Yoho
Torres	Young (AK)
Tsongas	
Van Hollen	
Vargas	
Veasey	
Vela	
Velázquez	
Visclosky	
Sires	
Slaughter	
Speier	
Swalwell (CA)	
Takai	
Takano	
Thompson (CA)	
Thompson (MS)	
Titus	

Paulsen	Waters, Maxine
Pearce	Watson Coleman
Perry	Welch
Pittenger	Wilson (FL)
Pitts	Yarmuth
Poe (TX)	
Poliquin	
Pompeo	
Posey	
Price (GA)	
Ratcliffe	
Hice (GA)	
Reed	
Reichert	
Renaacci	
Ribble	
Rice (SC)	
Rigell	
Roby	
Roe (TN)	
Rogers (AL)	
Rogers (KY)	
Rohrabacher	
Rokita	
Rooney (FL)	
Ros-Lehtinen	
Roskam	
Ross	
Rothfus	
Rouzer	
Royce	
Russell	
Ryan (WI)	
Salmon	
Sanford	
Scalise	
Schock	
Schweikert	
Scott, Austin	
Sensenbrenner	
Sessions	
Shimkus	
Shuster	
Simpson	
Smith (MO)	
Smith (NE)	
Smith (NJ)	
Smith (TX)	
Stefanik	
Stewart	
Stivers	
Stutzman	
Thompson (PA)	
Thornberry	
Tiberi	
Tipton	
Trott	
Turner	
Upton	
Valadao	
Wagner	
Walberg	
Walden	
Walker	
Walorski	
Walters, Mimi	
Weber (TX)	
Webster (FL)	
Collins (NY)	
Comstock	
Conaway	
Cook	
Costello (PA)	
Cramer	
Crawford	
Crenshaw	
Cuellar	
Culberson	
Curbelo (FL)	

Yoho	Young (IA)
Young (AK)	Young (IN)

Young (IA)	Zeldin
Young (IN)	Zinke

NOT VOTING—16

Carter (TX)	Hastings	Nunnelee
Deutch	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam	Rush
Duckworth	Maloney, Sean	Smith (WA)
Forbes	Marchant	
Green, Gene	Meeks	

□ 1307

Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. GARRETT changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. FARR, KIND, BECERRA, and Mrs. CAPPS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 44, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

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.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 179, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

AYES—242

Abraham	Davis, Rodney	Hudson
Aderholt	Denham	Huelskamp
Allen	Dent	Huizenga (MI)
Amash	DeSantis	Hultgren
Amodei	DesJarlais	Hunter
Babin	Diaz-Balart	Hurd (TX)
Barletta	Dold	Hurt (VA)
Barr	Duffy	Issa
Barton	Duncan (SC)	Jenkins (KS)
Benishek	Duncan (TN)	Jenkins (WV)
Bilirakis	Ellmers	Johnson (OH)
Bishop (MI)	Emmer	Jolly
Bishop (UT)	Farenthold	Jones
Black	Fincher	Jordan
Blackburn	Fitzpatrick	Joyce
Blum	Fleischmann	Katko
Bost	Fleming	Kelly (PA)
Boustany	Flores	King (IA)
Brady (TX)	Fortenberry	King (NY)
Brat	Fox	Kinzinger (IL)
Bridenstine	Franks (AZ)	Kline
Brooks (AL)	Frelinghuysen	Knight
Brooks (IN)	Garrett	Labrador
Buchanan	Gibbs	LaMalfa
Buck	Gibson	Lamborn
Bucshon	Gohmert	Lance
Burgess	Goodlatte	Latta
Byrne	Gosar	Lipinski
Calvert	Gowdy	LoBiondo
Carter (GA)	Granger	Long
Chabot	Graves (GA)	Loudermilk
Chaffetz	Graves (LA)	Love
Clawson (FL)	Graves (MO)	Lucas
Coffman	Griffith	Luetkemeyer
Cole	Grothman	Lummis
Collins (GA)	Guinta	MacArthur
Collins (NY)	Guthrie	Marino
Comstock	Hardy	Massie
Conaway	Harper	McCarthy
Cook	Harris	McCaul
Costello (PA)	Hartzler	McClintock
Cramer	Heck (NV)	McHenry
Crawford	Hensarling	McKinley
Crenshaw	Herrera Beutler	McMorris
Cuellar	Hice (GA)	Rodgers
Culberson	Hill	McSally
Curbelo (FL)	Holding	Meadows

Meehan	Rice (SC)	Stivers
Messer	Rigell	Stutzman
Mica	Roby	Thompson (PA)
Miller (FL)	Roe (TN)	Thornberry
Miller (MI)	Rogers (AL)	Tiberi
Moolenaar	Rogers (KY)	Tipton
Mooney (WV)	Rohrabacher	Trott
Mullin	Rokita	Turner
Mulvaney	Rooney (FL)	Upton
Murphy (PA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Valadao
Neugebauer	Roskam	Wagner
Newhouse	Ross	Walberg
Noem	Rothfus	Walden
Nugent	Rouzer	Walker
Nunes	Royce	Walorski
Olson	Russell	Walters, Mimi
Palazzo	Ryan (WI)	Weber (TX)
Palmer	Salmon	Webster (FL)
Paulsen	Sanford	Wenstrup
Pearce	Scalise	Westerman
Perry	Schock	Westmoreland
Peterson	Schweikert	Whitfield
Pittenger	Scott, Austin	Williams
Pitts	Sensenbrenner	Wilson (SC)
Poe (TX)	Sessions	Wittman
Poliquin	Shimkus	Womack
Pompeo	Shuster	Woodall
Posey	Simpson	Yoder
Price (GA)	Smith (MO)	Yoho
Ratcliffe	Smith (NE)	Young (AK)
Reed	Smith (NJ)	Young (IA)
Reichert	Smith (TX)	Young (IN)
Renacci	Stefanik	Zeldin
Ribble	Stewart	Zinke

NOES—179

Adams	Gallego	Nolan
Aguilar	Garamendi	Norcross
Ashford	Graham	O'Rourke
Bass	Grayson	Pallone
Beatty	Green, Al	Pascarell
Becerra	Grijalva	Payne
Bera	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Beyer	Hahn	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Hanna	Pingree
Blumenauer	Heck (WA)	Pocan
Bonamici	Higgins	Polis
Boyle (PA)	Himes	Price (NC)
Brady (PA)	Honda	Quigley
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Rangel
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Rice (NY)
Bustos	Israel	Richmond
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Jeffries	Ruiz
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Carney	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)	T. Kennedy
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Castro (TX)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Chu (CA)	Kilmer	Kind
Cicilline	Kind	Schakowsky
Clark (MA)	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Kuster	Schrader
Clay	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Cohen	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Connolly	Lee	Sherman
Conyers	Levin	Sinema
Cooper	Lewis	Sires
Costa	Lieu (CA)	Slaughter
Courtney	Loeb sack	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Lofgren	Speier
Cummings	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
Davis (CA)	Lowe y	Takai
Davis, Danny	Lujan Grisham	Takano
DeFazio	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Luján, Ben Ray	Titus
Delaney	(NM)	Tonko
DeLauro	Lynch	Torres
DelBene	Maloney,	Tsongas
DeSaulnier	Carolyn	Van Hollen
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
Doggett	Matsui	Veasey
Doyle (PA)	McCollum	Vela
Edwards	McDermott	Velázquez
Ellison	McGovern	Visclosky
Engel	McNerney	Walz
Eshoo	Mee ks	Wasserman
Esty	Meng	Schultz
Farr	Moore	Waters, Maxine
Fattah	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Frankel (FL)	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Fudge	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Gabbard	Neal	

NOT VOTING—12

Carter (TX)	Green, Gene	Marchant
Deutch	Hastings	Nunnelee
Duckworth	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Forbes	Johnson, Sam	Thompson (MS)

□ 1315

Mr. KATKO changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So 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. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 45, I regrettably missed the vote, but I fully support this crucial legislation to protect the unborn. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Stated against:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 45, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, January 22, 2015 I was not present to vote on H.R. 7, legislation intruding on women’s reproductive freedom and access to health care. I wish the record to reflect my intentions had I been present to vote. Had I been present for roll call No. 45, I would have voted “no.”

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Wednesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes for the week are expected around noon. On Thursday and Friday, no votes are expected.

The House will consider a number of bipartisan suspensions next week to combat human trafficking. A complete list will be announced at close of business today.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 351, authored by Representative BILL JOHNSON. This bipartisan bill will expedite liquefied natural gas exports to our allies. In order to boost our economy here at home and encourage global energy security, we must help clear the backlog of export applications currently pending at the Department of Energy, and I thank the gentleman from Ohio for sponsoring this important bill.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 399, the Secure Our Borders First Act, authored by Chairman MCCAUL, which requires the Department of Homeland Security to achieve operational control of our border. The

bill also ensures that we are using the latest technologies to assist with border enforcement and takes the commonsense step of allowing greater access to the border region—specifically, Federal lands—to Customs and Border Patrol officers.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information. The last bill he says will be on the floor, I presume that it will be on the floor on Wednesday. Is that accurate?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Yes, that is accurate.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

As the gentleman knows, in the last Congress the Homeland Security Committee, chaired by Mr. MCCAUL, passed out of the committee a bipartisan bill that was supported—as a matter of fact, I think it was reported out by voice vote, and it was supported by Chairman MCCAUL and Ranking Member THOMPSON, as well as Republicans and Democrats from the committee.

As you know, so far this month in January we have spent time, frankly, recycling what we perceive to be partisan bills from the last Congress. Unfortunately, it appears that we are going to do the same thing next week, and I ask the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, we have a bipartisan bill that just months ago was supported by Democrats and Republicans, reported out of committee, not brought to the floor, unfortunately, but reported out of committee I think unanimously, or at least without voiced opposition, and now instead of taking that bill up, which we know has broad bipartisan support, we have a bill that is now going to be reported to the floor without going to committee, without being marked up—excuse me, it was marked up yesterday. I am corrected. It was filed and marked up within hours of one another, no considered judgment, no hearings. It may have been marked up, but no hearings, no notice to the public that the bill was pending, no opportunity for the public or Members to look at it. As I understand it, the committee was organized yesterday at 10 a.m., and this bill was considered at 2 p.m. or some time in that timeframe.

But my concern, Mr. Leader, is that we continue to go down the path of having bipartisan agreements worked out in committee, and now at the beginning of this Congress we are simply seeing partisan bill after partisan bill.

I understand that your side had a victory in the election and expanded your membership. However, the President, as he pointed out, is still in office, and in order to get something done—we are all for border security. That is why the committee reported out the bill in the last Congress. We had agreement on it. I lament the fact that we didn’t bring the bipartisan bill, which would have gotten overwhelming support, in my opinion. Substituting that on Wednesday, where we are going to come in at

9 and go out at 12, we will have a rule on that, maybe the rule the day before. There will be a very short time to consider this.

We are bringing a partisan bill that is going to engender a lot of opposition on our side. It is going to be opposed by Mr. THOMPSON. It is so unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that having achieved bipartisan agreement on a priority item, that is, border security, that within hours yesterday we turned that into a partisan bill on which there is neither consensus nor widespread agreement.

I am sure the gentleman had the opportunity to hear a quote about the first 3 weeks of this session from one of his Republican Members, Mr. DENT, who talked about week one being, of course, the Speakership election.

Then week two, we got into a big fight over deporting children under DREAMers, which I thought we had a consensus on, but we got into a big fight about that.

And week three, we talked about rape and incest and, frankly, a partisan bill on a very, very important subject which did not have significant consideration and was substituted at 9 p.m. last night, no committee hearing, no committee input, no testimony available for that bill.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, we understand there are going to be differences between the Republican side and the Democratic side on issues, but repeatedly, Mr. Speaker, I hear the Speaker and the majority leader and others talk about a transparent Congress. I hear them talk about regular order and how they are going to return to that, and how they are going to have consideration of bills. The majority leader himself was quoted a number of times saying we are going to have 72 hours.

The bill that we just considered on this floor had less, frankly, than 12 hours before it was brought to this floor out of the Rules Committee. I would hope, Mr. Leader, that if you are going to go through with this border security bill—we will have an argument about it, and it will be largely a partisan vote on it. That is unfortunate, because we ought to be coming together, working together, creating consensus on making sure our borders are secure, as happened in the last Congress but is not repeated here.

□ 1330

I will be glad to yield to my friend.

I don't know whether this is going to be a closed rule or not. If I were betting, though, based upon the first 3 weeks of this session, I would bet it is going to be a closed rule or a structured rule with very, very few amendments, given the timeframe available to us.

I would say that we are very concerned on this side of the aisle, Mr. Leader, I will tell the Speaker that we are concerned about the closed processes that we are going through, the partisan processes that we are going through, and the lack of transparency

and consideration that is being given to the bills that are coming to this floor.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I listened very closely to you, but I think we have two different experiences. I watched on the day of swearing in we had Hire More Heroes. Every single Member on both sides of the aisle voted for it. That was bipartisan.

I watched, Mr. Speaker, bringing up a bill from Mr. FITZPATRICK, where we had a bipartisan vote just a few months before, and the reason we brought it back—committees were not organized yet, we were just in—so we grabbed a bipartisan bill, but many Members on the other side of the aisle—and we had it on suspension—changed their vote just in a month before, but we were able to pass that, again, bipartisan.

Earlier, in asking me what would come to the floor next week, you heard me say 12 bipartisan bills on suspension that deal with human trafficking.

You bring up the border bill. It has been noticed for a week—remember, we have been here for 2 weeks—it has been marked up in committee where both sides late into the night got to debate, where Members on both sides of the aisle got to express their opinions and their amendments the way the system should work.

We have noticed that today, more than 72 hours of why it will go up on Wednesday and not Friday, both sides have their retreats. We already had ours. We left that Wednesday, yours going through there. So there has been more notice. There has been clear debate. There has been bipartisan bills here.

I have no problem or qualm with a difference of philosophical opinion. The problem I have is when we misstate what history has shown.

You asked me about the rule. Bringing up the bill, I will leave the type of the rule that will accompany the bill up to the Rules Committee and Chairman SESSIONS. I do expect, though, a robust debate and look forward to consideration participation on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. HOYER. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure I heard. Do you think it is going to come up on a closed rule or a structured rule? I am sorry. Did you mention that?

Mr. MCCARTHY. If the gentleman will yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I expect the type of rule—and I leave that up to the Rules Committee and Chairman SESSIONS—but I do expect to have debate from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would find it shocking if a bill ever came to this floor that precluded all debate. The gentleman is telling me it is going to come up and there will be time for debate. I don't know that I have ever been here where a bill came up that

had no time for debate, so I assume that, Mr. Speaker, to be the case.

The question is: Will there be an opportunity for Members to offer amendments so that perhaps we can get back to the bipartisan bill that was reported out of the committee and leave the partisan parts of that bill for further discussion, debate, and amendment? We would like to have the opportunity to vote on such an amendment.

I ask my friend again, there is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that I believe there will be time for debate. It won't be very much time, I presume, but I presume there will be time for debate.

But will there be time to offer alternative views and provisions to that bill as it is debated?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, committees have jurisdiction. The Rules Committee is where you decide what rules comes forward. Chairman SESSIONS and those in the Rules Committee will take that up. As soon as a decision is made, we will notify every Member of the House.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman—I don't know the answer, but I thank the gentleman for his observation.

I would observe, though, he mentioned a heroes bill. That was obviously overwhelmingly a bipartisan bill. You didn't hear me complain about that or anybody else complain about it.

Mr. MCCARTHY. If the gentleman will yield, I didn't even hear you bring it up when you say we weren't bipartisan.

Mr. HOYER. Right.

The Keystone bill, however, which I think is a very important issue, was made partisan. The 30- to 40-hour workweek was made partisan.

The Regulatory Accountability Act, as the gentleman mentioned—excuse me, the Financial Services—that bill was changed. It was changed without a hearing. It was changed without public testimony, as I had a personal discussion, Mr. Speaker, with the majority leader about the change that occurred from the House bill that was passed.

So that bill was made, again, a partisan piece of legislation. Unfortunately, it could have passed on suspension, I think, as it did the year before, had it not been changed.

On the pipeline permitting legislation, again, not a bipartisan bill. This bill that we just considered, obviously very partisan, but no hearings and a closed rule.

Again, very important issues brought up and, I would suggest to the gentleman, nontransparent. He mentioned the bill that was filed last Friday, the border security bill, which is coming up Wednesday. The committee organized at 10. This bill was passed sometime shortly after 2—or thereafter. Debate started at 2.

When we talk about transparency, when we talk about regular order, very frankly, on pieces of substantive legislation, regular order, I would suggest,

Mr. Speaker, to the majority leader, is not introducing a bill, then we are off for 3 days, coming back, and the day after organizing the committee without hearings, without any testimony, then passing the bill, and bringing it to the floor, when clearly it is a partisan difference.

We will move on, Mr. Leader. I know you are happy about that.

As the gentleman knows, after next week, we have two 4-day weeks scheduled in February prior to the President's Day recess.

Can the gentleman give me a sense of what legislation will be on the floor in February, again, Mr. Speaker, so that Members can have some knowledge of what might be brought to the floor, so that they can prepare and the public knows what legislation is going to be considered?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We have made no decisions on February and notification yet, but as soon as we do, we will give ample time for all to know.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman and, again, would emphasize that the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, has made it clear in his statements, both in a book that he and two others coauthored prior to their taking the majority, but he has said numerous times since then about his commitment to transparency, openness, 72-hour rule, which has been 3-day rule—it used to be 72 hours, now 3 days.

Three days, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, can be 26 hours. That is the last hour of the third day and the first hour of the third day. I understand that, but that is not regular order. We have all breached that. We all understand that.

Having said that, this Congress has started with closed rules, no hearings, and anything but regular order. I would urge, Mr. Speaker, that the majority leader try to adhere to that.

As he has observed in the past, if we do that, I think we will have better legislation, greater participation by Members, and reflect better the voice of the American people.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, I want to thank the gentleman. If you quoted my book, I hope you bought it, so I thank you for that. Proceeds went to help the veterans.

I listened to what the gentleman said. As the gentleman knows, any new Congress, when you start, the committees are just beginning to organize. That is why, when we look to legislation, we look to those that the American public wanted.

You had brought up Keystone. Twenty-eight Members on your side of the aisle voted for it. I would consider that bipartisan. You have a large majority of Americans who want it and waited 5 years.

I know you bring up that we had a debate on the border, but we just now

organized, and we were just now sworn in, but they have been debating this issue for quite some time.

It is our intention to run this House in a very open manner. I have been here when it has not been, and just as we said in our book, I think the American public wins when we go through regular order and we have greater transparency. I look forward to working with the gentleman as we progress throughout the term.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I don't want to be very cynical, but talk is fine. Performance—as Ronald Reagan said: "Trust, but verify." We can read the talk, we can read the assertions, we can read the promises, but if it is not carried out, the American people are going to be—and continue to be, as they were when the gentleman appealed to them in his book—they are going to be cynical about our actions.

I think Mr. DENT observed it correctly. For the first 3 weeks, we have gone through a partisan practice. Hopefully, we can, Mr. Speaker, skew that in the future, give notice, make sure everybody has the opportunity to participate, make sure that we have the ideas from both parties and the American people, given opportunity to be expressed and, yes, to be included.

Next week, we will bring to the floor, as we have in the past, a bill that skews and abandons bipartisanship, which was achieved in the last Congress through the same committee for a partisan bill on which there will not be agreement. That is unfortunate for the security of our country. It is unfortunate for the due process of this institution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 2015

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, January 26, 2015, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARDY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SUPPORTING THE MARCH FOR LIFE

(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. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and thank the thousands—tens of thousands—of Americans who traveled to Washington, D.C., to participate in today's March for Life.

They came here today to remember a somber occasion, the anniversary of the Roe v. Wade Supreme Court decision. It has been 42 years since that

fateful decision, and while years have worn on, its impact on this country have not diminished.

Those who participated in the march today came from across the Nation, from every State—despite the cold and the weather—for one reason: the next generation of Americans depends on it.

Millions of Americans have been unable to pursue their dreams and defend their inalienable rights because of abortion. This is not justice. This is not freedom. I stand with those who march for life. I honor those who march for life.

This is my seventh March for Life since coming to Congress. Knowing that, I can promise that as long as the lives of innocent unborn children are at risk, there will be those who will make a stand against it.

HONORING WILLIAM KORTUM

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and memory of Bill Kortum, regarded by many as the father of the environmental movement in Sonoma County.

Bill grew up in a Sonoma County that was much more rural and undeveloped than today. By the early 1960s, he foresaw that a growing population could threaten the county's natural landscape, so he fought to protect the home he loved.

He was singularly responsible for instituting lasting environmental protections throughout Sonoma County and California, though he would never claim credit for them.

One of Bill's first victories was to prevent the development of PG&E's nuclear power plant at Bodega Head. He helped create the California Coastal Commission, which continues to guarantee public access to the coast today.

He established Sonoma County Conservation Action, helped create the Sonoma County Open Space District, and championed the Sonoma Land Trust and the SMART train.

Bill illustrates the incredible impact one person can have in making the world a better place. His legacy in Sonoma County and beyond will not soon be forgotten.

I extend my deepest condolences to his partner in much of this work, his dear wife Lucy, as well as his three children and grandchildren.

HONORING WINSTON CHURCHILL

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, January 24, marks the 50th anniversary of the death of Winston Churchill. Over the past half century, he has passed from memory into history, yet stands unchallenged as one of the greatest figures of modern times.

Born of an American mother and a British father, his life and career symbolized the fellowship of the English-speaking peoples.

Just outside this very Chamber, Mr. Speaker, stands an enduring tribute to the "British Bulldog" in the Freedom Foyer. The placement of Churchill's bust inside the U.S. Capitol serves as a testament to our special relationship with the United Kingdom and to the values our two nations have fought so dearly to defend: democracy and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit into the RECORD a touching account of Mr. Churchill's passing written by Celia Sandys, his granddaughter, and the only surviving member of the Churchill family present at his death.

MY GRANDFATHER'S FINAL DAYS

The Personal Account of Hon. Celia Sandys

His birthdays were always a big family occasion. The first one that I can remember clearly was his eightieth birthday in 1954 when there was a huge event in Westminster Hall. The purpose was for both Houses of Parliament to mark the day with tributes and the presentation of the portrait by Graham Sutherland, which had been commissioned as a gift for him.

The rumour was out that the image was less than flattering. I remember my parents discussing how he had disliked it when he had seen it two weeks earlier. He did, however, rise to the occasion and accepted it saying; "It is a remarkable example of modern art." As usual he had chosen the perfect words. The portrait was never seen again!

Ten years later we celebrated his ninetieth birthday at Hyde Park Gate. He had left his beloved Chartwell for the last time the month before. As we raised our glasses of Pol Roger to toast him, the unspoken thought in everyone's mind was that the final meeting could not be long delayed.

Six weeks later, on 10 January 1965 he suffered a stroke, the effects of which worsened over the next few days.

On the evening of the 15th, I received a call from his personal secretary, Anthony Montague Browne, to tell me that my aunt Sarah was on her way from Rome. He said she would be arriving at Heathrow in the early hours of the morning and had asked if she could stay with me.

I remember driving like the wind to get to Heathrow in time and then having to run the gauntlet of a huge crowd of journalists before we could get out of the airport. The press had only heard of my grandfather's condition a few hours before and so were hungry for information.

We went straight to Hyde Park Gate and found Grandpapa sleeping peacefully with his cat Jock curled up beside him. I don't know if Jock ever left the bed, but every time I was there the cat lay curled up by his master.

It was clear that the inevitable was about to happen. We were all sad; for ourselves not for him. Anyone who had spent time with him during the last few years knew that he was ready to go.

During the next nine days we had two urgent calls to go to Hyde Park Gate when it seemed the end was near, but each time he rallied. Otherwise during this period we visited once or twice a day, as much for my grandmother as for him.

Initially we had to struggle to get through the crowds of press and concerned onlookers who filled the little cul-de-sac day and night. After a few days, in response to a request

from my grandmother, the bystanders moved to the main road and our visits became much easier.

Early on the morning of the 24th of January we received what was clearly the final call from my aunt Mary. Sarah and I raced to Hyde Park Gate. There we joined my grandmother, Mary, my uncle Randolph and my cousin Winston.

Clementine sat holding Grandpapa's hand with his doctor, Lord Moran, sitting beside her; Randolph and Winston stood on the other side, while Sarah, Mary and I knelt at the foot of the bed. Also in the room were two nurses, whose work had finished, and Anthony Montague Browne.

No one made a sound except Grandpapa who breathed heavily and sighed. Then there was silence.

It seemed as though time stood still until Clementine asked Lord Moran, "Has he gone?" He nodded.

Seventy years to the day and almost to the minute since his father, Lord Randolph, had died, Winston Churchill had slipped imperceptibly away to meet his Maker.

We all sat down to a subdued breakfast and listened to the radio as the announcement of his death was broadcast to the world.

Some years earlier the Queen had decided that her first Prime Minister was to have a Lying-in-State and a State Funeral. The was the first time such an honour had been granted to a commoner since the funeral of the Duke of Wellington more than a century before.

Preparations for the ceremony had been given the code name "Operation Hope Not" and, in true British tradition, had been worked out to the last detail some years before.

More than 300,000 people queued in the freezing cold along the Embankment, across Lambeth Bridge, back along the Thames and across Westminster Bridge to file past the catafalque in Westminster Hall, the oldest surviving part of the Palace of Westminster where, my grandfather had spent so much of his working life.

The family were allowed to slip in by a side door and watch the extraordinary sight of so many who had come from near and far to bid farewell to the man for whom they felt love, respect and gratitude.

On the day of the funeral we gathered in Westminster Hall for the journey to St Paul's Cathedral.

The men of the family together with Anthony Montague Browne, who had served his master faithfully and lovingly to the end, walked behind the coffin, which was borne on a gun carriage.

The women rode in the Queen's carriages. My grandmother, Sarah and Mary were in the first carriage. My sister Edwina and I rode in the second. We had rugs and hot water bottles to keep us warm on a very cold day. We were so close to the crowds lining the streets that we could have touched them. The emotion in their faces I will never forget.

When we arrived at St Paul's, we all lined up for the procession up the aisle. The women of the family looked as though we were in uniform. Quite independently we were all wearing more or less identical black fox fur hats.

As the bearers struggled to carry the coffin up the steps and into the cathedral, it seemed they might be going to drop it. Apparently they had rehearsed but not with a lead-lined coffin! They made it and we all followed up the long aisle where the Queen and her family were waiting.

We were told that the Queen had said we should not curtsey to her so we filed into our seats opposite the Royal Family.

After the service we processed out and watched anxiously as the bearers carried the

coffin down the steps, probably an even more difficult task.

As we got back into our carriages, the Queen and her family joined on the cathedral steps with monarchs, presidents, wartime colleagues and political allies to say goodbye to the man they had come to honour.

The carriages took us to Tower Pier where, after Grandpapa had been piped aboard, there was a seventeen-gun salute. We boarded the Port of London Authority's survey vessel, MV Havengore, for the journey to Waterloo Station. As we sailed off we could hear the band playing Rule Britannia.

The crane drivers on the quayside dipped the heads of their cranes in salute. This was the only unscripted part of the day and one of the most moving. The RAF flew overhead.

At Waterloo the coffin was placed in the guard's van with a military escort of the 4th Hussars on constant watch.

We sat down to have lunch and a glass of champagne, which we certainly needed, as the train moved off, pulled by the engine, which my then seven-year-old brother Julian had named "Winston Churchill" during the war.

Along the entire route from Waterloo to Long Hanborough, the railway was lined with people of all ages, some waving, some crying, some saluting, all of them silently saying goodbye to the man they admired. Finally we reached the small churchyard at Bladon, the burial place of Winston's parents and his brother Jack and within sight of Blenheim Palace where he had been born ninety years before.

The day immediately turned into a family affair, and we could say goodbye in private to the husband, father and grandfather who we all loved so much.

After the service we stood by the graveside as the bearers lowered the coffin into the grave. The silence was broken by a metallic clatter. Lying on the coffin were the shiny medals that had fallen off the coat of one of the bearers.

We were a sombre party on the train going back to London. When I got home I realized how strange the past weeks had been. It was as though I had been in a state of suspension but had now come down to earth.

Aunt Sarah and I watched the rerun of the day on television and wondered at all the events in which we had played a part.

□ 1345

SHADOWS OF CRISES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it has been quite a week. There have been tragedies, and there have been wonderful events.

In having been to Nigeria this past year and in having met with family members of girls who were kidnapped because they went to Christian schools, there were three girls I met who had escaped after they had been kidnapped. The kidnapped girls, it was known, were being sexually abused and may have now been sold into sex trafficking, given as wives, and have been ordered to convert from Christianity to Islam or be killed. I know there are some in this town who think they are

being asked to convert to an Islam that doesn't exist as a religion, but to those girls who are being told they must convert to the religion of Islam or be killed, it does seem to be a religion.

In having grieved with others around the world who have been harmed or who have had family killed or harmed by radical Islam, it is tragic this week.

I will read a story from Breitbart:

According to the United Nations, ISIS—the Islamic State—is killing educated women following shari'a court sentences.

That is a problem. There is nothing wrong with religious people participating in government. Most of our Founders were very strong Christians. Around a third or so of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were actually ordained Christian servants. So that is a good thing, but when a religion also becomes the state, then this is the kind of thing you get, and it is tragic.

In an article by Edwin Mora, it says:

The U.N. warned on Tuesday that the Islamic State, known as ISIS, ISIL, or IS, is showing a "monstrous disregard for human life" in the areas it has conquered, which include swaths of Iraq and Syria.

This article points out:

Nevertheless, President Obama, during his State of the Union Address delivered Tuesday night, proclaimed that the United States "is stopping ISIL's advance" in Iraq and Syria. Just last week, *The Daily Beast*, citing an unnamed Pentagon official, reported that, despite U.S.-led airstrikes, ISIS is gaining ground in Syria.

The U.N. warned that the jihadist group is meting out "cruel and inhuman punishments against men, women, and children" through "unlawful" shari'a courts it has established in territory under its control.

The civilians falling victim to ISIS' wrath are accused of "violating the group's extremist interpretations of Islamic shari'a law or for suspected disloyalty," said Ravina Shamdasani, spokesperson for the U.N. Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights.

ISIS has killed fellow jihadists and local residents for violating the harsh version of Islamic law imposed on the areas it now controls.

"Educated, professional women, particularly women who had run as candidates in elections for public office, seem to be particularly at risk. In just the first 2 weeks of the year, reports indicated that three female lawyers were executed."

It goes on:

"The ruthless murder of two men who were thrown off the top of a building after having been accused of homosexual acts by a so-called 'court' in Mosul is another terrible example of the kind of monstrous disregard for human life that characterized ISIL's reign of terror over areas of Iraq that were under the group's control."

Look. I know, Mr. Speaker, that our President stood right here at the second level and told us "the shadow of crisis has passed." Apparently, he is not getting the briefings, or maybe the briefings don't include just how bad the situation is around the world. Christians are being persecuted and are being killed in greater numbers than at any time in history since Jesus came. Jews are being subjected to anti-Se-

mitic hate in many places, we are told, which has not been seen since before and during World War II.

Now, in growing up reading and studying history, I couldn't imagine that there would ever come another day that we would see hate growing against Jewish people that could inspire another Holocaust. I just didn't think it would happen. So, when I had read about General Eisenhower's having soldiers bring people from the surrounding communities to help clean up the death camps, I thought: These are civilians in the community, and that may have been a little harsh if they had nothing to do with the death camps.

I had read that his reasoning was—and this was many years ago—that he wanted to make sure that nobody could ever proclaim that the death camps did not exist and that they were a figment of someone's imagination. He wanted to make sure that could not happen, so they were brought out to clean up. Yet, mere decades later, here we are at a time when there are radical Islamists calling for a new, greater Holocaust to kill Jewish people, calling for the complete wiping off the map of Israel, calling for the complete destruction of what they call the "Great Satan"—the United States.

The shadow of crisis may have passed, but the mental image I got when I heard the President say "the shadow of crisis has passed" took me back to fifth grade. I was very small in elementary school, and there was one guy who could have been two grades ahead, but he had been held back. He was about two heads taller than I was. I was on the playground one day, and as a little kid, I saw Ray's shadow pass me. I turned around, and I got smashed in the face, and it made my nose bleed. That was the image I had when the President invoked the shadow of the crisis' passing. If the shadow of this crisis has passed, then we may be just about to get smacked in the face by these radical Islamists, and it will be a lot more than a bloody nose that ends up occurring.

This is a very desperate time in the world for millions of people. Since they, perhaps, weren't journalists—the nearly 2,000 or so Nigerians who were killed by radical Islamists—Boko Haram, in Nigeria, didn't quite get the attention I thought it should have as did the horrendous killings in Paris get the attention, as they absolutely should have.

Under Western civilization law—and it was true in the early days of this country, and it has been true, as far as I know, under every State's law. I know, absolutely, it is true under State law—when it comes to a physical assault, the law has been clear: provoking words are never a defense to a physical assault. In this country, under our law and under the law of every State, no matter what you say, it does not justify a physical attack. We have even had the President of the United

States basically stand up before the U.N., stand up in front of media, stand up in front of crowds, and say that we need to be more careful.

But he goes beyond that.

He appears to attribute blame for an attack on the people being attacked to the point that he and those who work for him were asked to go out and tell the country before the 2012 election that a video was responsible for the deaths of four Americans who were serving their country in Benghazi, Libya. It turns out that that was not true at all. It turns out people knew that before that was trotted out.

According to the book written about the blood feud between the Clintons and the Obamas, there was a phone call from Hillary Clinton to her husband in which she was upset that the President was asking her to go out and say that the Benghazi attack was the result of a video. According to the book, she was advised that America wouldn't buy a lie like that. Ultimately, they decided, at least, not to have her go on the Sunday shows—again, according to the book—and that, gee, if she resigns, that might cost him the election, and Democrats would be upset about it, so they would never want to nominate her for President if she resigned and cost Obama the election in 2012.

That was according to the book as to why she didn't resign, but she didn't go on the Sunday shows. Susan Rice was sent out with that task to blame a video when it was very clear, when Chris Stevens called, saying that he was under attack, there was nothing about a video mentioned. When the warnings were being given by those who were aware of a buildup of radicals—and of potential problems even across the street—nothing was mentioned about a video because it wasn't about a video; but that would have been an inconvenient truth so close to the election.

Our heartbreaks collectively for these killings, and it is my hope and prayer—liberal women's groups here in the United States prefer the easy task of attacking conservatives and of creating allegations that, gee, there is some war on women when, actually, as I speak, there is a war on women going on in radical Islamist-held countries. There is a war on baby women going on around the world, and there are people who actually choose to abort babies because they are baby women.

□ 1400

There is a war on women, but it is not by conservatives in the country, who want them to have the best health care they can get, who want young girls to have the best care they can get, both in the womb and outside the womb. This isn't where the war on women is occurring.

Although there are still some vestiges of prejudice against women, we are very hopeful that since the President has made such a big issue about treating women equally, it won't

be too long before the White House will start treating women equally and giving them equal pay for equal work. So I am encouraged the President keeps bringing that up, hoping that will inure to the benefit of people working at the White House so they will eventually be paid what men in the White House are paid.

I really do hope that liberal women's groups that take the easy path—taking potshots at conservatives—will stand with us against radical Islam.

I asked mothers of girls who were kidnapped by Boko Haram in Nigeria: Did they attack this school because it was a school for girls? They said that apparently they didn't realize that it was only girls at the school because they did ask: Where are the boys? Because they wanted to bring them out and shoot them, as they did at other places. When they realized it was only girls, they took them to become slaves, sexually and otherwise, and to force them to convert. But the school wasn't attacked because it was a girls school, because they didn't know it was only for girls. They knew it was Christian.

There was also an attack on Christian women. And I would hope that even the most atheist of women in the United States and in Western civilized countries around the world would start standing up for the mistreatment of Christian women who are particularly being brutalized because of their faith and because of their sex, combined.

So, of the Presidents we have had since 9/11, the President failed to mention al Qaeda. And I can understand that, and I have to be a little defensive for the President here. He and the Vice President had been saying before the 2012 election that al Qaeda was on the run. In some cases, Osama bin Laden is dead, al Qaeda is on the run, and General Motors is alive.

Well, it turns out if al Qaeda is on the run, it is a run directly at us and our allies, our friends. And that is particularly true of Israel. They consider Israel the little Satan and us the great Satan, but we have no better friend in the Middle East than Israel.

Our President has been overheard on a microphone that picked him up basically casting aspersions on the character of Prime Minister Netanyahu. Fair people that I have known, if they ever got caught maligning someone inappropriately, they would go out of their way to show that it was inappropriate—I want to make it up, and I want to show that we are friends. We may have disagreements, but we are friends.

Of course, people have read about him treating Prime Minister Netanyahu so poorly when he came to the White House in prior years, having him sit around. One account said he was told: Just wait here. And when you have a change of position, let me know. I'm going to eat with my family.

The Prime Minister ended up leaving rather than sitting in his corner for a timeout, as the President wanted.

We haven't seen this President make clear to the world that Israel is our friend, as well as to its leader, the people, and the legislature they have elected. We haven't seen those kind of outreaches.

And then, we find out the President is upset that the Speaker of the House invited Prime Minister Netanyahu to come speak here on February 11. And perhaps that is yet another indication of the ignorance. And, Mr. Speaker and our Parliamentarian, it doesn't cast aspersions to be ignorant of something—we are all ignorant of things—but apparently there is a blind spot in the Constitution for the President on a number of things, and apparently one is how the legislature works, even though he has been in the Senate, because under the Constitution, we can't have anybody in the people's House come speak here who is not a Member of Congress, with one exception. Under the Constitution and Thomas Jefferson's Rules of the House, under which we have been operating since 1789—with modifications, but it has still been the rule, you can't come speak in the House Chamber officially unless you are invited by the House. You can't come speak to a joint session of Congress, both the House and Senate, unless both the House and the Senate invite you.

Now how do we know that the President doesn't really grasp that concept and is not aware of the constitutional and the rule ramifications in Congress? It has been a few years back, but the President decided, as I recall, that he was going to come lecture Congress on a jobs bill and tell us—I think it was 16 or so times—that we had to pass it right now, right away, failing to mention he didn't even have a bill.

Nevertheless, the President went out publicly and the statement was released that he was going to come to Congress and speak to Congress on a specific day at a specific time, and he had not even spoken to the Speaker of the House. Maybe he had talked to Majority Leader REID, but he hadn't talked to the Speaker of the House, and this is the House Chamber where the House actually has to vote to invite him. He didn't even bother to see what was convenient.

And as I recall, not only was there ignorance of the rules and the constitutional requirements, but there was also ignorance about the NFL, what is known as football here in the United States, and I believe it was the beginning of the season. The President had just announced he wanted to come to Congress. He demanded to come speak to us, in conflict with the beginning of the first football game of the season. I believe it was the first. It was a big night. After that was pointed out, he ended up coming and speaking earlier. But the point being, no President has ever picked a date, said, Here's when I'm coming to speak to the House, without understanding you can't come unless you are invited.

You are not even allowed to come give an oral State of the Union Address unless the House and Senate vote to invite you to speak to a joint session. That has been the rule since we began. Under the Constitution, it is not required that a State of the Union Address be orally given in a speech. There is a constitutional requirement for a State of the Union report to be given. But in the early years of our country, there were times when the President just sent a report. Here's my report on the state of the Union.

So the President has snubbed Congress, the rules, and the Constitution repeatedly, and then our Speaker is condemned by the White House for inviting a world leader to come speak here. Again, the President doesn't realize there is no requirement to check with the President. If it hasn't already occurred, we will have to have a unanimous consent or a vote to have the House approve the invitation of Prime Minister Netanyahu to come speak here. That has to happen, if it hasn't already.

So there is no requirement to check with the President. We don't even have to invite him over here to speak to do his State of the Union. And when the unanimous consent request is made, anybody here could object to the President coming. I am not aware of that ever happening. I don't anticipate that ever happening.

Interestingly, we have been reading—when I have been in Israel and talked to leaders over there, they talk about the massive pressure by the Obama administration to try to push Israel into getting rid of Prime Minister Netanyahu. Now we know what our President did to help support the removal of President Mubarak. We know that he went even further in Libya, after Qadhafi—after the 2003 invasion of Iraq—threw all of his weapons systems open to the United States and said, You tell me what I can keep, basically. And as some in Israel have advised, after Qadhafi's conversion experience in fear that the U.S. would invade Libya in 2003, he became more of a help in going after radical Islamic terrorists than almost anybody, except in Israel.

We have got friends around the world that are trying to help us with radical Islam, and even our friends in Egypt, a neighbor of Israel. As many of us feared, they had an election too quick after the so-called Arab Spring, which was more of an Arab nightmare for the Egyptian people. They had an election too soon. The most organized group was the radical Islamic Muslim Brotherhood.

It was not really a military coup, and that has offended the Egyptian people, as they have indicated, when news media or the White House have said it was a coup because you had the largest uprising in the history of the world occur in Egypt. It was demonstration after demonstration for the ages. It was 20 million, 30 million, 33 million,

came the reports of the uprising, of the around 90 million people in Egypt—massive. That would be like over 100 million people in America going to the streets and demanding the President be removed. It is hard to get a third of the United States just to go out and vote. They did more than that. They put themselves at risk and came to the streets and said, Enough is enough.

And the Coptic Christian Pope has told me of how touched he was to have moderate Muslims, secularists, and people of different faiths come and literally and figuratively join arms and march together to stop the brutality against Christianity and against Jews in Egypt.

That was extraordinary. And so much of our media missed it. I think our President never really understood that. Briefings must not have been adequate—or he missed them—but that was extraordinary. That was an event for the ages, the Egyptian people uprising in millions like no country had ever experienced in our entire history of mankind. Extraordinary. They are to be commended.

□ 1415

What happened?

Yeah, there were even a couple of Republican Senators, but you had the President, the White House, the State Department, people condemning Egypt for saying: We don't want radical Islam running our country.

I didn't realize, but the constitution—that as I understand this administration helped with—did not include a provision for impeachment. We didn't give them a peaceable way within the constitution to remove a leader once he acted outside the constitution, as Morsi was doing.

Now, because I have been told by a former CIA operative—I asked General al-Sisi while he was still general, before Morsi was elected: Did you have evidence that he was trying to have you killed? I was told by a former CIA operative that he did.

He was reluctant to respond, but he eventually responded: Yes, we did. He didn't even really need that because of the unconstitutional actions of President Morsi. Now, I have had friends of Israel that were saying: We want to give Morsi a chance because he is really working to bring peace to the Sinai.

Well, as we found out after the people arose and a peaceful revolution occurred—I thought about the Egyptian peaceable revolution as I watched the movie "Selma." It is tragic that that ever came about and circumstances ever came to the point that we were treating, especially as a Christian, treating brothers and sisters like that.

Thank God for Martin Luther King, Jr. We honor him this week. What an example. People in Egypt know about Dr. King. The Pope, Coptic Christian Pope knows of Dr. King. He wanted a peaceful demonstration, and they were part of peaceful demonstration.

Unfortunately, radical Islam did not like being removed. They burned

churches. They went after Christians. They went after Jews. It was so offensive to the moderate Muslims that make up most all of Egypt that they even voted, overwhelmingly, for a constitution that required the government to build back the churches that the Muslim Brotherhood burned down. That is historic for the ages.

We have this one country, 90 million, most Muslim. At one time, there may have been, as I understand, maybe 10 percent or more Christians, but radical Islam took over after the alleged Arab Spring that was anything but a spring. It is a place of hope with a very, very difficult road in front of them.

Some of the military leaders were asking Members of Congress that were visiting over there about the Apache helicopters and the tanks that have been frozen by President Obama's administration and the refusal, for so long, to provide them.

The military leaders are saying: Does your President not understand that we use those Apache helicopters to keep the Suez Canal open? Does he want a tragedy at the Suez Canal? Is that why he is not allowing us to have new Apaches that we need in order to keep the Suez Canal properly open and safe?

We use the Apache helicopters to go after the massive weapon buildup that occurred in the Sinai under Morsi, and the Sinai is an area with rapid, huge weapon buildup under Morsi that is a threat and was a threat to Israel, our ally.

Somebody in the administration needs to get out a memo to everyone else saying: Look, Israel really is our friend. Netanyahu has more in common in his government and what his government believes than any other government in the entire Middle East with us here in America. Maybe we ought to go easy on pushing for a new leader.

Well, it hasn't happened today. Here is an article. Not only, apparently, is the White House furious with our Speaker—heck, I have been mad with our Speaker. I am telling you, this is a good thing, Mr. Speaker, that has been done here in inviting the Prime Minister of Israel.

Here is an article, since the leader of our closest ally and friend in the Middle East, Israel, is coming, this article from NBCNews.com, Kristen Welker and Carrie Dann:

President Barack Obama will not meet with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu when he visits the United Nations in March, his administration announced Thursday, citing a "longstanding practice" of avoiding appearances with heads of states in close proximity to their elections.

I guess he is glad that countries around the world don't have that same policy because he was sure running around before the election wanting to make appearances with them. I guess it would only be natural that foreign leaders would assume, since he did it before his election, that he would certainly not want to appear less than consistent.

They didn't use that excuse when the President gave Prime Minister Netanyahu a timeout. You wait here, I am going to go eat. Let me know when you have a change of mind.

I mean, that is what parents used to say to us. That is what some of us, as parents, have said: Until you are willing to act right, you go to your room.

For a President of the United States to do that to the leader of the country that is our best ally in the Middle East is really extraordinary, so I guess it shouldn't be a surprise that he wants him snubbed before his reelection; but I also think it is important, Mr. Speaker, that we have him here to hear his side about what Iran is doing.

Some of us, in December, met with leading investigators at the IAEA in Vienna to talk about Iran's current status, as best they can figure out. I think it was the most candid meeting that we have had with representatives of the IAEA. I appreciate their honesty and forthrightness.

But Iran's centrifuges are still spinning. They are still enriching uranium. They are increasing the amount of uranium that they are enriching. Even though they are assuring the IAEA that they are not taking it any more—they are not taking it past 5 percent enrichment, people that know about the enrichment process know it is not that much of a step to go from 5 percent to 90 percent, have weapons-grade uranium that can be used for bombs.

I think my friend, Joel Rosenberg, in his all-too-realistic novel, previously depicted Iran as developing enough nuclear material to use—not just in one bomb, they wanted enough to use in several bombs, so that when they got to that point, in a secret facility that even the IAEA, U.S., others didn't know about, according to the novel, they were able to prepare nuclear weapons, multiple nuclear weapons at the same time and immediately ship them out in different directions, so that anyone trying to stop their nukes, once developed, would have to worry that if they attacked Iran to stop their nuclear weapons—they had several—that it would be unlikely they would get them all, and that would mean that nukes would probably show up in Israel and the United States.

It seems pretty realistic. That seems like a realistic consideration for Iran. They seem to be following that procedure, developing as much 5 percent enriched uranium, that we know of; but as even the experts can tell you, it is possible they have got a facility we didn't know about. They have surprised us before.

This is a tragic time in so many places in the world. The shadow of the crisis may have passed us, but too often, that means, now, the shadow is passed and the crisis is upon us.

It is time to stand up to radical Islam and to stand in Erbil and talk to Kurdish leaders—or outside Erbil, at the headquarters where they are able to watch things that are going on; hear

a Commander say: You have no idea how heartbreaking it is to see a vehicle, an American vehicle, up-armored vehicle that the United States produced that is in the Islamic State hands, that has now been made into a massive suicide bomb, comes at our Kurdish fighters, fighting heroically, but not having a single weapon that will stop an American up-armored vehicle as the vehicle comes, as they know it is going to explode, and it gets nearer and nearer, and they are frantic.

Everybody watching the video feed, everybody on the ground there knows they are not going to stop it because the United States has not provided the weapons to our friends that will stop the weapons, the U.S. weapons that are in the hands of our enemies. Then, ultimately, the suicide bomb of a U.S. up-armored vehicle takes out those valiant, heroic Kurdish fighters.

These are not people that threw down their weapons and ran, like so much of the Iraqi Army did. There are Iraqi officials that say: This is why we really needed a small American presence here, to give us the backbone, to tell us, "Here is what you do. Yes, they are coming, but don't throw down your weapons. Go here. Go there."

We needed that help, that coordination, the same kind of help and direction, coordination that our embedded Special Forces, Special Ops people gave to the Northern Alliance in Afghanistan in late 2001 and early 2002, when the Taliban was initially decimated, defeated before we added tens of thousands of troops and became occupiers.

It has worked. It worked in Afghanistan before we became occupiers. It has worked when we help people that want to defend themselves to defend themselves.

We have seen over and over these reports that, in Syria, this so-called vetted, moderate Free Syrian Army is joining forces with al Qaeda affiliates. This administration still thinks it is a good idea to send them weapons that they can use, ultimately, to go after our friends, the Kurds.

□ 1430

Turkey, our ally and friend, NATO partner, says we can't use their bases to fight the Islamic State. I have got friends in Turkey, leaders there I have met with. They don't like the idea of the Kurds being armed.

Well, I think it is time the administration should announce that we are not sending weapons to Baghdad so that they can send what can't stop the Islamic State to the Kurds. We are sending weapons directly to Erbil. We are sending them directly to the Kurds.

Okay. Turkey, we understand you don't like that idea. If you don't like it enough, you have a powerful enough military to stop and destroy the Islamic State by yourself if you want to. So we would much prefer Turkey take out the Islamic State by themselves. But as it appears, Turkey is becoming more radical in their legislation and

activities. It explains, perhaps, why they will not allow us to use our bases and will not directly, themselves, fight the Islamic State.

Well, the Kurds are willing. They are doing it. They are fighting valiantly. Let's help them out directly, not through Baghdad, but directly.

Let's try to be friends with Israel. Let's try not to snub their leaders. I mean, since I have been in Congress, I have tried to be encouraging when I have met with other Israeli leaders. Before Netanyahu became the Prime Minister, we met with others. We encouraged them. I wasn't crazy about some of the things they were doing, but they were leaders of our friend Israel, and I wanted to be their friend. I wish that it were so with this administration.

Now, we had what was purported to be the State of the Union Address in here. We were told "the shadow of crisis has passed." I don't know. I am finding that maybe the President, a few years ago when he came and told us, "Pass my bill right away, right away, right away," maybe he didn't really know he didn't have a bill. But we kept trying for days to get a copy of his bill, and finally, after a week, there was no President's American Jobs Act.

Well, I went ahead and created one, and what it did was eliminate the biggest tariff that any country in the world puts on their own manufactured goods. It is called a corporate tax. It has to be passed on to consumers, which makes the price of the product or their services more expensive. Imagine the manufacturing jobs that would come flooding back to America if we even just reduced the corporate tax, this tariff that we are putting on our own goods.

And I have had reporters around Washington who don't really get it say: Well, how would you make up for the lost corporate taxes?

Those corporate taxes are paid by Americans. They are paid by the consumers. Any corporation that doesn't pass on that tax is not going to stay in business. So the consumers pay it. The American taxpayers pay it anyway.

But what would happen when you lower the corporate tax rate? Some of those massive manufacturing businesses—like the President's dear friends own that have moved over to China and other places—some of them have told a group of us that went over there: Well, the biggest reason we had to move is America had such a massive and now the highest corporate tax in the world. If you lower that like to China levels, 17 percent, we would be able to be back there.

Now, I loved hearing from leaders of industry in China that the best workers they have were American workers in the United States of America. Their best quality control is right here. Well, if we would lower the corporate tax, those jobs would come flooding back.

I loved hearing the President so pleased that we are becoming energy independent. Unfortunately, it is not

due to anything the Federal Government is doing. His administration is doing whatever it can to slow down energy production of oil and gas that we are so reliant on, and production from Federal lands, under his watch, is down significantly.

So it is all the private sector that has done this, Sarah Palin and others saying, "Drill, baby, drill." That has actually happened, and now we have got an abundance. It has brought down gasoline prices.

And what is the Democrat reaction to prices of gasoline going down? Well, that means we need to add some taxes to gasoline. Really?

I loved hearing the President say we need to do infrastructure, except, dadgummit, I remember him talking about that repeatedly when he first became President. That is why he said we had to have this massive \$900 billion, because we are going to build infrastructure.

And what did he do? He got the \$900 billion from a Democratic House and Senate, and only a fraction of it went to infrastructure. We were told it was going to go to shovel-ready jobs, and then we find out some years later, well, actually there was no such thing as the shovel-ready jobs. They did send it to companies like Solyndra and others that lived high off the hog for a while and then went broke. I am sure they are getting some other grant somewhere else.

Which brings us to another story, which was reported as a bombshell, a story by Richard Pollock, "Bombshell: IRS Has Active Contract for Millions With Company HHS Fired Over Botched Healthcare.gov" Web site.

Wow. Well, no wonder the President wants more money. He is still doing deals for millions of dollars with people they paid massive millions of dollars to do a Web site that didn't work. We have had people come to the Hill and say: We could have done that for about one-twentieth of the cost of what was paid and actually had it working.

But things are a little better in Texas. I loved hearing the President take credit for jobs that have been created in Texas. Unfortunately, when you look at the jobs that his policies have helped create around the country, the biggest thing he has helped create is part-time jobs in numbers like we have never had before.

I love when he brings people in here to hold them up as good examples. I wish he had brought some of my constituents, some of whom are broken-hearted because their part-time job went from 39 hours to 29. They had to get a second one. And they have also lost what benefits they did have at their first employment. Now they are spending more time away from their children, making less.

I know he has the image that \$15,000 a year is supposed to support a family of four, but what most people in business can tell you—especially small business that employs about 70 percent

of American workers—the minimum wage is entry level. And when I talk to people at places like McDonald's, they are not even paying the minimum wage. They are paying more than that. And places where oil is being drilled and gas is being drilled, they are paying a lot more than minimum wage. Some of them are paying bonuses because that is what happens when the Federal Government does not impede the ability of industry and of American entrepreneurialism.

But here, also, the President wants to provide net neutrality. I want neutrality. I want Internet neutrality. But I don't want the government taking over because I know his friends end up doing well and his enemies don't do well.

I would like to make sure that the market is able to play. I would love it if he had come in here and said: You know what? We have wasted a lot of money trying to prop up solar energy and wind energy. We have squandered massive amounts of money, of taxpayer dollars, money we have had to borrow from China that won't be paid back in my lifetime. But here is a tax notion. Let's eliminate the subsidies for every energy form, whatever it is, eliminate them. Nobody is going to get subsidies. Nobody gets grants. Good luck.

What would that mean? It would mean the free market would take over.

And when I hear the commercials, oh, buy a solar energy whatever, air conditioner or whatever it is, heater, buy it now because the subsidies may be running out before long, well, let's run them all out. Let's let energy be determined by the free market without government intervention, without using the Tax Code.

I am pleased that perhaps the President has heard some of us. As we have said, the President keeps talking about Warren Buffett paying a lower tax rate than his secretary, but he has never offered any solutions to fix that, as some of us here have. What would be the best solution? Well, bring down the secretary's income tax rate to the capital gains rate that Warren Buffett is paying. That is how you do it.

I just love Arthur Laffer, Ronald Reagan's former economic adviser, such a brilliant guy. He explained to a group of us a few years ago here—and I am paraphrasing Arthur—he said: I hear people talking about we are going to tax the rich. The rich, he says, are the ones you are not going to tax.

Now, if you say we are going to tax this activity of the rich, they will change the activity. They can do that because they are ultrarich. If you say we are going to tax you in this location, this State, this city, this country, they are ultrarich; they can move. That is what rich people do.

So if one State where Secretary Kerry has his yacht has a really high tax, well, what is he going to do? He is going to do what he has done. He is going to move the yacht to a State that has a lower tax. That is what rich

people do. So you may say: I am going to go after the rich and tax them, really put it to them, and then spread that wealth.

The ultrarich are the ones you are not going to tax. They will move. The rest of us, we can't just say: You know what? I am going to go be a lawyer in another country, another place.

You can't just do that. You have got to go through all kinds of training. You just can't do that. You can't go be a Member of Congress somewhere else. You can't just pick up your job and take it when you are middle class or you are poor.

So what happens when somebody says we are going to increase taxes on the rich, well, they move. They change their activity. They avoid the tax because they can do that. That is why Warren Buffett can say he is not worried about the inheritance tax. He takes actions to make sure he is not going to get hit with it. The poor can't do that. Of course, you have to have over a minimum amount now, so the poor don't get hit with it, but the middle class does.

My great-aunt was middle class through and through—as they say, land rich, cash poor. Land prices dropped within 6 months of her death. The IRS took every acre of her 2,500-acre farm. Every acre. They sold her home at an auction because land prices dropped. The FDIC had dumped land around there. Prices dropped. Under the inheritance tax, it is the value of that land at the time of the death. They took every acre, took the home place. The people she had specified in her will that would get specific things didn't get them. The IRS got them.

That is why I went when the call went out to family members to please show up and buy whatever you can so that we can keep it in the family. Yes, that lady was middle class. She lived middle class. I had been to her home numerous times. You wouldn't find anything that you would say was even upper middle class. They took every acre of her land, her home for taxes.

But if you are ultrarich, you don't run into that situation. You buy insurance policies. You convert the way you get income. You move cash here, there, to other countries. You can do that. But not when you are middle class.

So the policies of this President have caused, for the first time in American history, 95 percent of America's income to go to the top 1 percent.

□ 1445

The President admitted it a couple years ago, yeah, he was aware that happened. Well, how about working with the rest of us who have some good ideas that would increase the number of middle class, moving people up from poor; increase the people moving from lower middle class up to upper middle class; and moving people from middle class to wealthy? We want that. That is what we hope for. We don't want to bring down people from where they

have done well, even if they are one of the few that were born on third base and have gone through life thinking they hit a triple. We want everybody to do well. And if you get jealous of them, your life is going to be ruined.

I loved the quotes from Martin Luther King, so many of them brought out in the movie "Selma": If you get eaten up with anger, revenge—and in the cases around here—jealousy, you are the one that is going to be miserable. Let's encourage people to get wealthy not by taking from the wealthy and bringing people down. Let's have a flat tax: if you make more, then you are going to pay more; if you make less, then you are going to pay less.

Mr. Speaker, let me just conclude by saying that in 40 years over 57 million babies have been killed here in America. As a father who held a premature daughter in my hand and had her grasp the end of my finger with her tiny little hand, it wrenches my heart to think there are people that will want to kill a baby girl of that same age. Let's stop. God bless the March for Life.

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

HONORING THE LIFE OF THEODORE EMILE "BO" DOLLIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) for 30 minutes.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, before we left after this workweek, I wanted to make sure that I came to the floor and took the time to recognize the loss of a cultural icon in New Orleans and a family friend.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Theodore Emile "Bo" Dollis, the Big Chief of the Wild Magnolias Mardi Gras Indians and a cultural icon in New Orleans for decades. Bo Dollis died this week at the age of 71.

Though his family did not want him to join the Mardi Gras Indians as a child, Bo secretly sewed his own suit at his friend's home. He joined the Wild Magnolias as a Flag Boy and quickly rose in their ranks, becoming Big Chief in 1964, a position he held until his health no longer allowed it.

As Big Chief, just as his mentor, Big Chief Allison "Tootie" Montana, did, Bo encouraged the Indians to shun violence and instead hold prettiness contests when one group would meet another. Bo was also instrumental in bringing the music of the Mardi Gras Indians to an audience beyond New Orleans. With Bo Dollis on lead vocals, the Wild Magnolias recorded their first single in 1970 and their first album in 1974. Under Bo's leadership, the group toured all over the world, opened for Aretha Franklin, and played at Carnegie Hall. This week, the New Orleans Jazz and Heritage Festival announced

that Bo Dollis would appear on the festival's official poster. Bo has received numerous honors and awards, including *Offbeat Magazine's* Lifetime Achievement Award and the National Endowment for the Arts' National Heritage Fellowship.

Mr. Speaker, Bo Dollis embodied the happiness, the passion, and love of music that define the culture of New Orleans. His soaring voice brought joy to countless listeners, and his colorful personality brightened every room he entered. The city of New Orleans will not be the same without Bo Dollis, but his legacy will live on in the lives of all that he inspired. And this Mardi Gras will not be the same without Big Chief "Bo" Dollis' presence there.

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

SUNSET MEMORIAL

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, another legislative day has come to an end, and sunset approaches fast in Washington, DC. And as I have so many years, I stand before you in this House with what I call a Sunset Memorial, because, you see, Mr. Speaker, before the sun sets today in America, almost 4,000 more defenseless unborn children will be killed by abortion on demand in the land of the free and the home of the brave. That is more than the number of innocent lives lost on September 11 in this country by a multitude of thousands. And it happens every day.

It has now been 42 years since the tragedy called *Roe v. Wade* was first handed down. Since then, the very foundation of this Nation has been stained by the blood of almost 56 million of its own unborn children. Some of them, Mr. Speaker, cried and screamed as they died, but because it was amniotic fluid going over the vocal cords instead of air, we couldn't hear them.

All of them had at least four things in common, Mr. Speaker. First, they were just little babies who had never done anything wrong to anyone. Each one of them died a nameless and lonely death. And each one of their mothers, whether she realizes it or not, will never quite be the same. All the gifts that these children might have brought for humanity and to humanity are now lost forever.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, even in the glare of such tragedy, this generation still clings to this blind, invincible ignorance while history repeats itself over and over again, and our silent genocide mercilessly annihilates the most helpless of all victims—those yet unborn.

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

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

Mr. Lincoln called upon all of us to remember America's Founding Fathers when he said:

Their enlightened belief was 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—and that is us, Mr. Speaker:

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—again, Mr. Speaker, that is us—might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began.

Mr. Speaker, 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. Now, he didn't call it that. He called it "ensuring fetal demise." And 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.

Mr. Speaker, Ashley Baldwin, one of Dr. Gosnell's employees, said she saw babies breathing, and she described one as 2 feet long that no longer had eyes or a mouth, but, in her words, was making like this screeching noise. She said: "It sounded like a little alien."

For God's sake, Mr. Speaker, is this who we really are?

Kermit Gosnell now rightfully sits in prison for killing a mother and murdering innocent, pain-capable children like the one I just described. Yet if he had killed them only 5 minutes earlier and before they had passed through the birth canal, it would have all been perfectly legal in many of the United States of America, including here in the District of Columbia.

If there is one thing 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 worst atrocity in America today, and this in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Throughout history there has often been great intensity surrounding the debates of protecting the innocent lives of those who, through no fault of their own, find themselves obscured in the shadows of humanity. It encourages me greatly that in nearly all of those cases the collective conscience was finally moved in favor of the victims.

The same thing is beginning to happen in this debate related to innocent, unborn children, Mr. Speaker, especially those that are pain capable. We

are beginning to ask ourselves the real question: Does abortion take the life of a child? We are especially asking the question recently: Does very late-term abortion torture and take the life of a pain-capable baby? And we are finally beginning to realize as human beings that it does.

Ultrasound technology now demonstrates to all reasonable observers both the humanity of the victim and the inhumanity of what is being done to them. And we are beginning to realize as Americans that taking brutally the lives of the innocent unborn does not liberate anyone and that 56 million children, Mr. Speaker, is enough.

Ironically I have heard Barack Obama speak such poignant words that, whether he knows it or not, apply so profoundly to the tragedy of abortion on demand in America. Let me quote excerpted portions of his comments. He said:

This is our first task—caring for our children. It is our first job. If we don't get that right, we don't get anything right. That is how, as a society, we will be judged.

He went on to say:

And by that measure, can we truly say, as a nation, that we are meeting our obligations? Can we honestly say that we are doing enough to keep our children—all of them—safe from harm? Can we say that we are truly doing enough to give all the children of this country the chance they deserve to live out their lives with happiness and purpose?

The President went on to say:

I have been reflecting on this the last few days, and if we are honest with ourselves, the answer is no. We are not doing enough. And we will have to change.

Oh, how true the President's words are, Mr. Speaker.

The President also said:

We can't tolerate this anymore. These tragedies must end. And to end them, we must change.

And then the President asked:

Are we really prepared to say that we are 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 freedom?

Mr. Speaker, is this not the most relevant of questions we should all be asking in the midst of this genocidal murder of thousands of unborn babies in America every day?

□ 1500

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

Finally, he said: "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 Barack Obama as those I have just quoted, and yet this President in the most merciless distortion of logic and reason and humanity itself refuses to apply these majestic words to helpless unborn babies.

Oh, how I wish somehow that Mr. Obama and all of us could open our hearts and our ears to his words and ask ourselves in the core of our own soul why his words that should apply to all children cannot apply to the most helpless of all children.

Mr. Speaker, we honor Abraham Lincoln most because he found the courage as President of the United States in the days of slavery, and he found the humanity within himself to recognize the image of God stamped on the soul of slaves that the Supreme Court said were not human and that the tide of public opinion didn't recognize as protectable under the law.

Could it still be that President Barack Obama might consider that perspective as well as his own legacy, and even eternity itself, and recognize that those little unborn children look so desperately to him now for help?

Could it be that the President might finally remember that on the pages of the Bible on which he laid his hands were the words written in red: "Inasmuch as you have done it unto one of the least of these My brethren, you have done it unto Me"?

Whether he does or not, it is time for those of us in this Chamber to remind ourselves of why we are really all here. Thomas Jefferson 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 14th Amendment capsulizes our entire Constitution. It says:

No State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without the due process of law.

The 14th Amendment tells us that we should have equal protection of the laws for all. Mr. Speaker, protecting the lives of all Americans and their constitutional rights is why we are all here.

The bedrock foundation of this Republic is that clarion declaration of the self-evident truth that all human beings are created equal and endowed by their Creator with unalienable rights, the rights of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Every conflict and battle our Nation has ever faced can be traced to our commitment to this core self-evident truth. It has made us the beacon of hope for the entire world. Mr. Speaker, it is truly who we are.

Yet today another day has passed. As so many sunset memorials that I have given, another day has passed, and we in this body have failed again to honor that foundational commitment. We have failed our sworn oath and our God-given responsibility as we broke faith with nearly 4,000 more innocent, unborn babies who died today without the protection we should have given them.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me conclude this sunset memorial in the hope that perhaps someone new who heard it will finally embrace the truth that abortion really does kill little babies, that it

hurts mothers in ways that we can never express, and that it is time we stood up together again and looked up to the Declaration of Independence, and that we remember that we are the same America that rejected human slavery and marched into Europe to arrest the Nazi Holocaust, and we are still the courageous and compassionate Nation that can find a better way for mothers and their unborn children than abortion on demand.

It is still not too late for us to make a better world and for America to be the one that leads the rest of the planet, just as we did in the days of slavery, from this tragic genocide of murdering nearly 4,000 of our own children every day.

So now, Mr. Speaker, as we consider the thousands, the hundreds of thousands out on The Mall marching to protect these little babies, as we consider the plight of the unborn for 42 years under Roe v. Wade, maybe we can each remind ourselves that our own days in this sunshine of life are all numbered and that we, too, each one, shall walk from these Chambers one day for the very last time.

If it should be that Congress is allowed to convene on yet another day, may that be the day when we finally hear the cries, when we finally hear the cries of innocent, unborn children. May that be the day when we find the humanity and the constitutional duty to protect these, the least of our tiny little American brothers and sisters, from this murderous scourge upon our Nation called abortion on demand.

Mr. Speaker, it is now 42 years to the day since Roe v. Wade first stained the foundation of this Nation with the blood of its own children—this, in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

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

COMMUNICATION FROM DISTRICT OFFICE MANAGER, THE HONORABLE CHAKA FATTAH, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Dolores Ridley, District Office Manager, the Honorable CHAKA FATTAH, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
January 16, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, for grand jury testimony in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

DOLORES RIDLEY,
District Office Manager.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Joint Economic Committee:

Mr. AMASH, Michigan
Mr. PAULSEN, Minnesota
Mr. HANNA, New York
Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Arizona
Mr. GROTHMAN, Wisconsin

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(2) of House rule XI, I am submitting the rules of the Committee on the Budget for the 114th Congress. The rules were adopted earlier today during our Committee's organizational meeting.

GENERAL APPLICABILITY

RULE 1—APPLICABILITY OF HOUSE RULES

(a) Except as otherwise specified herein, the Rules of the House are the rules of the Committee so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, or a motion to recess subject to the call of the Chair (within 24 hours), or a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, is a non-debatable motion of privilege in the Committee. A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to the members of the Committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such day).

(b) The Committee's rules shall be publicly available in electronic form and published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Chair of the Committee is elected in each odd-numbered year.

MEETINGS

RULE 2—REGULAR MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting day of the Committee shall be the second Wednesday of each month at 11 a.m., while the House is in session, if notice is given pursuant to paragraph (c) and paragraph (g)(3) of clause 2 of rule XI of House Rules.

(b) Regular meetings shall be canceled when they conflict with meetings of either party's caucus or conference.

(c) The Chair shall give written notice of the date, place, and subject matter of any Committee meeting, which may not commence earlier than the third day on which members have notice thereof, unless the Chair, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, or the Committee by majority vote with a quorum present for the transaction of business, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, in which case the Chair shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. An announcement shall be published promptly in the Daily Digest and made publicly available in electronic form.

RULE 3—ADDITIONAL AND SPECIAL MEETINGS

(a) The Chair may call and convene additional meetings of the Committee as the Chair considers necessary or special meetings at the request of a majority of the members of the Committee in accordance with clause 2(c) of rule XI of House Rules.

(b) In the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Chair shall provide public

electronic notice of additional meetings to the office of each member at least 24 hours in advance while Congress is in session, and at least 3 days in advance when Congress is not in session.

RULE 4—OPEN BUSINESS MEETINGS

(a) Meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be called to order and presided over by the Chair or, in the Chair's absence, by the member designated by the Chair as the Vice Chair of the Committee, or by the Ranking majority member of the Committee present as Acting Chair.

(b) Each meeting for the transaction of Committee business, including the markup of measures, shall be open to the public except when the Committee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public in accordance with clause 2(g)(1) of rule XI of the House Rules.

(c) No person, other than members of the Committee and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as the Committee may authorize, shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public.

(d) Not later than 24 hours after commencing a meeting to consider a measure or matter, the Chair of the Committee shall cause the text of such measure or matter and any amendment adopted thereto to be made publicly available in electronic form.

RULE 5—QUORUMS

(a) A majority of the Committee shall constitute a quorum. No business shall be transacted and no measure or recommendation shall be reported unless a quorum is actually present.

RULE 6—RECOGNITION

Any member, when recognized by the Chair, may address the Committee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration before the Committee. The time of such member shall be limited to 5 minutes until all members present have been afforded an opportunity to comment.

RULE 7—CONSIDERATION OF BUSINESS

Measures or matters may be placed before the Committee, for its consideration, by the Chair or by a majority vote of the Committee members, a quorum being present.

RULE 8—AVAILABILITY OF LEGISLATION

(a) The Committee shall consider no bill, joint resolution, or concurrent resolution unless copies of the measure have been made available to all Committee members at least 24 hours prior to the time at which such measure is to be considered. When considering concurrent resolutions on the budget, this requirement shall be satisfied by making available copies of the complete Chairman's mark (or such material as will provide the basis for Committee consideration). The provisions of this rule may be suspended with the concurrence of the Chair and Ranking Minority Member.

(b) At least 24 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of legislation, the Chair shall cause the text of such legislation to be made publicly available in electronic form.

RULE 9—PROCEDURE FOR CONSIDERATION OF BUDGET RESOLUTION

(a) It shall be the policy of the Committee that the starting point for any deliberations on a concurrent resolution on the budget should be the estimated or actual levels for the fiscal year preceding the budget year.

(b) In the consideration of a concurrent resolution on the budget, the Committee shall first proceed, unless otherwise determined by the Committee, to consider budget aggregates, functional categories, and other

appropriate matters on a tentative basis, with the document before the Committee open to amendment. Subsequent amendments may be offered to aggregates, functional categories, or other appropriate matters, which have already been amended in their entirety.

(c) Following adoption of the aggregates, functional categories, and other matters, the text of a concurrent resolution on the budget incorporating such aggregates, functional categories, and other appropriate matters shall be considered for amendment and a final vote.

RULE 10—ROLL CALL VOTES

(a) A roll call of the members may be had upon the request of at least one-fifth of those present. In the apparent absence of a quorum, a roll call may be had on the request of any member.

(b) No vote may be conducted on any measure or motion pending before the Committee unless a quorum is present for such purpose.

(c) No vote by any member of the Committee on any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

(d) In accordance with clause 2(e)(1)(B) of rule XI of the House Rules, a record of the vote of each Committee member on each recorded vote shall be available for public inspection at the offices of the Committee and also made publicly available in electronic form within 48 hours of such record vote, and, with respect to any roll call vote on any motion to amend or report, shall be included in the report of the Committee showing the total number of votes cast for and against and the names of those members voting for and against.

HEARINGS

RULE 11—ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS

The Chair shall make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any Committee hearing at least one week before the hearing, beginning with the day in which the announcement is made and ending the day preceding the scheduled hearing unless the Chair, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, or the Committee by majority vote with a quorum present for the transaction of business, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, in which case the Chair shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Such announcement shall be published promptly in the Daily Digest and made publicly available in electronic form.

RULE 12—OPEN HEARINGS

(a) Each hearing conducted by the Committee or any of its task forces shall be open to the public except when the Committee or task force, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, or would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. The Committee or task forces may by the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of hearing.

(b) For the purposes clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI of House Rules, the task forces of the Committee are considered to be subcommittees.

RULE 13—QUORUMS

For the purpose of hearing testimony, not less than two members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

RULE 14—QUESTIONING WITNESSES

(a) Questioning of witnesses will be conducted under the 5-minute rule unless the

Committee adopts a motion pursuant to clause 2(j) of rule XI of the House Rules.

(b) In questioning witnesses under the 5-minute rule:

(1) First, the Chair and the Ranking Minority Member shall be recognized;

(2) Next, the Committee members present at the time the hearing is called to order shall be recognized in order of seniority; and

(3) Finally, the Committee members not present at the time the hearing is called to order may be recognized in the order of their arrival at the hearing.

(c) In recognizing Committee members to question witnesses, the Chair may take into consideration the ratio of majority members to minority members and the number of majority and minority members present and shall apportion the recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority.

(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (A), the Chair and Ranking Minority Member may designate an equal number of members from each party to question a witness for a period not longer than 30 minutes, or may designate staff from each party to question a witness for a period not longer than 30 minutes.

RULE 15—SUBPOENAS AND OATHS

(a) In accordance with clause 2(m) of rule XI of the House Rules, subpoenas authorized by a majority of the Committee or by the Chair (pursuant to such rules and limitations as the Committee may prescribe) may be issued over the signature of the Chair or of any member of the Committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by the Chair or such member.

(b) The Chair, or any member of the Committee designated by the Chair, may administer oaths to witnesses.

RULE 16—WITNESSES' STATEMENTS

(a) So far as practicable, any prepared statement to be presented by a witness shall be submitted to the Committee at least 24 hours in advance of presentation, and shall be distributed to all members of the Committee in advance of presentation.

(b) To the greatest extent possible, each witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity shall include with the written statement of proposed testimony a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or sub-grant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two preceding fiscal years.

(c) Such statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy of witnesses, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

PRINTS AND PUBLICATIONS

RULE 17—COMMITTEE PRINTS

All Committee prints and other materials prepared for public distribution shall be approved by the Committee prior to any distribution, unless such print or other material shows clearly on its face that it has not been approved by the Committee.

RULE 18—COMMITTEE PUBLICATIONS ON THE INTERNET

(a) To the maximum extent feasible, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form.

STAFF

RULE 19—COMMITTEE STAFF

(a) Subject to approval by the Committee and to the provisions of the following paragraphs, the professional and clerical staff of the Committee shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the Chair.

(b) Committee staff shall not be assigned any duties other than those pertaining to

Committee business, and shall be selected without regard to race, creed, gender, or age, and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of their respective positions.

(c) All Committee staff shall be entitled to equitable treatment, including comparable salaries, facilities, access to official Committee records, leave, and hours of work.

(d) Notwithstanding paragraphs a, b, and c, staff shall be employed in compliance with House rules, the Employment and Accountability Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and any other applicable Federal statutes.

RULE 20—STAFF SUPERVISION

(a) Staff shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chair, who shall establish and assign their duties and responsibilities, delegate such authority as he deems appropriate, fix and adjust staff salaries (in accordance with House Rule X, clause 9(c)) and job titles, and, at his discretion, arrange for their specialized training.

(b) Staff assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the minority members of the Committee, who may delegate such authority, as they deem appropriate.

RECORDS

RULE 21—PREPARATION AND MAINTENANCE OF COMMITTEE RECORDS

(a) A substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings shall be made of all hearings and business meetings subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections.

(b) The proceedings of the Committee shall be recorded in a journal, which shall among other things, include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is taken.

(c) Members of the Committee shall correct and return transcripts of hearings as soon as practicable after receipt thereof, except that any changes shall be limited to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections.

(d) Any witness may examine the transcript of his own testimony and make grammatical, technical, and typographical corrections.

(e) The Chair may order the printing of a hearing record without the corrections of any member or witness if he determines that such member or witness has been afforded a reasonable time for correction, and that further delay would seriously impede the Committee's responsibility for meeting its deadlines under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(f) Transcripts of hearings and meetings may be printed if the Chair decides it is appropriate, or if a majority of the members so request.

RULE 22—ACCESS TO COMMITTEE RECORDS

(a)(1) The Chair shall promulgate regulations to provide for public inspection of roll call votes and to provide access by members to Committee records (in accordance with clause 2(e) of rule XI of the House Rules).

(2) Access to classified testimony and information shall be limited to Members of Congress and to House Budget Committee staff and staff of the Office of Official Reporters who have appropriate security clearance.

(3) Notice of the receipt of such information shall be sent to the Committee members. Such information shall be kept in the Committee safe, and shall be available to members in the Committee office.

(b) The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with rule VII of the House Rules. The Chair shall notify the Ranking Minority

Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee.

OVERSIGHT

RULE 23—GENERAL OVERSIGHT

(a) The Committee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject of which is within its jurisdiction.

(b) The Committee is authorized at any time to conduct such investigations and studies as it may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under clause (1)(d) of rule X of the House Rules, and, subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by clause 6 of rule X of the House Rules, to incur expenses (including travel expenses) in connection therewith.

(c) Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, the Committee shall meet in open session, with a quorum present, to adopt its oversight plans for that Congress for submission to the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in accordance with the provisions of clause (2)(d) of rule X of the House Rules.

REPORTS

RULE 24—AVAILABILITY BEFORE FILING

(a) Any report accompanying any bill or resolution ordered reported to the House by the Committee shall be available to all Committee members at least 36 hours prior to filing with the House.

(b) No material change shall be made in any report made available to members pursuant to section (a) without the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member or by a majority vote of the Committee.

(c) Notwithstanding any other rule of the Committee, either or both subsections (a) and (b) may be waived by the Chair or with a majority vote by the Committee.

RULE 25—REPORT ON THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

The report of the Committee to accompany a concurrent resolution on the budget shall include a comparison of the estimated or actual levels for the year preceding the budget year with the proposed spending and revenue levels for the budget year and each out year along with the appropriate percentage increase or decrease for each budget function and aggregate. The report shall include any roll call vote on any motion to amend or report on any measure.

RULE 26—PARLIAMENTARIAN'S STATUS REPORT AND SECTION 302 STATUS REPORT

(a)(1) In order to carry out its duty under sections 311 and 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to advise the House of Representatives as to the current level of spending and revenues as compared to the levels set forth in the latest agreed-upon concurrent resolution on the budget, the Committee shall advise the Speaker on at least a monthly basis when the House is in session as to its estimate of the current level of spending and revenue. Such estimates shall be prepared by the staff of the Committee, transmitted to the Speaker in the form of a Parliamentarian's Status Report, and printed in the Congressional Record.

(2) The Committee authorizes the Chair, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, to transmit to the Speaker the Parliamentarian's Status Report described above.

(b)(1) In order to carry out its duty under sections 302 and 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to advise the House of

Representatives as to the current level of spending within the jurisdiction of Committees as compared to the appropriate allocations made pursuant to the Budget Act in conformity with the latest agreed-upon concurrent resolution on the budget, the Committee shall, as necessary, advise the Speaker as to its estimate of the current level of spending within the jurisdiction of appropriate Committees. Such estimates shall be prepared by the staff of the Committee and transmitted to the Speaker in the form of a Section 302 Status Report.

(2) The Committee authorizes the Chair, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, to transmit to the Speaker the Section 302 Status Report described above.

RULE 27—ACTIVITY REPORT

(a) After an adjournment sine die of the last regular session of a Congress or after December 15 of an even-numbered year, the chair of the Committee may file any time with the Clerk the Committee's activity report for that Congress pursuant to clause (1)(d)(1) of rule XI of the House Rules without the approval of the Committee, if a copy of the report has been available to each member of the Committee for at least seven calendar days and the report includes any supplemental, minority, or additional views submitted by a member of the Committee.

(b) Such report shall include separate sections summarizing the legislative and oversight activities of the Committee; a summary of the actions taken and recommendations made; a summary of any additional oversight activities undertaken by the Committee, and any recommendations made or actions taken thereon; and a delineation of any hearings held.

MISCELLANEOUS

RULE 28—BROADCASTING OF MEETINGS AND HEARINGS

(a) It shall be the policy of the Committee to give all news media access to open hearings of the Committee, subject to the requirements and limitations set forth in clause 4 of rule XI of the House Rules.

(b) Whenever any Committee business meeting is open to the public, that meeting may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, in accordance with clause 4 of rule XI of the House Rules.

RULE 29—APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

(a) Majority party members recommended to the Speaker as conferees shall be recommended by the Chair subject to the approval of the majority party members of the Committee.

(b) The Chair shall recommend such minority party members as conferees as shall be determined by the minority party; the recommended party representation shall be in approximately the same proportion as that in the Committee.

RULE 30—WAIVERS

When a reported bill or joint resolution, conference report, or anticipated floor amendment violates any provision of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Chair may, if practical, consult with the Committee members on whether the Chair should recommend, in writing, that the Committee on Rules report a special rule that enforces the Act by not waiving the applicable points of order during the consideration of such measure.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE
RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS
FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Rule XI clause 2, I am submitting the Ways and Means Committee rules for the 114th Congress. The rules were adopted during our Committee's organizational meeting, which was held January 21, 2015.

A. GENERAL

RULE 1. APPLICATION OF HOUSE RULES

The rules of the House are the rules of the Committee on Ways and Means and its subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, is a non-debatable motion of high privilege in the Committee.

Each subcommittee of the Committee is part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules so far as applicable. Written rules adopted by the Committee, not inconsistent with the Rules of the House, shall be binding on each subcommittee of the Committee.

The provisions of rule XI of the Rules of the House are incorporated by reference as the rules of the Committee to the extent applicable.

RULE 2. MEETING DATE AND QUORUMS

The regular meeting day of the Committee on Ways and Means shall be on the second Wednesday of each month while the House is in session. However, the Committee shall not meet on the regularly scheduled meeting day if there is no business to be considered.

A majority of the Committee constitutes a quorum for business; provided however, that two Members shall constitute a quorum at any regularly scheduled hearing called for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence. In establishing a quorum for purposes of a public hearing, every effort shall be made to secure the presence of at least one Member each from the majority and the minority.

The Chairman of the Committee may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet pursuant to the call of the Chair.

RULE 3. COMMITTEE BUDGET

For each Congress, the Chairman, in consultation with the Majority Members of the Committee, shall prepare a preliminary budget. Such budget shall include necessary amounts for staff personnel, travel, investigation, and other expenses of the Committee. After consultation with the Minority Members, the Chairman shall include an amount budgeted by Minority Members for staff under their direction and supervision.

RULE 4. PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE
DOCUMENTS

Any Committee or Subcommittee print, document, or similar material prepared for public distribution shall either be approved by the Committee or Subcommittee prior to distribution and opportunity afforded for the inclusion of supplemental, minority or additional views, or such document shall prominently display near the top of its cover the following: "Majority [or Minority] Staff Report," as appropriate.

The requirements of this rule shall apply only to the publication of policy-oriented, analytical documents, and not to the publication of public hearings, legislative docu-

ments, documents which are administrative in nature or reports which are required to be submitted to the Committee under public law. The appropriate characterization of a document subject to this rule shall be determined after consultation with the Minority.

RULE 5. OFFICIAL TRAVEL

Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolution as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern official travel of Committee Members and Committee staff. Official travel to be reimbursed from funds set aside for the full Committee for any Member or any Committee staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the Chairman. Official travel may be authorized by the Chairman for any Member and any Committee staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the Committee, its Subcommittees, or any other Committee or Subcommittee of the Congress on matters relevant to the general jurisdiction of the Committee, and meetings, conferences, facility inspections, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter relevant to the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the Chairman in writing the following:

- (1) The purpose of the official travel;
- (2) The dates during which the official travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the official travel is being made;
- (3) The location of the event for which the official travel is to be made; and
- (4) The names of the Members and Committee staff seeking authorization.

In the case of official travel of Members and staff of a Subcommittee to hearings, meetings, conferences, facility inspections and investigations involving activities or subject matter under the jurisdiction of such Subcommittee, prior authorization must be obtained from the Subcommittee Chairman and the full Committee Chairman. Such prior authorization shall be given by the full Committee Chairman only upon the representation by the applicable Subcommittee Chairman in writing setting forth those items enumerated above.

Within 60 days of the conclusion of any official travel authorized under this rule, there shall be submitted to the full Committee Chairman a written report covering the information gained as a result of the hearing, meeting, conference, facility inspection or investigation attended pursuant to such official travel.

RULE 6. AVAILABILITY OF COMMITTEE RECORDS
AND PUBLICATIONS

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of Rule VII, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any Member of the Committee. The Committee shall, to the maximum extent feasible, make its publications available in electronic form.

RULE 7. COMMITTEE WEBSITE

The Chairman shall maintain an official Committee website for the purpose of furthering the Committee's legislative and oversight responsibilities, including communicating information about the Committee's activities to Committee members and other members of the House. The ranking minority member may maintain a similar website for

the same purpose, including communicating information about the activities of the minority to Committee members and other members of the House.

B. SUBCOMMITTEES

RULE 8. SUBCOMMITTEE RATIOS AND
JURISDICTION

All matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means involving revenue measures, except those revenue measures referred to Subcommittees under paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6 shall be considered by the full Committee and not in Subcommittee. There shall be six standing Subcommittees as follows: a Subcommittee on Trade; a Subcommittee on Oversight; a Subcommittee on Health; a Subcommittee on Social Security; a Subcommittee on Human Resources; and a Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures. The ratio of Republicans to Democrats on any Subcommittee of the Committee shall be consistent with the ratio of Republicans to Democrats on the full Committee.

1. The Subcommittee on Trade shall consist of 16 Members, 10 of whom shall be Republicans and 6 of whom shall be Democrats.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Trade shall include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means that relate to customs and customs administration including tariff and import fee structure, classification, valuation of and special rules applying to imports, and special tariff provisions and procedures which relate to customs operation affecting exports and imports; import trade matters, including import impact, industry relief from injurious imports, adjustment assistance and programs to encourage competitive responses to imports, unfair import practices including antidumping and countervailing duty provisions, and import policy which relates to dependence on foreign sources of supply; commodity agreements and reciprocal trade agreements involving multilateral and bilateral trade negotiations and implementation of agreements involving tariff and non-tariff trade barriers to and distortions of international trade; international rules, organizations and institutional aspects of international trade agreements; budget authorizations for the customs revenue functions of the Department of Homeland Security, the U.S. International Trade Commission, and the U.S. Trade Representative; and special trade-related problems involving market access, competitive conditions of specific industries, export policy and promotion, access to materials in short supply, bilateral trade relations including trade with developing countries, operations of multinational corporations, and trade with non-market economies.

2. The Subcommittee on Oversight shall consist of 11 Members, 7 of whom shall be Republicans and 4 of whom shall be Democrats.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Oversight shall include all matters within the scope of the full Committee's jurisdiction but shall be limited to existing law. Said oversight jurisdiction shall not be exclusive but shall be concurrent with that of the other Subcommittees. With respect to matters involving the Internal Revenue Code and other revenue issues, said concurrent jurisdiction shall be shared with the full Committee. Before undertaking any investigation or hearing, the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight shall confer with the Chairman of the full Committee and the Chairman of any other Subcommittee having jurisdiction.

3. The Subcommittee on Health shall consist of 16 Members, 10 of whom shall be Republicans and 6 of whom shall be Democrats.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Health shall include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means

that relate to programs providing payments (from any source) for health care, health delivery systems, or health research. More specifically, the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Health shall include bills and matters that relate to the health care programs of the Social Security Act (including titles V, XI (Part B), XVIII, and XIX thereof) and, concurrent with the full Committee, tax credit and deduction provisions of the Internal Revenue Code dealing with health insurance premiums and health care costs.

4. The Subcommittee on Social Security shall consist of 11 Members, 7 of whom shall be Republicans and 4 of whom shall be Democrats.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Social Security shall include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means that relate to the Federal Old Age, Survivors' and Disability Insurance System, the Railroad Retirement System, and employment taxes and trust fund operations relating to those systems. More specifically, the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Social Security shall include bills and matters involving title II of the Social Security Act and Chapter 22 of the Internal Revenue Code (the Railroad Retirement Tax Act), as well as provisions in title VII and title XI of the Act relating to procedure and administration involving the Old Age, Survivors' and Disability Insurance System.

5. The Subcommittee on Human Resources shall consist of 11 Members, 7 of whom shall be Republicans and 4 of whom shall be Democrats.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Human Resources shall include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means that relate to the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act, including temporary assistance for needy families, child care, child and family services, child support, foster care, adoption, supplemental security income, social services, eligibility of welfare recipients for food stamps, and low-income energy assistance. More specifically, the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Human Resources shall include bills and matters relating to titles I, IV, VI, X, XIV, XVI, XVII, XX and related provisions of titles VII and XI of the Social Security Act.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Human Resources shall also include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means that relate to the Federal-State system of unemployment compensation, and the financing thereof, including the programs for extended and emergency benefits. More specifically, the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Human Resources shall also include all bills and matters pertaining to the programs of unemployment compensation under titles III, IX and XII of the Social Security Act, Chapters 23 and 23A of the Internal Revenue Code, and the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970, and provisions relating thereto.

6. The Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures shall consist of 11 Members, 7 of whom shall be Republicans and 4 of whom shall be Democrats.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures shall consist of those revenue measures that, from time to time, shall be referred to it specifically by the Chairman of the full Committee.

RULE 9. EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS OF SUBCOMMITTEES

The Chairman of the full Committee and the Ranking Minority Member may sit as ex-officio Members of all Subcommittees. They may be counted for purposes of assisting in the establishment of a quorum for a Subcommittee. However, their absence shall not

count against the establishment of a quorum by the regular Members of the Subcommittee. Ex-officio Members shall neither vote in the Subcommittee nor be taken into consideration for the purposes of determining the ratio of the Subcommittee.

RULE 10. SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS

Insofar as practicable, meetings of the full Committee and its Subcommittees shall not conflict. Subcommittee Chairmen shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman of the full Committee and other Subcommittee Chairmen with a view towards avoiding, wherever possible, simultaneous scheduling of full Committee and Subcommittee meetings or hearings.

RULE 11. REFERENCE OF LEGISLATION AND SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Except for bills or measures retained by the Chairman of the full Committee for full Committee consideration, every bill or other measure referred to the Committee shall be referred by the Chairman of the full Committee to the appropriate Subcommittee in a timely manner. A Subcommittee shall, within three legislative days of the referral, acknowledge same to the full Committee.

After a measure has been pending in a Subcommittee for a reasonable period of time, the Chairman of the full Committee may make a request in writing to the Subcommittee that the Subcommittee forthwith report the measure to the full Committee with its recommendations. If within seven legislative days after the Chairman's written request, the Subcommittee has not so reported the measure, then there shall be in order in the full Committee a motion to discharge the Subcommittee from further consideration of the measure. If such motion is approved by a majority vote of the full Committee, the measure may thereafter be considered only by the full Committee.

No measure reported by a Subcommittee shall be considered by the full Committee unless it has been presented to all Members of the full Committee at least two legislative days prior to the full Committee's meeting, together with a comparison with present law, a section-by-section analysis of the proposed change, a section-by-section justification, and a draft statement of the budget effects of the measure that is consistent with the requirements for reported measures under clause 3(d)(1) of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 12. RECOMMENDATION FOR APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Whenever in the legislative process it becomes necessary to appoint conferees, the Chairman of the full Committee shall recommend to the Speaker as conferees the names of those Committee Members as the Chairman may designate. In making recommendations of Minority Members as conferees, the Chairman shall consult with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

C. HEARINGS

RULE 13. WITNESSES

In order to assure the most productive use of the limited time available to question hearing witnesses, a witness who is scheduled to appear before the full Committee or a Subcommittee shall file with the Clerk of the Committee at least 48 hours in advance of his or her appearance a written statement of their proposed testimony. In addition, all witnesses shall comply with formatting requirements as specified by the Committee and the Rules of the House. Failure to comply with the 48-hour rule may result in a witness being denied the opportunity to testify in person. Failure to comply with the formatting requirements may result in a wit-

ness' statement being rejected for inclusion in the published hearing record. In addition to the requirements of clause 2(g)(5) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House regarding information required of public witnesses, a witness shall limit his or her oral presentation to a summary of their position and shall provide sufficient copies of their written statement to the Clerk for distribution to Members, staff and news media.

A witness appearing at a public hearing, or submitting a statement for the record of a public hearing, or submitting written comments in response to a published request for comments by the Committee must include in their statement or submission, a list of all clients, persons or organizations on whose behalf the witness appears. Oral testimony and statements for the record, or written comments in response to a request for comments by the Committee, will be accepted only from citizens of the United States or corporations or associations organized under the laws of one of the 50 States of the United States or the District of Columbia, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman of the full Committee or Subcommittee involved. Written statements from non-citizens may be considered for acceptance in the record if transmitted to the Committee in writing by Members of Congress.

RULE 14. QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES

Committee Members may question witnesses only when recognized by the Chairman for that purpose. All Members shall be limited to five minutes on the initial round of questioning. In questioning witnesses under the five minute rule, the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member shall be recognized first, after which Members who are in attendance at the beginning of a hearing will be recognized in the order of their seniority on the Committee. Other Members shall be recognized in the order of their appearance at the hearing. In recognizing Members to question witnesses, the Chairman may take into consideration the ratio of Majority Members to Minority Members and the number of Majority and Minority Members present and shall apportion the recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage Members of the majority.

RULE 15. SUBPOENA POWER

The power to authorize and issue subpoenas is delegated to the Chairman of the full Committee, as provided for under clause 2(m)(3)(A)(i) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 16. RECORDS OF HEARINGS

An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of all testimony taken at a public hearing. The staff shall transmit to a witness the transcript of his or her testimony for correction and immediate return to the Committee offices. Only changes in the interest of clarity, accuracy and corrections in transcribing errors will be permitted. Changes that substantially alter the actual testimony will not be permitted. Members shall have the opportunity to correct their own remarks before publication. The Chairman of the full Committee may order the printing of a hearing without the corrections of a witness or Member if he determines that a reasonable time has been afforded to make corrections and that further delay would impede the consideration of the legislation or other measure that is the subject of the hearing.

RULE 17. BROADCASTING OF HEARINGS

The provisions of clause 4(f) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives are specifically made a part of these rules by reference. In addition, the following policy shall apply to media coverage of any meeting of the full Committee or a Subcommittee:

(1) An appropriate area of the Committee's hearing room will be designated for members of the media and their equipment.

(2) No interviews will be allowed in the Committee room while the Committee is in session. Individual interviews must take place before the gavel falls for the convening of a meeting or after the gavel falls for adjournment.

(3) Day-to-day notification of the next day's electronic coverage shall be provided by the media to the Chairman of the full Committee through an appropriate designee.

(4) Still photography during a Committee meeting will not be permitted to disrupt the proceedings or block the vision of Committee Members or witnesses.

(5) Further conditions may be specified by the Chairman.

D. MARKUPS

RULE 18. PREVIOUS QUESTION

The Chairman shall not recognize a Member for the purpose of moving the previous question unless the Member has first advised the Chair and the Committee that this is the purpose for which recognition is being sought.

RULE 19. POSTPONEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS

The Chairman may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment.

The Chairman may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time. In exercising postponement authority the Chairman shall take reasonable steps 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.

RULE 20. MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE

The Chairman is authorized to offer a motion under clause 1 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

RULE 21. OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPTS OF MARKUPS AND OTHER COMMITTEE MEETINGS

An official stenographic transcript shall be kept accurately reflecting all markups and other official meetings of the full Committee and the Subcommittees, whether they be open or closed to the public. This official transcript, marked as "uncorrected," shall be available for inspection by the public (except for meetings closed pursuant to clause 2(g)(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House), by Members of the House, or by Members of the Committee together with their staffs, during normal business hours in the full Committee or Subcommittee office under such controls as the Chairman of the full Committee deems necessary. Official transcripts shall not be removed from the Committee or Subcommittee office.

If, however, (1) in the drafting of a Committee or Subcommittee decision, the Office of the House Legislative Counsel or (2) in the preparation of a Committee report, the Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation determines (in consultation with appropriate majority and minority committee staff) that it is necessary to review the official transcript of a markup, such transcript may be released upon the signature and to the custody of an appropriate committee staff person. Such transcript shall be returned immediately after its review in the drafting session.

The official transcript of a markup or Committee meeting other than a public hearing shall not be published or distributed

to the public in any way except by a majority vote of the Committee. Before any public release of the uncorrected transcript, Members must be given a reasonable opportunity to correct their remarks. In instances in which a stenographic transcript is kept of a conference committee proceeding, all of the requirements of this rule shall likewise be observed.

RULE 22. PUBLICATION OF DECISIONS AND LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE

A press release describing any tentative or final decision made by the full Committee or a Subcommittee on legislation under consideration shall be made available to each Member of the Committee as soon as possible, but no later than the next day. However, the legislative draft of any tentative or final decision of the full Committee or a Subcommittee shall not be publicly released until such draft is made available to each Member of the Committee.

E. STAFF

RULE 23. SUPERVISION OF COMMITTEE STAFF

The staff of the Committee shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman of the full Committee except as provided in clause 9 of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives concerning Committee expenses and staff.

Pursuant to clause 6(d) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the full Committee, from the funds made available for the appointment of Committee staff pursuant to primary and additional expense resolutions, shall ensure that each Subcommittee receives sufficient staff to carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the Committee, and that the minority party is fairly treated in the appointment of such staff.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 26, 2015, at noon for morning-hour debate.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

'I AB do solemnly swear (or Affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.'

Has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the fol-

lowing Members of the 114th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

ALABAMA

- 1 Bradley Byrne
- 2 Martha Roby
- 3 Mike Rogers
- 4 Robert B. Aderholt
- 5 Mo Brooks
- 6 Gary J. Palmer
- 7 Terri A. Sewell

ALASKA

At Large, Don Young

ARIZONA

- 1 Ann Kirkpatrick
- 2 Martha McSally
- 3 Raúl M. Grijalva
- 4 Paul A. Gosar
- 5 Matt Salmon
- 6 David Schweikert
- 7 Ruben Gallego
- 8 Trent Franks
- 9 Kyrsten Sinema

ARKANSAS

- 1 Eric A. "Rick" Crawford
- 2 J. French Hill
- 3 Steve Womack
- 4 Bruce Westerman

CALIFORNIA

- 1 Doug LaMalfa
- 2 Jared Huffman
- 3 John Garamendi
- 4 Tom McClintock
- 5 Mike Thompson
- 6 Doris O. Matsui
- 7 Ami Bera
- 8 Paul Cook
- 9 Jerry McNerney
- 10 Jeff Denham
- 11 Mark DeSaulnier
- 12 Nancy Pelosi
- 13 Barbara Lee
- 14 Jackie Speier
- 15 Eric Swalwell
- 16 Jim Costa
- 17 Michael M. Honda
- 18 Anna G. Eshoo
- 19 Zoe Lofgren
- 20 Sam Farr
- 21 David G. Valadao
- 22 Devin Nunes
- 23 Kevin McCarthy
- 24 Lois Capps
- 25 Stephen Knight
- 26 Julia Brownley
- 27 Judy Chu
- 28 Adam B. Schiff
- 29 Tony Cárdenas
- 30 Brad Sherman
- 31 Pete Aguilar
- 32 Grace F. Napolitano
- 33 Ted Lieu
- 34 Xavier Becerra
- 35 Norma J. Torres
- 36 Raul Ruiz
- 37 Karen Bass
- 38 Linda T. Sánchez
- 39 Edward R. Royce
- 40 Lucille Roybal-Allard
- 41 Mark Takano
- 42 Ken Calvert
- 43 Maxine Waters
- 44 Janice Hahn
- 45 Mimi Walters
- 46 Loretta Sanchez
- 47 Alan S. Lowenthal
- 48 Dana Rohrabacher
- 49 Darrell E. Issa
- 50 Duncan Hunter
- 51 Juan Vargas
- 52 Scott H. Peters
- 53 Susan A. Davis

COLORADO

- 1 Diana DeGette

- 2 Jared Polis
 - 3 Scott R. Tipton
 - 4 Ken Buck
 - 5 Doug Lamborn
 - 6 Mike Coffman
 - 7 Ed Perlmutter
- CONNECTICUT
- 1 John B. Larson
 - 2 Joe Courtney
 - 3 Rosa L. DeLauro
 - 4 James A. Himes
 - 5 Elizabeth H. Esty
- DELAWARE
- At Large, John C. Carney, Jr.
- FLORIDA
- 1 Jeff Miller
 - 2 Gwen Graham
 - 3 Ted S. Yoho
 - 4 Ander Crenshaw
 - 5 Corrine Brown
 - 6 Ron DeSantis
 - 7 John L. Mica
 - 8 Bill Posey
 - 9 Alan Grayson
 - 10 Daniel Webster
 - 11 Richard B. Nugent
 - 12 Gus M. Bilirakis
 - 13 David W. Jolly
 - 14 Kathy Castor
 - 15 Dennis A. Ross
 - 16 Vern Buchanan
 - 17 Thomas J. Rooney
 - 18 Patrick Murphy
 - 19 Curt Clawson
 - 20 Alcee L. Hastings
 - 21 Theodore E. Deutch
 - 22 Lois Frankel
 - 23 Debbie Wasserman Schultz
 - 24 Frederica S. Wilson
 - 25 Mario Diaz-Balart
 - 26 Carlos Curbelo
 - 27 Ileana Ros-Lehtinen
- GEORGIA
- 1 Earl L. “Buddy” Carter
 - 2 Sanford D. Bishop, Jr.
 - 3 Lynn A. Westmoreland
 - 4 Henry C. “Hank” Johnson, Jr.
 - 5 John Lewis
 - 6 Tom Price
 - 7 Rob Woodall
 - 8 Austin Scott
 - 9 Doug Collins
 - 10 Jody B. Hice
 - 11 Barry Loudermilk
 - 12 Rick W. Allen
 - 13 David Scott
 - 14 Tom Graves
- HAWAII
- 1 Mark Takai
 - 2 Tulsi Gabbard
- IDAHO
- 1 Raúl R. Labrador
 - 2 Michael K. Simpson
- ILLINOIS
- 1 Bobby L. Rush
 - 2 Robin L. Kelly
 - 3 Daniel Lipinski
 - 4 Luis V. Gutiérrez
 - 5 Mike Quigley
 - 6 Peter J. Roskam
 - 7 Danny K. Davis
 - 8 Tammy Duckworth
 - 9 Janice D. Schakowsky
 - 10 Robert J. Dold
 - 11 Bill Foster
 - 12 Mike Bost
 - 13 Rodney Davis
 - 14 Randy Hultgren
 - 15 John Shimkus
 - 16 Adam Kinzinger
 - 17 Cheri Bustos
 - 18 Aaron Schock
- INDIANA
- 1 Peter J. Visclosky
 - 2 Jackie Walorski
 - 3 Marlin A. Stutzman
 - 4 Todd Rokita
 - 5 Susan W. Brooks
 - 6 Luke Messer
 - 7 André Carson
 - 8 Larry Bucshon
 - 9 Todd C. Young
- IOWA
- 1 Rod Blum

- 2 David Loebsack
 - 3 David Young
 - 4 Steve King
- KANSAS
- 1 Tim Huelskamp
 - 2 Lynn Jenkins
 - 3 Kevin Yoder
 - 4 Mike Pompeo
- KENTUCKY
- 1 Ed Whitfield
 - 2 Brett Guthrie
 - 3 John A. Yarmuth
 - 4 Thomas Massie
 - 5 Harold Rogers
 - 6 Andy Barr
- LOUISIANA
- 1 Steve Scalise
 - 2 Cedric L. Richmond
 - 3 Charles W. Boustany, Jr.
 - 4 John Fleming
 - 5 Ralph Lee Abraham
 - 6 Garret Graves
- MAINE
- 1 Chellie Pingree
 - 2 Bruce Poliquin
- MARYLAND
- 1 Andy Harris
 - 2 C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger
 - 3 John P. Sarbanes
 - 4 Donna F. Edwards
 - 5 Steny H. Hoyer
 - 6 John K. Delaney
 - 7 Elijah E. Cummings
 - 8 Chris Van Hollen
- MASSACHUSETTS
- 1 Richard E. Neal
 - 2 James P. McGovern
 - 3 Niki Tsongas
 - 4 Joseph P. Kennedy, III
 - 5 Katherine M. Clark
 - 6 Seth Moulton
 - 7 Michael E. Capuano
 - 8 Stephen F. Lynch
 - 9 William R. Keating
- MICHIGAN
- 1 Dan Benishek
 - 2 Bill Huizenga
 - 3 Justin Amash
 - 4 John R. Moolenaar
 - 5 Daniel T. Kildeer
 - 6 Fred Upton
 - 7 Tim Walberg
 - 8 Mike Bishop
 - 9 Sander M. Levin
 - 10 Candice S. Miller
 - 11 David A. Trott
 - 12 Debbie Dingell
 - 13 John Conyers, Jr.
 - 14 Brenda L. Lawrence
- MINNESOTA
- 1 Timothy J. Walz
 - 2 John Kline
 - 3 Erik Paulsen
 - 4 Betty McCollum
 - 5 Keith Ellison
 - 6 Tom Emmer
 - 7 Collin C. Peterson
 - 8 Richard M. Nolan
- MISSISSIPPI
- 1 Alan Nunnelee
 - 2 Bennie G. Thompson
 - 3 Gregg Harper
 - 4 Steven M. Palazzo
- MISSOURI
- 1 Wm. Lacy Clay
 - 2 Ann Wagner
 - 3 Blaine Luetkemeyer
 - 4 Vicky Hartzler
 - 5 Emanuel Cleaver
 - 6 Sam Graves
 - 7 Billy Long
 - 8 Jason Smith
- MONTANA
- At Large, Ryan K. Zinke
- NEBRASKA
- 1 Jeff Fortenberry
 - 2 Brad Ashford
 - 3 Adrian Smith
- NEVADA
- 1 Dina Titus

- 2 Mark E. Amodei
 - 3 Joseph J. Heck
 - 4 Cresent Hardy
- NEW HAMPSHIRE
- 1 Frank C. Guinta
 - 2 Ann M. Kuster
- NEW JERSEY
- 1 Donald Norcross
 - 2 Frank A. LoBiondo
 - 3 Thomas MacArthur
 - 4 Christopher H. Smith
 - 5 Scott Garrett
 - 6 Frank Pallone, Jr.
 - 7 Leonard Lance
 - 8 Albio Sires
 - 9 Bill Pascrell, Jr.
 - 10 Donald M. Payne, Jr.
 - 11 Rodney P. Frelinghuysen
 - 12 Bonnie Watson Coleman
- NEW MEXICO
- 1 Michelle Lujan Grisham
 - 2 Stevan Pearce
 - 3 Ben Ray Lujan
- NEW YORK
- 1 Lee M. Zeldin
 - 2 Peter T. King
 - 3 Steve Israel
 - 4 Kathleen M. Rice
 - 5 Gregory W. Meeks
 - 6 Grace Meng
 - 7 Nydia M. Velázquez
 - 8 Hakeem S. Jeffries
 - 9 Yvette D. Clarke
 - 10 Jerrold Nadler
 - 11 [VACANT]
 - 12 Carolyn B. Maloney
 - 13 Charles B. Rangel
 - 14 Joseph Crowley
 - 15 José E. Serrano
 - 16 Eliot L. Engel
 - 17 Nita M. Lowey
 - 18 Sean Patrick Maloney
 - 19 Christopher P. Gibson
 - 20 Paul Tonko
 - 21 Elise M. Stefanik
 - 22 Richard L. Hanna
 - 23 Tom Reed
 - 24 John Katko
 - 25 Louise McIntosh Slaughter
 - 26 Brian Higgins
 - 27 Chris Collins
- NORTH CAROLINA
- 1 G. K. Butterfield
 - 2 Renee L. Ellmers
 - 3 Walter B. Jones
 - 4 David E. Price
 - 5 Virginia Foxx
 - 6 Mark Walker
 - 7 David Rouzer
 - 8 Richard Hudson
 - 9 Robert Pittenger
 - 10 Patrick T. McHenry
 - 11 Mark Meadows
 - 12 Alma S. Adams
 - 13 George Holding
- NORTH DAKOTA
- At Large, Kevin Cramer
- OHIO
- 1 Steve Chabot
 - 2 Brad R. Wenstrup
 - 3 Joyce Beatty
 - 4 Jim Jordan
 - 5 Robert E. Latta
 - 6 Bill Johnson
 - 7 Bob Gibbs
 - 8 John A. Boehner
 - 9 Marcy Kaptur
 - 10 Michael R. Turner
 - 11 Marcia L. Fudge
 - 12 Patrick J. Tiberi
 - 13 Tim Ryan
 - 14 David P. Joyce
 - 15 Steve Stivers
 - 16 James B. Renacci
- OKLAHOMA
- 1 Jim Bridenstine
 - 2 Markwayne Mullin
 - 3 Frank D. Lucas
 - 4 Tom Cole
 - 5 Steve Russell
- OREGON
- 1 Suzanne Bonamici
 - 2 Greg Walden

3 Earl Blumenauer
4 Peter A. DeFazio
5 Kurt Schrader

PENNSYLVANIA

1 Robert A. Brady
2 Chaka Fattah
3 Mike Kelly
4 Scott Perry
5 Glenn Thompson
6 Ryan A. Costello
7 Patrick Meehan
8 Michael G. Fitzpatrick
9 Bill Shuster
10 Tom Marino
11 Lou Barletta
12 Keith J. Rothfus
13 Brendan F. Boyle
14 Michael F. Doyle
15 Charles W. Dent
16 Joseph R. Pitts
17 Matt Cartwright
18 Tim Murphy

RHODE ISLAND

1 David N. Cicilline
2 James R. Langevin

SOUTH CAROLINA

1 Mark Sanford
2 Joe Wilson
3 Jeff Duncan
4 Trey Gowdy
5 Mick Mulvaney
6 James E. Clyburn
7 Tom Rice

SOUTH DAKOTA

At Large, Kristi L. Noem

TENNESSEE

1 David P. Roe
2 John J. Duncan, Jr.
3 Charles J. "Chuck" Fleischmann
4 Scott DesJarlais
5 Jim Cooper
6 Diane Black
7 Marsha Blackburn
8 Stephen Lee Fincher
9 Steve Cohen

TEXAS

1 Louie Gohmert
2 Ted Poe
3 Sam Johnson
4 John Ratcliffe
5 Jeb Hensarling
6 Joe Barton
7 John Abney Culberson
8 Kevin Brady
9 Al Green
10 Michael T. McCaul
11 K. Michael Conaway
12 Kay Granger
13 Mac Thornberry
14 Randy K. Weber, Sr.
15 Rubén Hinojosa
16 Beto O'Rourke
17 Bill Flores
18 Sheila Jackson Lee
19 Randy Neugebauer
20 Joaquin Castro
21 Lamar Smith
22 Pete Olson
23 Will Hurd
24 Kenny Marchant
25 Roger Williams
26 Michael C. Burgess
27 Blake Farenthold
28 Henry Cuellar
29 Gene Green
30 Eddie Bernice Johnson
31 John R. Carter
32 Pete Sessions
33 Marc A. Veasey
34 Filemon Vela
35 Lloyd Doggett
36 Brian Babin

UTAH

1 Rob Bishop

2 Chris Stewart
3 Jason Chaffetz
4 Mia B. Love

VERMONT

At Large, Peter Welch

VIRGINIA

1 Robert J. Wittman
2 E. Scott Rigell
3 Robert C. "Bobby" Scott
4 J. Randy Forbes
5 Robert Hurt
6 Bob Goodlatte
7 Dave Brat
8 Donald S. Beyer, Jr.
9 H. Morgan Griffith
10 Barbara Comstock
11 Gerald E. Connolly

WASHINGTON

1 Suzan K. DelBene
2 Rick Larsen
3 Jaime Herrera Beutler
4 Dan Newhouse
5 Cathy McMorris Rodgers
6 Derek Kilmer
7 Jim McDermott
8 David G. Reichert
9 Adam Smith
10 Denny Heck

WEST VIRGINIA

1 David B. McKinley
2 Alexander X. Mooney
3 Evan H. Jenkins

WISCONSIN

1 Paul Ryan
2 Mark Pocan
3 Ron Kind
4 Gwen Moore
5 F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.
6 Glenn Grothman
7 Sean P. Duffy
8 Reid J. Ribble

WYOMING

At Large, Cynthia M. Lummis

PUERTO RICO

Resident Commissioner, Pedro R. Pierluisi

AMERICAN SAMOA

Delegate, Amata Coleman Radewagen

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Delegate, Eleanor Holmes Norton

GUAM,

Delegate, Madeleine Z. Bordallo

NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

Delegate, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Delegate, Stacey E. Plaskett

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information.

Ralph Lee Abraham, Alma S. Adams, Robert B. Aderholt, Pete Aguilar, Rick W. Allen, Justin Amash, Mark E. Amodei, Brad Ashford, Brian Babin, Lou Barletta, Andy Barr, Joe Barton, Karen Bass, Joyce Beatty, Xavier Becerra, Dan Benishek, Ami Bera, Donald S. Beyer, Jr., Gus M. Bilirakis, Mike Bishop, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Diane Black, Marsha Blackburn, Rod Blum, Earl Blumenauer, John A. Boehner, Suzanne Bonamici, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Mike Bost, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Brendan F. Boyle, Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Dave Brat, Jim Bridenstine, Mo Brooks, Susan W. Brooks, Corrine Brown, Julia Brownley, Vern Buchanan, Ken Buck, Larry Bucshon, Michael C. Burgess, Cheri Bustos, G. K. Butterfield, Bradley Byrne, Ken Calvert,

Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Tony Cardenas, John C. Carney, Jr., André Carson, Earl L. "Buddy" Carter, John R. Carter, Matt Cartwright, Kathy Castor, Joaquin Castro, Steve Chabot, Jason Chaffetz, Judy Chu, David N. Cicilline, Katherine M. Clark, Yvette D. Clarke, Curt Clawson, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Mike Coffman, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, Chris Collins, Doug Collins, Barbara Comstock, K. Michael Conaway, Gerald E. Connolly, John Conyers, Jr., Paul Cook, Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Ryan A. Costello, Joe Courtney, Kevin Cramer, Eric A. "Rick" Crawford, Ander Crenshaw, Joseph Crowley, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Carlos Curbelo, Danny K. Davis, Rodney Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, John K. Delaney, Rosa L. DeLauro, Suzan K. DelBene, Jeff Denham, Charles W. Dent, Ron DeSantis, Mark DeSaulnier, Scott DesJarlais, Theodore E. Deutch, Mario Diaz-Balart, Debbie Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Robert J. Dold, Michael F. Doyle, Tammy Duckworth, Sean P. Duffy, Jeff Duncan, John J. Duncan, Jr., Donna F. Edwards, Keith Ellison, Renee L. Ellmers, Tom Emmer, Eliot L. Engel, Anna G. Eshoo, Elizabeth H. Esty, Blake Farenthold, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Stephen Lee Fincher, Michael G. Fitzpatrick, Charles J. "Chuck" Fleischmann, John Fleming, Bill Flores, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Bill Foster, Virginia Foxx, Lois Frankel, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Marcia L. Fudge, Tulsi Gabbard, Rubén Gallego, John Garamendi, Scott Garrett, Bob Gibbs, Christopher P. Gibson, Louie Gohmert, Bob Goodlatte, Paul A. Gosar, Trey Gowdy, Gwen Graham, Kay Granger, Garret Graves, Sam Graves, Tom Graves, Alan Grayson, Al Green, Gene Green, H. Morgan Griffith, Raúl M. Grijalva, Glenn Grothman, Frank C. Guinta, Brett Guthrie, Luis V. Gutiérrez, Janice Hahn, Richard L. Hanna, Cresent Hardy, Gregg Harper, Andy Harris, Vicky Hartzler, Alcee L. Hastings, Denny Heck, Joseph J. Heck, Jeb Hensarling, Jaime Herrera Beutler, Jody B. Hice, Brian Higgins, J. French Hill, James A. Himes, Rubén Hinojosa, George Holding, Michael M. Honda, Steny H. Hoyer, Richard Hudson, Tim Huelskamp, Jared Huffman, Bill Huizenga, Randy Hultgren, Duncan Hunter, Will Hurd, Robert Hurt, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Sheila Jackson Lee, Hakeem S. Jeffries, Evan H. Jenkins, Lynn Jenkins, Bill Johnson, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. "Hank" Johnson, Jr., Sam Johnson, David W. Jolly, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, David P. Joyce, Marcy Kaptur, John Katko, William R. Keating, Mike Kelly, Robin L. Kelly, Joseph P. Kennedy III, Daniel T. Kildee, Derek Kilmer, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Adam Kinzinger, Ann Kirkpatrick, John Kline, Stephen Knight, Ann M. Kuster, Raúl R. Labrador, Doug LaMalfa, Doug Lamborn, Leonard Lance, James R. Langevin, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Robert E. Latta, Brenda L. Lawrence, Barbara Lee, Sander M. Levin, John Lewis, Ted Lieu, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Billy Long, Barry Loudermilk, Mia B. Love, Alan S. Lowenthal, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Ben Ray Lujan, Michelle Lujan Grisham, Cynthia M. Lummis, Stephen F. Lynch, Thomas MacArthur, Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean Patrick Maloney, Kenny Marchant, Tom Marino, Thomas Massie, Doris O. Matsui, Kevin McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Tom McClintock, Betty McCollum, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, David B. McKinley, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNERney, Martha McSally, Mark Meadows, Patrick Meehan, Gregory W. Meeks, Grace Meng, Luke Messer, John L. Mica, Candice S. Miller, Jeff

Miller, John R. Moolenaar, Alexander X. Mooney, Gwen Moore, Seth Moulton, Markwayne Mullin, Mick Mulvaney, Patrick Murphy, Tim Murphy, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Randy Neugebauer, Dan Newhouse, Kristi L. Noem, Richard M. Nolan, Donald Norcross, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Richard B. Nugent, Devin Nunes, Alan Nunnelee, Pete Olson, Beto O'Rourke, Steven M. Palazzo, Frank Pallone, Jr., Gary J. Palmer, Bill Pascrell, Jr., Erik Paulsen, Donald M. Payne, Jr., Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Ed Perlmutter, Scott Perry, Scott H. Peters, Collin C. Peterson, Pedro R. Pierluisi, Chellie Pingree, Robert Pittenger, Joseph R. Pitts, Stacey E. Plaskett, Mark Pocan, Ted Poe, Bruce Poliquin, Jared Polis, Mike Pompeo, Bill Posey, David E. Price, Tom Price, Mike Quigley, Amata Coleman Radewagen, Charles B. Rangel, John Ratcliffe, Tom Reed, David G. Reichert, James B. Renacci, Reid J. Ribble, Kathleen M. Rice, Tom Rice, Cedric L. Richmond, E. Scott Rigell, Martha Roby, David P. Roe, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Todd Rokita, Thomas J. Rooney, Peter J. Roskam, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Dennis A. Ross, Keith J. Rothfus, David Rouzer, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, Raul Ruiz, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Steve Russell, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Matt Salmon, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, Mark Sanford, John P. Sarbanes, Steve Scalise, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Aaron Schock, Kurt Schrader, David Schweikert, Austin Scott, David Scott, Robert C. "Bobby" Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Terri A. Sewell, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Kyrsten Sinema, Albio Sires, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Jason Smith, Lamar Smith, Jackie Speier, Elise M. Stefanik, Chris Stewart, Steve Stivers, Marlin A. Stutzman, Eric Swalwell, Mark Takai, Mark Takano, Bennie G. Thompson, Glenn Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Patrick J. Tiberi, Scott R. Tipton, Dina Titus, Paul Tonko, Norma J. Torres, David A. Trott, Niki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Fred Upton, David G. Valadao, Chris Van Hollen, Juan Vargas, Marc A. Veasey, Filemon Vela, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Ann Wagner, Tim Walberg, Greg Walden, Mark Walker, Jackie Walorski, Mimi Walters, Timothy J. Walz, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Bonnie Watson Coleman, Randy K. Weber, Sr., Daniel Webster, Peter Welch, Brad R. Wenstrup, Bruce Westerman, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Ed Whitfield, Roger Williams, Frederica S. Wilson, Joe Wilson, Robert J. Wittman, Steve Womack, Rob Woodall, John A. Yarmuth, Kevin Yoder, Ted S. Yoho, David Young, Don Young, Todd C. Young, Lee M. Zeldin, Ryan K. Zinke

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

100. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Reserve Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting the National Guard Youth Challenge Program Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2014, pursuant to 32 U.S.C. 509(k); to the Committee on Armed Services.

101. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the Defense Production Act (DPA) Title III Fund for Fiscal Year 2014, pursuant to 50

U.S.C. app. 2094; to the Committee on Financial Services.

102. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a certification of export to the People's Republic of China, pursuant to Public Law 105-261, section 1512; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

103. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report to Congress on United States Participation in the United Nations in 2013, pursuant to Public Law 79-264, section 4(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

104. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting consistent with the Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-243) and the Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 1991 (Pub. L. 102-1), and in order to keep the Congress fully informed, a report prepared by the Department of State for the August 15, 2014 — October 14, 2014, reporting period; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

105. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Certification Related to Condition 7(C)(i) of Senate Executive Resolution 75 (1997) Concerning Advice and Consent to the Ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

106. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Belarus that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

107. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Labor, transmitting pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act of 1998 (Pub. L. 105-270), the Department's 2012 and 2013 Inventories of Inherently Governmental Activities and of Commercial Activities; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

108. A letter from the Vice President, Congressional and Public Affairs, Millennium Challenge Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Fiscal Year 2014 Agency Financial Report, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

109. A letter from the Director, Employee Services, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's interim rule — Veterans' Preference (RIN: 3206-AM79) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

110. A letter from the Federal Liaison Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes to Patent Term Adjustment in View of the Federal Circuit Decision in *Novartis v. Lee* [Docket No.: PTO-P-2014-0023] (RIN: 0651-AC96) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

111. A letter from the FMCSA Division Chief, Regulatory Development, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inspection, Repair, and Maintenance; Driver-Vehicle Inspection Report (DVIR) [Docket No.: FMCSA-2012-0336] (RIN: 2126-AB46) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Com-

mittee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

112. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule; correction — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Division Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0072; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-04-AD; Amendment 39-18017; AD 2014-23-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

113. 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-2013-0981; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-032-AD; Amendment 39-18036; AD 2014-24-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

114. 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-2013-0366; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-024-AD; Amendment 39-18038; AD 2014-24-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

115. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Beechcraft Corporation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0771; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-006-AD; Amendment 39-18056; AD 2014-26-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

116. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; GROB-WERKE Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0848; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-031-AD; Amendment 39-18055; AD 2014-26-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

117. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Saab AB, Saab Aerosystems Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0460; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-222-AD; Amendment 39-18054; AD 2014-26-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

118. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's immediately adopted final rule — Prohibition Against Certain Flights in the Simferopol (UKFV) and Dnipropetrovsk (UKDV) Flight Information Regions (FIRs) [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0225; Amdt. No.: 91-331A] (RIN: 2120-AK56) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

119. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazmat, PHMSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Harmonization with International Standards (RRR) [Docket Nos.: PHMSA-2013-0260 (HM-215M)] (RIN: 2137-AF05) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. JONES, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. MESSER, Mr. HARPER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LONG, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 463. A bill to amend the General Education Provisions Act to prohibit Federal education funding for elementary schools and secondary schools that provide on-campus access to abortion providers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. RIBBLE):

H.R. 464. A bill to authorize Members of Congress to bring an action for declaratory and injunctive relief in response to a written statement by the President or any other official in the executive branch directing officials of the executive branch to not enforce a provision of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROBY (for herself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mrs. LOVE, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. ELLMERS, Ms. FOX, Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BYRNE, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. KLINE, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. SALMON, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. YODER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MICA, Mr. DOLD, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BLUM, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. HILL, Mr. PALMER, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Ms. MCSALLY):

H.R. 465. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself and Mr. AMASH):

H.R. 466. A bill to prohibit the Central Intelligence Agency from using an unmanned aerial vehicle to carry out a weapons strike or other deliberately lethal action and to transfer the authority to conduct such strikes or lethal action to the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDWARDS, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 467. A bill to direct the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy to carry out programs and activities to ensure that Federal science agencies and institutions of higher education receiving Federal research and development funding are fully engaging their entire talent pool, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada (for himself, Mr. KLINE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.R. 468. A bill to amend the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act to increase knowledge concerning, and improve services for, runaway and homeless youth who are victims of trafficking; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. MARINO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. KLINE):

H.R. 469. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 470. A bill to authorize the sale of certain National Forest System land in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARINO (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H.R. 471. A bill to improve enforcement efforts related to prescription drug diversion and abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 472. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to issue oleoresin capicum spray to officers and employees of the Bureau of Prisons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 473. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 474. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a five-year extension to the homeless veterans reintegration programs and to provide clarification regarding eligibility for services under such programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 475. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs relating to educational assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 476. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the process of approving courses of education pursued using educational benefits administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. HILL):

H.R. 477. A bill to extend the authority to the establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia and its environs to honor Brigadier General Francis Marion and his service; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. ESTY (for herself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MATSUL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAUKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 478. A bill to prohibit the marketing of electronic cigarettes to children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ESTY (for herself and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 479. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require contracting officers to consider information regarding domestic employment before awarding a Federal defense contract, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ:

H.R. 480. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for employer-provided employee housing assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial 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.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 481. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the work opportunity credit for hiring the long-term unemployed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (for himself and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 482. A bill to redesignate Ocmulgee National Monument in the State of Georgia and revise its boundary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TAKAI (for himself, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 483. A bill to exempt children of certain Filipino World War II veterans from the numerical limitations on immigrant visas and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 484. A bill to amend the Pay-As-You-Go-Act of 2010 to create an expedited procedure to enact recommendations of the Government Accountability Office for consolidation and elimination to reduce duplication; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 485. A bill to ensure that the percentage increase in rates of basic pay for prevailing wage employees shall be equal to the percentage increase received by other Federal employees in the same pay locality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. COLE, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 486. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to ensure that on-duty time does not include waiting time at a natural gas or oil well site for certain commercial motor vehicle operators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 487. A bill to allow the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma to lease or transfer certain lands; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. AMODEI (for himself, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. HARDY):

H.R. 488. A bill to prohibit the further extension or establishment of national monuments in Nevada except by express authorization of Congress; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. JONES, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 489. A bill to require States to report information on Medicaid payments to abortion providers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 490. A bill to provide for a strategic plan to reform and improve the security clearance and background investigation processes of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 491. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to specify the circumstances in which a person may acquire geolocation information and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LATTA, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. MESSER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan):

H.R. 492. A bill to ensure that women seeking an abortion receive an ultrasound and the opportunity to review the ultrasound before giving informed consent to receive an abortion; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mrs. BLACK, Mr.

JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. MULVANEY):

H.R. 493. A bill to update avian protection laws in order to support an all-of-the-above domestic energy strategy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BABIN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. ROKITA):

H.R. 494. A bill to restore the application of the Federal antitrust laws to the business of health insurance to protect competition and consumers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. MENG, Ms. LEE, Mr. HONDA, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 495. A bill to strengthen student achievement and graduation rates and prepare young people for college, careers, and citizenship through innovative partnerships that meet the comprehensive needs of children and youth; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 496. A bill to establish the Alabama Hills National Scenic Area in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 497. A bill to require training for teachers in social and emotional learning programming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 498. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense to jointly ensure that the Vet Centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs have access to the Defense Personnel Record Image Retrieval system and the Veterans Affairs/Department of Defense Identity Repository system; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 499. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the volume cap for private activity bonds shall not apply to bonds for facilities for furnishing of water and sewage facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BASS, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 500. A bill to establish the United States Advisory Council on Human Trafficking to review Federal Government policy on human trafficking; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COOK, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CART-

WRIGHT, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 501. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 502. A bill to establish a pilot program to improve the management and accountability within the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to provide oversight of the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 503. A bill to amend section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem specified activities in support of terrorism as renunciation of United States nationality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 504. A bill to clarify that no express or implied warranty is provided by reason of a disclosure relating to voluntary participation in the Energy Star program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 505. A bill to establish a Hazardous Materials Information Advisory Committee to develop standards for the use of electronic shipping papers for the transportation of hazardous materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 506. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand personal saving and retirement savings coverage by enabling employees not covered by qualifying retirement plans to save for retirement through automatic IRA arrangements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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.

By Mr. NUGENT:

H.R. 507. A bill to allow Members of Congress to decline certain retirement benefits and contributions by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 508. A bill to establish a task force to review policies and measures to promote,

and to develop best practices for, reduction of short-lived climate pollutants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MENG, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. PLASKETT):

H.R. 509. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction allowed for student loan interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 510. A bill to establish a uniform and more efficient Federal process for protecting property owners' rights guaranteed by the fifth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROKITA (for himself, Mr. KLINE, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. COLE, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. JONES, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas):

H.R. 511. A bill to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands under the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROSKAM (for himself and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 512. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to encourage the development and use of DISARM antimicrobial drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. ASHFORD, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 513. A bill to repeal the provision of law that provides automatic pay adjustments for Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. BASS, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 514. A bill to prioritize the fight against human trafficking within the Department of State according to congressional intent in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 without increasing the size of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. SIREN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. PITTEMBERGER, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. YOHIO):

H.R. 515. A bill to protect children from exploitation, especially sex trafficking in tourism, by providing advance notice of intended travel by registered child-sex offenders out-

side the United States to the government of the country of destination, requesting foreign governments to notify the United States when a known child-sex offender is seeking to enter the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 516. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to save the American taxpayers money by immediately altering the metallic composition of the one-cent, five-cent, dime, and quarter dollar coins, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 517. A bill to establish a task force to evaluate the backlog of appeals to claims submitted to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 518. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain emergency medical devices from the excise tax on medical devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MICA, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. JONES, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. BARTON):

H.R. 519. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the individual and employer health insurance mandates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 520. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt student workers for purposes of determining a higher education institution's employer health care shared responsibility; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 521. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation located in Bethel, Alaska; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 44. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to permit Delegates and the Resident Commissioner to the Congress to cast votes in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GUINTA (for himself, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. COOK, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARR, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. JOLLY, and Ms. SINEMA):

H. Res. 45. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to re-

quire each report of a committee on a public bill or public joint resolution to include an analysis of whether the bill or joint resolution creates a program, office, or initiative that would duplicate or overlap with an existing program, office, or initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H. Res. 46. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives condemning the recent terrorist attacks in Nigeria that resulted in the deaths of over 2,000 innocent persons and offering condolences to those personally affected by this cowardly act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H. Res. 47. A resolution supporting women's reproductive health care decisions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 463.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: the Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 464.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 2, Section 1, Clause 8

By Mrs. ROBY:

H.R. 465.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 466.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section VIII, Clause 1, "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States . . ." In addition, Article I, Section VIII, Clause 14 provides, "To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces." Lastly, Article I, Section VIII, Clause 16 states "The Congress shall have Power To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress."

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 467.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada:

H.R. 468.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. BASS:

H.R. 469.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 1.

Article I.

Section 1.

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 470.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 471.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution. The Constitution's Commerce Clause allows Congress to enact laws when reasonably related to the regulation of interstate commerce.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 472.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 9 of the Constitution, and Section 1 of Article 3 of the Constitution to create and regulate Federal Courts.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 473.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 474.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 12, 13, 14, and 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 475.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 476.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 12, 13, 14, and 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 477.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2, relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 478.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 479.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 480.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 481.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 482.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. TAKAI:

H.R. 483.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 484.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 485.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8. "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 486.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 487.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 488.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 489.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—The Congress shall have power to . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 490.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 491.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3, and the 4th and 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina:

H.R. 492.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment V, Section 1—the "Due Process" clause protects any life from being taken without due process of law; this legislation provides unborn citizens a modicum of due process.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina:

H.R. 493.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

the rules and regulations for property owned by the United States pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

Authority to stay misapplied regulations from the executive Branch stems from Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 494.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3. (commerce clause)

"The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 495.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 496.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 497.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 498.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 499.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 500.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 501.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, sec 8, cl. 3 (commerce clause), & cl. 18 (necessary and proper clause); section 1 of the 14th Amendment (due process and equal protection clauses), and section 5 of the 14th Amendment (enforcement). In addition, Article 1, sec 8, & cl. 16.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 502.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 503.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 which states: "The Congress shall have the Power To . . . establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization . . ."

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 504.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, cl. 3

The Congress shall have the power . . . to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the states, and with Indian Tribes;

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 505.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the US constitution gives Congress the authority "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes"

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 506.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I and the 16th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. NUGENT:

H.R. 507.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 6 of Article I of the Constitution as amended by the 27th Amendment to the Constitution. This section of the Constitution allows Congress to set their own compensation so long as new representatives have been elected.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 508.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 509.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article XVI of the Constitution—Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes . . .

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 510.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

5th Amendment to the Constitution

By Mr. ROKITA:

H.R. 511.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 512.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(a) Article I, Section 1, to exercise the legislative powers vested in Congress as granted in the Constitution; and

(b) Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the authority "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof"; and

(c) Article I, Section 9, Clause 7, which states that "No Money shall be drawn from

the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

By Ms. SINEMA:

H.R. 513.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 6.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 514.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18, as this bill better equips the Executive Branch to properly carry out the powers vested in it by the Constitution, as well as ensures that Congress is accurately informed of a foreign nations' trafficking record and tier ranking when Congress considers regulation of commerce with foreign nations.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 515.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, as sex offenders are traveling in foreign commerce.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 516.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8—"To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures"

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 517.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Amendment XVI, of the United States Constitution

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 518.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 519.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section, 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution, as the Supreme Court of the United States has held that the imposition of the burdensome mandate on hardworking American taxpayers is an action Congress may take under its power to tax, and that this bill seeks to repeal sections of title 26 U.S.C., the Internal Revenue Code.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 520.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 521.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 24: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. BABIN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. YODER.

H.R. 27: Mr. RIGELL, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 91: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 129: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 159: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mrs. BLACK, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. WALBERG, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 181: Mrs. WAGNER and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 187: Ms. GRAHAM.

H.R. 199: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 217: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 223: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, and Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 228: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 231: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 232: Ms. NORTON and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 238: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 242: Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 243: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 246: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 248: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 249: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 258: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 264: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 271: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 281: Mr. GOWDY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MICA, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 284: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 285: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 287: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 289: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 290: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 296: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 303: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 304: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 310: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 317: Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HAHN, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 321: Mr. ZINKE, Mr. KING of New York, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 344: Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. LOWEY, and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 346: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 349: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 350: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 351: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 357: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 362: Mr. WELCH and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 363: Mr. SCHOCK.
 H.R. 366: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ASHFORD, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 373: Mr. WESTERMAN.
 H.R. 399: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. BARTON.
 H.R. 402: Mr. LONG, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H.R. 416: Mr. PALLONE.
 H.R. 420: Mr. JONES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. COOK.
 H.R. 429: Mr. PIERLUISI.
 H.R. 431: Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. MENG, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. VELA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. HAHN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. BASS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of

California, Mr. COSTA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BECERRA, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 438: Ms. GRANGER.
 H.R. 448: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. SINEMA.
 H.R. 451: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
 H.R. 452: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.R. 456: Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. KILMER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. BLUM.
 H.J. Res. 1: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. BARTON.
 H.J. Res. 2: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. BARTON.
 H.J. Res. 9: Mr. JONES and Mr. PALAZZO.
 H.J. Res. 22: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. POLIS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. HIMES.
 H. Res. 11: Mr. RIBBLE.
 H. Res. 12: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
 H. Res. 21: Mr. NUNNELEE.
 H. Res. 24: Mr. FORBES, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BABIN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. LONG, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
 H. Res. 25: Mrs. LOWEY.
 H. Res. 28: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. LEVIN.

H. Res. 32: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
 H. Res. 35: Mr. BARLETTA.
 H. Res. 43: Mr. SERRANO.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 7 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Ways and Means in H.R. 7 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

The provisions that warranted to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 7 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.