The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. Foxx).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:
WASHINGTON, DC, October 3, 2017.
I hereby appoint the Honorable VIRGINIA Foxx to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.
PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

GUN SAFETY
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Blumenauer) for 5 minutes.
Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, what if the headline in the morning paper was slightly different? What if we had a disease that had killed 59 people yesterday and sickened over 500 others? Do you think the Nation would demand action?
If we had an outbreak every day that had over 100,000 people a year killed and injured, Congress would be in a frenzy. Yesterday, we found 2 minutes for a moment of silence, and we moved on.

Gun violence is a public health hazard every bit as important as any other disease or outbreak. Ours is the only developed country in the world that cannot protect our families from death and injury from guns on a massive scale.

After years of frustration in Congress and another school shooting in my district, I sat down with my constituents to go through, what are the things that we can do that would make a difference?

We understood that you cannot completely stop evil people. There is not a statute that is foolproof, but our statutes are filled with efforts to try to make things better.

Let’s stop dealing with gun violence as a political issue and think about it as the public health epidemic that it is, already claiming over 12,000 lives in the United States this year.

We attacked auto death and safety in a resolute fashion. It didn’t happen overnight that we made automobiles safer and our highways less dangerous, but we stayed at it with law enforcement, with engineering, and with research, and we cut the rate of death over half.

We are starting now to deal with massive addiction and overdose as a medical condition that requires treatment, not just law enforcement with harsh punishment.
My report outlined nine areas where we could take action. There are 26 bills in Congress now that deal with these items, and we haven’t been able to deal with them meaningfully: no hearings and certainly nothing on the floor of the House.

There are provisions to keep guns away from the most dangerous users. Even members of the NRA support that. We can improve the mental health system. We can authorize and increase research into gun safety.

There is an outrageous provision in United States law that prevents the Centers for Disease Control to research gun violence that was authored by our late colleague Jay Dickey from Arkansas who, later in life, realized that was a horrific mistake. We ought to be able to understand and find ways to help prevent it.

We can control access to the most dangerous products. We can increase product safety for guns, which are inherently dangerous. We can empower healthcare professionals to deal with families to help prevent gun violence and understand what risks their families face, rather than outrageous provisions that seek to limit what healthcare professionals can do to deal with their patients. We can effectively regulate the sale of firearms. There should be no hidden sales where we do not have background checks.

This is all within our capacity. We can enforce existing laws, and we can mitigate the loss of life in shooting by helping provide more resources for first responders.

This isn’t pie in the sky. This will do nothing to take away the rights of Americans who want to target shoot or hunt. What it will do, is start the slow, steady process toward making our families safer and make sure that America is not the only developed country that cannot protect its families from gun violence.

GENERAL AVIATION
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Mitchell) for 5 minutes.
Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to do a little myth-busting. Critics of the 21st Century AIRR Act are selling a myth that the 21st Century AIRR Act will be damaging and adverse to general aviation. This couldn’t be further from the truth.

I am a regular general aviation user and a student pilot. My brother-in-law
is a GA pilot. I would never support legislation that would be bad for my rural communities and the airports in those communities.

Let’s address a few of those myths. The non-profit service provider for air traffic control will be prohibited from charging user fees to any segment of general aviation in contrast to the myths that are being sold out there.

The act also prohibits the ATC provider from restricting access to any airspace or any airport.

Puerto Ricans and the language of the island is not alone. The language of the island is as frustrated as I am that the response to help.

I know the Congress treats Puerto Rico fairly and seriously. And I am not alone. The other Puerto Ricans and the Congressional Hispanic Caucus are working with the leadership of the House to put together an aid package.

The mayor of the City of Chicago just yesterday said he has the ability to make a way where there is no way, to improvise, and, most importantly, to work together.

Yesterday, I spoke at a press conference in Chicago with Mayor Rahm Emanuel and leaders from Chicago, including Fire Commissioner Santiago and the head of Chicago’s Office of Emergency Management and Communications, a brigadier general in our National Guard.

The mayor announced that 22 Chicago firefighters, on their own dime, are going to Puerto Rico to help with rescue and recovery efforts, including bringing equipment that may help communications to remote parts of the island.

The mayor also announced that, in Chicago, we want to be for Puerto Rico what Houston was for New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina—place of refuge where we will help you get settled, get your kids into school, get you the medical care you need, and make you feel welcome.

One thing I learned in Puerto Rico this weekend is that, in Chicago and in the rest of the U.S., we need to start thinking about evacuation in addition to rebuilding and recovery.

I have welcomed my own family into my home, and people I know across the country are welcoming relatives escaping the Virgin Islands.

But we need to wrap up our commitment beyond the family-to-family informal relationships and look systematically at how we organize ourselves to meet the great need of our fellow citizens on the island in the Caribbean.

Rebuilding Puerto Rico—making her a strong and self-sufficient island nation of industrious and hardworking people—will not only require a long-term commitment from this Congress and this country so that the well-being of our fellow man on the island can be met.

So, Madam Speaker, let’s roll up our sleeves and get to work. Once again, Chicago is there to help you, to enroll your kids in school, to get you medical attention, and to make sure you have a safe place until the recovery and rebuilding has been accomplished.

The Speaker pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois will provide a translation of his remarks to the Clerk.
A NEW ABSOLUTE AIRSPEED RECORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNIGHT. Madam Speaker, I am truly blessed to represent a district in southern California that is the home of so many distinguished citizens.

Today, I would like to tell you about one of those feats that turned 50 years old today, October 3, 1967, is a date I will never forget, but it is probably a date I will never remember either because I was 9 months old.

On that date, a B-52 flew down the runway of Edwards Air Force Base with a small, white airplane tucked underneath her wing. A major who had thousands of hours in different platforms was in that cockpit today. He had been on several different programs and had been a test pilot for many years and was a graduate of the United States Air Force Test Pilot School. He was the pilot of that small, white aircraft.

The plan was simple on paper. It was to accelerate to 100,000 feet and achieve a Mach of 6.50. As the pilots at Edwards Air Force Base will also tell you, it is a profession that they go about, and they do so in a very professional manner. The terms were 100,000 feet and 6.50, the ending was 102,100 feet and 6.72—a new airspeed record.

The interesting thing about this is that the air speed record had been set on November 18, 1966, by the same pilot and in the same airplane. He had been on several different programs and had been a test pilot for many years and was a graduate of the United States Air Force Test Pilot School. He was the pilot of that small, white aircraft.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ESPAILLAT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, any comments that I make in Spanish, I will provide translation in English.

Madam Speaker, I witnessed the devastation and humanitarian crisis this weekend when I traveled to the island of Puerto Rico with my colleague from Chicago, Illinois, LUIS GUTIERREZ. As I traveled throughout the area, I met dozens of emergency workers from various cities around our Nation on their way to provide assistance to families in Puerto Rico.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

I had the privilege of travelling to Puerto Rico this weekend along with my colleague from the State of Illinois, Congressman LUIS GUTIERREZ, and witnessed the devastation caused by Hurricane Maria. But most importantly, I saw how the Puerto Rican people has united to work in restoring Puerto Rico from its current state. Thousands and thousands of people, including Mayor Carmen Yulin Cruz and the Governor, are compromised with the well-being of the Puerto Rican people. I saw firemen and emergency workers at the Philadelphia airport trying to reach Puerto Rico to help their brothers and sisters. This has moved me and I understand the Puerto Rican people have a very big heart and immense solidarity.

Tuve el privilegio de viajar este fin de semana a Puerto Rico con mi colega del Estado de Illinois, Congresista Luis Gutiérrez, y fui testigo ocular de la devastación causada por el Huracán María. Pero más importante, vi cómo el pueblo puertorriqueño se ha unido a trabajar para levantar a Puerto Rico del estado donde se encuentra; miles y miles de personas, incluyendo la alcaldesa Carmen Yulín Cruz y el mismo Gobernador están comprometidos con el bienestar del pueblo puertorriqueño. Vi a bomberos, trabajadores de emergencia, en el aeropuerto de Philadelphia tratando de llegar a Puerto Rico para darle ayuda a su hermano.

We discussed with them efforts currently under way and ways that the Federal Government and Congress can improve our response to address immediate and long-term goals to help rebuild the island of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands—let’s not forget them.

Yesterday, I released a 10-point plan following my assessment, and I offer this as a solution to provide an immediate emergency relief package for the humanitarian crisis we are witnessing in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

It is my hope that we, as Members of Congress, will work together to find solutions quickly, as the lives of U.S. citizens and the efforts to rebuild have remained encumbered.

Madam Speaker, I call for an immediate $20 billion emergency relief package for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Congress needs to act on a humanitarian emergency relief package for Puerto Rico and U.S. Virgin Islands no later than this week. They cannot wait another week.

It is estimated that Puerto Rico will need $85 billion for their recovery efforts. At a minimum, Congress need to enact a $20 billion emergency relief package for Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

Also, I call for a hearing on Puerto Rico and U.S. Virgin Islands recovery efforts. A congressional task force for coordinated relief efforts must be put in place. The delayed response in Puerto Rico was egregious.

I join my colleagues in calling for a hearing on Puerto Rico and U.S. Virgin Islands recovery efforts and for a full assessment on how to mitigate delayed reactions in the future and a strategic plan on a long-term recovery effort not only for Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, but for the entire Caribbean region that, unfortunately, stands on the pathway of natural disasters, including hurricane season.

As my colleagues have stated, the Hurricane Sandy Rebuilding Task Force resulted in a comprehensive plan...
developed by Federal and local stakeholders, which then helped aid the recovery efforts in U.S. and elsewhere. A similar plan is needed for all of the areas affected during this hurricane season. We must also create a permanent waiver of the Jones Act for diesel and fuel. The latest 10-day waiver by the Trump administration is not nearly enough. The Jones Act needs to be waived for at least a year so that response and rebuilding efforts are not encumbered. I also call for a permanent waiver for diesel and fuel.

I joined 145 Members of Congress in urging the President to deploy the USS Abraham Lincoln aircraft carrier. Madam Speaker, what we really need is more judges at all levels who have a little more humility. Many of the issues that the courts are dealing with involve freedom of religion. Our Founding Fathers came here to this country to get freedom of religion, not from religion. I think it was very sad that a very intolerant group from Wisconsin went to great lengths to get a Bible verse removed from the Knoxville Police Department. We need people who proclaim their tolerance the loudest are some of the most intolerant people in this country today, and aimed primarily at conservative Christians. In Zorach v. Clauson, a 1952 U.S. Supreme Court case, Justice William O. Douglas wrote that the law should not prefer "those who believe in no religion over those who do believe," and that there is "no constitutional requirement which makes it necessary for government to be hostile to religion and to ignore the aims and efforts to widen the effective scope of religious influence."

Justice Douglas was one of the most liberal Justices who ever served on the U.S. Supreme Court. It surprises me now when I tell them that we open every session of the House and Senate with prayer, that there is a prayer room in the center of the Capitol, and several Bible studies go on in the Capitol each week. We need to develop a similar plan is needed for all affected during this hurricane season. It was ironic that the only President in the last 70 or 80 years who has tried to rein depletion.

We spend well over $700 billion on defense and military construction each year. Last year, we spent $177.5 billion on new planes, tanks, weapons, and equipment, and similar amounts to that for many years. Most of this equipment does not wear out after just 1 year. In the book "Ike's Bluff," when Eisenhower was told he could not cut defense spending, he replied that if he told Congress he reduced his budget that he would get another star, you would have to get out of the way of the rush. He also said: "Heaven help us if we ever have a President who doesn't know as much about the military as I do."

Over 80 percent of those in Congress today have never served in our Armed Forces. I am proud to have been one who was privileged to serve. Most of the Members of Congress today are afraid to oppose or even question wasteful defense spending for fear of some demagogue calling them unpatriotic or saying they are not supporting the troops. But, Madam Speaker, we need to wake up and realize that there is waste even in the Defense Department.

MADAM SPEAKER: The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes. Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, today, there are over 800 so-called enterpriser carriers from Mexico operating heavy trucks long distance in the United States. Now, what is wrong with that? Well, Mexico doesn't have any drug or alcohol testing of its commercial drivers. Mexico does not have a centralized database of commercial driver's licenses and driving offenses, making it difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain whether or not Mexican drivers are unsafe and who would be disqualified here in the United States.

In Mexico, truck drivers are pretty much exploited and abused. They don't even have hours of service rules. Some drivers will drive for 1 or 2 days straight.

In the United States, of course, we have very restrictive rules for safety on hours of service. Those laws, theoretically, apply to the 900 Mexican enterpriser carriers operating in the United States.

However, how many hours did that person drive before they got to the border? Was it 24 or 48?

Then they cross over the border and they are limited.

Congress objected and voted multiple times by huge bipartisan majorities on legislation I supported to say: No, we do not want these Mexican truck drivers from Mexico into the United States until they can prove that they meet the same standards as our truck drivers.

We have had a few offenses. We don't even put special scrutiny on these enterpriser carriers. We have very few inspectors out there. But they have managed to rack up some pretty horrific records on a random basis that raise huge questions about their safety.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GUVEN). Mr. GUVEN. Madam Speaker, what is wrong with the Jones Act waiver of the Jones Act for diesel and fuel. The lastest 10-day waiver by the Trump administration is not nearly enough. The Jones Act needs to be waived for at least a year so that response and rebuilding efforts are not encumbered. I also call for a permanent waiver for diesel and fuel.

I also call for immediate deployment of the USS Abraham Lincoln aircraft carrier. I joined 145 Members of Congress in urging the President to deploy the USS Abraham Lincoln.

We need to repair telecommunications and authorize the Army and engineers to repair hospitals.

Madam Speaker, I have four other points that I will later present to you. I spoke out in every way and voted against most of the major initiatives of the Obama administration, but it was false to say that the military has been depleted.

We spend well over $700 billion on defense and military construction each year. Last year, we spent $177.5 billion on new planes, tanks, weapons, and equipment, and similar amounts to that for many years. Most of this equipment does not wear out after just 1 year. In the book "Ike's Bluff," when Eisenhower was told he could not cut defense spending, he replied that if he told Congress he reduced his budget that he would get another star, you would have to get out of the way of the rush. He also said: "Heaven help us if we ever have a President who doesn't know as much about the military as I do."

Over 80 percent of those in Congress today have never served in our Armed Forces. I am proud to have been one who was privileged to serve. Most of the Members of Congress today are afraid to oppose or even question wasteful defense spending for fear of some demagogue calling them unpatriotic or saying they are not supporting the troops. But, Madam Speaker, we need to wake up and realize that there is waste even in the Defense Department.

Mr. GUVEN. Madam Speaker, we need to repair telecommunications and authorize the Army and engineers to repair hospitals.

Madam Speaker, I have four other points that I will later present to you. I spoke out in every way and voted against most of the major initiatives of the Obama administration, but it was false to say that the military has been depleted.

We spend well over $700 billion on defense and military construction each year. Last year, we spent $177.5 billion on new planes, tanks, weapons, and equipment, and similar amounts to that for many years. Most of this equipment does not wear out after just 1 year. In the book "Ike's Bluff," when Eisenhower was told he could not cut defense spending, he replied that if he told Congress he reduced his budget that he would get another star, you would have to get out of the way of the rush. He also said: "Heaven help us if we ever have a President who doesn't know as much about the military as I do."

Over 80 percent of those in Congress today have never served in our Armed Forces. I am proud to have been one who was privileged to serve. Most of the Members of Congress today are afraid to oppose or even question wasteful defense spending for fear of some demagogue calling them unpatriotic or saying they are not supporting the troops. But, Madam Speaker, we need to wake up and realize that there is waste even in the Defense Department.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, today, there are over 800 so-called enterpriser carriers from Mexico operating heavy trucks long distance in the United States. Now, what is wrong with that? Well, Mexico doesn't have any drug or alcohol testing of its commercial drivers. Mexico does not have a centralized database of commercial driver's licenses and driving offenses, making it difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain whether or not Mexican drivers are unsafe and who would be disqualified here in the United States.

In Mexico, truck drivers are pretty much exploited and abused. They don't even have hours of service rules. Some drivers will drive for 1 or 2 days straight.

In the United States, of course, we have very restrictive rules for safety on hours of service. Those laws, theoretically, apply to the 900 Mexican enterpriser carriers operating in the United States.

However, how many hours did that person drive before they got to the border? Was it 24 or 48?

Then they cross over the border and they are limited.

Congress objected and voted multiple times by huge bipartisan majorities on legislation I supported to say: No, we do not want these Mexican truck drivers from Mexico into the United States until they can prove that they meet the same standards as our truck drivers.

We have had a few offenses. We don't even put special scrutiny on these enterpriser carriers. We have very few inspectors out there. But they have managed to rack up some pretty horrific records on a random basis that raise huge questions about their safety.
these unsafe carriers operating in the United States. We can close that door again by just modifying NAFTA.

The Trump administration is approaching this issue perhaps as early as next week in the NAFTA negotiations, and this should be at the top of their agenda. We give them no national treatment; they will have to meet our standards and prove that they have met our standards; they have to develop a meaningful driver's license base; they will have to have drug and alcohol testing; they have to have hours of service. Then we can talk about whether or not they can operate in the United States.

We had a system before NAFTA. Mexican truck drivers would bring the trucks just over the border. They were limited in how far they could go. They would drop the trailers. U.S. truck drivers would pick them up.

Then there is one other issue here: Are we going to do to our trucking industry as we have done to so many in manufacturing? Are we going to drive down truck drivers' wages? It is already a tough business, particularly for independent drivers. Are we going to make them compete with people who are making 2 bucks an hour and don't have to meet the same rules as they do? That is not fair competition, and it is not good for the American people, not for the jobs or the safety on our highways.

So I am asking the Trump administration to hang tough on this issue and take away this national treatment that we are giving to Mexico, which does not have an equivalent system to the United States, and go to something that is based on reciprocity and equivalence. That would be a good change to the NAFTA agreement, which, of course, I opposed from day one.

RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL MANUFACTURING DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Jody B. Hice of Georgia). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Thompson) for 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this Friday is National Manufacturing Day. We celebrate Manufacturing Day annually in order to recognize the manufacturing industry's part in the growth and prosperity of the country, as well as raise awareness of the important investment and career opportunities within the manufacturing sector.

Manufacturing Day started in 2012 as an annual celebration of modern manufacturing meant to inspire the next generation of manufacturers, and it has done just that. According to a 2016 survey of students who attended Manufacturing Day events, 89 percent were more aware of manufacturing jobs in their communities; 84 percent were more likely to tell friends, family, parents, or colleagues about manufacturing after attending the event.

Mr. Speaker, the manufacturing industry impacts every community in the United States and is certainly true for Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District. Pennsylvania has a rich history of being a manufacturing leader, especially our storied Pennsylvania Steel. The Commonwealth has been an important cog in the wheels of this American revolution, providing thanks to industries like iron, coal, and lumber, in addition to steel.

Our Pennsylvania farmers have fed and continue to feed generations of Americans, providing safe and nutritious food for all our neighbors. From heritage companies to newer rising stars, we have a wide cross-section of products produced in the Fifth District of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight just a few.

Brookville Equipment Corporation in Jefferson County is the leading American manufacturer of diesel locomotive engines, street trolleys, and mining machinery. Brookville's mass transit refurbishing streetcar fleet for cities, including New Orleans, Philadelphia, and San Francisco. Since 1889, W.R. Case & Sons Cutlery Company has been fashioning handcrafted pocketknives and sporting knives in McKean County, since 1936. Major leaguers have been swining our fine Pennsylvania hardwoods thanks to Jefferson County company BWP Bats. BWP's slogan is "Built With Pride."

Huntingdon County's Bonny Forge has a state-of-the-art forge facility capable of manufacturing our entire line of forged steel fitting and forged steel valve products since 1875.

A new manufacturer is DiamondBack Truck Covers. Two Penn State students started this company in their garage in 2003. They make heavy-duty, utility-oriented, diamond plate aluminum truck bed covers for pickup trucks in Philipsburg, Pennsylvania, in Centre County.

Mr. Speaker, this is just a handful of the manufacturers in my district who produce quality, American-made products. As co-chair of the Career and Technical Education Caucus, I am proud that the manufacturing industry employs thousands of career and technical education students in family-sustaining careers. These are great family-sustaining jobs.

As we celebrate National Manufacturing Day on Friday and draw attention to the roles manufacturers play in our communities, I commend all those who keep our economy booming through manufacturing.

STopping Gun Violence

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Schneider) for 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we should be debating how we can make our communities safer. Why are we considering a bill that makes firearms more deadly and makes it more difficult for police to respond? But that is not all. There is also a proposal to weaken State concealed carry laws with national reciprocity.

This dangerous legislation would undermine local safety laws and deny States their right to establish their own concealed carry safety standards. Requiring States to accept the concealed standards of every State will effectively create a dangerous race to the bottom and leave the least restrictive State law as the effective national standard.

Mr. Speaker, we should be debating and voting on proposals that can reduce gun violence in our communities. We must not allow the difficulty of the path ahead prevent us from embracing solutions that move us in the right direction.

Earlier this year, I introduced the Ghost Guns Are Guns bill with my colleague, Congressman Espaillat of New York. This bill will address the glaring
loophole that allows gun buyers to bypass a background check by purchasing their weapons as unassembled kits online. These kits can be delivered to anyone’s doorstep with all the parts needed to assemble a fully functioning, totally untraceable firearm.

The Ghost Guns Are Guns Act simply says that these weapons should be regulated like other firearms and require a background check like other firearms. More than 9 out of 10 Americans support background checks. This bill is a commonsense step forward, and I urge my colleagues to join me in seeking its passage.

We also face the problem of stolen guns. Last year alone, more than 18,000 guns were lost or stolen from Federal firearm dealers. Many of these stolen weapons were later used in violent crimes. That is why I introduced the SECURE Firearm Storage Act, to require all Federal firearm licensees to securely store their inventory when not open for business.

The Chicago Sun-Times said this bill was, “so obviously right, it’s hard to believe it is even necessary.” I agree, and invite my colleagues to join me in passing this bill as well.

There are two commonsense ideas. I am open to any and all ideas to make progress in reducing gun violence in our communities and helping make our communities safe—from universal background checks to making gun trafficking a Federal crime, to limiting access to high-capacity magazines and military assault weapons.

Enough is enough. We cannot allow this epidemic to continue. Together, we have the opportunity to save lives. I urge my colleagues to join me, and let’s take this time to act.

21ST CENTURY AIRR ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, Congress has just approved an FAA extension to fund the agency for 6 months, but our work is not done. We have a responsibility to pass a long-term FAA bill that ensures America remains a leader in aviation.

The status quo means American aviation manufacturing will lose out to competitors in Europe, China, Brazil, and Canada. We will lose jobs. It means the drone industry will continue to go overseas for testing and development. That is more lost jobs. The status quo means more delays and lost time for our passengers.

Let me read you a quote: “The FAA is the only agency of government worse at procurement than the Pentagon. Congress has tried to reform it; it didn’t stick. We have got to try something different to get it to be more agile to give us 21st century equipment and software that we need.”

Mr. Speaker, that is not my quote. I am quoting the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. And that, based on what he has said and what we have seen over the last 20 years, is that why it is time to reform the FAA.

With my Republican and Democratic colleagues, I introduced H.R. 2997, the 21st Century AIRR Act. Like all major reforms, there have been false claims made against this bipartisan bill. The false issues I want to address are from general aviation.

My colleague Representative Sam Graves, worked with the general aviation community to include everything they have asked for in this bill. Not one of their legislative requests was excluded. In fact, Congressman Graves now supports the bill because of how far we went to address the needs of the GA community. We did so because general aviation is vital to our unique aviation system, and I would never sponsor legislation that harms my own general aviation pilot community. We got the hundred GA pilots and the several hundred GA pilots who live within it.

Here is what the general aviation community asked for:

They did not want to pay user fees to use air traffic control services, and they won’t. All they have to do is look at page 83 in the bill. The only entity that will be able to change this is Congress, just like it is today.

They did not want any airspace restrictions. This bill prohibits airspace restrictions for the GA, and just look at page 114 to find that. In fact, GA doesn’t have that guarantee today. Our bill actually puts that guarantee in law for the first time.

They wanted to fully fund the Airport Improvement Program. I want to fully fund the Airport Improvement Program, in part, because it helps my district and small- and medium-sized airports in the tiny communities around this country. AIP will be funded the way it has been in the past, and it will be, going forward, by the traveling public.

Currently, AIP funding is flat lined at $3.3 billion a year, but over the course of the bill, we will raise that up to almost $4 billion, and you will find that on page 7 of the bill.

GA wanted parity on the board, and they got it, the ability to nominate two board members. So the board will be balanced. It will include airports, pilots, controllers, commercial passenger carriers, cargo carriers, regional carriers, general aviation, business aviation, plus the government will put two seats on the board.

A super majority will choose two independent board members, and then they will choose a CEO.

Yet even when faced with these facts in black and white text, opponents of reform still claim these guarantees are not in the bill. Ask a member of the GA community what we can do to get their support, and they will say: “Nothing.” They want to keep the status quo.

Unfortunately, a few Washington special interests that represent business jets oppose this commonsense reform. Think about it this way: 850 million passengers will fly commercially every year, and that number will go to a billion over the next 10 years; this bill is real reform that will benefit them at no cost and harm to the business jet aviation; in fact, every person that flies commercially subsidizes business jets using the air traffic control system.

A small number of GA owners, the number is about 500,000, are opposing something that will benefit a billion passengers that will fly annually.

Another thing that was brought up is that we harm the defense of this country. That is absolutely not true. As a senior member of the Armed Services Committee, I would never do anything that would harm the defense of this country. And Secretary Mattis and Deputy Secretary of Defense Shanahan have been on the Hill, have written letters supporting our efforts to this fact.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this is not speculation. This reflects the very carefully drafted text of the bill that the House will vote on in the coming days. We encourage Members to read the bill and come to us with questions.

This bipartisan bill has broad and diverse support. For example, Heritage Action, the pilots and the air traffic controller union, and the flight attendants union all support this very bipartisan bill. We will conform aviation in this country, keep us competitive, keep us safe, and keep us efficient.

I ask all my colleagues to support the bipartisan H.R. 2997.

GUN SAFETY LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) for 5 minutes.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we grieved for 59 Americans who were killed watching a concert and 227 people who were injured as bullets rained down on them. As horrible as it is, it is only an inflection point on the daily loss of life to gun violence.

We have had our grisly House ritual of expressing our heartfelt grief, followed by a moment of silence, but the moments have extended into years.

Families at home did not send us here for our thoughts and prayers. No one in this Chamber was elected to tackle our country’s challenges with moments of silence.

We were elected to work together, to debate, to argue, even fight tooth and nail about the problems Americans are facing and what we can do to help, but that is not what we are doing here.

Even after the massacre of children and now the worst massacre by guns in American history, our Republican leaders continue to block debate on commonsense gun safety legislation that is
backed by Americans across the spectrum of political ideology.

Now we have had our moment of silence, so it is back to business as usual: Members of Congress who call a mass shooting evil and turn around and take cash from the gun lobby.

The leadership of this House is so enamored with silence that one of the only policies that they will talk about is silencing guns. Why would you endanger police officers and families by remaining silent on solutions to reduce gun violence and promote a bill that deregulates silencers? There is only one explanation, and that is that the monstrous roar of the gun lobby is drowning out the voices of families, it is drowning out the voices of the patients in my care. Now, as a legislator, I can help save people with my vote.

I invite the entire House to be a voice for unborn Americans and pass the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

MASS SHOOTINGS IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I know you have heard the story. Sunday, in Las Vegas, 59 people at a concert were mowed down and more than 500 were wounded.

I know you have heard this story, too: last June, 49 cellphones on the floor of the Pulse Nightclub were ringing and ringing and were never answered.

What about this story: two years ago, eight students who just wanted to learn and their professor who was there to teach them were mowed down in their classrooms at Umpqua Community College.

And everyone knows that, nearly 5 years ago, the bodies of 20 elementary school children and 6 teachers lay in Sandy Hook Elementary School in what was then the unthinkable act of horror.

So here we are again with what was once unthinkable becoming mundane. Mr. Speaker, how have we as a society become so debased, how have we strayed so far from what is right and just so that we blantly just sit at the massacre of innocents in schools and movie theaters and classrooms and concerts and nightclubs? And it goes on and on and on.

So I ask you today, how many lives must be destroyed before Congress acts? Nine lives in Charleston showed us nine was not enough. Thirteen lives at Columbine showed us that 13 was not enough. Certainly 20 small children killed in their classrooms at Newtown? No. The 32 lives lost at Virginia Tech? Again, not enough. Forty-nine lives in Orlando? No. The more than 33,000 Americans killed each year by guns? No, that is not enough.

The fact that more Americans have died from guns in the United States since 1968 than on battlefields in all our wars since the American Revolution, is that not enough?

Now 59 people have been murdered in Las Vegas and hundreds more are left struggling with injuries, both physical and mental, but the worst part—and I believe me, I have trouble picking out the worst part—daily mass shootings have somehow become just ordinary.

The massacre in Las Vegas was the 273rd mass shooting in the United States this year.

Last year, I posted the name and photo of every single victim killed in mass shootings on the walls outside my office. There were 476 shootings, with 597 people killed and 1,734 wounded. Not enough. It is never enough.

That is how I learned about Tamia Sanders, who was 14 years old when she was killed while sitting on her porch next to her mother; about Antonio Hinkle, who was 32 when he was gunned down and killed at a cookout pushing children out of the way of gunfire; and about Willow Short, age two, who survived a heart transplant only to be slaughtered outside and alongside the rest of her family by her own father.

I stand before you filled with rage and sadness to say this has to stop. Moments of silence provide little comfort—frankly, no comfort. It is a show here to somehow suggest that if you make the headlines, we will give you a moment of silence, but for the 476 other mass shootings each year, we are not going to give you a moment of silence.

Do we really lack the courage of conviction? No. Other industrialized countries have seen no such blood-soaked streets.

By remaining silent, we are not just being cowardly, we are being complicit in these crimes.

Mr. Speaker, we must honor the dead by taking action. Now is the time for a vote, and we know what the vote is on. Our human instinct to pain is to try to find patterns and make sense out of the most horrific and senseless acts. Whether the shooters are terrorists or domestic abusers or the mentally ill, one pattern is the same: access to deadly weapons that can allow a lone gunner to lay waste to human life on a massive scale must stop.

This is why we must ban assault weapons that have, time and time again, caused mass bloodshed and the attachments that make them into automatic weapons that you can purchase for a mere $50.

Automatic weapons are banned in the United States, machine guns are banned in the United States, but if you can buy a $30 attachment and make it into a machine gun, how have we banned anything?

Let’s make sure every gun purchase requires background checks rather than just 60 percent of gun purchases.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to do more than be silent.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE UNIFIED TAX REFORM FRAMEWORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share some information about the Unified Tax Reform Framework that was released last week by Republicans in the House of Representatives.
I think it is important that, with all of the sad news coming out this week in the country, particularly in Puerto Rico and Las Vegas, we do share with the American people some information that will be so important to them long term and will help our economy get a good jump start.

Incidentally, last quarter, our economy grew at 3.1 percent, but very few people have heard about that, and it is important that we point that out.

Mr. Speaker, the material provided by the Ways and Means Committee is extraordinarily valuable, and I also would encourage people to go on the Ways and Means’ website and on my website and on individual websites of Members to gain more information about this framework.

First, it lowers the rates for individuals and families. The framework shrinks the current seven tax brackets into three: 12 percent, 25 percent, and 35 percent. And actually, Mr. Speaker, many Americans will pay no taxes as a result of the tax reform, because we are going to double the standard deduction and enhance the child tax credit.

The framework roughly doubles the standard deduction so that typical middle class families will keep more of their paycheck. It also significantly increases the capital gains tax credit. It eliminates loopholes for the wealthy and protects bedrock provisions for the middle class. It repeals the death tax and alternative minimum tax.

Mr. Speaker, dying should not be a taxiable event. It is important that we not tax people, particularly farmers and small businesses, at the death of a business owner or farm owner.

It creates a new lower tax rate structure for small businesses. It will help to create jobs and promote competitiveness by lowering the corporate tax rate. So that Americans can compete on a level playing field, the framework reduces the corporate tax rate to 20 percent, below the 22.5 percent average of the industrialized world.

It will boost the economy by allowing for expensing of capital investments. The framework allows, for at least 5 years, businesses to immediately write off or expense the cost of new investments, giving a much-needed lift to the economy.

It moves to an American model for competitiveness. The framework ends the perverse incentives to offshore jobs and keep foreign profits overseas. It levels the playing field for American companies to compete by allowing the profits achieved overseas to come back by imposing a one-time low tax rate on wealth that is already accumulated overseas so there is no tax incentive to keep the money offshore.

Mr. Speaker, we need to get our economy booming again to create jobs and to make our country much greater than it is today. I endorse this framework put out by the Ways and Means Committee and look forward to the work that is going to be done by the committee as it refines the framework and brings forth a bill for us to vote on.

WE CAN BREAK THE CYCLE OF VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, we all awoke yesterday to a grim but familiar ritual. As we looked at our phones, we saw that dozens of people had been slaughtered in Las Vegas by a madman with a gun.

For the victims, the survivors, and their families, this is a nightmare come true, and my heart goes out to them and to the first responders and to the many people who rushed to help in that hellish situation. But now what?

The question can’t be escaped, and it hits particularly home for some who live in the shadow of Sandy Hook, years ago, where 20 babies were killed, and we thought that that would be enough to cause this Congress to act—to act for sanity, to act for common-sense, to act for life. But it wasn’t. And neither was Orlando, neither was San Bernardino, and now neither, I fear, will be the horrendous massacre in Las Vegas.

Let’s be clear that no other tragedy that we suffer not terrorists flying into buildings, not hurricanes which render entire islands without power and without hope, cause us to say: This is not a time to address this problem.

We ask ourselves: What can we do better? What can we learn? How can we stop this? Except on this issue. Orlando—Congress does nothing; Sandy Hook, 20 dead children—Congress does nothing; now Las Vegas.

What is happening right now is that conversations are happening in offices to figure out what the decent interval of time is between the deaths in Las Vegas and when we can introduce a bill that will make it easier for people to buy silencers. Not even the near fatal attack on one of our own, my friend STEPHEN SCALISE, was enough to cause us to seriously consider what we might do to staunch the flow of blood that characterizes this country, and this country alone.

Let’s be clear. Let’s be very clear about what we can and what we don’t want to do.

First of all, to all those who are listening to this and saying, “They just want to take away my guns,” no, we do not. I and those of us who stand for gun safety respect the Second Amendment. Many of us enjoy hunting. Many of us enjoy target practice. Many of us believe that perhaps you are safer if you can defend yourself. We have no interest in taking away anybody’s guns.

We have, perhaps, at least two things that harm the virtue of being supported by the vast majority of Americans: universal background checks, the simple idea that, if you are going to exercise your Second Amendment rights and buy a weapon, we should check to see if you are violent, if you are a terrorist, if you are likely to do harm with that deadly weapon. That is a simple idea that has about 90 percent support in this country, and yet we have not brought that to this floor in what is known as the House of Representatives.

Do we represent or do we not? There are other ideas. There has to become limit on the nature of the lethal technology that Americans can get access to. We saw in Las Vegas what very powerful weapons, perhaps modified to turn them into military-style weapons, can do to people and their bodies. I think most Americans would agree that there is some line—some line—between the weapons that we should have access to as a result of our Second Amendment rights and to do what we need to do and those weapons that can wreak the kind of havoc that we saw in Las Vegas.

Last year, after the shooting at the Pulse nightclub, I decided in desperation that I would not participate in any more moments of silence in this Chamber, that prayers and sympathy are fine, but this room can fix this problem. But this room and the people in it refuse to do so, even though we call ourselves Representatives, and we will not bring forward ideas that our constituents would support.

So today, in our despair, we must remember that our great struggles—suffrage, civil rights, healthcare—took decades for us to achieve. We can break the cycle of violence, but we have to act. We have no other choice.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o’clock and 7 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Pastor Kevin McKee, Chapel on the Campus, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, creator of Heaven and Earth, sustainer of all things, O Lord, our God, creator of Heaven and Earth, sustainer of all things, observed the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, creator of Heaven and Earth, sustainer of all things, grant this House the wisdom and courage to pursue justice in their legislation. Give them compassion and hope as they offer aid and relief to those who have suffered from the devastation of disaster. Give them unity that is necessary to achieve the highest levels of peace in our land.

Give the women and men of this Chamber the character and courage to
pursue what is right and what is good. May they be able to discern what is best not only for their constituents, but for all Americans. Understanding the human condition and the mercy of God, may they work together to advance true liberty.

Be present today, O God of wisdom, to direct the affairs and deliberations of this honorable assembly and their committees.

This we ask in the name of Jesus Christ.

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 1, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KENNEDY 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.

WELCOMING PASTOR KEVIN McKEE

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Pastor Kevin McKee, who opened with the prayer this morning in this Chamber.

Kevin and his wife, Mary, have been amazing pillars in our community as we have been through extraordinary challenges associated with Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, Gustav, Ike, and Isaac; a thousand-year flood last year; the worst oil spill in the Nation’s history; the incredible shootings of five of our police officers last year; and racial divisiveness.

Kevin and Mary have been incredible at proping up our community and sharing the Word in eastern Europe, China, and around the United States. I want to thank both of them for their incredible service to our State, our Nation, and our community as we have been through these times of challenge.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

SUPPORT FOR PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

(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, our prayers go to all victims of the Las Vegas massacre.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that I have been an advocate for pro-life values and protecting the rights of unborn babies. Today, the House will vote on the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This will save the lives of babies who are too young to speak for themselves but who are old enough to feel physical pain.

I appreciate the success of South Carolina Citizens for Life, who work to give a voice to those who do not have one. With the great leadership of Executive Director Holly Gatling of the Midlands, Leon Wiozrek of Barnwell, and Sally Zaleski of Orangeburg, this organization has been working to save lives.

As a cosponsor of the legislation with colleagues TRENT FRANKS, VICKY HARTZLER, MIA LOVE, and KAREN HANDEL, I am grateful to stand for life, upholding the conservative values and protecting the lives of our unborn babies. Every life is precious and has great value.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Thank you, Dr. Tom Price and Betty Price, for your successful service to American families.

CHIP AND CHC PROGRAM

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge swift reauthorization of the Children’s Health Insurance Program and the Community Health Center Program. CHIP keeps kids covered today to urge swift reauthorization of the Children’s Health Insurance Program and the Community Health Center Program immediately.

CONGRATULATING LIGO ON RECEIVING NOBEL PRIZE IN PHYSICS

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, when folks think of innovation and new technology, Louisiana often comes to mind.

We have been able to pioneer cell phone technology and have been involved in genomics and DNA. We have incredible naval technologies, with offshore oil and gas at depths never before even contemplated. We have been able to power this Nation’s economy.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, with the Laser Interferometer Gravitational-Wave Observatory receiving the Nobel Prize in Physics for the discovery of and measurement of gravitational waves, Louisiana is recognized once again.

I want to give a shout-out to LIGO and Livingston Parish for their amazing discovery in 2015 and for being recognized with the Nobel Prize in Physics.

CONGRESS MUST RESPOND APPROPRIATELY

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, Las Vegas, Nevada, 3 days ago—59 people dead, 527 injured, one shooter. It was the deadliest mass shooting in U.S. modern history.

Pulse nightclub, Orlando, Florida, 2016—49 people dead, 58 injured, one shooter.

Sand Hook Elementary School, Newtown, Connecticut, 2012—20 kids aged 6 and 7 and 6 adults, all dead, one shooter. The one shooter killed his mother and then killed himself.

I have heard it said that the best gun control is a steady hand. Perhaps, but a steady hand requires a healthy and sound mind. Assault weapons are designed to kill people, and to kill lots of people quickly. Their availability made massacres in Las Vegas, Newtown, and Orlando possible.

In the days ahead, we will learn much more about the shooter and his guns than about his victims—once again. My hope is that this Congress will use this information wisely and find the courage to respond appropriately. In this way, and only in this way, do we actually honor the victims.

RECOGNIZING OLD GREGG SCHOOL ON ITS 10TH ANNIVERSARY

(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 today to congratulate Old Gregg School Community and Recreation Center on its 10th anniversary. I recently had the opportunity to visit the repurposed school in Spring Mills and partake in the anniversary celebration.

For more than 80 years, the Old Gregg School building in Spring Mills educated children and young adults throughout the eastern Penns Valley in the time-honored values and responsibilities of community and service. The traditions of the historic Gregg Township School have been celebrated and expanded in the Old Gregg School Community and Recreation Center, which is now a multipurpose, nonprofit facility benefiting the entire Penns Valley community.

Old Gregg School Community and Recreation Center is regarded as a treasure in the heart of Penns Valley. It supports small businesses with affordable office space, offers athletic facilities for recreation, open space for meetings and events both indoors and out, and has well-maintained grounds and outdoor play areas.

Mr. Speaker, Old Gregg is an example of how to repurpose a space to benefit the community. It truly is a gem of Penns Valley that all residents treasure.
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PROTECTING LIFE

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

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, the Founding Fathers enshrined the guarantee of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They regarded life as a core promise and one that was to be protected. The Federal Government is responsible for protecting those rights, and currently we are failing at that responsibility.

As I speak in this body, America is one of only a few countries in the world that have legalized late-term elective abortion after 20 weeks. More specifically, it is estimated that approximately 13,000 late-term abortions are carried out in our country each year on healthy babies.

This is simply immoral and, as lawmakers, we have the ability to take commonsense measures to protect the unborn. The bill that we are voting on today, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, is one of those measures.

Mr. Speaker, every human being was given inalienable rights, chief among them being life itself. Governments are supposed to protect those rights. As a lawmaker, I plan to do so by supporting the bill before us today. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

RAW DEAL FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, Republicans have once again presented a budget that is reckless, regressive, and reprehensible. It is a budget that would hurt working families, the middle class, the poor, the sick, the afflicted, veterans, and rural America. It is even a budget that would cut Head Start, Meals on Wheels, and Special Olympics.

It is a raw deal for the American people. That is why Democrats are focused on better jobs, better wages, and a better future. Democrats are focused on higher pay for the American people, lower costs for the American people, and providing the American people with the tools to succeed in the 21st century economy.

Democrats are focused on providing the American people with a better deal.

IN SUPPORT OF THE 21ST CENTURY AIRR ACT

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the 21st Century AIRR Act gives a voice to rural America on aviation issues. For too long, our aviation assets have been managed with little to no input from the citizens in the real world who are most impacted. The 21st Century AIRR Act benefits rural and small communities through local empowerment.

This bill enhances the Airport Improvement Program and ensures grant availability for airports in the years ahead. These grants support infrastructure construction and rehabilitation critical to local and regional economic development.

The bill also promotes air traffic control tower technology. This promising concept has vast potential to allow rural airports to maintain tower service at a far lower cost and to actually bring service to airports that have previously been unable to support it.

The 21st Century AIRR Act is visionary, innovative legislation that will make the long-needed improvements to more efficiently serve American fliers and keep rural America connected to our aviation system.
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This bill is not a partisan issue but, instead, a moral issue. By passing this law, every year we would be saving over 12,000 babies who can feel pain and hear our voices. It should be noted that this proposal has seen bipartisan support across the country. In fact, 60 percent of Senators support prohibiting abortions after 20 weeks, including 63 percent of those who consider themselves pro-choice.

This legislation is about nothing less than protecting those who cannot protect themselves. We remain one of only seven countries in the entire world that continues to allow abortions after 20 weeks.

We must act to change this. I urge my colleagues to join me today in supporting the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, or Micah's Law.

A CALL TO RENEW YOUR STATUS UNDER DACA

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because this Thursday, October 5, is an important deadline: 154,000 young men and women have until this Thursday to renew their status under the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, or DACA. Those 154,000 DACA recipients, whose authorization expires before March 6, 2018, must renew their application.

If you are one of them, please send in your application today. Under the new DACA rules, you are entitled to receive two more years of deferral, but only if the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services receives your application by October 5. If you have not already sent in your application, send it in the fastest way possible. A regular first class stamp will likely not arrive in time.

My district is home to many DACA beneficiaries known as DREAMers. Do not wait. To all the other DREAMers, I urge you to get right than protecting the God-given souls of the unborn.

HONORING ELAINE NEKRITZ

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a dedicated public servant, terrific mentor, and good friend, Elaine Nekritz, who retired this week as State representative for Illinois' 57th District.

For more than 14 years, Elaine has ably represented the communities of Buffalo Grove, Arlington Heights, Northbrook, Wheeling, Palatine, Mount Prospect, and Prospect Heights in the Illinois House of Representatives.

During this time, she has been an outspoken advocate for her constituents, a passionate defender of the environment, and a champion for women's rights.

Future generations in Illinois will benefit from Elaine's work to invest in infrastructure, including a high-speed rail link between Chicago and St. Louis.

Her smart backing of criminal justice reform ensures more young offenders have an opportunity to reform their lives through juvenile court.

The residents of the 57th District will miss her energy, dedication, and tireless communication with her constituents.

I am personally grateful for Elaine's service and wish her the best and her husband, Barry, the very best in whatever comes next.

HONORING PASTOR LORAN LIVINGSTON

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Pastor Loran Livingston and his wife, Sandra, in recognition of their 40 years of ministry at Central Church of God in Charlotte, North Carolina.

God has used the Livingstons to grow and lead a church that truly impacts the Charlotte community and the world. Each week, over 6,000 people gather together for a wonderful praise and worship experience, along with a dynamic biblical message from Pastor Livingston.

Under their leadership, the congregation actively serves those in poverty, provides help for women facing an unplanned pregnancy all the way through life, and programs to assist seniors. Central Church also hosts an annual 5K race to raise awareness in the fight against human trafficking.

If you want to address race relations in Charlotte, a good place to start is Central Church, whereation activities worship together every Sunday hearing the love of Jesus.

Thank God for Pastor and Mrs. Livingston and their dedication to Christ, Central Church, the Charlotte community and their various missions around the world.

SENDING CONDOLENCES TO NEVADAN FAMILIES AND VICTIMS OF LAS VEGAS SHOOTING

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, then why is it so hard for us to come together in a bipartisan, bicameral way? Where is the concern?

Why are we not moved when people are dying in our districts daily? The American people send condolences and they deserve action.

PROTECTING THE GOD-GIVEN SOULS OF THE UNBORN

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of a more important issue to get right than protecting the God-given souls of the unborn and their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I will never forget listening to the heartbeat of my first child, Nathan. I cried all the way to the car, praising God for this miracle, and the words of the Psalmist came to me: "You formed me in the inward parts." You formed me in the womb so I could help me together in my mother's womb.

Currently, the United States is one of only seven developed countries that allow elective abortions after 20 weeks. That puts us on the same moral equivalent, in this regard, to China and North Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 36. I stand with the vulnerable and the
voiceless, and I kneel in submission to the author of life and ask for His blessings on this country and this initiative.

HONORING PALM SPRINGS POLICE OFFICERS JOSE VEGA AND LESLEY ZEREBNY

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

Mr. RUIZ, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an incredible constituent in my district, Richard Thelen.

Seventy-two years ago, Mr. Thelen was aboard the USS Indianapolis with nearly 1,200 others when it was hit by two Japanese torpedoes and sank within a matter of minutes. He and 316 men of the crew survived 5 days in the ocean surrounded by sharks without any food or drinking water. He defied truly remarkable odds.

After this ordeal, Mr. Thelen went on to finish high school and was honorably discharged from the Navy. He was a truck driver for more than 40 years and raised six children. Today, he is 89 years young, and it is a privilege to have him as a part of the Eighth District community.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House of one constituent in my district, Cora. Now a year old, Cora will never hold her mother. Lesley’s community will always remember her as a fighter and a protector.

This weekend, the entire Coachella Valley community will honor their memory by dedicating a 4-mile stretch of Highway 111 in their honor. I am proud of our community for supporting the Vega and Zerebny families. Let’s come together to ensure they have what they need to mourn, recover, and prosper.

Officers Vega, Zerebny, and family: We honor you for your sacrifice, and we are grateful for your service. Officer Vega and Officer Zerebny, end of watch, October 8, 2016.

COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS

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

Mr. BARR, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to act quickly to reauthorize the Community Health Center Fund, which expired last week on September 30.

Community health centers provide cost-effective and accessible primary care, mental health counseling, and substance abuse treatment for over 27 million patients nationally, including over 200,000 of my constituents in Kentucky’s Sixth District.

The upfront Federal investment in community health centers leads to savings down the road by fighting the cycle of opioid addiction, preventing more complex medical conditions, and diverting patients away from higher cost centers of care, such as the emergency room.

I have visited community health centers in my district, including White House Clinics, Sterling Health Solutions, Family Care of Bluegrass, and HealthFirst Bluegrass, and I have witnessed firsthand what a difference these organizations make in providing much needed care to at-risk Kentuckians.

Without the support of the Community Health Center Fund, these CHCs may soon be forced to cut back services, lay off staff, or even shut down clinics.

Mr. Speaker, admittedly, there is a robust debate in this country and a wide diversity of opinion about healthcare reform, the ACA, and what repeal and replacing the ACA should look like, but we should all agree that community health centers are part of the solution.

PROTECTING THE UNBORN

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

Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my support to the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

This legislation is crucial toward protecting the most vulnerable among us: the unborn.

As a doctor, it is my job to stay current with the latest medical research, and I have done so in my job in Congress, too.

The research overwhelmingly shows that children 20 weeks or less are capable of feeling pain. This is brought forth by the fact that when an in-utero procedure is done, both the mother and the unborn child are given anesthesia.

Not to do so allows that child to recoil in pain and show a stress response in the uterus. I have heard, personally, as a physician, heartbeats in babies as early as 6 weeks of age in utero.

So this legislation is critical; it is needed, it is past due, and I urge my colleagues to support this.

Providing for Consideration of H.R. 36, Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act

Ms. CHENEY, Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 548 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 548

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 36) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The 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 chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wyoming is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

Mr. Speaker, 44 years ago, the Supreme Court in Roe v. Wade decision declared that a woman has the right to choose when to have a child. Cutting off access to that choice is wrong. The majority tries to direct this debate, to label the right to choose as abortion, when in fact, it is the constitutional right to choose abortion. This is the Constitution of the United States that we all justly revere.

Mr. Speaker, this bill before us is dangerous, and it is unconstitutional. The Supreme Court established in Roe v. Wade, and reaffirmed in Planned Parenthood v. Casey, that a woman has the unequivocal right to choose abortion care. This is the Constitution of the United States that we all justly revere.

Mr. Speaker, this bill before us is nothing more than the latest attempt by conservative political groups to pass off political posturing as proven science.

Now, after birth, strangely, this body exhibits scarce attention to the well-being of the child, and that is proven by the fact that you cut back on food stamps; Women, Infants, and Children care; daycare; Head Start; one after the other. You also cut back on food stamps and the school lunch program because of the child, and that is proven by the fact that you cut back on food stamps; Women, Infants, and Children care; daycare; Head Start; one after the other, the same group that couldn’t find it in their hearts last Friday to extend the Children’s Health Insurance Program before it expired, along with such programs which again helps children. More than 9 million children in America get their health insurance through the program that expired.

The majority did absolutely nothing after 21 children, 6-year-olds and 7-year-olds were shot and killed at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut, 5 years ago. And funding, as I said, for both food stamps and the school lunch program is routinely cut.

Mr. Speaker, this bill before us is nothing more than the latest attempt by conservative political groups to pass off political posturing as proven science.

Conservative political groups have also been pushing the bill to try to use it to run up the score in the next election. Why do they do it? Well, the main sponsor of this bill has admitted—and I hope everybody hears this; this is a Congressman from Arizona who sponsored this bill, who believes the abortion bans are, in his words, good politics—"it will cost some people the election, but it will cost more Democrats the election than it will Republicans."

Mr. Speaker, this is a moral obligation of this House and of our government. Therefore, I urge support for the rule to allow for consideration of H.R. 36.

Mr. Speaker, 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, 44 years ago, the Supreme Court issued its landmark Roe v. Wade decision. It reaffirmed the constitutionally protected right of every woman to safe and legal healthcare, including the right to choose.

When life is the toughest of circumstances, the highest court in the land said the decision that she makes should be hers, free from any interference from the government. Roe v. Wade said that women rely on, but with every passing year and every new session of Congress, politicians have tried to chip away at it brick by brick, hoping it will crumble away. Most politicians are not medical professionals. We shouldn’t be meddling in healthcare decisions that should be made between a woman, her doctor, her family, and anyone else that she chooses to include. The American people are tired of politicians who are not doctors, often playing one on television.

This is the only medical procedure that Congress has made an attempt to regulate, and it says quite plainly: We can’t trust women to make a decision; we have to do it for them. The majority tries to direct this over and over again.

The medical professionals whom we should be listening to all oppose this ban. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists call it a part of a legislative agenda that is "not based on sound science" and that “attempt to prescribe how physicians should care for their patients.”

That certainly speaks it loudly.

The American Medical Association said that it “strongly condemns any interference by the government or other third parties that causes a physician to compromise his or her medical judgment as to what information or treatment is in the best interest of the patient.”

Conservative political groups have also been pushing the bill to try to use it to run up the score in the next election. Why do they do it? Well, the main sponsor of this bill has admitted—and I hope everybody hears this; this is a Congressman from Arizona who sponsored this bill, who believes the abortion bans are, in his words, good politics—"it will cost some people the election, but it will cost more Democrats the election than it will Republicans." I am convinced that in very few districts in America someone will lose because they voted" for this ban. “And if that is the case, maybe they need a different district anyway,” whatever that means.

That makes it as plain as day, as far as I am concerned, why year after year, for 40 years, we have been confronted with this.

It is abhorrent to me, and it should be to everyone here, that matters of personal conscience are being reduced to a game up and who is down in the polls.

The majority tried to direct this debate, to label the right to choose as abortion, when in fact, it is the constitutional right to choose abortion care. This is the Constitution of the United States that we all justly revere.

Mr. Speaker, this bill before us is nothing more than the latest attempt by conservative political groups to pass off political posturing as proven science.

Now, after birth, strangely, this body exhibits scarce attention to the well-being of the child, and that is proven by the fact that you cut back on food stamps; Women, Infants, and Children care; daycare; Head Start; one after the other, the same group that couldn’t find it in their hearts last Friday to extend the Children’s Health Insurance Program before it expired, along with such programs which again helps children. More than 9 million children in America get their health insurance through the program that expired.

The majority did absolutely nothing after 21 children, 6-year-olds and 7-year-olds were shot and killed at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut, 5 years ago. And funding, as I said, for both food stamps and the school lunch program is routinely cut.

Mr. Speaker, this bill before us is nothing more than the latest attempt by conservative political groups to pass off political posturing as proven science.
A 3-year-old girl in my district was recently killed by the adults she believed were supposed to take care of her. They abused her so violently that she was bruised from head to toe and was internally hurt. There were adults around, but not a single one helped her.

The Child Protective Services of Monroe County got two reports about abuse and neglect, but the agency was too overworked and stretched too thin to act in time, which is another hypocrisy: We are not going to find those programs enough so that little children would live. Three years old, and nobody lifted a finger to help this child. They did nothing to save her life.

This is just some of the reality that children face today. All too often, this Congress does absolutely nothing to address it. To truly care about children is to care for them long after they are born.

Now, we have taken up this bill before, and it was a one-house bill, never able to pass the Senate, and I sincerely hope this bill sees that same fate.

When the American people went to the ballot box, they were electing politicians, not somebody to meddle around with their medical needs. It is simply appalling. Just remind yourself that we deal with is the fact of a woman’s right to choose, which is protected by the Constitution of the United States. Enough already.

Mr. Speaker, the majority acts like a group of elected physicians. It has some. They are quiet. It is shameful.

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today not as an elected doctor, not as an elected thing except as a Member of Congress. But also I rise today as a father of a child who we were told before she was born that it would probably be best to kill her; that she had a disability, and it was probably best that there would be better choices for us to make in life than to not have her.

I rise today for Micah’s bill simply for those that the statement has been made that once children are here, there are problems that are political choices and life circumstances. Those are things that we have to deal with and that we should actually look at, but those are only available for those who are lucky enough to have a birthday. This bill is really about a birthday. It is about giving the unborn a chance at life.

It is interesting to me today, Mr. Speaker, that many medical professionals who support this bill also will choose to anesthetize those same babies in the womb because of their rule to the procedure. They don’t want to talk about that. They want to talk about something else.

But I simply come back to saying that this bill is about life. And maybe, it is said, that this is something we are talking about, a procedure, but it is talking about birthdays. It is talking about that life in that womb matters, and the potential from life until death is something that I believe God has given.

When we vote, let’s take it out of the realm of choosing a choice. We are standing here today and I am standing here today to take up for the rights of that baby in the womb and making sure that birthdays come, that life happens. When you look at someone like Micah and you understand that many people would have wrote them off as unviable, God had a different choice, and that is, today, that young boy that was on Capitol Hill last week.

But it doesn’t take Micah for me. It just takes Jordan for me, my 25-year-old who just texted me just a few minutes ago to say: Daddy, I love you. Over 25 years ago someone told me and my spouse that our life then would be short and having.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to stand for those still in the womb waiting for life.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, as Kerri and Kerri from New Jersey. This is her story.

With the help of a fertility specialist, Kerri and her husband were thrilled to be expecting their first baby in January of 2016. All of Kerri’s tests and scans were looking great until the 20-week ultrasound.

Kerri recounts: Our ultrasound tech spent a lot of time looking at her heart, and, finally, the doctor from maternal fetal medicine came in.

As she scanned, she told Kerri and her husband that there were some severe brain and heart abnormalities. The doctor also told them the chest cavity was small and that the lungs were not developing properly. A few days later, a geneticist told Kerri and her husband that the baby had three copies of every chromosome, a very rare condition. The doctor informed them that infants born with this condition very rarely survive more than a few days after birth.

According to Kerri: We both calmly made the decision to have an abortion. We did not want our little girl to suffer. We would much rather take on that suffering then.

On behalf of Kerri, New Jerseys, and women everywhere, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this rule and vote “no” on H.R. 36.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to stand and support this rule that will allow for the passage of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, which is also known as Micah’s Law. The underlying legislation will protect thousands of unborn babies from the excruciating pain of abortion.

Twenty weeks post-fertilization is an incredible milestone in pregnancy for moms and their unborn babies. Children at this stage in development have fingers and toes, and they have well-developed neurological structures that can feel pain. In fact, babies at this age are hypersensitive, feeling pain more acutely than you and me.

Fremies, children born at the beginning of the sixth month, just like Micah, can survive outside the womb. These babies are the future doctors, nurses, scientists, teachers, law enforcement officers in our country.

H.R. 36 protects this next generation. Eighteen weeks is new. Our country is unified in protecting life at 20 weeks. Six in ten Americans support the pain-capable legislation, and 20 States have passed similar legislation.

Let’s put an end to the abortion of these potential children. Let’s support this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak for April and against this unconstitutional underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, her story is about one of the most complex and difficult decisions a woman can face, but it would have been even more painful if this bill that we are debating, which is opposed by the American Medical Association, was the law at the time.

At 21 weeks, April had an abortion. With this bill, the Federal Government would compel every woman like April against their will to carry to term a fetus that they knew would either be stillborn or would suffer and die immediately at birth. She was heartbroken. She went to other doctors for more tests. These tests took additional weeks. Tragically, the tests confirmed the diagnosis.

At 21 weeks, April had an abortion. With this bill, the Federal Government would compel every woman like April against their will to carry to term a fetus that they knew would either be stillborn or would suffer and die at birth.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on this underlying bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members to heed the gavel.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. HARTZLER).
Mr. Speaker, Allie has one thing to say to lawmakers here today: We made the choices that are best for our family, and I trust all women to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, an overwhelming majority of Americans—some 60 to 64 percent, according to pollsters—support legal protection for pain-capable unborn children at, at least, the 20th week, or about 5 months.

Today we know that unborn babies not only die, but suffer excruciating pain during dismemberment abortion, a cruelty that rips arms and legs off of a helpless child. Even Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy, the swing vote on the court in the Stenberg vs. Carhart decision said: "The fetus, in many cases, feels pain, just as a human adult or child would. It bleeds to death as it is torn limb from limb."

He points out that, with a D&E dismemberment abortion, "the fetus can be alive at the beginning of the dismemberment process and can survive for a time while its limbs are being torn off."

Mr. Speaker, even if pain wasn't present, dismembering a child is violence against children, and it is inhumane. But these babies at this age actually suffer.

Dr. Robert White, a professor of neurology at Case Western Reserve University, has said: "An unborn child at 20 weeks is fully capable of experiencing pain. Without question, abortion is a dreadfully painful experience for that child."

Mr. Speaker, after what has happened in the last couple of days, this terrible tragedy in Las Vegas, this Congress should be spending every minute focusing on what we were sent here to do: taking action to enact commonsense safety measures to reduce gun violence.

But what do we hear on that subject from the leadership on the Republican side? Nothing. But what we get is yet another attack on the individual rights of women in this country to make decisions about their own healthcare, about their bodies, about themselves.

Those sorts of decisions should be made between a woman and her doctor. Today we know that unborn babies, whom, unbeknownst to the Supreme Court of the United States, people in Washington, D.C., sitting in this Congress, should not be able to interfere in the private health decisions that women can only make for themselves.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE).

Mrs. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to send my love and prayers to the victims and the family members of those who were hurt in Nevada.

I would also like to plead to the American people today to be good to one another. We have enough people out there outside of our country trying to hurt us. We have enough natural disasters trying to tear down our homes and our lives. We don't have to do that to each other.

I rise today as an American, as a wife, and mainly as a mother to address some of the double standards that we have in this country. As a member of the Select Panel on Infant Lives, I learned that Federal law increases criminal penalties for crimes involving pregnant women. These laws give protections to the mother and her unborn child—rightfully so.

However, this begs the question: When does the unborn have a right to protection just like their mother? Obviously, this is an important issue. Why is abortion not considered murder and killing a pregnant woman a double homicide?

Martin Luther King, Jr., said this about the civil rights movement: "The Negro cannot win as long as he is willing to sacrifice the lives of his children for comfort and safety." How can the dream survive if we murder our children?

Each human life should be protected under the rule of law. Each life that feels pain should be free from being tortured.

I cannot believe that we are here on the floor of the House, the people's House, continuing to plead and advocate for life. I am asking that we support H.R. 36 and help provide these protections for our unborn.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise for Dr. Jennifer and her patients. This is their story.
Dr. Jennifer’s patients come from my home State of California. They were a married couple on their second pregnancy. They were so excited to grow their family. But they discovered, at 22 weeks, that the fetus was severely growth-restricted, had no fluid around it, had anomalies, and could not survive the pregnancy. Although this was a wanted pregnancy, they chose to terminate the pregnancy at 23 weeks rather than prolong the suffering of the mother and her fetus.

Dr. Jennifer wants lawmakers to know that abortion restrictions would have forced her patient to carry this pregnancy until the fetus died in the womb, despite the medical advice that their baby would not survive to term. H.R. 36 and policies like it deny families their constitutional right to a choice about how they want to move forward with medical decisions that impact their bodies and their families.

On behalf of Dr. Jennifer and her patient, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on H.R. 36. We must stop these bans.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

We come here today, of course, as Members of Congress, but as we look at what happened in our country the last several weeks, one of the things that has been lauded very much is first responders. We stand on the scene to help people who have been affected, who are going through pain and suffering.

I would like you to consider today’s legislation and the rule, as we are first responders. We stand for life. We stand for the ability, as a people, and there is no other nation in the world like the American people who respond when other people are in trouble, when they are suffering when they are in pain, when their lives are in danger. And yet we turn a blind eye and a deaf ear to other people are in trouble, when they are poked or prodded or there is an uncomfortable situation, they experience pain. That is why this legislation is referred to as the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

I encourage support of this legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on H.R. 36. We must stop the bans.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, or Michae’s Law, is of utmost importance. Not only does the bill protect a common humanity and inherent rights that we share with the most vulnerable members of our society, it offers our Nation an opportunity to prevent excruciating pain for those same members, and it will stop a form of violence that has gone on for too long. This bill is a step forward in reversing a culture of violence and restoring a culture of life.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that passage of this legislation will save 2,750 children per year. That is 2,750 girls and boys who will have a chance to contribute to our society.

If you want to facilitate a culture of life, vote for this bill. If you want to begin to prevent violence in our country, vote for this bill. I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, let’s talk about pain here today.

Let’s talk about Leslie and her husband, who found out that they were pregnant and were thrilled. Unfortunately, the pregnancy did not go well. Tests revealed that Leslie’s fetus’ brain never developed to separate hemispheres, giving her child no chance for survival. Let’s talk about pain.

By the time the test exposed this tragic news, Leslie was over 20 weeks pregnant, but she lived in a State without a medical abortion. Now she lives in Wisconsin, where abortions after 20 weeks are illegal. Had she lived there during this time, she would have been forced to deliver a baby and be pregnant for 20 more weeks, compounding the emotional horror of the experience. Let’s talk about pain.

In Leslie’s own words: “I still mourn my daughter every day, but I cannot begin to understand how a position that would rather see me dead and neither of my sons ever born just to prolong a tragically doomed pregnancy can be called ‘pro-life.’”

On behalf of Leslie, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on H.R. 36. We must stop the bans and stop the pain.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Ms. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think we should take up the bill on the floor today because, when you talk to physicians and OB/GYNs, they will tell you that, if they are doing work, if they are doing an amniocentesis, then that baby feels pain, that baby responds, that child in the womb.

So I would encourage my colleagues, talk to Dr. ROE, talk to some of the OB/GYNs who serve in this Chamber, because they fully understand, as we understand, that the gift of life is not something that comes through the law. It comes from a natural gift from God. And that child who is receiving that life, who is held in the womb, if they are poked or prodded or there is an uncomfortable situation, they experience pain. That is why this legislation is referred to as the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

I encourage support of this legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I remind the House that the House keeps the District of Columbia from spending its own funds for low-income women who want to end a pregnancy at even 1 week.

But today I rise for Christy Zink, a District of Columbia resident who was a mother of one, soon-to-be mother of two. However, at 21 weeks, an MRI detected a fatal anomaly regarding her unborn son’s brain. A critical part of the brain of the fetus had simply not developed. She decided to end the pregnancy at almost 22 weeks.

On behalf of Christy Zink, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on H.R. 36. We must stop the bans.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, which I was among one of the first co-sponsors. God bless Representative TRENT FRANKS for his tireless leadership.

This is a commonsense, pro-life bill that prohibits late-term elective abortions on unborn babies after 20 weeks postfertilization. At this tender age, they can feel the excruciating pain of abortion.

America has always been a beacon for human rights. Yet, according to a 2014 report by the Charlotte Lozier Institute, the U.S. is among just seven countries that permit elective abortion
past 20 weeks. These countries include China and North Korea.

Our Nation suffers an egregious offense to be listed with North Korea and China, two oppressive regimes that show no respect for human life or human rights in allowing the killing of these precious babies as they endure these cruel abortions.

This bill is important, as we speak for those who cannot speak for themselves. As an engaged and active member of the Congressional Pro-Life Caucus, I fully support this bill, as I stand for life.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise for Rose from Michigan.

In Rose’s first pregnancy, which was planned and very wanted, severe brain abnormalities were detected in the 22nd week. She made the decision, she said “I will take that risk,” because the chances were there was a 70 percent chance that the child would be able to function. But at 28 weeks, the doctor made an analysis that said a severe brain condition with a life expectancy under 4 years, with severe seizures and limited development.

We are talking about suffering now. The baby would have problems swallowing, breathing, even smiling. The baby would never be able to communicate or control her body. And today we are talking about suffering.

Rose made the choice between a short, painful life and peace. She chose the latter.

Rose says: “I believe we made the most compassionate and loving choice we could for our baby, but the grief was initially overwhelming.”

On behalf of Rose, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on H.R. 36. We must stop the bang.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think it is important to acknowledge the pain of the cases that those on the other side of the aisle are mentioning. But I would note, Mr. Speaker, that there has been no mention, no discussion on the other side of the aisle about the pain that these babies feel, and that when you are in a situation like the ones that have been described, what is happening is those babies are being subjected to really, oftentimes, a horrific procedure. The question is, because a baby is found to have some chromosomal anomaly, to have some very severe handicap, whether or not they deserve to be subjected to the pain we now know they feel.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, we have seen work done by Northwestern University that demonstrates that the pain that these young preemies feel may, in fact, be even worse than the pain that older babies feel, because the pain inhibitors develop later in life than the pain receptors do.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle not to ignore the challenges and the issues involved here with respect to the pain that these babies feel. I would also note, Mr. Speaker, that the CBO, in a very unusual step, has stated that this bill would save 2,750 babies annually. That is something that the CBO doesn’t often do, but it is very important for us to recognize.

I don’t think we can have a discussion about this bill, about these issues, without talking about the pain that these babies feel, and I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to focus on that as well.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what my colleague is saying, but there is no scientific evidence or proof that an unborn fetus feels the pain. That is one of the reasons we are not discussing it over here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ).

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding. For over 40 years, the landmark Supreme Court decision, Roe v. Wade, has stood as a bulwark for women’s reproductive rights and healthcare rights. Now, in 2017, House Republicans are leading yet another unconstitutional, dangerous, and outright assault on women’s health and privacy. This extreme bill not only takes aim at Roe v. Wade by lowering the ban on abortion to 20 weeks, it goes even further by promising to throw doctors in jail. This is a cynical, repugnant effort by Republicans to pander to a far-right base while jeopardizing women’s health—all for a political payoff.

At the same time this House is considering a measure restricting a woman’s right to choose, we have not found time to assist 3.5 million American citizens who are suffering and dying in Puerto Rico. You call that pro-life? I urge Republicans: listen to the majority of Americans who support a woman’s right to privacy and a safe abortion. Reject this shamefull bill.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just note, Mr. Speaker, that the scientific evidence is extensive in terms of the pain that these unborn babies feel. In particular, the standard of care, Mr. Speaker, for babies who are born prematurely, as well as for babies who are patients in vitro, is to provide anesthesia. And that standard of care is based upon evidence that these babies have pain receptors, that these babies react to pain, and that they feel pain.

Mr. Speaker, I think the notion that there is no scientific evidence for this is flat wrong. I don’t think we can ignore the example of babies like Micah, babies who are born, babies who grow up to lead very full and healthy lives and who deserve a chance.

Mr. Speaker, I think that as individuals and as Representatives, elected Representatives, it is our obligation, in fact, to do everything we can to protect these babies, and that is what this bill is about.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUÍZ), a doctor.

Mr. RUÍZ. Mr. Speaker, like every physician, I took an oath to do no harm and make every decision in the best interest of my patients in the emergency department.

That oath drives every choice a doctor makes, whether it is prescribing medications, treating chronic illnesses, and even choosing how best to triage and treat a trauma patient. H.R. 36 would stand in the way of a doctor’s ability to best care for their patients.

This bill would force doctors to ignore the symptoms that they have learned through years of training and practice that show a patient’s condition could become a more serious medical condition.

Can you imagine going into your doctor’s office as a pregnant woman and being told your twins would not live and that giving birth could rupture your uterus, causing severe bleeding? That is what happened to Phil and his wife from Missouri. They learned at week 21 that she was at risk of a ruptured uterus and that the twins would die because of twin-twin transfusion syndrome.

Phil said: “Decisions about abortion need to be made with families and the best medical information available.” I couldn’t agree more. A physician’s sole focus should be the health of their patient, not the consequences of an arbitrary law that has no basis in medical evidence, and no basis that this bill is even necessary or that it will improve health outcomes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RUÍZ. Mr. Speaker, that is why, as a physician and a father, I oppose this legislation. We need less bureaucratic obstacles that get in the way of a doctor caring for their patients. We don’t want to interfere with a provider’s ability to deliver the best care for their patients.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3440, the Dream Act, which deals with children as well. This bill, if passed, bicameral legislation would help thousands of young people, children who are Americans in every way except on paper.
Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my 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 insertion of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Soto), to discuss our proposal.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, President Barack Obama, under his executive powers, established the DACA program which temporarily protected immigrants who were brought to the United States as children from potential deportation.

Our Nation made a promise to DREAMers that by coming out of the shadows, following the rules and laws of our great land, they would not be deported to a foreign country that they never knew or barely remembered.

DREAMers, like the majority of the United States under no volition of their own as young children, making this country the only home most have ever known.

DREAMers have jobs, pay taxes, and contribute to the prosperity of our Nation. In fact, since its inception, the DACA program has added over 50,000 jobs to our economy. Ninety-three percent of DREAMers are currently employed.

Over the next decade, DACA beneficiaries are projected to contribute $600 billion to our Nation’s GDP; $24.6 billion in Medicare and Social Security; and an estimated $2.5 billion annually for State and Federal contributions.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York. However, on September 5, President Trump announced he would end DACA and look to Congress to develop a legislative solution for DACA recipients.

Well, Congress has a solution. It is H.R. 3440, the Dream Act. We have heard about it from sea to shining sea. The Dream Act would allow DREAMers to earn lawful permanent residence with a pathway to citizenship. It would also give them the opportunity to continue to belonging to their communities by encouraging them to pursue higher education, work for at least 3 years, or serve in our United States military.

To qualify under the Dream Act, a person must graduate from high school, pass a background check, demonstrate proficiency in the English language, and not have a felony or any other serious crime that could pose a threat to our country. With the DACA program to expire, now is the time for Congress to act.

We must bring the Dream Act to the floor for a vote because Congress has been silent for too long. DREAMers are doing their jobs. What we ask is that Congress does theirs. It is time for Congress to do its job and pass the Dream Act without delay.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. Lamborn), for his leadership.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I believe Americans are compassionate people. I also believe Americans are angered by injustice, and I know Americans are eager to protect the defenseless.

In a past hearing before the Judiciary Committee on this bill, Dr. Maureen Condic said in her testimony: "Imposing pain on any pain-capable living creature is cruelty. And ignoring the pain experienced by another human individual for any reason is barbaric."

H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, gives us a chance to choose compassion by preventing abortions from taking place if the child is 20 weeks or older. Science proves that not only can these children feel pain, but since their pain inhibitors are undeveloped, they feel pain even more intensely than we can. In Dr. Condic's words, "whether we will choose to ignore the pain of the fetus or not."

Mr. Speaker, I am choosing not to ignore their pain. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this compassionate bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the majority keeps trying to choose compassion by preventing abortions--the only home most have ever known. They would not be killed--watching their hands expand and then contract, as any mother of a newborn infant has watched many times.

It is truly horrific, and I think, as a society, Mr. Speaker, we have to be willing to face the exact nature of what it is we are talking about. We have an obligation as elected Representatives, Mr. Speaker, to protect the lives of these unborn babies. This legislation would do that.

We have a moral obligation, and it is our job. It is in the interest of the States to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that we do everything possible to protect life.

In this case, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a bill that would protect babies at moments when we know they can feel pain in the womb. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of both the rule and of H.R. 36 so that we can continue to protect and save lives.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 548 OFFERED BY Ms. SLAUGHTER

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to
clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3440) to authorize the canceling of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long- term United States residents and who entered the United States as children and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution, or one motion to recommit with or without instructions as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIX, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(e) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3440.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the reason 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, 306-311), 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 pursues the subject contained in the special rule of which the Member in charge is the sponsor. The vote on the previous question is a vote to prevent the House from pursuing the agenda set forth in the special rule.

In Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives the chapter 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 House to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on an amendment reported on a rule, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion which 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 of those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan of action.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, 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. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas and nays were ordered. The previous question was ordered on the rule; and further debate was disallowed.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 184, not voting 16; and as follows:

[Vote Roll No. 55]
The vote was taken by electronic de-
ing. There are 2 minutes remain-
ing.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant
to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair
will postpone further proceedings
today on motions to suspend the rules
on which a recorded vote or the yeas
and nays are ordered, or on which the
vote incurs objection under clause 6
of rule XX in the subsection proceed-
ing.

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

EARLY HEARING DETECTION AND
INTERVENTION ACT OF 2017

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move
to suspend the rules and pass the bill
(S. 652) to amend the Public Health
Service Act to reauthorize a program
for early detection, diagnosis, and
treatment regarding deaf and hard-
of-hearing newborns, infants, and young
children.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM
FOR EARLY DETECTION, DIAGNOSIS,
AND TREATMENT REGARDING DEAF
AND HARD-OF-HEARING NEWBORNS,
INFANTS, AND YOUNG CHILDREN.
(a) SECTION HEADING.—The section heading
of section 399M of the Public Health Service
Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-1) is amended to read as
follows:

(1) SEC. 399M. EARLY DETECTION, DIAGNOSIS,
AND TREATMENT REGARDING DEAF
AND HARD-OF-HEARING NEWBORNS,
INFANTS, AND YOUNG CHILDREN.

(b) STATEWIDE SYSTEMS.—Section 399M(a)
of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C.
280g-1(a)) is amended—

(1) by inserting heading, by striking
"NEWBORN AND INFANT" and inserting "NEW-
BORN, INFANT, AND YOUNG CHILD";
(2) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—
   (A) by striking “newborn and infant” and inserting “newborn, infant, and young child”; and
   (B) by striking “providers” and inserting “providers (including, as appropriate, education and training of family members),”;
   (3) in paragraph (1)—
      (A) by inserting “in the first line—
         (i) by striking “newborns and infants” and inserting “newborns, infants, and young children (referred to in this section as ‘children’);” and
         (ii) by striking “and medical” and all that follows through the period and inserting “and qualified health care providers (including medical homes for children), and in programs mandated”; and
      (iv) by striking “hard of hearing” and all that follows through the period and inserting “hard of hearing and young children;” and
   (B) by striking the second sentence—
      (i) by striking “Early” and inserting the following:
         “(A) Early;”
      (ii) by striking “and delivery of” and inserting “, and delivery of;”;
      (iii) by striking “by schools” and all that follows through the period and inserting “by organizations such as schools and agencies (including community, consumer, and family-based agencies, in health care settings (including medical homes for children), and in programs mandated);” and
      (iv) by striking “hard of hearing” and all that follows through the period and inserting “hard of hearing and young children;” and
   (C) by striking the last sentence and inserting the following:
      “(B) Information provided to families should be accurate, comprehensive, up-to-date, and evidence-based, as appropriate, to allow families to make important decisions for their children in a timely manner, including decisions with respect to the full range of assistive hearing technologies and communications modalities, as appropriate.
   (C) Programs and systems under this paragraph shall offer mechanisms that foster family-to-family and deaf and hard-of-hearing consumer-to-family support.”;
(4) in paragraph (2), by striking “To collect” and all that follows through the period and inserting “To continue to provide technical support to States, through one or more technical assistance coordinators, in all areas of developing and enhancing State early hearing detection and intervention programs;”;
(5) in striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:
   “(3) To identify or develop efficient models (educational and medical) to ensure that children who are identified as deaf or hard-of-hearing through screening receive follow-up by qualified early intervention providers or qualified health care providers (including those at medical homes for children), and referrals, as appropriate, including to early intervention services under part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. State agencies shall be encouraged to effectively increase the rate of such follow-up and referral.”;
(c) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, DATA MANAGEMENT, AND APPLIED RESEARCH.—Section 399M(b)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290g–1(b)(1)) is amended—
   (1) in paragraph (a)—
      (A) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:
         “(A) In GENERAL.—The Secretary;”
      (B) by striking “to complement an intra-mural program and” and inserting the following: “or designated entities of States—
         (i) to develop, maintain, and improve data collection related to newborn, infant, and young child hearing screening, evaluation (including audiologic, medical, and language acquisition evaluations), diagnosis, and intervention services;”;
         (C) by striking “to conduct” and inserting the following:
         “(ii) to conduct;” and
         (D) by striking “newborn” and all that follows through the period and inserting the following: “newborn, infant, and young child hearing screening, evaluation, and intervention programs and outcomes;”;
         “(iii) to ensure quality monitoring of hearing screening, evaluation, and intervention programs and systems for newborns, infants, and young children; and
         (iv) to support newborn, infant, and young child hearing screening, evaluation, and intervention programs, and information systems;”;
   (2) in the second sentence—
      (A) by striking the matter that precedes subparagraph (A) and all that follows through subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:
         “(B) USE OF AWARDS.—The awards made under subparagraph (A) may be used—
            (i) to provide technical assistance on data collection and management, including to coordinate and develop standardized procedures for data management;
            (ii) to assess and report on the cost and program effectiveness of newborn, infant, and young child hearing screening, evaluation, and intervention programs and systems;
            (iii) to collect data and report on newborn, infant, and young child hearing screening, evaluation, diagnosis, and intervention programs and systems for applied research, program evaluation, and policy improvement;”;
      (B) by redesignating subparagraphs (D), (E), and (F) as clauses (iv), (v), and (vi), respectively, and aligning the margins of those clauses with the margins of clause (i) of subparagraph (B) as inserted by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph;
      (C) in clause (v) (as redesignated by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph)—
         (i) by striking “newborn and infant” and inserting “newborn, infant, and young child;” and
         (ii) by striking “language status” and inserting “hearing status;” and
         (D) in clause (vi) (as redesignated by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph)—
            (i) by striking “(B) to establish newborn, infant, and young child hearing screening, evaluation, diagnosis, and intervention programs and systems for applied research, program evaluation, and policy improvement;”;
            (E) by striking “(C) to identify” and inserting the following:
               “(I) to improve State and local agencies’ provision of nonmedical services,” and inserting
               “(II) to procedures” and inserting the following:
               “(A) to assess;”
               (B) by striking “to establish” and inserting the following:
                  “(B) to establish;”
               (D) by striking “auditory disorder;” and inserting “auditory disorder;”;
            (F) by striking “to identify” and inserting the following:
               “(C) to identify;”
               (G) by striking “appropriate agencies,” and inserting “appropriate agencies;”;
            (H) by striking “medical evaluation;” and inserting “medical evaluation;”;
            (I) by striking “to full range of assistive hearing technologies appropriate for newborns, infants, and young children;” and
               “(IV) audiologic rehabilitation treatment; and
                  “(V) referral to national;” and
               (B) by striking “parent, and education” and inserting “parent, family, and education;”
            (2) by striking paragraph (2);
   (3) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (6) as paragraphs (2) through (5);
   (4) in paragraph (2) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection)—
      (A) by striking “refers to providing” and inserting the following: “options, including—
         (i) linkage;”
      (B) by striking “appropriate agencies,” and inserting “appropriate agencies;”
      (C) by striking “medications;” and inserting “medications;”
      (D) by striking “(F) other qualified;” and
      (E) by striking “newborns, infants, toddlers, children,” and inserting “children;”;
      (F) by striking “third-party” and inserting the following:
         “(G) third-party;” and
      (J) by striking “related commercial” and inserting the following:
         “(H) related commercial;” and
   (2) in paragraph (3)—
      (A) by striking “States to establish newborn and infant” and inserting the following: “(A) to establish newborn, infant, and young child;”
      (B) by inserting a semicolon after “section (a)” and “(C) by striking ‘‘to develop’’ and inserting the following: ‘‘(C) to develop;’’
      (C) by striking “parents’” and inserting “parent’s”;
      (D) by striking “to assess” and inserting the following:
         “(A) to assess;”
         (B) by striking “to establish” and inserting the following:
            “(B) to establish;”
         (D) by striking “auditory disorder;” and inserting “auditory disorder;”;
      (E) by striking “to identify” and inserting the following:
         “(C) to identify;”
      (F) by striking “options,” and all that follows through “to procedures” and inserting the following:
         “options, including—
            (i) linkage;”
      (G) by striking “appropriate agencies;” and inserting “appropriate agencies;”
      (H) by striking “medical evaluation;” and inserting “medical evaluation;”
      (I) by striking “to full range of assistive hearing technologies appropriate for newborns, infants, and young children;” and
         “(IV) audiologic rehabilitation treatment; and
         (v) referral to national;” and
   (H) by striking “parent, and education” and inserting “parent, family, and education;”
   (2) by striking paragraph (2);
   (3) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (6) as paragraphs (2) through (5);
   (4) in paragraph (2) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection)—
      (A) by striking “refers to providing” and inserting the following: “means—
         (A) providing ‘‘linkage;’’
      (B) by striking “with hearing loss, including nonmedical services,” and inserting “who is deaf or hard-of-hearing, including nonmedical services;”
      (C) by striking “ensuring that families of the child are provided” and inserting the following:
         “(B) ensuring that the family of the child is—
            (i) provided;”
My home State of Florida has required newborn screening since October 1, 2000. We need to keep this going. According to the most recent State data in Florida, 98 percent of all newborns in Florida will be screened within the first month. That is absolutely vital to de-cide the problem early in their lives.

So let's work together. Extending this newborn screening initiative for another 5 years ensures that babies will continue to have access to this vital hearing screening, and we can make sure that kids across America get the healthcare that they need.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again thank my colleagues, Representatives GUTHRIE and MATSUI and Senators PORTMAN and Kaine, for leading the charge on this important effort. I encourage my colleagues to support this bipartisan S. 652.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I also want to be in strong support of H.R. 652, the Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Act of 2017, sponsored by Senator PORTMAN from Ohio. This legislation has been championed in the House by my friend, the vice chair of the Health Subcommittee, Representative BRET GUTHRIE, as H.R. 1539.

The bill does have strong bipartisan support and, in fact, passed this House unanimously in the last Congress. Federal support for early hearing detection and intervention programs across the country help identify children with hearing loss and directs them to early intervention services.

This program is a model of how government at different levels and public and private agencies can and should work together. In addition to improving upon current programs, this legislation improves the recruitment, retention, education, and training of qualified personnel and health providers to identify and assist young children with hearing loss.

This bill emphasizes the importance of the Health Resources and Services Administration, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the National Institutes of Health partnering together to improve outcomes and strengthen the early hearing detection and intervention program. I commend Representative GUTHRIE for spearheading this initiative on the House side.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Act authored by two of my Energy and Commerce Committee colleagues, Mr. GUTHRIE from Kentucky and Ms. MATSUI from California. I thank Chairman WALDEN and Chairman BURGESS for their help. I also thank Senators Portman and Kaine from the Senate.

It is vital that the House reauthorize the early hearing detection and intervention initiative for an additional 5 years because it provides the all-important newborn and infant hearing screening, evaluation, and intervention.

The bill will provide vital resources to aid in their care.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Act authored by two of my Energy and Commerce Committee colleagues, Mr. GUTHRIE from Kentucky and Ms. MATSUI from California. I thank Chairman WALDEN and Chairman BURGESS for their help. I also thank Senators Portman and Kaine from the Senate.

It is vital that the House reauthorize the early hearing detection and intervention initiative for an additional 5 years because it provides the all-important newborn and infant hearing screening, evaluation, and intervention.

The bill will provide vital resources to aid in their care.
The Newborn Hearing Screening and Intervention Program established almost 2 decades ago has been life-changing for those born deaf or hard of hearing. A member of my staff in Sacramento, Devin, was born hard of hearing but didn’t receive a screening at birth. For most of her first few years of her life, she appeared to be struggling to keep up with her peers.

It wasn’t until Devin reached the middle of kindergarten that her teacher suggested she get her hearing tested. After driving her diagnosis, Devin’s family was able to seek out tools and resources to help her catch up to her classmates in school.

Devin’s story illustrates the importance of early detection and intervention. We know that a child’s development in the first few years of their life can have a major impact on their well-being later on.

By extending this program through our legislation, we are ensuring that infants continue to have access to hearing screenings at birth so their parents can make informed choices about their care and management early on.

We have come so far in increasing the number of babies who are screened every year. By passing this legislation, we are continuing that progress.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Congressman GUTHRIE, for his leadership on this issue, and I ask for everyone’s support.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), the author of the bill and the vice chairman of the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) and I have worked on a lot of issues together, and it is always a pleasure working with her and to move important things forward. I know a lot of times you see a lot of big issues need to be addressed, but a lot of things are getting done here in the House.

Today, once we pass this bill, it goes to the President. It is coming back from the Senate, so it goes to the President.

My interest in this is when I was in the General Assembly of Kentucky, the Governor had a proposal dealing with children in the first 3 years of their life and was looking at a lot of money to be spent. And I remember doing research on a site. I found a report from a doctor from Vanderbilt, and I went down and met with her. So there has been a lot of debate on the research of some of the things that we were looking at moving forward.

She said: In normal stimulation, a child is going to rise to their ability. But if you did say this: If you took a healthy baby and put it into a closet with no light, and it couldn’t hear, and pull it out 3 years later—which obviously you couldn’t do that—it wouldn’t be able to see and it would never be able to develop its hearing because the brain does start adjusting at a young age.

That is why you can learn a language far better as a child than you can as an adult.

So I was driving back, and part of what Governor Patton of Kentucky had proposed was screening, early screening, and early childhood hearing detection as part of the bill. So a lot of us were saying: ‘What do you do with mandates?’

I was driving back, and I remember thinking, well, if you were born and you can’t see well, then is that the same thing as being put in a dark closet? Because if you don’t figure out till you show up to school that you can’t see, I mean, that number is rising.

If you can really test them, when we gather them, but you can test newborns at birth. If you can find a newborn at birth that has a hearing impairment and get it corrected, it will develop just like all the other healthy children, so why not do it?

So I got to Washington, D.C. It is a national program. It is not something I came up with. It was authored before, so we are here today to reauthorize it. I just want to point out this program is a success. In 2000, 40 percent of newborns were screened for hearing loss. That number has gone up to about 86 percent in 2011. In 2015, CDC has reported that roughly 97 percent of infants are screened for hearing loss. Think of the difference that makes in these children’s lives when we catch them.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman GUTHRIE and Ms. MATSUI.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again, I would like to thank my Energy and Commerce colleagues, especially Mr. GUTHRIE and Ms. MATSUI. I urge approval of this bipartisan bill.

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

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, once again, I would like to thank my Energy and Commerce colleagues, especially Mr. BURGESS and Ms. MATSUI. I urge approval of this bipartisan bill.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bipartisan bill to reauthorize the Newborn Hearing Screening and Intervention Program.

If this law were around when I was a newborn, we might have caught my hearing loss at a younger age. I don’t want kids to go through what I have gone through. Representative GUTHRIE said it about his child. I had vision problems, too.

I would urge these children to have an opportunity to succeed. That is why we are here in this Congress. That is why it makes it worthwhile to make a difference in a person’s life. All they are asking for is an opportunity to succeed. So now as a user of hearing aids myself, I was proud to cosponsor the bipartisan bill, the House version introduced by my colleagues, Mr. GUTHRIE and Ms. MATSUI.

Studies have shown that important language development skills are learned prior to a child’s third birthday, as hearing and language are closely linked. According to the American Academy of Pediatrics, 33 children are born every day with hearing impairment, making it the most common congenital condition in the United States. If left undiagnosed, a child can risk developmental challenges and setbacks.

Since its inception in 1999, the Newborn Hearing Screening and Intervention Program has improved the lives of numerous children. Over its first 15 years, the percentage of newborn babies screened every year increased from 40 percent in 2000 to approximately 96 percent of infants in 2015.

The bill builds on this legacy of success, allowing for vital screenings and monitoring to continue, while improving timely follow-up for infants to receive the care they need—key to healthy development.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, all these children are asking for is an opportunity to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a pleasure to work with her and to thank the President. It is coming back to the Senate. If the law were around when I was a child, I can say I had difficulty hearing in the classroom. I don’t know how I got through, but I did. I had a hard time seeing the blackboard. I don’t know how I got through my math, but I did.

Again, this is why we are here: to make a difference.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to vote in favor of this important legislation.

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

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to vote in favor of this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2408) to enhance the targeting, monitoring, and evaluate the impact of the programs on girls, monitor programs to effectively address barriers to such education; and (3) incorporate into the design and implementation of such programs measures to combat child marriage, gender-based violence, and severe forms of trafficking in persons (as such term is defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(9))); and (4) coordinate with the governments of countries hosting significant numbers of displaced people to—

(A) promote the inclusion of displaced children into the educational systems of such countries; and

(B) develop innovative approaches to providing safe primary and secondary educational opportunities in circumstances in which such inclusion is not possible or appropriate, such as schools that permit space for displaced children to be educated by extending the hours of schooling and expanding the number of teachers.

SEC. 5. UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE TO SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR DISPLACED CHILDREN.

(a) In General.—The Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development are authorized to prioritize and advance ongoing efforts to support programs that—

(1) provide safe primary and secondary education for displaced children;

(2) build the capacity of institutions in countries hosting significant numbers of displaced people to prevent discrimination against displaced children, especially displaced girls, who might otherwise be vulnerable to severe forms of trafficking in persons; and

(3) incorporate into the design and implementation of such programs measures to combat child marriage, gender-based violence, and severe forms of trafficking in persons (as such term is defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(9))); and

(b) Coordination With Multilateral Organizations.—The Secretary and the Administrator are authorized to coordinate with the World Bank, appropriate agencies of the United Nations, the International Labour Organization, and other relevant multilateral organizations to work with governments in other countries to collect relevant data, disaggregated by age and gender, on the ability of displaced people to access education and participate in economic activity, in order to improve the targeting, monitoring, and evaluation of related assistance efforts.

(c) Coordination With Private Sector and Civil Society Organizations.—The Secretary and the Administrator are authorized to coordinate with appropriate agencies of the United States Agency for International Development and other relevant private sector and civil society organizations to promote safe primary and secondary education for displaced children.

SEC. 6. REPORT.

During the five-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Administrator shall include in any report or evaluation submitted to Congress regarding foreign assistance programs for or to displaced persons, a description of how such program benefitted displaced persons, and a description of any primary or secondary educational services supported by such program that specifically address the needs of displaced girls.
Promoting girls’ access to education reduces their risk of falling victim to gender-based violence or to early marriage or to human trafficking. It is also the just thing to do.

H.R. 2408, the Protecting Girls’ Access to Education in Vulnerable Settings Act, authorizes the State Department and authorizes USAID to enhance existing education programs for displaced children and to especially be engaged with girls.

The bill calls for the State Department and USAID to coordinate efforts with the private sector as well, with civil society groups, with multilateral organizations, to collect relevant data to improve the effectiveness of these programs that we are engaged in.

Finally, the bill would require that the State Department and the USAID include data on education programs for displaced children in any report to Congress on disaster relief and recovery efforts so that we are aware that they are engaged in addressing this issue.

We must strengthen the role of education in humanitarian assistance. Refugees and other displaced persons live on a knife edge of despair. Without access to education, children in conflict zones, especially girls, are more exposed to violence, to exploitation, and even to radicalization.

By helping to realize their innate potential, education gives these children hope, hope for today, and it gives them critical skills for tomorrow so that they can contribute to their homes, their communities, and so that they can contribute to the next generation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the bill.

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

Mr. Sires. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure, and I yield myself as much time as I may consider.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our chairman on the Foreign Affairs Committee, Ed Royce, and our ranking member, Eliot Engel, as well as the authors of this bill, Mr. Chabot of Ohio and Ms. Kelly of Illinois. Both of these Members have worked hard on the bill to expand access to education around the world. I agree with them that this is an important priority for our foreign policy.

When children are able to get basic education, it pays massive dividends down the road. Those girls and boys grow up with great opportunity, and they play a bigger role in their economies and their communities.

We have seen research that, when children can learn about certain issues like nonviolent civic engagement, support for violence drops. That adds up to stronger and more stable countries and better partners for the United States.

Children belong in a classroom. Mr. Speaker, where they happen to be born, but in too many places, that access just doesn’t exist. What happens then?

We know in places like the Middle East, in north Africa, violent extremists are happy to fill in the void, to recruit and indoctrinate the next generation with their hateful and violent ideology. This problem is especially acute among refugees of displaced populations.

Mr. Speaker, 3.7 million schoolchildren under the U.N. refugee agency’s mandate have no school to go to. Some countries are trying to tackle this challenge, like Lebanon, where the government recently began to enroll Syrian refugees in schools, but the need is just too great. Out of 500,000 school-age refugees, nearly half are out of school.

This bill aims to help address those really desperate situations. It calls for the USAID to ramp up access to these children, and particularly young girls. It will help us gather more data to assist government and NGOs that are also grappling with this problem, and it authorizes the Secretary of State and the USAID Administrator to prioritize this issue, to work with multilateral organizations, and to seek out partners in the private sector and civil society that will bring innovative new approaches to expanding access to education.

This bill will put more young girls in the classroom in places around the world where this help is badly needed. I am glad to support it.

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

Mr. Royce of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Chabot), who is on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and is the author of this legislation.

Mr. Chabot. Mr. Speaker, Chairman Royce has been a strong proponent of this, as has Eliot Engel. I want to especially thank Robin Kelly for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2408, a bipartisan bill that aims to provide a safe education for millions of children, especially girls, who live in the most dangerous and unstable places across the globe.

As a parent and now a grandparent, a former teacher, I know that education physically and mentally empowers our children.

Unfortunately, millions of children receive no education due to the circumstances which are beyond their control. This is particularly true for the growing number of displaced people across the world, as it is exceedingly difficult for children in conflict zones to receive a primary or secondary education. Armed conflicts across the world, particularly in places like Syria and now Burma, have led to the internal displacement of millions of women and children, and forced them to literally flee their own homes.

There are currently 65 million people displaced worldwide, and at least 21 million are refugees. They are out of their own countries. This is the highest number since World War II, and the number has been steadily rising since 2011.

Many of the displaced people are survivors of human rights abuses and violence. Half of these victims are under the age of 18. They have grown up in the most formative years of their lives. If they are not given the opportunity to succeed, they will be subjected to a lifetime of conflict and instability.

Education is a key component to helping lift these vulnerable children out of the depths of poverty. Access to education not only gives children the opportunity to grow and learn, but also provides safety and shields them from violence, extremist ideology, human trafficking networks, and a relentless cycle of abuse.

There is no question that access to education provides stability and consistency to children living in extremely unstable conditions, especially girls.

That is why I introduced H.R. 2408, the Protecting Girls’ Access to Education in Vulnerable Settings Act, to help lift vulnerable children out of poverty.

This legislation will move us in the right direction by making access to primary and secondary education a priority with our State Department and USAID. It aims to directly benefit displaced children, specifically girls, and will help to address one of the world’s greatest challenges facing refugees across the globe.

This legislation also encourages greater international coordination and leverages existing resources by promoting education for refugees where they are through local schools.

The Protecting Girls’ Access to Education in Vulnerable Settings Act will ensure that millions of child refugees will have an opportunity to reach their highest potential, even those in the most tumultuous conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Sires. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. Frankel), my colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee and a real champion for women and girls.

Ms. Frankel of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and the leaders of our committee for their bipartisan efforts. It is very appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bipartisan legislation that directs the State Department and USAID to support programs and educate displaced children, with a special focus on girls.

When you look at the horrors of the world, from South Sudan to Burma, to Syria, think about the fact that there are 55 million displaced children, 28 million refugee children that have been uprooted from their homes due to violence and poverty, and making up half of the refugee population.

Here is the thing. What happens when a young person has no hope, no education, no future potential of a good
job to one day take care of their family? Will they become victims of trafficking or violent members of society? Will these millions of children become our friends or foes? Will the communities they live in be our trading partners or havens for terrorists?

Across the world, only a quarter of refugee children are enrolled in secondary school, and the number, as my colleagues have pointed out, is even worse for girls. Just seven girls for every ten refugee boys are enrolled in secondary school. We are talking about a lost generation.

In Syria alone, over 5,000 schools have been destroyed. Just ask a young lady named Muzoon. She is known as the Malala of Syria. At age 15, she fled her besieged home in Syria. When she was told to bring only her essentials, she packed a suitcase full of books because she knows, “That education is a shield that we can use to protect ourselves in life.” She even went door to door in Syria, begging to convince parents to keep their daughters in school instead of pressuring them into early marriage.

Muzoon knows and we know that when girls are educated, they lead to healthier, more productive lives that enhance the economy and the peacefulness of their societies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this fine legislation.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), who chairs the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ROYCE; Ranking Member ENGEL; and, in this case, especially Congressman ALBIO SIRES, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, for once again helping to bring another important bipartisan Foreign Affairs measure to the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I am a proud cosponsor of the Protecting Girls’ Access to Education in Vulnerable Settings Act. My good friend, STEVE CHABOT, has been a former teacher. We understand how important education is to future success. Mr. Speaker, I am also a former certified teacher, and expanding access to education, especially young girls, have access to education. I urge my colleagues to support this important measure. I urge our partners in responsible nations around the world to join us in prioritizing our efforts toward access to education for all.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL, and I especially thank my good friend from New Jersey (Mr. SIRES).

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

Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2408).

The question was taken; and (two-thirds in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NICARAGUAN INVESTMENT CONDITIONALITY ACT (NICA) OF 2017

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1198) to oppose loans at international financial institutions for the Government of Nicaragua unless the Government of Nicaragua takes effective steps to hold free, fair, and transparent elections, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1198

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Nicaraguan Investment Conditionality Act (NICA) of 2017”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The House Committee on Foreign Affairs convened a congressional hearing on December 1, 2011, entitled “Democracy Held Hostage in Nicaragua: Part 1” where former United States Ambassador to Nicaragua Robert Callahan testified, “First, that Daniel Ortega’s candidacy was illegal, illegitimate, and unconstitutional; second, that the period leading to the elections and the elections themselves were marred by serious fraud; third, that Daniel Ortega and his Sandinista party have systematically undermined the country’s fragile governmental institutions.”

(2) According to the Organization of American States (OAS) report on the Nicaraguan
2011 Presidential elections, the OAS recommended that the Government of Nicaragua take a number of steps to improve its electoral systems, including accrediting polling places, and political parties and civil society are represented to observe elections, and redesigning the structure of the Nicaraguan electoral council to allow proper registration of the electorate.

(3) On January 25, 2012, a press statement from Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said: "As noted by international observers and Nicaragua's opposition groups, Nicaragua's current government may have limited democratic space leading up to the elections in November and stated that "[o]n June 8, the Nicaraguan Supreme Court stripped the Liberal Party (PLI) from its long-recognized leader. The Supreme Court took similar action on June 17 when it invalidated the leadership of the remaining Party candidates and opposition party with the legal standing to present a presidential candidate. Most recently, on July 29, the Supreme Electoral Council removed 28 PLI national assembly members (16 seated and 12 alternates) from their popularly-elected positions.

(4) According to the Department of State's 2015 Fiscal Transparency Report: "Nicaragua's fiscal transparency would be improved by including all off-budget revenue and expenditure in the budget, auditing state-owned enterprises, and conducting a full audit of the government's annual financial statements, making audit reports publicly available within a reasonable period of time.''

(5) According to the Department of State's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2015: "In 2011 the Supreme Electoral Council (CSE) announced the re-election of President Daniel Ortega of the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN) in elections that international and domestic observers characterized as seri-

(6) According to the Department of State's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2015 in Nicaragua: "The principal human rights abuses reported in 2015 included the following: (a) restrictions on access by independent media, as well as increased restriction of access to public information, including national statistics from public offices; and (b) intimidation and harassment of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society organizations.

(7) The same 2015 report stated: "Addi-

(8) On June 7, 2016, the Department of State's Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor posted on social media the dis-
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SEC. 4. INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.
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Daniel Ortega who lost the Presidency in 1990, has tightened his grip on power by weakening government institutions and the opposition and ensuring power for himself and his family by excluding international election observers.

By requiring that the Secretary of State certify that Nicaragua has taken steps to provide election transparency and combat corruption before the United States votes to provide the Government of Nicaragua with loans, we help ensure that taxpayer money is not used to prop up corrupt authoritarians, or to derail the legitimate democratic rights of the Nicaraguan citizens.

We need only to look to Venezuela to see that the consolidation of state power and organized crime and corruption actually go hand in hand. As a region, we must stand in strong opposition to authoritarianism and corruption in Nicaragua, while not punishing the people of Nicaragua. And it is this point of not punishing the people of Nicaragua that also have to include in this measure; and for that reason, and because of this, the authors of the bill have insured a carve-out, and that carve-out exempts all loans that are for humanitarian purposes.

So this bill stands squarely with the people of Nicaragua and their hopes for freedom and democracy and the rule of law. Its passage is just one way that we can demonstrate this support. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my remarks and include extraneous material on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIRES) will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

General Leave

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I seek unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the world has watched with great concern, with mounting horror, actually, as Venezuela suffers economic ruin amid a potential crisis that has eroded democracy, and that threatens to disqualify the region. Meanwhile, less noticed, Nicaragua continues to violate the region’s democratic values by failing to conduct fair and transparent elections and by denying Nicaraguan freedom of expression and freedom of association.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the leadership of chairman emeritus of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN; and the chairman and ranking member of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, Mr. DUNCAN, and the ranking member, Mr. SIRES, in bringing this measure to the floor.

This legislation will require U.S. representatives at international financial institutions to use the vote and influence of the United States to oppose any loans to Nicaragua unless the country has shown a willingness to respect the human and democratic rights of its citizens.

Nicaragua’s authoritarian President Daniel Ortega, and that’s the same

Daniel Ortega who lost the Presidency in 1990, has tightened his grip on power by weakening government institutions and the opposition and ensuring power for himself and his family by excluding international election observers.

By requiring that the Secretary of State certify that Nicaragua has taken steps to provide election transparency and combat corruption before the United States votes to provide the Government of Nicaragua with loans, we help ensure that taxpayer money is not used to prop up corrupt authoritarians, or to derail the legitimate democratic rights of the Nicaraguan citizens.

We need only to look to Venezuela to see that the consolidation of state power and organized crime and corruption actually go hand in hand. As a region, we must stand in strong opposition to authoritarianism and corruption in Nicaragua, while not punishing the people of Nicaragua. And it is this point of not punishing the people of Nicaragua that also have to include in this measure; and for that reason, and because of this, the authors of the bill have insured a carve-out, and that carve-out exempts all loans that are for humanitarian purposes.

So this bill stands squarely with the people of Nicaragua and their hopes for freedom and democracy and the rule of law. Its passage is just one way that we can demonstrate this support. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my remarks and include extraneous material on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIRES) will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

General Leave

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I seek unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the world has watched with great concern, with mounting horror, actually, as Venezuela suffers economic ruin amid a potential crisis that has eroded democracy, and that threatens to disqualify the region. Meanwhile, less noticed, Nicaragua continues to violate the region’s democratic values by failing to conduct fair and transparent elections and by denying Nicaraguan freedom of expression and freedom of association.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the leadership of chairman emeritus of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN; and the chairman and ranking member of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, Mr. DUNCAN, and the ranking member, Mr. SIRES, in bringing this measure to the floor.

This legislation will require U.S. representatives at international financial institutions to use the vote and influence of the United States to oppose any loans to Nicaragua unless the country has shown a willingness to respect the human and democratic rights of its citizens.

Nicaragua’s authoritarian President Daniel Ortega, and that’s the same
H.R. 1918 calls on the U.S. Government to oppose loans at international financial institutions for Nicaragua unless the Nicaraguan Government takes some effective steps to hold free, fair, and transparent elections and commits to upholding democratic principles. I hope that the administration need to work together and find ways to empower the Nicaraguan people and defend against Ortega’s hostile behavior towards innocent civilians. It is my hope that this bipartisan legislation will pass both the Senate and quickly be signed into law.

I thank the chairman and ranking member once again and their staff for all their help in bringing the NICA Act to the floor. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill to hold the Ortega regime accountable for its actions.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker. I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) who chairs the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, and is the author of this legislation.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, H.R. 1918, the Nicaraguan Investment Conditionality Act, also known as the NICA Act, and I want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for working with my office to bring this important measure to the floor today.

I also want to thank my legislative “brother,” “mi hermano,” the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Sires), who is the Democratic lead on this legislation, because his leadership on all things related to human rights is admirable, and his steadfast support for the people of Nicaragua has been unwavering.

I also want to thank the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee Chairman JEFF DUNCAN. He has been helping us in leading the effort and bringing attention to the human rights abuses that are sadly occurring in Nicaragua.

This legislation before us, Mr. Speaker, is straightforward, and it is simple. There have been a lot of exaggerations about what this bill does and what this bill doesn’t do.

Our bill is aimed at leveraging America’s influence and conditioning our vote on international financial institutions for Nicaragua until the leadership in that country takes significant steps to restore democratic order.

I think that we would all agree, as Members of the United States Congress, that to have democracies in that region is beneficial; and to have strong governance and strong rule of law and a strong independent judiciary, these are all values that we share and that the people throughout the hemisphere would like to have that in their countries as well.

So let’s go over, just briefly, what are some of the conditions in this bill.

And please, as I go through them, ask yourself: Is that a damaging condition, or is that something that would help the people? Not whether it helps the ruling class, the rich guys, the fat-cat bankers, not whether it helps the regime or the government in power, but whether it helps the people of those countries.

So let me go through the list, Mr. Speaker. This bill has as conditions:

1. To promote democracy. Promoting democracy, promoting an independent judiciary, these are wonderful values. Promoting an independent electoral council, so that the ruling party doesn’t steal elections;

2. Strengthen the rule of law so that you don’t have corrupt judges deciding in favor of the rich guys against the poor of the country;

3. Fighting corruption, including investigating and prosecuting government officials who are credibly alleged to be corrupt, who go against the people of Nicaragua, particularly those who wish to do damage to the country.

What else does the bill do? Well, one of the conditions is that it protects the right of political opposition parties. Don’t we want that, political opposition parties; journalists who are trying to get the truth to the Nicaraguan people just as they do here to the American people; trade unionists; human rights defenders and other civil rights advocates to operate without interference. Isn’t that what we want for all countries to have?

These conditions, Mr. Speaker, they are not unheard of; in fact, they are similar to what this country has already passed, what this Congress has already passed for the Northern Triangle countries of Honduras, of Guatemala, and of El Salvador. And now we want to do that for Nicaragua, so it is intended to help the people of Nicaragua.

This bill has safeguards in place to ensure that humanitarian assistance continues to be provided to address basic human needs. Humanitarian assistance will continue.

Some of those basic needs that we talked about, such as free and fair elections, they are not being met today due to the failed leadership in Nicaragua. And who does that help? Well, it helps the leaders, and it hurts the people when you don’t have free and fair elections, you want to help the people of Nicaragua.

Now, reports have surfaced that the Nicaraguan electoral council is giving away identity cards, so that minors, underage individuals can be allowed to vote. Nicaraguans who are not on the electoral rolls are also being allowed to vote.

What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? It means that there will be no way to determine if the individual voted more than once, and that is exactly how the status quo wants it: the fat-cats, they like it so that they can stay there and they can manipulate the results of the elections.

We are also seeing civil society leaders publicly expressing their concern regarding the deterioration of human rights in Nicaragua. As a result of speaking out against the government, they have been targeted for persecution. You speak out against the government, you have some false charges thrown at you.

And what about the indigenous communities? They have also expressed their concern regarding land grabs by the government. Violence is breaking out in the Nicoya Peninsula, being dispatched to squash the peaceful protests by these indigenous communities.

So let us not forget, Mr. Speaker, just what kind of leadership structure we are dealing with in Nicaragua. The Russians have set up operations in Nicaragua, they are proud of it, they put it in the front pages, and that poses a threat to U.S. national security interests.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 2 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, Nicaragua continues to offer its unconditional support to Nicolas Maduro and the authoritarian regime in Venezuela. And according to congressional testimony, Venezuela’s entity, PDVSA, has also used its subsidiary in Nicaragua, which is called Albanisa—and I will give the exact letters of those names— to launder money.

So, Mr. Speaker, if Venezuela’s Maduro is using Nicaragua in order to evade U.S. sanctions, we need to take a closer look at these ties. We need to hold people accountable because all of that hurts the people of Venezuela and the people of Nicaragua. It helps the government, but it doesn’t help the people.

That is what this bill does. We want to hold the Nicaraguan Government accountable just like we do in other countries, as I said, in Central America. This is not something new, out of whole cloth, that we have invented. It has worked, and it has truly helped the people.

Now, earlier this year, Mr. Sires and I, we traveled to Honduras, we traveled to Guatemala, and we saw firsthand how conditioning our support for these countries works and has been extremely effective. How hurt those countries? It has not. It has worked. It has strengthened their democracy. It has strengthened the rule of law, the independent judiciary.

So placing conditions incentivizes countries to do the right thing, and it makes institutional reforms, as needed, to improve the livelihood of their citizens.

So I know that the Nicaraguan Government does not like this bill, but I tell you, Mr. Speaker, the people of Nicaragua would like to know that the United States Congress stands with them as they call for reforms that promote democracy, that strengthen the
rule of law, that fight corruption, and that protect the rights of all political opposition parties, and that is exactly what this bill does.

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern with H.R. 1918, the Nicaraguan Investment Conditionality Act of 2017. Today I stand with the people of Nicaragua and the people of south Texas. Nicaragua has been our partner to the south. They work with us to combat drug trafficking, limit irregular migration, and make our region and our world a safer place. Nicaragua today is the safest country in Central America.

I agree, we must be vigilant in monitoring Nicaragua's transition to democracy. However, we must recognize that enacting this bill could have serious consequences on the region.

Nicaragua stood with the United States, to my border district, and an increase in criminal activity. My district was ground zero for the last immigration surge, and I would like to prevent that from happening again.

Nicaragua has its economic and political challenges, but it has taken steps to address poverty, climate change, and to grow its economy. How can we, in good conscience, support a measure that would punish the poorest country in Central America and the second poorest in the Western Hemisphere?

Moreover, Nicaragua stands with America and our allies against the rogue nation of North Korea. We cannot compare Nicaragua to Venezuela.

While we must hold countries accountable, we should bring them in rather than throw them out. We have the ability to guide these nations to embrace democracy and condemn bad actors.

Lastly, I want to make clear that this is not an endorsement of the Sandinistas or any other regime. Today I speak for the less fortunate in Nicaragua who suffer the most from NICA.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues to find a solution to this complex issue.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield my 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important, when we consider the challenge that we have here, the Carter Center was involved in Nicaragua trying to oversee the election there. They came to the conclusion that the election was not transparent. The elections were not fair in Nicaragua.

The European Union was engaged in trying to monitor those elections. Again, the same conclusion.

The Organization of American States, it is the standard or it is the organization representing all of the governments in this hemisphere, they again raised the same issue.

When we think what we are trying to do here, the goal is, first, any loans that go to the benefit of the people of Nicaragua that is exempt anyway. From the humanitarian standpoint, we want them to have the loans. But if we are going to make a loan that benefits the head of state or the government and, as part of that, we put the same conditions that the OAS puts on member loans, then the same conditions that we put on other countries with respect to the rule of law or with respect to transparency and free and fair elections, I don’t think that that is unusual in the least. As a matter of fact, those are the conditions we apply.

The attempt to focus on this and our frustration with it is to give that added boost, just as the Carter Center is trying to do, just as the European Union is trying to weigh in, just as the OAS is suggesting and that the question be these reforms and transparency. I think it is proper that this institution does the same. I think the carve-out we put in the bill for humanitarian aid addresses the other issues.

So from that standpoint, I think it is necessary for us to do what we can at this time to nudge this bill back toward free and fair elections.

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank Chairman ROYCE, Ranking Member ENGEL, and mi hermana from Florida, my sister, ILEANA ROS LEHTINEN, for their work on this bipartisan measure and for their commitment to democracy in the Western Hemisphere. They have skillfully crafted the NICA Act to hold President Ortega accountable, while ensuring that the Nicaraguan people do not suffer. I am glad that we are advancing this measure, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In summing up here, the focus of this legislation is clearly to seek to end a practice which many in the international community find a vexing one, and that is it tries to ensure that the loans that are given to the Government of Nicaragua meet certain democratic benchmarks. Is it possible any loans that would specifically benefit those in the government. There is a carve-out, as I shared, for any humanitarian loans.

I think the reason this approach has gained bipartisan support is because the United States, in this instance, will be engaged still, but engaged in a way where we are not encouraging corruption. I say that because it pushes Nicaragua to allow for free and transparent elections, and that should be our goal.

That is the goal of other election observers who have been involved in the past and have expressed their concerns about the state of play there.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1918, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:


Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Speaker:

Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 3, 2017, at 9:26 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 396.

That the Senate passed with amendment H. R. 3161.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

MUNICIPAL FINANCE SUPPORT ACT OF 2017

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1624) to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to treat certain municipal obligations as level 2A liquid assets, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1624
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
This Act may be cited as the “Municipal Finance Support Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN MUNICIPAL OBLIGATIONS.
(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 18 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828) is amended—
(1) by moving subsection (2) so that it appears after subsection (4); and
(2) by adding at the end the following:
should receive a lower standing than foreign sovereign debt with equivalent or, frankly, even lesser credit quality and market liquidity. Finally, disincentivizing financial institutions from holding investment-grade municipal bonds could cause banks to retreat from the $3.8 trillion market, thereby forcing State and local governments to scale back pending projects on roads, schools, and other infrastructure projects financed with the bonds. Classifying investment-grade municipal bonds as HQLAs will ensure low-cost infrastructure financing remains available for State and local governments.

Although the Federal Reserve has issued an amended rule allowing municipal bonds to count as HQLAs for some banks, neither the OCC nor the FDIC have acted to follow the Fed’s lead in amending their HQLA definitions to include these municipal securities. Their inaction creates a split regulatory system in which the treatment of municipal securities for the purpose of measuring the liquidity of the bank’s holdings depends entirely upon who the regulator is.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my coauthor on this bill, Congresswoman MALONEY, for her great leadership on this legislation, as well as Chairman HUIZENGA, Chairman HENSARLING, Ranking Member WATERS, and the entire Financial Services Committee team for their hard work on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is a rare occasion in Washington when Republicans and Democrats can come together and get behind a change to the banking regulations, but we stand here today behind H.R. 1624 because the banking regulators, frankly, well, they messed it up.

They created a rule that gives foreign municipalities a competitive advantage over our American cities and towns, and this advantage is hurting our communities.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is really quite simple. It will help cities and towns in my State and across the United States save money on roads and bridges.

H.R. 1624 reverses a backwards banking regulation that made it more expensive for U.S. municipalities to finance infrastructure projects. Specifically, the bill will amend the regulation to enable more banks to hold municipal bonds to cover their liquidity requirements. This change should reduce the cost of borrowing for cities and towns across the country.

Ultimately, this bill helps taxpayers by making it cheaper to finance infrastructure projects.
Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here. I am pleased that we can support H.R. 1624, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1624, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to treat certain municipal obligations as no lower than level 2B liquid assets, and for other purposes.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING RESOURCES, OFFICERS, AND TECHNOLOGY TO ERADICATE CYBER THREATS TO OUR CHILDREN ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 782) to reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Providing Resources, Officers, and Technology To Eradicate Cyber Threats to Our Children Act of 2017” or the “PROTECT Our Children Act of 2017.”

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE NATIONAL INTERNET CRIMES AGAINST CHILDREN TASK FORCE PROGRAM.


The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 782, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today that we are voting to reauthorize the Prosecutorial Remedies and Other Tools to
end the Exploitation of Children Today Act of 2003, or the PROTECT Act.

The PROTECT Act authorizes local law enforcement task forces to combat crimes against children online. These internet crimes against children, or ICAC, task forces have been absent in any crucial in the prevention, investigation, and prosecution of internet crimes against children. The program was developed in response to the increasing number of children and teenagers using the internet, the proliferation of child sexual abuse images available electronically, and heightened online activity by predators seeking unsupervised contact with potential underage victims.

Since the ICAC program’s inception in 1998, more than 580,000 law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and other professionals have been trained on techniques to investigate and prosecute ICAC-related cases. More than 700,000 complaints of alleged child sexual victimization have been reviewed resulting in the arrest of more than 73,000 individuals. There are now 61 coordinated task forces representing over 4,500 Federal, State, and local law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies.

The need for these ICAC task forces has never been greater. The use of the internet by children is only increasing, and so are the crimes committed against them. Law enforcement officers are encountering new types of crimes, such as new forms that create the new complexities in their investigations.

I would like to take a moment to commend Ms. Wasserman Schultz from Florida and Mr. Smith from Texas for introducing the companion bill in this House. During his tenure as Judiciary Committee chairman, my friend, Lamar Smith, was a tireless advocate on behalf of our Nation’s children.

Children are our most precious resource, and we must be vigilant in ensuring their protection. As a father and grandfather, I can think of no more important role we can play than protecting our children.

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

Ms. Jackson Lee, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first, before I start, I would like to congratulate the gentlewoman from Florida for her consistent work on this legislation. For those of us who have served, we certainly are well aware of the work that has been done, and I have been very privileged on the Judiciary Committee to join with her work, and I just want to congratulate her on that.

As we begin, let me also take just a moment to acknowledge, again, the massacre that occurred on Sunday night in Las Vegas, Nevada. As I was pondering the actions of this body last evening with a moment of silence, I wondered whether that—although it is of much reverence—whether that, in fact, will heal the wounds of those who lost their loved ones or those who are still mending—the 500-plus who were in the hospital and have been in the hospital.

So before I speak to S. 782, I want to make it clear that I think it is crucial that the letter that both Mr. Conyers and Mr. Nadler wrote regarding jurisdiction of the silencer bill is crucial. And as well it is crucial that this body does more than this, in essence, a moment of silence to heal the wounds of those who are now speechless about the loss of their loved ones. And well it might be time to take a knee or to kneel, but it is time to pass legislation.

I would hope that we would pass legislation that has been offered, the King-Thompson bill, and a number of other legislative initiatives that many of us have.

With that, I rise in support of S. 782, the Providing Resources, Officers, and Technology to Eradicate Cyber Threats to Our Children Act of 2017.

This legislation will reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program by amending the language in section 105(h) of the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008, introduced by then-Senator Joe Biden.

This bill authorizes appropriations for this program in the amount of $60 million for each fiscal year from 2018 through 2022. These figures are consistent with current appropriated levels.

We have a special responsibility to protect our young people. For that reason, I support S. 782, a bill that will provide adequate resources to help eradicate the cyber threats that continue to threaten the lives of our children.

I support this important bipartisan measure for several reasons. First, it will facilitate more comprehensive investigation into violent acts perpetrated against innocent children.

Second, this bill will provide support to officers that will allow them to better identify these threats, conduct investigation and training, and enforce the laws.

The task force is particularly important because it becomes a specialty entity that deals with saving our children.

The task forces aid local and State law enforcement in creating and implementing effective responses to technologically facilitated child sexual exploitation and internet crimes against children.

As the internet becomes more sophisticated and there are those who want to be bad actors and utilize this very important national/international asset, this task force is crucial. They provide law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies with guidance on victim support, forensic investigations, training and technical assistance, prevention, and community education— all crucial elements to a holistic approach to stopping the attack on our children, stopping the sexual exploitation on our children, and stopping the internet crimes against children.

In the Judiciary Committee today, we were dealing with another aspect of this issue, which is sex trafficking and human trafficking.

This is an important component, again, to giving our children back their innocence and letting them be strong in the knowledge of the love and affection the Nation has for them and protecting them as they grow and thrive.

Finally, this bill will provide the technological resources to detect online threats in real time and provide a platform on which law enforcement can operate in order to bring these perpetrators to justice.

Just this morning, the Judiciary Committee, as I indicated, held a hearing regarding online sex trafficking. We are all in agreement that we must eradicate this threat and letting them be strong in the knowledge of the love and affection the Nation has for them and protecting them as they grow and thrive.

For the foregoing reasons, I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 782, the “Providing Resources, Officers, and Technology to Eradicate Cyber Threats to Our Children Act of 2017.”

This legislation will reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program by amending the language in section 105(h) of the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008, introduced by then-Senator Joe Biden.

This bill authorizes appropriations for this program in the amount of $60,000,000 for each fiscal year from 2018 through 2022. These figures are consistent with current appropriated levels.

We have a special responsibility to protect our young people.

For that reason, I support S. 782, a bill that would provide adequate resources to help eradicate the cyber threats that continue to threaten the lives of our children.

I support this important bipartisan measure for several reasons. First, it will facilitate more comprehensive investigation into violent acts perpetrated against innocent children.

The Task Forces aid local and State law enforcement in creating and implementing effective responses to technologically facilitated child sexual exploitation and internet crimes against children.

The Task Force Program creates a coordinated group of investigative task forces representing 3,500 local, State, and federal law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies.

Second, this bill will provide support to officers that will allow them to better identify these threats, conduct investigation and training, and enforce the laws.

The task force is particularly important because it becomes a specialty entity that deals with saving our children.

The task forces aid local and State law enforcement in creating and implementing effective responses to technologically facilitated child sexual exploitation and internet crimes against children.

As the internet becomes more sophisticated and there are those who want to be bad actors and utilize this very important national/international asset, this task force is crucial. They provide law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies with guidance on victim support, forensic investigations, training and technical assistance, prevention, and community education—all crucial elements to a holistic approach to stopping the attack on our children, stopping the sexual exploitation on our children, and stopping the internet crimes against children.
They provide law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies with guidance on victim support, forensic investigations, training and technical assistance, prevention and community education.

And finally, this bill will provide the technological resources needed to detect online threats in real-time and provide a platform on which law enforcement can operate in order to bring these perpetrators to justice.

Just this morning, the Judiciary Committee held a hearing regarding Online Sex Trafficking. We were all in agreement that we must stop this threat to our young people, as we must take action against other victimization of children that can occur online.

Although we still have work to do to address these problems, this bill is a good start, and for the foregoing reasons, I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 782, the Providing Resources, Officers, and Technology to Eradicate Cyber Threats to Our Children Act of 2017, and thank my colleagues from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), who has worked so diligently on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes appropriations for this program in the amount of $60 million for each fiscal year from 2018 through 2022. These figures are consistent with current appropriated levels.

We must continue to protect our children from the daily threats that permeate the electronic platform and endanger the well-being of our children.

Earlier this morning, as has been said, the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations held a hearing addressing these very problems. As ranking member of that committee, I vow to continue my commitment toward eradicating this infectious poison that has claimed the innocence of so many of our youth.

I look forward to working with my colleagues and others on these very important issues. That is why I support the measures put forth in this bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), who has been a key supporter and advocate for this important legislation.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for her commitment, for her work, and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I spent 5 years as a proud member of the Judiciary Committee, as it is and I hope to return one day to add on to my responsibilities as a member of the Appropriations Committee.

I also thank Mr. GOODLATTE for his leadership and solid, consistent support for this program over the last decade.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 782, Providing Resources, Officers, and Technology to Eradicate Cyber Threats to Our Children Act—or the PROTECT Our Children Act—because at this very moment there are thousands of children out there waiting to be saved.

Our children deserve, as we all agree, a future that is prosperous, bright, and, most of all, safe. That is, of course, what every parent cares about the most: the safety of their children. But, sadly, our children are vulnerable when they are online.

With the proliferation of the internet and wireless technology, online child pornography has become an epidemic, and I don’t use that term lightly. The ever-increasing reach of the modern internet has facilitated an exploding, multibillion-dollar market for child pornography.

Tragically, the demand for this criminal market can only be supplied by graphic new images, and these images can only be supplied through the sexual assault of more children. Let’s be clear: These are not just heinous photos or images. They are, simply put, crime scene photos created by a thriving industry that uses children as sexual commodities.

Ten years ago, I introduced H.R. 3845, the Providing Resources, Officers, and Technology to Eradicate Cyber Threats to Our Children Act of 2007—or PROTECT Our Children Act of 2007.

At a House Judiciary hearing on that bill, my colleagues will remember we heard from a very brave young woman, Alicia Kozakiewicz. She had been abducted by an internet predator when she was just 13 years old. She was held captive in his dungeon basement and sexually tortured for 4 days.

The FBI, the Virginia Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force—or ICAC—had the technology to lift the digital fingerprints of this perpetrator’s crimes. They were able to discover the location where he held her captive, chained to the floor, connected to a collar around her neck. Internet crimes officers tracked the IP address back to his door and literally rescued Alicia from death.

The FBI and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children helped countless families over the course of that next year, many of the members of that committee, including myself, to tears. Over the course of that next year, we learned a lot about these types of offenders: who they are, how they operate, and, most importantly, where they are.

We saw detailed law enforcement maps that showed the locations of hundreds of thousands of sexual predators, over half of whom had actual child victims waiting to be rescued.

That number might lead people to think: Come on, that has to be an exaggeration. It is not. I have seen the evidence before my eyes: hundreds of thousands of sexual predators, each on a computer uploading pictures of child victims that they are sexually assaulting. Those maps described the truly harrowing environment.

Congress did what it was supposed to do. We acted. We passed H.R. 3845 and, with the help of my friend, Mr. GOODLATTE, the companion, S. 1738. This legislation established the National Internet Crimes Against Children—or ICAC—Task Force Program, a specialized group of law enforcement officials dedicated to the protection of our children.

In 2009 and 2010, Congress funded the ICAC Task Force at close to their full authorization levels of $50 million per year. The task forces grew from 42 to 61, and arrests and child rescues doubled.

Literally thousands more predators were apprehended and children rescued. An untold number of sexual assaults were prevented by virtue of the fact that these predators were sitting behind bars, where they could no longer harm our children.

In 2011, however, the ICAC Task Force budget was slashed, cut from $50 million to where it is today at $27 million. So, with all due respect, I have to correct my colleagues. We are not funding the ICAC Task Force at authorized levels.

This cut remains intact, despite the fact that, as of August 2017, law enforcement has seen nearly a half million unique IP addresses trafficking in sexual abuse images in the U.S. That is hundreds of thousands of separate online sexual predators, and that number is only from January 2017 to August 31, 2017.

Even more heartbreaking, law enforcement officials tell us that the victims are getting younger, most under the age of 10, and the abuse is getting more sadistic. According to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, 44 percent of the images, Mr. Speaker, they viewed in 2016 depicted sexual torture.

Law enforcement also tells us that only 7 percent of the top 100 traders on peer-to-peer networks trading these types of images are even under investigation.

Mr. Speaker, this is not just unacceptable; it is tragic. We owe our children much better than that. They deserve our help and a Congress that will do whatever it can to ensure their health and safety.

S. 782, the Senate version of a bill that I introduced in March of this year with my colleague and friend, LAMAR SMITH, as the chairman kindly thanked us, reauthorizes the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force.

According to estimates, half of the attacks made by ICAC teams lead us to the door of a hands-on offender and, thus, a child waiting to be rescued.

The PROTECT Our Children reauthorization before us today will help us continue to provide the safety net we so desperately need to preserve these highly successful ICAC Task Forces to continue to support State and local law enforcement agencies.
While I applaud House leadership for making sure this crucial child rescue program and funding is not allowed to expire, I beseech my colleagues to also make sure that the ICAC Task Forces are fully funded. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I press for that that statement short ballot not only of prevention, but the intervention, passion, and with number of reasons, but then wooed by a internet as they do online for any numbers.

We have to do better. We have to get as close to the authorization level as we can, because we actually rescue children with the more resources we put into this.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, we must give the protection of these children our full focus and efforts. Please think about these precious babies being victimized. If you are a parent—and many of us are—God forbid if it was your own child. It could be anyone's, because of the prevalence of our children being online.

Let's give these ICAC teams the resources they need to rescue as many children as possible. If we do that, thousands more innocent children will be protected from these unspeakable crimes. There, but for the grace of God, go our families and children.

I thank my Republican lead cosponsor, Congressman LAMAR SMITH, for teaming up with me again to reauthorize this program and has provided services in his sheriff’s department that have protected thousands of children not just in our immediate region in south-west Virginia, but all across the country.

I am very, very familiar with the work that goes on, day in and day out, of training law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and others, as well as the detection and prosecution of individuals who would commit these heinous crimes. This bill has done as much as any I know to keep children safe on the internet.

This law and this bill are important to reauthorize for another 5 years. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their strong bipartisan support and our staff on both sides of the aisle for their outstanding work on this very important legislation to reauthorize a program that I am, very, very familiar with.

The sheriff of Bedford County, Virginia, has been a leading advocate for this program and has provided services in his sheriff’s department that have protected thousands of children not just in our immediate region in south-west Virginia, but all across the country.

I am very, very familiar with the work that goes on, day in and day out, of training law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and others, as well as the detection and prosecution of individuals who would commit these heinous crimes. This bill has done as much as any I know to keep children safe on the internet.

This law and this bill are important to reauthorize for another 5 years. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 782, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ELDER ABUSE PREVENTION AND PROSECUTION ACT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 178) to prevent elder abuse and exploitation and improve the justice system's response to victims in elder abuse and exploitation cases.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows: S. 178

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 ‘‘Elder Abuse Prevention and Prosecution Act’’.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—SUPPORTING FEDERAL CASES INVOLVING ELDER JUSTICE

Sec. 101. Supporting Federal cases involving elder justice.

TITLE II—IMPROVED DATA COLLECTION AND FEDERAL COORDINATION

Sec. 201. Establishment of best practices for local, State, and Federal data collection.

TITLE III—ENHANCED VICTIM ASSISTANCE TO ELDER ABUSE SURVIVORS

Sec. 301. Sense of the Senate.
Sec. 302. Report.

TITLE IV—ROBERT MATAVA ELMER ABUSE PROSECUTION ACT OF 2017

Sec. 401. Short title.
Sec. 402. Enhanced penalty for tele-marketing and email marketing fraud directed at elders.
Sec. 403. Training and technical assistance for States.
Sec. 404. Interstate initiatives.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 501. Sense of the Senate.
Sec. 502. GAO reports.
Sec. 503. Outreach to State and local law enforcement agencies.
Sec. 504. Model power of attorney legislation.
Sec. 505. Best practices and model legislation for guardianship proceedings.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the terms ‘‘abuse’’, ‘‘adult protective services’’, ‘‘elder’’, ‘‘elder justice’’, ‘‘exploitation’’, ‘‘law enforcement’’, and ‘‘victim’’ have the meanings given those terms in section 2011 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397);

(2) the term ‘‘elder abuse’’ includes abuse, neglect, and exploitation of an elder; and

(3) the term ‘‘State’’ means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

TITLE I—SUPPORTING FEDERAL CASES INVOLVING ELDER JUSTICE

SEC. 101. SUPPORTING FEDERAL CASES INVOLVING ELDER JUSTICE.

(a) SUPPORT AND ASSISTANCE.—

(1) ELDER JUSTICE COORDINATORS.—The Attorney General shall establish a ‘‘National Elder Justice Initiative’’ and a ‘‘National Elder Justice Initiative’’ in each Federal judicial district not less than one Assistant United States Attorney to serve as the Elder Justice Coordinator for the district, who, in addition to any other responsibilities, shall be responsible for—

(A) serving as the legal counsel for the Federal judicial district on matters relating to elder abuse;

(B) prosecuting, or assisting in the prosecution of, elder abuse cases;
(C) conducting public outreach and awareness activities relating to elder abuse; and
(D) ensuring the collection of data required to be collected under section 202.

§ 202. COLLECTION OF DATA

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall, with respect to crimes relating to elder abuse, extend and implement a comprehensive data collection program to train agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the investigation and prosecution of such crimes. The data shall relate to elder abuse, and which shall include—

(A) specialized strategies for communicating with and assisting elder abuse victims;
(B) relevant forensic training relating to elder abuse;
(C) resource and information group or subcommittee to the Attorney General’s Advisory Committee on Elder Abuse and Exploitation, established under subsection (a)(1), shall ensure coordination and support of the law enforcement efforts and policy activities of the Federal Trade Commission on elder justice issues; and
(D) serving as, or ensuring the availability of, a central point of contact for individuals, victims, Federal agencies on matters relating to the enforcement and consumer education efforts and policy activities of the Federal Trade Commission on elder justice issues.

(b) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and once every year thereafter, the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission and the Attorney General shall each submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report detailing the enforcement actions taken by the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice, respectively, over the preceding year in each case in which not less than one victim was an elder or that involved a financial scheme or scam that was either targeted directly toward or largely affected elders, including—

(A) the name of the district where the case originated;
(B) the style of the case, including the case name and number;
(C) a description of the scheme or scam; and
(D) the outcome of the case.

(c) USE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section.

TITLE II—IMPROVED DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING

SEC. 201. ESTABLISHMENT OF BEST PRACTICES FOR LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL DATA COLLECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Departments of Justice, Labor, and the Federal law enforcement agencies, shall—

(1) establish best practices for data collection to focus on elder abuse; and
(2) provide technical assistance to State, local, and tribal governments in adopting the best practices established under paragraph (1).

(b) DEADLINE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall publish on the website of the Department of Justice in a publicly accessible manner.

(c) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to obligate compliance with the best practices established under subsection (a)(1).

SEC. 202. EFFECTIVE INTERAGENCY COORDINATION AND FEDERAL DATA COLLECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall, on an annual basis—

(1) collect from Federal law enforcement agencies, other agencies as appropriate, and Federal prosecutors’ offices statistical data related to elder abuse cases, including cases or investigations where one or more victims were elders, or the case or investigation involved a financial scheme or scam that was either targeted directly toward or largely affected elders; and
(2) publish on the website of the Department of Justice in a publicly accessible manner—

(A) a summary of the data collected under paragraph (1); and
(B) recommendations for collecting additional data relating to elder abuse, including recommendations for ways to improve data reporting across Federal, State, and local agencies.

(b) REQUIREMENT.—The data collected under subsection (a)(1) shall include—

(1) for each case described in paragraph (1), the data collected by Federal law enforcement agencies, other agencies as appropriate, and Federal prosecutors’ offices relating to elder abuse; and
(2) for each case described in paragraph (1), the number of elder abuse cases filed in Federal courts; and
(3) for each case described in paragraph (1), the data described in paragraph (a)(4).
§ 2328. Mandatory forfeiture

para. (1)—

(1) any property, real or personal, constituting or traceable to gross proceeds obtained from such offense; and

(2) any equipment, software, or other technology to be used to commit or facilitate the commission of such offense.

(b) Procedures.—The procedures set forth in section 413 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 853), other than subsection (d) of that section, and in Rule 32.2 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, shall apply to a forfeiture proceeding under this section.

(1) The table of chapters at the beginning of part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to chapter 113A and inserting the following:

"113A. Telemarketing and email marketing fraud ..................... 2325".

(2) The table of sections for chapter 113A of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2327 the following new section:

"2328. Mandatory forfeiture.".

SEC. 403. TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR STATES.

The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and in coordination with the Elder Justice Coordinating Council (established under section 2021 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397k)), shall create, compile, evaluate, and disseminate materials and information, and provide the necessary training and technical assistance, to assist States and units of local government in—

(1) investigating, prosecuting, pursuing, preventing, understanding, and mitigating the impact of—

(A) physical, sexual, and psychological abuse of elders;

(B) exploitation of elders, including financial abuse and scams targeting elders; and

(C) neglect of elders;

and

(2) assessing, addressing, and mitigating the physical and psychological trauma to victims of elder abuse.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

§ 501. COURT-APPOINTED GUARDIANSHIP OVERSIGHT DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.

(a) ELDER JUSTICE RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on such programs and initiatives; and

(b) Recommendations on Interstate Communication.—The Executive Director of the State Justice Institute, in consultation with the Chief Justice of the United States, the Attorney General, and other officials of the Federal, State, and local governments and of professional associations with expertise in data sharing and technical assistance, to assist States and units of local government in—

(1) a report on such programs and initiatives; and

(2) any recommendations the Comptroller General determines are appropriate to improve elder justice in the United States.

SEC. 502. GAO REPORTS.

(a) Elder Justice Recommendations.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall review existing Federal programs and initiatives that address Federal criminal justice system relevant to elder justice and shall submit to Congress—

(1) a report on such programs and initiatives; and

(2) any recommendations the Comptroller General determines are appropriate to improve elder justice in the United States.

(b) Report on Elder Justice.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on—

(1) Federal Government efforts to monitor the exploitation of older adults in the United States in global drug trafficking.
schemes and other international criminal enterprises;
(b) the extent to which exploitation of older adults of the United States by international criminal enterprises has resulted in the incarceration of these citizens of the United States in foreign countries; and
(c) the total annual number of elder abuse cases in the United States.
Sec. 503. Outreach to State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies
The Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on efforts by the Department of Justice to conduct outreach to State and local law enforcement agencies on the process for collaborating with the Federal Government for the purpose of investigating and prosecuting interstate and international elder financial exploitation cases.

Sec. 504. Model Power of Attorney Legislation
The Attorney General shall publish model power of attorney legislation for the purpose of preventing elder abuse.

Sec. 505. Best Practices and Model Legislation for Guardianship Proceedings
The Attorney General shall publish best practices for improving guardianship proceedings and model legislation relating to guardianship proceedings for the purpose of preventing elder abuse.

The Speaker pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Goodlatte) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Conyers) each had 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 178, currently under consideration.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. Goodlatte. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 178, currently under consideration.

The Speaker pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Goodlatte) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Conyers) each had 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 178, currently under consideration.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 178, the Elder Abuse Prevention and Prosecution Act, takes several steps to protect American seniors from financial exploitation and physical abuse. This legislation promotes the investigation and prosecution of perpetrators who prey upon seniors, enhances data collection, and provides resources for robust elder abuse prevention programs.

Some estimate that approximately 1 in 10 senior citizens are abused annually, pending in the United States; and elder abuse are reported to authorities each year. At least $2.9 billion is taken from older adults each year due to financial abuse and exploitation.

The abuse of these vulnerable victims causes harm ranging from physical, mental, emotional, and financial consequences to the victims and their loved ones, and we must combat this injustice.

This bill requires each U.S. Attorney’s Office to appoint an elder justice coordinator and requires the FBI to provide specialized training to agents relating to the investigation of elder abuse crimes. It mandates that both the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission designate an elder justice coordinator.

It strengthens criminal laws to ensure that offenders who seek to exploit seniors through fraudulent email marketing are appropriately punished, and it enhances data collection on crimes against senior citizens so we can one day understand the full scope of this problem.

I believe it was Mahatma Gandhi who said: “A nation’s greatness is measured by how it treats its weakest members.” We must ensure that appropriate measures are taken to protect our senior citizens, and that is precisely what this bill aims to do.

This bill passed the Senate unanimously, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation in similar fashion.

I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan, the ranking member of the committee, for his work on this important legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 178, the Elder Abuse Prevention and Prosecution Act. I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for his excellent work in this area.

This legislation would increase protections for elder abuse victims, which is very important, as a vast majority of cases of abuse, neglect, and exploitation of older adults in the United States often go unreported and unaddressed.

Each year, nearly $3 billion is taken from older adults due to financial abuse and exploitation, and this is happening across racial, social, economic, gender, and geographic lines.

This important measure increases protections for victims by, first, ensuring support for Federal cases involving elder abuse. This support will include the requirement that the Attorney General designate at least one assistant United States attorney to serve as an elder justice coordinator in every judicial district to prosecute, train, assist with, and conduct public outreach on elder abuse cases.

Additionally, this measure would also require that the Executive Office for United States Attorneys operate an elder abuse resource group and a working group to advise the Justice Department on elder abuse issues.

Secondly, this measure would require the establishment of best practices for local, State, and Federal data collection to focus on elder abuse, including, for example, the total number of Federal investigations of elder abuse and locations where cases are filed.

Findings under this legislation include the fact that older adults who are abused are three times more likely to die earlier than older adults of the same age who are not abused, and that up to half of all older adults with dementia will experience abuse.

For these reasons, a third component of this measure that I find extremely important and valuable is the enhanced victim assistance to elder abuse survivors. This measure would require that an annual report be submitted to Congress on the funding under the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 for victims of crimes who are elder abuse.

And finally, this measure adds a new definition of “telemarketing and email marketing” under the telemarketing statute to protect victims of such scams, which typically involve elders.

We must do everything possible to support victims of elder abuse and prevent the abuse from occurring in the first place. And so for these several reasons, I am very pleased to support the bill with the chairman of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the elder abuse problem has devastating consequences to the victims as well as their loved ones, and it is an affront to America’s elder adults. It involves the exploitation of some of our most vulnerable citizens.

This measure includes a multipronged approach to prevent elder abuse and exploitation, protect the victims of elder abuse and exploitation from further harm, and bring the perpetrators of these crimes to justice. Accordingly, I am pleased to urge my colleagues to support this measure.

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

Mr. Goodlatte. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to again thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their work on this important legislation to help protect senior citizens from crime.

I know, from experience, that there are many, many senior citizens who become victims of online, on-telephone, and other forms of fraud perpetrated upon them; and this legislation helps to provide resources and appropriate punishments, to detect the people who perpetrate these crimes and to bring them to justice, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

The Speaker pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Goodlatte) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 178. The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

Mrs. Handel. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 548, I call up
the bill (H.R. 36) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 36

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act”.

SEC. 2. LEGISLATIVE HISTORY AND DECLARATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY FOR ENACTMENT.

Congress finds and declares the following:

(1) Pain receptors (nociceptors) are present throughout the unborn child’s entire body and nerves link these receptors to the brain’s thalamus and subcortical plate by no later than 20 weeks after fertilization.

(2) By 8 weeks after fertilization, the unborn child reacts to touch. After 20 weeks, the unborn child reacts to stimuli that would be recognized as painful if applied to an adult human, for example, by recoiling.

(3) In the unborn child, application of such painful stimuli is associated with significant increases in stress hormones known as the stress response.

(4) Subjection to such painful stimuli is associated with long-term neurodevelopmental effects, such as altered pain sensitivity and, possibly, emotional, behavioral, and learning disabilities later in life.

(5) For the purposes of surgery on unborn children, fetal anesthesia is routinely administered and is associated with a decrease in stress hormones compared to their level when painful stimuli are applied without such anesthesia. In the United States, surgery is being performed by 20 weeks after fertilization and earlier in specialized units affiliated with children’s hospitals.

(6) The position, asserted by some physicians, that the unborn child is incapable of experiencing pain until a point later in pregnancy than 20 weeks after fertilization predates the discovery of significant increases in stress hormones. The ability to experience pain depends on the cerebral cortex and requires nerve connections between the thalamus and the cortex. Howowever, recent medical research and analysis, especially since 2007, provides strong evidence for the conclusion that a functioning cortex is not necessary to experience pain.

(7) Substantial evidence indicates that children born missing the bulk of the cerebral cortex, those with hydrencephaly, nevertheless experience pain.

(8) In adult humans and in animals, stimulation or ablation of the cerebral cortex does not alter pain perception, while stimulation or ablation of the thalamus does.

(9) Substantial evidence indicates that structures used for pain processing in early development differ from those of adults, using different neural elements available at specific times during development, such as the subcortical plate, to fulfill the role of pain processing.

(10) The reaction, asserted by some commentators, that the unborn child remains in a coma-like sleep state that precludes the unborn child experiencing pain is inconsistent with the documented reaction of unborn children to painful stimuli and with the experience of fetal surgeons who have found it necessary to sedate the unborn child with anesthetics under conditions where the unborn child is engaging in vigorous movement in reaction to invasive surgery.

(11) Consequently, there is substantial medical evidence that an unborn child is capable of experiencing pain at least by 20 weeks after fertilization, if not earlier.

(12) It is therefore the compelling governmental interest in protecting the lives of unborn children from the stage at which substantial medical evidence indicates that they are capable of feeling pain.

(13) The compelling governmental interest in protecting the lives of unborn children from the stage at which substantial medical evidence indicates that they are capable of feeling pain is intended to be separate from and independent of the compelling governmental interest in protecting the lives of unborn children from the stage of viability, and neither governmental interest is intended to replace the other.

(14) Congress has authority to extend protection to pain-capable unborn children under the Supreme Court’s Commerce Clause precedents and under the Constitution’s grants of powers to Congress under the Equal Protection, Due Process, and Enforcement Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment.

SEC. 3. PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1531 the following:

“SEC. 1532. PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION.

“(a) UNLAWFUL CONDUCT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, it shall be unlawful for any person to perform an abortion or attempt to do so, unless in conformity with the requirements set forth in subsection (b).

“(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR ABORTIONS.—

“(1) ASSESSMENT OF THE AGE OF THE UNBORN CHILD.—The physician performing or attempting the abortion shall first make a determination of the probable post-fertilization age of the unborn child or reasonably rely upon such a determination made by another physician. In making such a determination, the physician shall make such inquiries of the pregnant woman and perform or cause to be performed such medical examinations and tests as a reasonably prudent physician would consider necessary to make an accurate determination of the post-fertilization age.

“(2) REQUIREMENT ON PERFORMANCE OF CERTAIN ABORTIONS.—

“(A) GENERALLY FOR UNBORN CHILDREN 20 WEEKS OR OLDER.—Except as provided in subsection (b), if an abortion is performed or attempted, if the probable post-fertilization age, as determined under paragraph (1), of the unborn child is 20 weeks or greater:

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Subparagraph (A) does not apply if—

“(i) in reasonable medical judgment, the abortion is necessary to save the life of a pregnant woman whose life is endangered by a physical disorder, physical illness, or physical injury, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself, but not including psychological or emotional conditions;

“(ii) the abortion is the result of rape against an adult woman, and at least 48 hours prior to the abortion—

“(I) she has obtained counseling for the rape; or

“(II) she has obtained medical treatment for the rape or an injury related to the rape; or

“(iii) the pregnancy is the result of rape against an adult woman, and at least 48 hours prior to the abortion—

“(I) she has obtained counseling for the rape; or

“(II) she has obtained medical treatment for the rape or an injury related to the rape; or

“(iii) the pregnancy is a result of rape against a minor, and the rape or incest has been reported at any time prior to the abortion to either—

“(I) a government agency legally authorized to act on reports of child abuse; or

“(II) a law enforcement agency.

“(C) REQUIREMENT AS TO MANNER OF PROCEDURE.—No person shall perform an abortion or attempt an abortion in a manner or at a location that describes ‘abortion’ or ‘attempt an abortion’ in this section, a physician terminating or attempting to terminate a pregnancy by an exception provided by subparagraph (B) may do so only in the manner which, in reasonable medical judgment, provides the best opportunity for the unborn child to survive.

“(D) REQUIREMENT THAT A PHYSICIAN TRAINED IN NEONATAL RESUSCITATION BE PRESENT.—If, in reasonable medical judgment, the pain-capable unborn child has the potential to survive outside the womb, the physician who performs or attempts an abortion under an exception provided by subparagraph (B) shall ensure a second physician trained in neonatal resuscitation is present and prepared to provide care to the child consistent with the requirements of subparagraph (E).

“(E) CHILDREN BORN ALIVE AFTER ATTEMPTED ABORTIONS.—When a physician performs or attempts an abortion under a provision of law inconsistent with this section, and the child is born alive, as defined in section 8 of title 1 (commonly known as the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002), the following provisions shall apply:

“(i) DEGREE OF CARE REQUIRED.—Any health care practitioner present at the time shall humanely exercise the same degree of professional skill, care, and diligence to preserve the life and health of the child as a reasonably diligent and conscientious health care practitioner would render to a child born alive at the same gestational age in the course of a natural birth.

“(ii) IMMEDIATE ADMISSION TO A HOSPITAL.—Following the care required to be rendered under clause (i), the child born alive shall be immediately transported and admitted to a hospital.

“(iii) MANDATORY REPORTING OF VIOLATIONS.—A health care practitioner or any employee of a hospital, a physician’s office, or an abortion clinic who has knowledge of a failure to comply with the requirements of this subparagraph must immediately report the failure to an appropriate State or Federal law enforcement agency or both.

“(F) DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS.—

“(i) DOCUMENTATION PERTAINING TO ADULTS.—A physician who performs or attempts an abortion under an exception provided by subparagraph (B)(i) shall, prior to the abortion, place in the patient medical file documentation from a hospital, clinic, or other authority of a Federal agency, a medical clinic licensed by the State or operated under authority of a Federal agency, from a physician licensed by the State, a counselor licensed by the State, or a victim’s rights advocate provided by a law enforcement agency that the adult woman seeking the abortion obtained medical treatment or counseling for the rape or an injury related to the rape.

“(ii) DOCUMENTATION PERTAINING TO MINORS.—A physician who performs or attempts to perform an abortion under an exception provided by subparagraph (B)(ii) shall, prior to the abortion, place in the patient medical file documentation from a government agency legally authorized to act on reports of child abuse that the rape or incest was reported prior to the abortion; or, as an alternative, documentation from a law enforcement agency that the rape or incest was reported prior to the abortion.

“(G) INFORMED CONSENT.—

“(i) DOCUMENTATION PERTAINING TO MINORS.—The physician who intends to perform or attempt to perform an abortion under the provisions of
paragraph (B) may not perform any part of the abortion procedure without first obtaining a signed Informed Consent Authorization form in accordance with this subparagraph.

"(ii) CONTENT OF CONSENT FORM.—The Informed Consent Authorization form shall be signed by the physician and shall consist of—

"(I) a statement by the physician indicating the probable post-fertilization age of the pain-capable unborn child;

"(II) a statement that Federal law allows abortion after 20 weeks gestational age only if the mother’s life is endangered by a physical disorder, physical illness, or physical injury, when the pregnancy was a result of rape, or an act of incest against a minor;

"(III) a statement that the abortion must be performed by the method most likely to allow the child to be born alive unless this would cause significant risk to the mother;

"(IV) a statement that in any case in which an abortion procedure results in a child born alive, Federal law requires that the child be given every form of medical assistance that is provided to children spontaneously born prematurely, including transportation and admittance to a hospital;

"(V) a statement that those requirements are binding upon the physician and all other medical personnel who are subject to criminal and civil penalties and that a woman on whom an abortion has been performed may take civil action if these requirements are not followed; and

"(VI) affirmation that each signer has read and understood the information contained in the form.

"(III) SIGNATURES REQUIRED.—The Informed Consent Authorization form shall be signed by the physician performing or attempting to perform the abortion, and a witness.

"(IV) RETENTION OF CONSENT FORM.—The physician performing or attempting to perform an abortion must retain the signed informed consent form in the patient’s medical file.

"(H) REQUIREMENT FOR DATA RETENTION.—Paragraph 164.595 of 45 Code of Federal Regulations, shall apply to documentation required to be placed in a patient’s medical file pursuant to subparagraph (F) of this paragraph and a consent form required to be retained in a patient’s medical file pursuant to subparagraph (G) of such subsection in the same manner and to the same extent as such paragraph applies to documentation required by paragraph (j)(1) of such section.

"(I) ADDITIONAL EXCEPTIONS AND REQUIREMENTS.—

"(i) in cases of risk of death or major injury to the mother.—Subparagraphs (C), (D), and (G) shall not apply if, in reasonable medical judgment, the attempt to comply with such paragraphs would pose a greater risk of—

"(I) the death of the pregnant woman; or

"(II) the substantial and irreversible physical injury to a major bodily function, not including psychological or emotional conditions, of the pregnant woman.

"(ii) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN FACILITIES.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (A), (B)(i), (C), (D), and (G), this subparagraph does not apply to medical treatment and counseling in subsection (g), the counseling or medical treatment described in subparagraph (B)(i) may not be performed at a facility that performs abortions (unless that facility is a hospital).

"(iii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION IN CASES OF REPORTS TO LAW ENFORCEMENT.—The requirement of subparagraph (B)(i) does not apply if the abortion has been reported at any time prior to the abortion to a law enforcement agency or Department of Defense victim assistance personnel.

"(IV) COMPLIANCE WITH CERTAIN STATE LAWS.—(a) State laws regarding reporting of rape and incest.—The physician who performs or attempts to perform an abortion under an exception provided by subparagraph (B)(i) shall comply with all applicable State laws that are in effect as the State’s Attorney General may designate, regarding reporting requirements in cases of rape or incest.

"(b) State laws regarding parental involvement.—The physician who intends to perform an abortion on a minor under an exception provided by subparagraph (B)(ii) shall comply with all applicable State laws requiring parental involvement in a minor’s decision to have an abortion.

"(c) Criminal penalties.—Whoever violates subsection (a) shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(d) Bar to prosecution.—A woman upon whom an abortion in violation of subsection (a) is performed or attempted may not be prosecuted for complicity in violation of this section, or for a conspiracy to violate, subsection (a), or for an offense under section 2, 3, or 4 of this title based on such a violation.

"(e) Civil remedies.—(1) Civil action by a woman on whom an abortion is performed.—A woman upon whom an abortion has been performed or attempted in violation of any provision of this section may, in a civil action against any person who committed the violation, obtain appropriate relief.

"(2) Civil action by a parent of a minor on whom an abortion is performed.—A parent of a minor upon whom an abortion has been performed or attempted in violation of any provision of subsection (b)(2)(B), and that was performed in violation of any provision of this section may, in a civil action against any person who committed the violation, obtain appropriate relief, unless the pregnancy resulted from the plaintiff’s criminal conduct.

"(f) Appropriate relief.—Appropriate relief in a civil action under this subsection includes—

"(I) A objectively verifiable money damages for all injuries, psychological and physical, occasioned by the violation;

"(II) Statutory damages equal to three times the expenses incurred in consultation; and

"(III) Punitive damages.

"(g) Attorneys fees for plaintiff.—The court shall award a reasonable attorney’s fee as part of the costs to a prevailing plaintiff in a civil action under this subsection.

"(h) Attorneys fees for defendant.—If a defendant in a civil action under this subsection prevails and the court finds that the plaintiff’s suit was frivolous, the court shall award a reasonable attorney’s fee in favor of the defendant against the plaintiff.

"(i) Exclusive remedies.—Except under paragraph (5), in a civil action under this subsection, no damages, attorney’s fee or any other monetary relief may be assessed against the woman upon whom the abortion was performed or attempted.

"(j) DATA COLLECTION.—

"(1) DATA SUBMISSIONS.—Any physician who performs or attempts an abortion described in subsection (b)(2)(B) shall annually submit a summary of all such abortions to the National Center for Health Statistics (hereafter referred to as the ‘Center’) not later than 60 days after the end of the calendar year in which the abortion was performed or attempted.

"(2) CONTENT OF SUMMARY.—The summary shall include the number of abortions performed or attempted on an unborn child who had a post-fertilization age of 20 weeks or more and specify the following for each abortion under subsection (b)(2)(B)—

"(A) the probable post-fertilization age of the unborn child;

"(B) the method used to carry out the abortion;

"(C) the location where the abortion was conducted; and

"(D) any incident of live birth resulting from the abortion.

"(3) EXCLUSIONS FROM DATA SUBMISSIONS.—A summary required under this subsection shall contain and identifying the woman whose pregnancy was terminated and shall be submitted consistent with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (22 U.S.C. 1320d-2 note).

"(4) PUBLIC REPORT.—The Center shall annually issue a public report providing statistics by State for the previous year compiled from all of the summaries made to the Center under this subsection. The Center shall take care to ensure that none of the information compiled in the public report could reasonably lead to the identification of any pregnant woman upon whom an abortion was performed or attempted. The annual report shall be issued by July 1 following the year in which the abortions were performed or attempted.

"(g) Definitions.—In this section the following definitions apply:

"(1) Abortion.—The term ‘abortion’ means the use or prescription of any instrument, medicine, drug, or any other substance or device, with the intent other than—

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

"(ii) to remove a dead unborn child.

"(2) Attempt.—The term ‘attempt’, with respect to an abortion, means conduct that, if completed, would constitute a violation of this section. Counseling means counseling provided by a counselor licensed by the State, or a victims rights advocate provided by a law enforcement agency.

"(3) Facility.—The term ‘facility’ means any medical or counseling group, center or clinic and includes the entire legal entity, including any entity that controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with such facility.

"(4) Fertilization.—The term ‘fertilization’ means the insertion of a human spermatozoon with a human ovum.

"(5) Medical treatment.—The term ‘medical treatment’ means treatment provided at a hospital licensed by the State or operated under authority of a Federal agency, at a medical clinic licensed by the State or operated under authority of a Federal agency, or by a personal physician licensed by the State.

"(6) Minor.—The term ‘minor’ means an individual who has not attained the age of 18 years.

"(7) Perform.—The term ‘perform’, with respect to an abortion, includes inducing an abortion through a medical or chemical intervention including writing a prescription for a drug or device intended to result in an abortion.

"(8) Perform.—The term ‘perform’, with respect to an abortion, includes inducing an abortion through a medical or chemical intervention including writing a prescription for a drug or device intended to result in an abortion.
Mr. Speaker, this bill reflects today’s medical understanding about a baby’s ability to feel pain. Micah’s Law reflects those changing hearts and minds of Americans. Micah’s Law reflects the higher aspirations of this Nation, a truly moral nation, to foster a culture of life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 36. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin my remarks today by extending my condolences to the family and friends of the 58 individuals who were killed in the shooting in Las Vegas, and I express my best hopes for the recovery of the more than 500 persons who were injured.

This Congress has a responsibility to find a way to prevent tragedies like this, as well as the daily incidents of gun violence in our communities, but instead of considering legislation to prevent gun violence, the House is busy considering this bill, which was drafted by a so-called pro-life group, not on the mother.

This bill prohibits most elective abortions at 20 weeks after fertilization and thereafter. That is the beginning of the fifth month of pregnancy. That is the point in a pregnancy when a substantial body of medical evidence shows that a baby in the womb can feel pain.

H.R. 36 is humane legislation for innocent babies and for mothers. It includes exceptions for the life of the mother and exceptions in the case of rape and incest. Additionally, this bill imposes criminal liability only on the medical professional performing that abortion, not on the mother.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this dangerous and mean-spirited legislation.
save over 2,000 lives each year, giving America the gift of thousands more children with all the wondrous human gifts they will bring to the world in so many amazing forms for generations to come.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank Judiciary Committee member TRENT FRANKS for introducing this vital legislation. I urge my colleagues to support this bill both on behalf of unborn children and on behalf of the voters you represent, who overwhelmingly favor such a bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the time to speak on this important subject. While it is important, it is also embarrassing somewhat to us, because I listen to the other side, and the first thing that the chairman does over here is he reads from the New York Times. And because of The New York Times ad at the time of Roe v. Wade, he suggests that we should turn over Roe v. Wade because it is antiquated.

Well, in 1791, the Second Amendment was something we had pistols, and we had guns that you could shoot one bullet at a time; and yesterday, we had a man in Las Vegas with guns who could shoot ‘da da da da da da da da da’ and kill 59 people and wound 500. If a man in Las Vegas with those weapons were not in that ad, but do they talk about changing the Second Amendment, do they talk about protecting Americans from that type of violence? No. They come here and talk about protecting the unborn, forgetting about the rights of women guaranteed by Roe v. Wade, the law of the land, which is the law of the land that says viability comes at 24 weeks.

They talk about what they say are medical experts and a substantial body of medical evidence. What they don’t tell you is the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists are against this bill, and there is no medical group or medical society in this country that is for this bill, but they know more about medicine and about pain for the unborn than do the doctors and the scientists.

They bring this to us, an unconstitutional bill, an unconstitutional bill that violates a substantial body of medical evidence. What don’t they tell you is the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists are against this bill, and there is no medical group or medical society in this country that is for this bill, but they know more about medicine and about pain for the unborn than do the doctors and the scientists.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The bottom line is, this bill is unconstitutional, an attack on women’s rights, an attack on the Constitution, and we should be looking at changes in our laws about guns and violence, at least mental health, something to respond to what happened in Las Vegas, instead of silence.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS), my colleague and the lead sponsor of Micah’s Law.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, I yield to all of those who founded this Nation and dreamed the Senate’s action will be considered the gentleman for yielding.

The bottom line is, this bill is unconstitutional, an attack on women’s rights, an attack on the Constitution, and we should be looking at changes in our laws about guns and violence, at least mental health, something to respond to what happened in Las Vegas, instead of silence.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS), my colleague and the lead sponsor of Micah’s Law.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, I yield to all of those who founded this Nation and dreamed of America and the Milk Man who said: ‘The care of human life and happiness, and not their destruction, is the first and only object of good government.’

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

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

Madam Speaker, protecting the lives of all innocent Americans and their constitutional rights is why we are really all here, and yet today a great and tragic shadow looms over America.

More than 18,000 very-late-term abortions are occurring in America every year, placing the mothers at exponentially greater risk and subjecting their little, pain-capable unborn babies to torture and death without anesthesia or Federal protection of any kind: this in the land of the free and the home of the brave. It is the greatest and most insidious human rights atrocity in the United States today.

Almost every other major civilized nation on Earth protects pain-capable unborn babies at this age, and every credible poll of the American people shows that they are overwhelmingly in favor of protecting them, and yet we have given these little babies less legal protection from unnecessary cruelty than the protection we have given farm animals under the Federal Humane Slaughter Act.

Madam Speaker, it seems like we are never quite so eloquent as when we decry the crimes of a past generation. And how is it that sometimes we are so staggeringly blind when it comes to facing and rejecting the worst atrocities in our own time?

Today, Madam Speaker, I am especially thankful, because the winds of change are now beginning to blow and the tide of blindness and blood is finally turning in America.

There is a new leader who lives in the White House, and he is deeply committed to protecting the least of us, our little brothers and sisters.

Madam Speaker, today we are poised to pass the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act in this Chamber. No matter how it is shouted down or what distortions or deceptive what-ifs, distractions, divisions, gotchas, twisting of words, twisting of subject, or blatant falsehoods the abortion industry hurls at this bill and its supporters, this bill is a deeply sincere effort, beginning at their sixth month of pregnancy, to protect both mothers and their pain-capable unborn babies from the atrocity of late-term abortion on demand, and ultimately it is a bill all humane Americans will support if they truly understand it for themselves.

Madam Speaker, this will be a vote that all of us remember for the rest of our lives. It will be a time now for the U.S. Senate to find the will and humanity to take a stand for these, the most helpless of all human victims. The Senate’s action will be considered in the annals of history and, I believe, in the counsels of eternity itself.

Madam Speaker, passing this bill really shouldn’t be so hard because, in spite of all the political noise, protecting little pain-capable, unborn children and their mothers is not a Republican issue and it is not a Democratic issue. It is a test of our basic humanity and who we are as a human family.

It is time for the Members of the U.S. House and the U.S. Senate to open our eyes and our souls and remember that protecting those who cannot protect themselves is why we are really all here. It is time for us, all of us as Americans, Madam Speaker, to open our eyes and our hearts to the humanity of these little pain-capable children of God and the inhumanity of what is being done to them.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman
Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to protect the Nation’s most vulnerable children and ensure they are not subject to unimaginable pain and to affirm life by voting in favor of this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, today I rise for Phil and his wife, to tell their story.

Phil and his wife tried to get pregnant for several years. After fertility treatment, they were thrilled when his wife finally became pregnant with identical twins. Sadly, their twins were diagnosed with twin-twin transfusion syndrome, a deadly complication. At week 21, Phil and his wife learned the devastating and frightening news that not only would both twins die, but that without an abortion, his wife was at serious risk of suffering a ruptured uterus.

Their options were limited. Their doctor could not perform an abortion because he was affiliated with a Catholic hospital, and Phil’s wife was unable to fly due to her high-risk pregnancy.

Instead, they drove from their home in Missouri to Kansas to terminate the pregnancy by induced labor and delivery.

Phil and his wife were devastated. After the twins’ deaths, Phil participated in a baptism and grieved their loss.

Phil wants lawmakers to know: “Decisions about abortion need to be made not say, as a society, with a good and upright conscience, that we can just continue to ignore it.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield 1 1⁄2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. D EUTCH), a senior member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. D EUTCH. Madam Speaker, today I rise for Phil and his wife, to tell their story.

Phil and his wife tried to get pregnant for several years. After fertility treatment, they were thrilled when his wife finally became pregnant with identical twins. Sadly, their twins were diagnosed with twin-twin transfusion syndrome, a deadly complication. At week 21, Phil and his wife learned the devastating and frightening news that not only would both twins die, but that without an abortion, his wife was at serious risk of suffering a ruptured uterus.

Their options were limited. Their doctor could not perform an abortion because he was affiliated with a Catholic hospital, and Phil’s wife was unable to fly due to her high-risk pregnancy.

Instead, they drove from their home in Missouri to Kansas to terminate the pregnancy by induced labor and delivery.

Phil and his wife were devastated. After the twins’ deaths, Phil participated in a baptism and grieved their loss.

Phil wants lawmakers to know: “Decisions about abortion need to be made
with the families and with the best medical information available.” As he rightly puts it: “There is no one-size-fits-all situation for all pregnancies.”

Placing government limitations on the constitutionally protected healthcare options for women and their families will only add heartache and tragedy to these most difficult and painful decisions.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of Phil and his family, I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 36.

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Washington for her leadership on this legislation, and I rise to support life.

Madam Speaker, this is about the values that define us as Americans. We see the potential in every life, and that includes the unborn. The McLaugh Act is life-affirming legislation that shows compassion for the baby and the mom. Ten years ago, I received tough news that my son, a senior 21st chromosome, an extra 21st chromosome. The doctors told us it would be a long road ahead.

Today, I see more clearly. Too often others try to define a baby’s future before they are even born. Part of being an American is not letting others define us.

I look at our son, Cole, and I see a healthy 10-year-old working his way through fifth grade. His life is different than we imagined—in a good way. He lights up a room. People are drawn to him. He plays sports and is in Cub Scouts. He is living a full life with huge potential.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to support this legislation that reflects our values and the sanctity of life, and that, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Conyers. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York. Now, a senior member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Nadler. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlemen for yielding the time to me.

Madam Speaker, more than 40 years ago, the Supreme Court held that women have the constitutional right to terminate a pregnancy prior to viability or at any time to protect the life and health of the mother. This bill is flatly unconstitutional on both counts.

The Respect for Life Act has blocked every other 20-week ban because 20 weeks is well before the point of viability. Further, the bill includes no exception for the health of the mother, only waiving the ban if a woman’s life is at immediate risk and no clear violation of a woman’s constitutional rights.

Shamefully, the bill places new and cruel restrictions even on women accessing abortion after rape or incest.

Once again, the Republicans are proclaiming the falsehood that 20-week-old fetuses can feel pain, contrary to the conclusions of every reputable researcher in the field.

What about women like Danielle from New York, who found out in the 29th week of her pregnancy that her baby’s brain was dangerously deformed and that, if she and the baby were to survive the pregnancy, the baby would only live a short, extremely painful life.

Danielle and her husband had two young children and faced a heartbreaking decision: Should they put Danielle and their family through the pain and suffering of a dangerous pregnancy and birth and allow their baby to suffer and die in pain, or should she terminate the pregnancy and mourn their baby as a family?

The Constitution guarantees Danielle the right to make that choice with her family and her doctors. It does not grant that right to the politicians sitting in this room.

I will close with Danielle’s words: “What my husband and I experienced was just so horrible. Unless people have walked in our shoes, they don’t understand. I did what was right for my son and my family, and it’s no one else’s business.”

On behalf of Danielle, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this horrible bill. We must stop the bans.

Mrs. Handel. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. King).

Mr. King of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to address the House of Representatives on this issue, as I seek to protect our pro-life issue that we have come before this Congress.

This is a powerful piece of legislation that has had a lot of hands on it to produce good work; and the difference in this debate that you hear here, Mr. Speaker, is anecdotes on this side, looking for exceptions that might sway, somehow, the people on the side that understand the rule is this: life begins at the moment of conception.

Human life is sacred in all of its forms and these little babies that are 20-weeks mature can and have and do survive outside the womb, and they can feel pain inside the womb. And doctors that are doing surgery on pregnant mothers give anesthetic to those children that are 20-weeks mature to make sure that they don’t want them flinching in the womb and suffering while they do the surgery.

How can we support a ghastly procedure of abortion on demand to end the life of a baby that is 20 weeks and 6 days and have young mothers live to have another child? It is unacceptable.

I applaud everyone who has done the work on this. I stand solidly with the entire pro-life movement we have in this country. We have a long ways to go to get to where we need to be, but this is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Conyers. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. McEachin).

Mr. McEachin. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to share Denise’s story. Already a mother of two young children, Denise was expecting her third child. Until her 20-week scan, all her tests had come back perfectly. Her entire family was eagerly awaiting a baby boy.

The scan revealed that her son’s brain had several severe deformities. He was also showing signs of other complications. It was the most painful and devastating day of Denise’s life.

But at 19 weeks, Stephanie got heartbreaking news. Her fetus had a devastating fetal birth defect. Based on her age, medical history, and test results, she was strongly advised to terminate the pregnancy.

Stephanie ultimately decided not to carry the pregnancy to term. She told me, through tears, that her daughter needed her mother, and it wasn’t worth the risk. It is a profoundly difficult situation for any family, but it was their decision.

H.R. 36 punishes women like Stephanie. It takes personal medical decisions out of families’ hands and lets politicians decide. It also places a cruel burden on survivors of sexual assault and child abuse. It is unacceptable.

On behalf of Stephanie, I urge my colleagues to vote “no.” We must stop the bans.

Mrs. Handel. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia for her leadership on this legislation, and I rise to support life.

Stephanie and her husband were eagerly awaiting a baby boy. They had one young child and faced a heart-wrenching decision: Should they put Denise and their family through the pain and suffering of a dangerous pregnancy and birth and allow their baby to suffer and die in pain, or should she terminate the pregnancy and mourn their baby as a family?

The Constitution guarantees Denise the right to make that choice with her family and her doctors. It does not grant that right to the politicians sitting in this room.

I will close with Denise’s words: “What my husband and I experienced was just so horrible. Unless people have walked in our shoes, they don’t understand. I did what was right for my son and my family, and it’s no one else’s business.”

On behalf of Denise, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this horrible bill. We must stop the bans.

Mr. Conyers. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. McEachin).

Mr. McEachin. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to share Denise’s story. Already a mother of two young children, Denise was expecting her third child. Until her 20-week scan, all her tests had come back perfectly. Her entire family was eagerly awaiting a baby boy.

The scan revealed that her son’s brain had several severe deformities. He was also showing signs of other complications. It was the most painful and devastating day of Denise’s life.
She spoke to numerous doctors and specialists. She spoke to her family and sought the guidance of counselors and professionals.

Ultimately, she and her husband decided to end the pregnancy. But finding a provider and arranging for the procedure was not easy. Their OB–GYN was not a single doctor in Virginia she could go to.

Denise, as a grieving mother in the middle of an absolutely emotional crisis, desperately calling doctors and hospitals all over the country to access the medical care she needed. Thanks to a family friend, she was ultimately able to find a provider in a major city within driving distance. H.R. 36 would have denied her that chance.

On behalf of Denise and others like her, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on H.R. 36. We must stop the bans.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Mississippi (Ms. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise because our family will welcome its first grandchild in the coming months. This is her 17-week ultrasound, and I cannot wait to meet her. This child is already known by her mother, Julia, quoting Psalm 139: “For You created my inmost being; You knit me together in my mother’s womb.”

Mr. Speaker, this child is a gift from God, a gift that we have far too often abandoned in this country.

Today, we know so much more. We know that, after 3 weeks, my granddaughter had a heartbeat. After 7 weeks, she began kicking her mother, like any good Wagner child would. By week 12, she could suck her thumb, and at week 20, my granddaughter knew the sound of her mother’s voice and could feel pain.

Mr. Speaker, I stand for life, from conception to natural death. I stand for H.R. 36—the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. And on behalf of my granddaughter, I will continue to fight for the day when abortion is not only illegal, but it is unthinkable.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS).

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise for Dr. Danielle. Here’s her story.

Dr. Danielle recently had three patients in North Carolina to Washington, D.C., to access abortion care. One patient from Winston was diagnosed with Edwards’ syndrome just before 20 weeks. Edwards’ syndrome has no treatment, and it is usually fatal before birth or within the first year of life.

Given the 72-hour waiting period in North Carolina, the patient would have passed State limits for when she could access abortion. She had to drive more than 6 hours to the Washington, D.C., area for the care.

North Carolina already has an awful 20-week ban. We don’t need this ban nationwide.

On behalf of Dr. Danielle and the women she helped, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on H.R. 36. Stop the bans.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCArTHY).

Mr. McCArTHY. Madam Speaker, last week I had the pleasure of meeting a young boy named Micah Pickering. He was cute and shy and, you know, as young boys often are, he would give me a high five, play around and run to where everybody had to catch him.

Now, he gave me this bracelet. You see, it says: “Miracles for Micah.” And you know what? He is a miracle. He is strong. He was born prematurely at only 20 weeks. He spent the first 128 days of his life in a neonatal intensive care unit.

Though he could fit in the palm of your hand, his parents couldn’t hold him at first. His skin was so sensitive, the slightest touch could cause little Micah intensive pain. It didn’t matter where he was. If he was in that intensive care unit, or if he was still waiting for that expected date to be born, he could feel, and he wanted to live.

The fact is that children at 20 weeks feel pain. Pain strikingly similar to it. The European Journal of Anesthesiology describes how it is critical to administer anesthesia during fetal surgery procedures.

You know, a standard text on human development, Patton’s Foundations of Embryology, shows how the basics of the nervous system are formed by week 4.

Dr. Ronald Brusseau, of Boston’s Children’s Hospital, wrote that by week 18, children have developed sensory receptors for pain.

Two independent studies in 2006 used brain scans and showed unborn children respond to pain. These children have noses, eyes, and ears. You can hear their heartbeats and feel them move. They are human.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act—I like to call it Micah’s Law—is called what it is because children like Micah feel pain. Those children are strong, just like Micah is strong, and those children should be protected.

Now, I have to admit, Madam Speaker, across the aisle I do hear some beautiful speeches filled with compassion for the defenseless, the defenseless, and the marginalized. They are trying to speak for those who can’t speak for themselves.

But what about Micah? What about the thousands of others like him, the same age he was born? What about the millions who were never given a chance?

Look into Micah’s face—I think we all should—and tell me he isn’t human. Look at him when he was born and tell me that child doesn’t have a right to live.

We should care for the voiceless, for those whose cries of pain are never heard. We should care for the defenseless, for those who will only be saved if we act to protect them.

We should care for the marginalized, for those who have their very humanity denied, even as their noses, eyes, ears, and heartbeats, every movement and visible testament of their lives.

These children are suffering. Their mothers need love. Let’s end the pain. These children want to live, so let’s end their pain.

Micah is a beautiful kid, and there are millions of Micahs who will never smile; Micahs who will never walk; Micahs who will never scrape their knees and get into trouble; Micahs who will never learn to read; Micahs who will never fall in love and have children of their own; Micahs who will never have the chance to tell their mother and father: “I love you.”

We will never know those Micahs. Our lives are poorer because their lives were cut short. But there are more. Instead of pain—instead of pain—we should fill them with love.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOwSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOwSKY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, I rise for Tori. This is her story.

Tori and her husband planned her pregnancy carefully to make sure that her maternity leave worked with her graduate studies, and they were thrilled that the plan right for their family came together and they were pregnant.

At 20 weeks, during a routine ultrasound, they were devastated to learn that the fetus carried a rare disorder that resulted either in the death of the infant shortly after delivery, or a very shortened lifespan wrought with profound disability. Their situation was now out of control. It is one decision that no parent ever wants to have to make.

Their decision was agonizing: end the pregnancy after 20 weeks or watch their child die or suffer.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of Tori, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on H.R. 36. We must stop the bans.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, a former abortionist, Dr. Levatino testified before Congress and described how he and other abortionists actually kill helpless babies. He killed 1,200 of them. He said: “Imagine, if you can, that you are a pro-choice OB–GYN like I was. Using a Sopher 13-inch clamp with rows of ridges or teeth, grasp anything you can inside the womb. Once you grasp something in the clamp, set the jaws and pull hard—really hard. You feel something let go, and out pops a fully formed leg about 6 inches long.
Reach in again and grasp anything you can, and out pops an arm. Reach in again, and again, and again with the clamp, and tear out the spine, the intestines, the heart and lungs.

Even if pain wasn’t present, Madam Speaker, dismembering a child is violence, and it is worse than murder. But these babies actually suffer excruciating pain during the abortion.

Dr. Colleen Malloy from Northwestern University has said: In today’s medical arena, we resuscitate patients at 20 weeks and are able to witness their ex-utero growth. I could never imagine subjecting my tiny patients to horrific procedures such as those that involve limb detachment."

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 36.

Overwhelming majorities of Americans—some 60–64% according to pollsters—support legal protection for pain-capable unborn children.

Today we know that unborn babies not only die but suffer excruciating pain during dismemberment abortion—a cruelty that rips arms and legs off a helpless child.

A former abortionist, Dr. Anthony Levatino, testified before Congress that he had performed 1,200 abortions—over 100 late-term abortions—up to 24 weeks.

Dr. Levatino described what the abortion actually does to the helpless child. "Imagine if you can that you are a pro-choice obstetrician/gynecologist like I was. Using a Sopher 13 clamp, clamp your own child's arms and legs or teeth. "Grasp anything you can" inside the womb. "Once you've grasped something inside, squeeze on the clamp to set the jaws and pull—really hard. You feel something let go and out pops a fully formed leg about six inches long. Reach in again and grasp anything you can . . . and out pops an arm."

He noted that "a second trimester D&E abortion is a blind procedure." He said, "Reach in again and again with that clamp and tear out the spine, intestines, heart and lungs."

Madam Speaker, even U.S. Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy noted in his dissent to the U.S. Supreme Court's 2000 Stenberg v. Carhart decision, Justice Kennedy observed that in D&E dismemberment abortions, "The fetus, in many cases, dies just as a human adult or child would: It bleeds to death as it is being torn from the womb. The fetus can be alive at the time of the abortion. It can kick, move and react and develop and sense—perceive—pain."

Moreover, "following the care required to be provided and the standard of care for extremely premature infants. Building a bridge between the mother's womb and the outside world, the artificial womb provides a soft, sterile, fluid filled environment for the child to continue to grow."

The babies we seek to protect from harm today may survive if treated humanely, with expertise and compassion—not the cruelty of the abortion.

Four years ago, Pennsylvania abortion doctor Kermit Gosnell was convicted of murder, conspiracy to kill and involuntary manslaughter and sentenced to life imprisonment.

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

The Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, Micah's Law, is needed now more than ever because there are Gosnells all over America, dismembering and decapitating pain-capable babies for profit. The bill protects kids from preventable pain—and death.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, it is always hard for me to understand why our colleagues on the other side of the aisle embrace junk science, whether it is around global warming, where 99 percent of the scientists say, yes, it is happening, or in this case.

We have the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists from 2010 (Connor and colлегates from 2010)."
In 2012, ACOG, in the Journal of American Medical Association, embraced that statement. So the vast majority of physicians and scientists say there is not pain perception at 20 weeks.

But let me talk about Dr. Jenn and Sammi. Sammi was 17, terrified, and pregnant when she went to a ‘clinic’ that ended up being a crisis pregnancy center. The center gave Sammi a free, private ultrasound, which was actually broadcast throughout the clinic for all to see—a violation, I might say, of HIPAA. When Sammi said she wanted to end the pregnancy, the center called her almost daily saying she would die, get sick, and go to hell.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. SPEIER. The center also lied about a due date, telling Sammi it was too late for an abortion. Finally, Sammi called her mom, who flew her to California to see Dr. Jenn.

On behalf of Dr. Jenn and Sammi, I urge my colleagues to vote ‘no’ on H.R. 36.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, Dr. Jenn and I were both in the Midwest, where I live, and she had this to say about abortion: ‘‘It is evidence with women’s lives and focus on the real problems facing this government and this country, and stop interfering in the private lives of women. We must stop this ban.

Mrs. Handel. Madam Speaker, it is difficult to imagine what could be more important than establishing who is protected under the law and who is not; who is given a chance of life and who is denied it.

As technology continues to evolve, the more we can celebrate the ability we have to save a baby at just 20 weeks after conception is truly remarkable. I remember when I first became a nurse some 40 years ago. I vowed to devote myself to the welfare of those committed to my care, whether they were born or unborn. I am still committed to that today. And 40 years later, the science tells us that after 20 weeks of pregnancy, unborn babies are able to feel pain instead of dying.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act protects those who cannot protect themselves when handed a death sentence.

Madam Speaker, there are currently seven countries in the world that allow elective late abortions, countries such as North Korea and China. Why in the world is the United States on a list of countries characterized as human rights abusers?

Our Nation can do better than that. I have seen how special care is given to reduce the pain of these precious premature babies at 20 weeks in the NICU. Unborn children in the womb at this stage should be protected, too, and we must pass the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act to give these unborn children a chance to see the light of day.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 11½ minutes remaining and the gentlewoman from Nebraska has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, today I rise for Emilia. This is her story:

Eighteen years ago, Emilia was pregnant with her second child. She was happily married, financially secure, and eager to welcome a new baby into her family. After Emilia’s baby was diagnosed with Down syndrome, she was even more determined to raise her baby with love and compassion.

Imagine her devastation when, after a 20-week ultrasound, the baby was diagnosed with fetal hydrops and a battery of tests revealed her baby would not survive to term. Emilia made a wrenching decision to terminate her pregnancy rather than have her baby suffer.

Emilia’s hospital didn’t provide abortion services, so she went to Boston and had to pass through a wall of picketers that told her she was a murderer.

In the waiting room, she realized every other patient had the same amount of love they were carrying a healthy baby. Every woman there was experiencing profound loss.

Under a 20-week ban, none of these moms can make a decision for their families with their doctors. We would give that decision for them in Congress.

On behalf of Emilia, I urge my colleagues to vote ‘no’ on H.R. 36. We must stop the ban.

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

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative HANDEL for yielding.

As a former minister and as an American, even as a human being, I believe that every boy and girl is conceived with God-given potential and unique talents and abilities—they will use to serve others and make a difference.

As I put it this way: I know a young man named Luke. Luke’s mother was in for a surprise when, at only 24 weeks into her pregnancy, her baby boy decided it was time to meet the world. To make a long story short, Luke worked through complications with his family, and he serves in our district office in North Carolina.

Every life is an opportunity. Every life is precious.

A little earlier we were challenged by the accusation that Republicans only care concerned about budget. It goes out the window when it comes to this issue.

You know what?

You are right. We don’t put a price on life. We cherish it.

Madam Speaker, I am a proud co-sponsor of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, today I rise for Donna. This is her story:

In 2012, ACOG, in the Journal of American Medical Association, embraced that statement. So the vast majority of physicians and scientists say there is not pain perception at 20 weeks.
She said it was a miracle. At age 41, she was finally pregnant. Early blood tests and ultrasound showed a healthy fetus. Donna was filled with the joy of an expectant mother. Then tragedy struck. Her fetus stopped growing at 26 weeks. An ultrasound showed anencephaly, a fetus without a brain, a fetus that could not sustain life on its own.

Madam Speaker, this 20-week abortion bill is cruel punishment for women like Donna, forcing them to face weeks of preventable agony with no hope for this life that they so wanted. This is a bill that inflicts pain, not stops it, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, as the father of 5 and the grandfather of 13, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, also known as Micah's Law, named after Micah Pickering.

Micah was born prematurely at 22 weeks of age. In fact, the same age and exact stage of development that the current dispensable policy permits for legal, on-demand abortion.

After receiving intensive care in his infancy, Micah is now an active, healthy, and happy kindergartner. Micah is living proof that we need to pass H.R. 36. Congress needs to take this crucial step to ensure the protection of thousands of innocent lives every year. Innocent lives just like pre-born Micah.

The scientific evidence is overwhelming that, by at least 20 weeks of age, unborn babies can feel excruciating pain during typical abortion procedures. This is both cruel and inhumane. As Members of Congress, it is our duty and our moral obligation to pass this commonsense legislation.

We must protect the most defenseless. Enough is enough. I urge my colleagues in support of this critical bill to protect the sanctity of every human life. God knows it is time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, today I rise for Eva, an Oregon doctor who is one of the compassionate providers women turn to when facing an unintended or dangerous pregnancy.

Oregon has rejected restrictions on abortions, but because of bans or restrictions in other States, Dr. Eva provides healthcare services, including abortion, to women from around the country.

One patient was a high school senior who could not get an abortion in her home State. She spent weeks saving every penny she could to buy a plane ticket and pay for the procedure. Imagine, I making women fly across the country, instead of debating this bill, and instead of cutting programs like the Teen Pregnancy Prevention Program, which my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have done, we should be focused on preventing unintended pregnancies, and we should be expanding access to comprehensive reproductive care, something the Oregon Legislature did when they passed the landmark Reproductive Health Equity Act.

Madam Speaker, when abortion is banned, it does not go away. It drives women to unsafe back alleys and to dangerous self-induced abortions. We have the same resources in our States, and we have the same women and their healthcare providers. Please vote "no" on H.R. 36.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

Multiple scientific studies indicate that, by 20 weeks after fertilization, an unborn child's nervous system have developed sufficiently for that child to feel pain. The United States stands among only a handful of nations that permit elective abortions after 20 weeks. It should pain us all that we fall into the same camp as North Korea and China.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act will moderate our extreme position and ensure we protect the most vulnerable, like Micah Pickering, a lively 5-year-old I met last week. Micah was born prematurely at the same age children would be protected under H.R. 36. Micah was able to survive and thrive after spending nearly 4 months in the neonatal intensive care unit. He is now in kindergarten, and I found out when talking to him that we share a love of Legos.

The bottom line is this: 20 weeks is halfway through a pregnancy. It is too late to end the life of an unborn baby. It violates that American want, it violates science, and it violates our country's most enduring values.


Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1/2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise for a second time today in strident opposition to H.R. 36.

This bill is unconstitutional, and it is an overt attempt to challenge women's constitutional right to a safe and legal abortion.

It is doubly disturbing that funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program and community health centers has expired, but yet this majority is focusing on doubling down on their crusade against women's healthcare.

Let's talk about pain a little bit here. What is really difficult is the pain felt by women after 20 weeks. The bottom line is this: 20 weeks is halfway through a pregnancy. It is too late to end the life of an unborn baby. It violates that American want, it violates science, and it violates our country's most enduring values.


Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Georgia for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

In States that permit elective abortions after 20 weeks, we have the most vulnerable, like Micah Pickering, dying. We have a responsibility to defend the most vulnerable in our Nation, and that is exactly what this legislation does: it protects unborn children from abortion at 5 months.

It is truly disheartening that I have to stand on this beautiful floor to bring up this issue. Every child should be given a chance at life. New life is created by God, and we must give a voice to these precious babies who cannot speak for themselves. Our Nation can and must protect the most vulnerable among us.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL).

Mr. CARBAJAL. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman CONyers for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, today I rise for Katie in California and in support of women everywhere who have relied on access to safe abortion procedures in their lifetime.

When Katie and her husband found out she was pregnant, they were overjoyed. Eighteen weeks later, they discovered that the fetus had multiple severe health problems, including spina bifida and a tethered spinal cord. This news was heartbreaking, and Katie and her husband made the decision to end the pregnancy at 22 weeks.

Katie wants lawmakers in Washington to know that it is not their...
right to make this decision for her or other women. She says that it is a hor-
ific situation, and until you have been through it, you have no idea, and you
can’t make that decision for someone else.

On behalf of Katie, I urge my col-
leagues to vote “no” on H.R. 36. We
must stop the bans.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I
yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I
rise today in strong support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Pro-
tection Act.

It is a long title for a bill; however,
we are talking about protecting unborn
children. As it has been obvious here
today, it is always difficult to talk
about this issue, but when we talk
about pain-capable unborn children, we
are referring to, in particular, children
who are still in the womb at 20 weeks.

As it has been pointed out by my col-
leagues, and time again, scientists
have proven that unborn children, even
at 20 weeks old, are capable of feeling
pain. The goal of this legislation is to
protect these children by ensuring that
they cannot be aborted.

Topic: A patient performs an in-
utero surgery on a 20-week-old unborn
child, the standard protocol for the child
is to be treated as a patient, not
just a blob of tissue. That child would
be given an injection of pain medica-
tion before the surgery, and this is
above and beyond the anesthesia given
to the mother before the surgery.

These babies have demonstrated to
medical experts that they respond to
painful stimuli because they flinch and
recoil from sharp objects.

Madam Speaker, I urge my col-
leagues to vote “yes” on this legisla-
tion when it comes to the floor. Let’s
do the right thing and protect unborn
children.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I
yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman
from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), who is
a senior member on the Judiciary
Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker,
I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CONYERS and I can remember
the same type of hearings and the same
type of legislation many years ago,
again denying women their constitu-
tional rights. I can see as clear as I can
see you, speaker, the women who
were sitting and begging us not to
undermine them, their doctor, and
their faith.

So I rise today to say to my friends
on the other side of the aisle: You have
got it wrong. There are no mass
abortions. There is no call for mass
abortions. The women that are undergoing
these procedures are women who have
prayed and who have looked to their
faith, their doctor, and their family.

So I oppose this bill because it puts
the lives of women at risk, it interferes
with women’s constitutionally guar-
anteed right of privacy, and it diverts at-
tention from the real problem facing
American women. Let us reauthorize
SCHIP. People are crying about that in
my district. How outrageous.

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

What number did I say? 10? 20? 1.5?
and this is not diminishing the aspects
of this.

But it is those women who have
prayed. They have sought doctors’
help, and they, as well, have sought
their family’s consultation.

We are making a mockery of these
women. These women are not standing
on the street corner saying, “I want to
have an abortion.” They have a serious
situation, like April Salazar.

At 18 weeks, she and her husband
found out that their baby had a lethal
diagnosis, and if she carried the preg-
nancy to term and he was born alive,
he would die shortly from suffocation.
It is not pain of getting him out—he
would die. April hoped the news wasn’t
true, so she requested more tests to
confirm the diagnosis. At 21 weeks she
had an abortion. This bill would have
stopped April.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I
yield the gentlewoman from Texas an
additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. This would have
stopped April, her husband, her family,
her God, and her doctor from making
the decision.

Even the exceptions are bogus be-
cause you frighten these women. The
idea of Jeni, in my home State, where
they had a 2-day waiting period listen-
ing to a mandatory script about abort-
ion and a sign-off from two separate
doctors. Once you start this, you are
taking it away from women who have
sought their church leader, their doctor,
and their family.

This is a bad bill. We need to do some
important things. I would hope with
the carnage of Las Vegas, to save lives,
we would ban assault weapons and we
would not have that gentleman having
42 guns in his home and in his posses-

sion. That is what we need to fight
to save lives, not this bill that under-
mines the rights of women and their
faith and their doctor.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker,
Mr. ADERHOLT, in strong opposition
to H.R. 36, the “Pain Capable Unborn
Child Protection Act” and the underly-
ing bill.

I opposed this irresponsible and reckless
legislation the last time it was brought to
the floor.

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
2017.”

Instead of resuming their annual War on
Women, our colleagues across the aisle
should be working with Democrats to help re-
build the ravaged communities hit by hurri-
canes Harvey, Irma, and Maria.

Madam Speaker, we could and should
instead be voting reauthorize the important
SCHIP program that has helped families get
on their feet for years.

The one thing we should not be doing is de-
bating irresponsible “messaging bills” that
abridge the rights of women and poses a na-
tionwide 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 per-
cent of abortions that occur after 20 weeks.

Jeni and her husband chose to terminate
the pregnancy, but because they live in Texas,
they were forced to endure several cruel re-
strictions: a two-day waiting period, listening
to a mandatory script about abortion, and a sign-
off from two separate doctors.

Madam Speaker, every pregnancy is dif-
ferent.

No politician knows, or has the right to as-
sume he knows, what is best for a woman
and her family.

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

Madam Speaker, I also strongly oppose
H.R. 36 because it lacks the necessary excep-
tions to protect the health and life of the mo-
the.

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 commu-
nity is that viability is acknowledged as not oc-
curring prior to 24 weeks gestation.

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

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

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

I strongly oppose H.R. 36 and urge all
Members to join me in voting against this un-
wise measure that put the lives and health of
women and their children at risk.

I would like to include in the RECORD
stories from two women:

April Salazar, New York: “It would have
been too hard for me to carry to term, and it
seemed pointless to make the baby suffer too when she would never survive."

At 18 weeks, April and her husband found out that their baby had lethal skeletal dysplasia, that would make them unable to breathe on their own. If she carried the pregnancy to term and he was born alive, he would die shortly after birth. April knew that they would not get to see him live, but she also knew that it wasn’t true, so she requested more tests to confirm the diagnosis, which took two weeks. At 21 weeks, she had an abortion. April shares her story because she has found that it can change opinions. Several people she knows personally who previously had been anti-abortion told her that they would have done the same thing she did.

Julie Bindeman, Maryland: “Everything about a later termination is already so incredibly difficult even just picking up the phone to make the appointment. The 20-week ban adds another hurdle. It’s just cruel.

Julie’s doctor told her and her husband that their son’s brain had a serious abnormality, a diagnosis that they confirmed with tests, more ultrasounds, and an MRI. If the baby survived birth, he would never speak, walk, or have conscious thoughts based upon what had developed in his brain. Julie and her husband decided to end the pregnancy, and to prevent it, they could get the appointment was at 22 weeks. Julie could not find a surgeon in Maryland at that time willing to perform the procedure, so she had to be induced elsewhere. Her baby was born alive and died very shortly after.

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, for the past 25 years, I have had the privilege of delivering over 5,000 babies. I am absolutely convinced that babies can feel pain at 14 weeks. At 16 weeks, they can recognize their mom’s voice, their brother’s voice, and their sister’s voice.

Once or twice a year, I have been in that delivery room and have been forced to deliver a very premature baby, a 22-week or a 24-week baby. We are doing things we never thought we could do to the life of that baby, calling in pediatrists and anesthesia people, doing everything heroically possible.

How can we live in a world where we are trying to save that baby’s life in apart limb by limb and decapitating it? We are trying to save that baby’s life in the delivery room and have been doing everything we can to save the life of that baby, calling in pediatricians, a 22-week or a 24-week baby. We are doing everything we can to save the life of that baby, calling in pediatricians.

But I also know that our role as a so-called profession, and women’s groups, and the pro-abortion groups, and the pro-choice groups, and the pro-life groups, and the pro-euthanasia groups, and the pro-abortion groups, and the pro-choice groups, and the pro-life groups, and the pro-euthanasia groups, and the pro-abortion groups, and the pro-choice groups, and the pro-life groups, and the pro-euthanasia groups, and the pro-abortion groups, and the pro-choice groups, and the pro-life groups, and the pro-euthanasia groups, and the pro-abortion groups, and the pro-choice groups, and the pro-life groups, and the pro-euthanasia groups, and the pro-abortion groups, and the pro-choice groups, and the pro-life groups, and the pro-euthanasia groups, and the pro-abortion groups, and the pro-choice groups, and the pro-life groups, and the pro-euthanasia groups, and the pro-abortion groups, and the pro-choice groups, and the pro-life groups.

But I also know that our role as a so-called profession, and women’s groups, and the pro-abortion groups, and the pro-choice groups, and the pro-life groups, and the pro-euthanasia groups, and the pro-abortion groups, and the pro-choice groups, and the pro-life groups, and the pro-euthanasia groups, and the pro-abortion groups, and the pro-choice groups, and the pro-life groups, and the pro-euthanasia groups, and the pro-abortion groups, and the pro-choice groups, and the pro-life groups.

Today the House is taking a critical but seemingly uncontroversial step forward in protecting life by prohibiting abortions after 20 weeks of pregnancy, or put another way, when unborn children can feel pain.

The United States is one of only seven countries worldwide, including North Korea, that still allow late-term abortions. This bill would end these horrific procedures.

I pray that one day our Nation will protect all unborn children, but this legislation does stir a great number of us. I urge our colleagues to support it today.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Today, I rise for Dr. Erica of New York. This is her story.

Dr. Erica’s patient was raped by an unknown assailant. The patient’s emotions surrounding the pregnancy were extremely complex. She desperately wanted to have a child but felt guilt, shame, and isolation after being raped.

She ultimately decided to continue the pregnancy. She believed it would help her to believe and grasp onto something positive after such a traumatic experience.

But then the patient went in for a scan at 20 weeks and was devastated to learn that the fetus had multiple lethal abnormalities. The patient had to face yet another agonizing decision. Ultimately, she decided to end the pregnancy.

Thankfully, Dr. Erica was able to help this patient through the most difficult time in her life. I want to share her words: “As a physician, it is my job to guide the patient through the risks, benefits, and alternatives of all options available to her. It is not my job to place judgment on patients that only want a child, but it certainly is not the job of the legislature to interfere with the patient-physician relationship.”

On behalf of Dr. Erica and the women she helps, I urge our colleagues to vote “no.” We must support every woman’s right to make reproduction choices for herself.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST).

Mr. MAST. Madam Speaker, this legislation does stir a great number of emotions in me. I do know what it is to protect life, take life, and to see life lost, and our role should always be to protect the innocent.

But I also know that our role as a societynull has been to subsidize the genocide of our unborn, and that reflects how desensitized we have become to the true value of a child each year, as we kill hundreds of thousands of the most innocent among us: unborn children who smile, who grab, and who are self-aware and feel pain.

If we truly are what we do, then who are we if we purposely bring unthinkable pain to a baby boy or baby girl just before their life is snuffed out of them?

This legislation is a leap forward for our collective conscience as a nation, and it is a strong step forward in returning value to life that we see, especially the most unique life that exists out there: that special creature that was created by God.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, how much time remains on both sides? SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Georgia has 2½ minutes remaining.

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

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, as a proud cosponsor of this legislation, for some of the reasons behind this legislation, because of this long debate to reitera a central idea: the reason behind this legislation is because of what we stand for as Americans.

The Declaration of Independence, as we know, is our Nation’s birth certificate, and it states very succinctly in the second paragraph what has come to be known as the American’s Creed: “We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”

The reason that the Founders put the right to life first, listed as our most fundamental freedom, is because they understood that we are made in the image of a holy God.

Our creator, who gave us those unalienable rights, is the one who made each and everyone of us. Because of that, there is a central truth that comes through: every single person, every single life, is of inestimable dignity and value. Your value is not related in any way to where you went to school, what you make for a living, how good-looking you are, how talented you are, what your fortune was in life, whether or not you have a physical disability. Your value is inherent in who you are as a creation of the God who made you.

That is the reason we stand for this. It is the reason the bill is so important. We urge our colleagues to support it today.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, in closing, H.R. 36 is a dangerous and unconstitutional bill that demonstrates a fundamental distrust of women to make private decisions that are best for themselves and their families. It is, therefore, unsurprising that this legislation is strongly opposed by the Nation’s leading civil rights organizations, the medical profession, and women’s groups.

In addition, 36 religious organizations who oppose this bill that the decision to end a pregnancy must be left to an individual woman, in consultation with her
family, doctors, and any others she chooses to involve, in keeping with her personal beliefs.

Madam Speaker, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to please oppose this dangerous legislation, and I yield back my time.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, we have heard many impassioned stories this afternoon.

Much has changed since Roe v. Wade was upheld in the 1970s. With the world having made extraordinary medical advances. Today, we know with great certainty that babies in the womb, starting at the fifth month of pregnancy, do indeed feel pain.

It is extraordinarily heartbreaking when an unborn baby is diagnosed with a severe and life-threatening abnormality, still that baby deserves a right to life and right to dignity.

My sister was born with no esophagus and given little hope to live. By the grace of God, it was a miracle, with just weeks of her birth, a new technology, a new treatment came forward. Today, she is the proud mother of my two nieces.

Madam Speaker, this is a good bill. It is just a bill. It is a moral bill to do what we are called to do, not just as Americans but as human beings: to protect lives of the most innocent.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support and urge every colleague to vote in support of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

H.R. 36 would prohibit the performance or attempted performance of an abortion after 20 weeks, and harshly punishes physicians who violate the law. This bill has narrow exemptions for the life of a mother (rape and incest) but there are no exemptions in the bill for conditions where the fetus has conditions or diagnoses that are incompatible with life.

We have spent the entirety of this Congress defending women’s reproductive rights and fighting against plans that would eliminate funding and access to the health care providers of a woman’s choosing. This bill is yet another attack on a woman’s right to decide what is best for her and her body. A woman, not a politician, must be able to make health decisions that are best for her own circumstances.

H.R. 36 ignores that every pregnancy is different and compromises a woman’s right to the health care she is legally entitled to. It punishes women who are already in difficult situations. The Supreme Court has repeatedly ruled that neither a state nor the federal government can ban safe and legal abortion services pre-viability.

I support a woman’s legal right to opt for or against an abortion. The decision is private. It’s a matter of faith and it’s a matter of conscience, and our Constitution recognizes this. What I do not support is a bill that takes away women’s constitutional right. The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is a shameful attempt to impose a radical political agenda on women. It strips away their individual liberties and puts their health at serious risk. This bill is wrong, this bill is dangerous, and this House should reject it.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Madam Speaker, the science is clear, as dismemberment abortion procedures pull children apart from limb to limb, the baby feels pain. The baby recoils as the instruments get closer. The fight or flight instinct is there. If that isn’t proof of life, I don’t know what is. These late term abortions must end.

My position on this matter is well-known. It has long been my mission to protect the unborn.

A vast majority of Americans agree, late term abortions are wrong. Period. Full stop.

This bill isn’t just for the sake of the babies. This bill protects their mothers. At 20 weeks, this horrendous procedure is risky and subjects mothers to serious dangers.

Lives are at stake, both for mothers and their babies.

I support this bill, and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in support of H.R. 36, to ban this cruel and dangerous procedure.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 36.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to share my strong support for the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, or Micah’s Law.

My colleagues who oppose this bill adamantly defend a mother’s ability to have a late-term abortion and a doctor’s ability to perform it. But, Madam Speaker, I have heard no mention of the third person in the room: the unborn baby.

I am astounded that the opposition chooses to focus solely on the two individuals who can speak for themselves, with no mention of the one who cannot. That is exactly what we are here to do today. We are here to speak up for those who can’t speak for themselves. We are here to defend those who cannot defend themselves.

Our bill seeks to do this by restricting abortions after 20 weeks, or at the 6th month of pregnancy, the point at which research shows the unborn babies can feel pain.

Last week, I, too, had the opportunity to meet the little boy this bill is named for: Micah. As many of you know, he was born at 22 weeks and spent 4 long months in intensive care.

This is not the first bill that has been brought to the floor that shows disrespect for women and their families. The House has considered bills that waste taxpayers’ dollars on the one who can’t, and research shows the unborn babies can feel pain.

This bill fits a disturbing pattern. Just this year, the House has considered bills that waste taxpayers’ dollars on the one who can’t, and research shows the unborn babies can feel pain.

Madam Speaker, my amendment simply adds the health of the mother to the existing exemptions in this bill.

Without my amendment, H.R. 36 devalues the health and well-being of women and puts their life at risk. It tells our mothers, our daughters, our nieces, and our granddaughters that decisions about their long-term health are not their own.

This is not the first bill that has been brought to the floor that shows disregard for women and their families. This bill fits a disturbing pattern.

Just this year, the House has considered legislation that tells women that they need to get their employer’s permission if they want affordable birth control.

The House has considered bills that would eliminate women’s essential health benefits, like maternity care and mammograms.

The House has considered legislation to cut funding for women’s healthcare centers.

The House has also considered legislation that would allow insurance companies to charge women higher premiums and label pregnancy as a pre-existing condition.

Tomorrow, we will consider a budget that decimates programs that are critical to the health and welfare of women and families so that we can give a massive tax cut to the wealthiest 1 percent.

Just take one moment to think about those priorities.

Madam Speaker, bills like this one disrespect and devalue women. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the motion to recommit and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition.

Madam Speaker, I am unapologetically pro-life, and I oppose abortion at any stage. I will always fight to grant greater protections for life under the law. As a society, I pray that we will start assigning greater value to life at all stages in this country.

Madam Speaker, so often we get caught up in the policies of this issue and we forget that these are babies, for goodness’ sake. They feel pain, and we need to protect them. That is why I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion to recommit and join me in supporting this underlying bill.

Madam Speaker, 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. BROWNLEY of California. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill, if ordered, and suspending the rules and passing S. 762.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 187, nays 238, not voting 8, as follows:

[(Roll No. 548) YEAS—187

YEAS—187

Micah survived, and this year he is in kindergarten. You see, children like Micah, who are born prematurely, are treated as patients. Special care is given to reduce their pain and increase their chances for survival, just as it should be.

So, Madam Speaker, my question to those who would oppose this bill is this: What is the difference between a baby born at 6 months outside the womb and a baby at 6 months inside the womb? Is one treated like a miracle they are created to be and the other be treated like medical waste? If a baby like Micah can survive outside the womb given the appropriate care, shouldn’t we give other babies like him the same protection and chance to live?

I have listened to my colleagues on the other side call this bill extreme. I say to oppose this bill is extreme. If we won’t stop abortions at 6 months of pregnancy when a baby feels pain, when will we stop them?

We have to draw a line somewhere. To say aborting a little baby who can actually feel the pain of the procedure being forced upon them crosses the line is a gross understatement.

Madam Speaker, I am unapologetically pro-life, and I oppose abortion at any stage. I will always fight to grant greater protections for life under the law. As a society, I pray that we will start assigning greater value to life at all stages in this country.
Messrs. BUCHON, MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and DENHAM changed their vote from "yea" to "nay." 

Messrs. BISHOP of Georgia and KEATING 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. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 548.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye, 237; noes, 189, not voting, 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 549]

AYES—237

Adams
Aguilar
Barraggan
Bates
Boyce
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brooks (AL)
Bruneau
Burns
Duncan (SC)
Dunn
Emmer
Ennis
Engel
Foster
Frank (NY)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte

NOT VOTING—8

Bridenstine
Foster
Himes
Long
Loudermilk

Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ronny

eight-Lehtinen
Rokkan
Rothus
Rounder
Royce (CA)
Russell
Sanford
Sanford
Sarbanes

eight-Lehtinen
Rokkan
Rothus
Rounder
Royce (CA)
Russell
Sanford
Sanford
Sarbanes

NOT VOTING—7

Bridenstine
Himes
Kihuen

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tem. The Chair will now announce all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

PROVIDING RESOURCES, OFFICERS, AND TECHNOLOGY TO ERADICATE CYBER THREATS TO OUR CHILDREN ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tem. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 782) to reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tem. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 3, not voting 13, as follows:

(Roll No. 550)

YEAS—417

Abraham, butterfield  
Adams, Byrne  
Adler, Calvert  
Ala, Cisneros  
Allen, Crist  
Amodei, Arrington  
Aquaill, Balser  
Aguilar, Bacon  
Allen, Carbajal  
Amodei, Cisneros  
Akin, Carson (IN)  
Alsop, Beatty  
Allred, Cleaver  
Alexander, Clark (NY)  
Alexander, Bergman  
Alexander, Beatty  
Allred, Blum  
Allred, Brooks (CA)  
Allred, Bishop (UT)  
Alexander, Bishop (GA)  
Allred, Bishop (MO)  
Allred, Bishop (NY)  
Allred, Bishop (NM)  
Allred, Black  
Allred, Blackburn  
Allred, Bishop (TX)  
Allred, Bishop (IN)  
Allred, Brooks (AL)  
Allred, Brad (PA)  
Allred, Brad (TX)  
Allred, Brat  
Allred, Brooks (IA)  
Allred, Brooks (CT)  
Allred, Brooks (VA)  
Allred, Brown (MD)  
Allred, Brownley (CA)  
Allred, Buchanan  
Allred, Buck  
Allred, Buck (KY)  
Allred, Bucshon  
Allred, Budd  
Allred, Burgess  
Allred, Bustos  

NAYS—3

Aum, Hastings  
Bugs, Kilien  
Bridenstine, Long  
Hanabusa, Loeckenhoff  
Himes, Meeks  
Jones, Rooney, Francis  

So (two-thirds in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ROSEN. Madam Speaker, on October 3rd, on rollcall votes 546, 547, 548, 549, and 550, I was not present because I was tending to my community in Las Vegas, in the aftermath of the deadliest mass shooting in United States history. Had I been present, I would have voted “Nay” on rollcall votes 546, “Yea” on rollcall vote 547, “Nay” on rollcall vote 549, and “Yea” on rollcall vote 550.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 71, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

Mr. WOODALL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-339) on the resolution (H. Res. 553) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

RESTRICTING ABORTIONS AFTER 20 WEEKS

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, a measure that will restrict abortions after 20 weeks.

Substantial scientific evidence has proven that abortions inflict pain on unborn children who have reached the age of 20 weeks. It has also been proven that, at 20 weeks, an unborn child is capable of surviving outside the womb.

Just last week, I had the honor of meeting Micah Pickering, who had been born prematurely at 20 weeks. Micah is now a vibrant 5-year-old boy who is living a full and healthy life.

Currently, the United States is one of only seven countries that allow abortions after 20 weeks. This bill is a commonsense measure that will protect our next generation and end the egregious practice of late-term abortions.

During my time as a member of the New York State Assembly, I was the
prime sponsor of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act and was honored to champion this bill in an effort to protect the most vulnerable in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to protect the sanctity of life by voting ‘yes’ on the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

WHAT A RENEGOTIATED NAFTA COULD MEAN FOR AMERICA’S WORKERS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, during the August recess, I held a field hearing in Ohio to hear firsthand accounts from American workers and farmers and all our constituents on what a renegotiated NAFTA could mean for jobs in Ohio and America.

At the end of my remarks, I will include in the RECORD the testimony of Roger Wise, Ohio and National Farmers Union, and Nick “Sonny” Nardi, of the Teamsters Local 416 in Greater Cleveland.

Roger discussed the loss of American jobs to low-wage workers south of the border. He emphasized the need to overhaul U.S. trade policy, including outlawing child labor, with stronger labor rights and true enforcement, calling for a tri-national Labor Secretariat to hear and resolve labor issues.

I am grateful for their contributions, as only by listening to those who have witnessed the effects of bad trade agreements can we move forward and bring jobs back to America and prevent exploitation of workers abroad.

TESTIMONY OF ROGER WISE, OHIO AND NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

(August 3, 2017 NAFTA Remarks)

Good afternoon. Thank you Rep. Kaptur, Elizabeth of the Citizens Trade Campaign and President Mark Payne, Local 1250 for hosting this very timely event about this very important topic.

My name is Roger Wise and I am a 4th generation full-time family farmer and have been so for more than 40 years. I am here today on behalf of the Ohio and National Farmers Union. NFU is the oldest active farm organization in the country, advocating since 1902. Ohio has been chartered since 1904.

Nationally we represent over 200,000 family farmers and ranchers and fishers. Here in Ohio we tout 2500 of those members. Four of them are here with me today, Marge and Mardy Townsend from Ashtabula County, and of course Congresswoman Kaptur.

The Farmers Union organization works through grassroots-driven policy to improve the well-being and quality of life for family farmers, ranchers, fishers and rural communities. Each year at our national fly in we host a 150,000 members of Congress on our most prestigious award, the Golden Triangle. Rep. Kaptur has received it more than 25 years running, more than any other legislat

I remember vividly when the Secretary of Agriculture, Earl Butz declared the United States would plant ‘fence row to fence row’ and we would export our nation to prosperity and feed the world along the way. That 70’s expansion lasted only a few years because America faced multiple surpluses, interest rates, inflation ad input costs skyrocketed, prices plummeted and competing countries developed their own surpluses. The beginning of the 80’s began and lasted for the next 25 years. Farm program payments accounted for 50% of farm income. The mantra was the in¬come came in ‘ecologies of scale’; and we must ‘get big or get out’.

Many family farmers and ranchers did exactly that, some by choice, many were bankrupct.

Trade agreement seeds were planted and gathered momentum in the 80’s. NAFTA was born and our child care assurances were given that no jobs would be lost. In fact, many more would be created; and the economies of the United States, Mexico and Canada would explode for the benefit of the people in all 3 countries. President Clinton signed on to the agreement ensuring us this would be the economic model for the world.

Now, 25 years later we know the reesy assumptions and predictions did not play out in reality like they did on paper. American workers lost their manufacturing jobs to low wage Mexicaners and also decul¬lated product quality eroded, unions were decimated, family farmers either quit or were forced out of business, the middle class began to shrink and the trade deficit began to climb.

Agriculture, however, through it all was championed because the United States con¬sistently enjoyed trade surpluses primarily form corn and soy exports. Unfortunately though, family farmers, ranchers, and con¬sumers did not benefit from NAFTA. With the exception of the boom year 2008-2013, which were due to the Renewable Fuel Standard, not NAFTA, close inspection re¬veals virtually all multi-national companies reaped the profits while farmers in all 3 countries saw margins decline to the point of non-profitability; and all the while our trade deficits soared. Additionally, trade deals opened the door to consolidation and mega-mergers which led to less competition, non-competitive markets, higher costs, fewer choices for research and development. An example of the latter is herbi¬cide weed resistance.

For decades the origin Labelling, “COOL” has been the signature issue the Farmers Union. We pushed for its passage with great vigor because it benefits pro¬ducers and 95% of consumers support it. Sim¬ply, it requires beef pork and poultry to be labeled with the country from which these products came. Rep. Kaptur has been inde¬fatigable promoting this issue. In fact, she is more steadfast supporting and promoting COOL than any congressperson in D.C. and we are grateful for her efforts. This require¬ment is not unique and this virtually all of our trading partners have a form of COOL and all of them are WTO compliant.

Our coalition in 2002, when COOL was included in the Farm Bill. Unfor¬tunately, special interests, uncaring about its popularity and practicality, lobbied to prevent its passage and a amendment was not im¬plemented. Our efforts continued and in the 2008 Farm Bill COOL was mandatory and it became law of the land.

Again special interest went to work to de¬rall the law. They challenged it 3 times in Federal Court and lost each time. Undeterred and well financed, Canada and Mexico were coerced into filing suit with the WTO. Ironically, the tribunal was chaired by none other than Mexico. With the deck clear¬ly stacked against us, our case was lost and reprisals repealed COOL.

For NAFTA to be meaningfully renegoti¬ated, re-instating COOL must be a high prior¬ity for the benefit of farmers and con¬sumers.

For some production and its safety are na¬tional security issues as well as an economic ones. Trade agreements have led to reduced border inspections of food imports. Further, these countries less stringent safety regulations ade¬quate for our import inspections. This relaxing of regulations puts our farmers and ranchers at a disadvantage because our prod¬ucts are routinely of higher quality.

Currency manipulation and the overvalued U.S. dollar makes our exports more expen¬sive, inhibiting us from gaining our re¬sult which also adds to the trade deficit.

Farmers and ranchers were not helped by America’s withdrawal from the Paris Cli¬mate Agreement. Farmers are poised to help mitigate climate change both here and around the world through conservation, car¬bon sequestration and other initiatives to as¬sure sustainability for decades to come. Cli¬mate change must be part of any meaningful trade agreement based on public funded, peer reviewed science based research.

To conclude, the record must be clear.

NFU is not anti trade or protectionist. We are keenly aware that the economy is global and that it is a critical component of world economies. We do, however, believe that trade deals should benefit farmers and work¬ers in all counties. Living wages, competi¬tive markets, with safety and welfare in the workplace guaranteed; and all nations must strive for a clean and healthy environment to preserve our planet for centuries hence. Only then will trade be fair and our deficit decline.

Thank you.

NAFTA FIELD HEARING WITH REP. MARCY KAPTUR

President, Teamsters Local 416

Good afternoon. My name is Sonny Nardi and I am president of Teamsters Local 416 in Cleveland.

In May 2000, 320 Teamsters got laid off from the Mr. Coffee plant in Glenwillow, about 20 miles east of here. Their jobs went to Mexico because of the North American so-called ‘Free Trade Agreement’.

My Local, Teamsters 416, lost hundreds of jobs to NAFTA — 120 jobs at HOSPECO on 79th and Carnegie in Cleveland; 60 jobs at Muller Electric on Pain Avenue in Cleveland; 96 in Bedford Heights, the Mr. Coffee Filter Division; 115 blue at Coral Bay in Maple Heights.

These were all good paying jobs with bene¬fits and many were inner city jobs, workers could walk to work and had much tenure.

Most of these guys, because their pro¬duction jobs were simply shifted to Mexican plants, were eligible for some federal bene¬fits under a narrow NAFTA program called ‘Trade Adjustment Assistance,’ or TAA. Here in Ohio, under NAFTA TAA, more than 150,000 workers have been certified as lost their jobs due to offshoring—plant relocation like Mr. Coffee—or because of increased im¬ports from Mexico and Canada that reduce production and jobs at American companies.

But, as everybody knows, the TAA totals are the tip of the iceberg because that pro¬duction only the manufacturing jobs that we have lost because of NAFTA—not the services jobs that depend on a strong manufacturing base.

As a voting member of those jobs, as well as the manufacturing jobs Ohio has lost due to our flawed and failed so-called ‘free trade’ agreements, I urge all of my colleagues to protect the sanctity of life by voting ‘yes’ on the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

Thank you.
trade" policies, than Ohio. And, on a personal note, as a longtime northern Ohio Teamster leader, there aren’t many Local unions that have been declawed, the way 416 have in my lifetime.

And on another point of personal privilege, I want to say that American workers, not just here in Cleveland but all over the country, have been betrayed by a government that was Marc Kaptur shining a legislative light on the NAFTA disaster even as the jobs were staring to flow south.

That’s why this field hearing is so important and that’s why the renegotiation of NAFTA is an historic opportunity. So for a couple of minutes on how we can overhaul the NAFTA to begin to repair the damage. Specifically, I want to describe some things that must be included in a new NAFTA, new Chapters, as well as some old parts of NAFTA that must come out.

But let me be really clear at the outset: if the Trump trade team does not renegotiate NAFTA, that is, in a way that is acceptable to workers, then the US should quit the deal altogether.

I can’t speak for the other folks on this panel today, but the Teamsters demand a complete overhaul of the NAFTA model. No cut-n-paste of the Trans-Pacific-Partnership, no tweaking around the edges. We want a NAFTA that puts in place robust enforcement mechanisms for working families first and foremost.

To achieve this goal, the top priority has to be for a new Labor Rights Chapter to replace the weak and unenforceable side agreement added to NAFTA to get Congress to support ratification in 1993.

When it comes to North American worker rights, we’ve got to level the playing field, so Mexican workers and union organizers have the same rights we take for granted up here. That will reduce the incentive for corporations to relocate jobs down there, if they can’t oppress labor or avoid collective bargaining.

The new NAFTA must prohibit child labor and forced labor and protect the freedom of association and the right to bargain collectively through independent unions. Further, those same standards for labor rights must be enforceable by the same or better trade sanctions that protect commercial interests.

Moreover, a truly modernized NAFTA should put in place to determine fair living wage rates in all regions of all free countries and an enforcement mechanism to guarantee a decent standard of living, including to save for retirement.

All these basic labor rights and the sanctions that protect them and the commitment to living wage must be enforced by an independent tri-national labor secretariat that can hear labor cases and resolve them on behalf of all workers, including migrant workers.

Last point on labor: this new NAFTA chapter will serve as a template for future negotiations, so it is crucial that America get it right this time.

Another new chapter that must be part of the NAFTA replacement model is Currency. One of the reasons we could not support the TPP was the previous administration’s refusal to include enforceable disciplines against currency manipulation.

America has learned the hard way how our trading partners’ currencies are used against the dollar to increase their exports to us (and limit imports from us), which increases our trade deficits, which costs American jobs. A couple of examples: Mexico is currently manipulating their currencies. But we are saying that a replace-
My heart goes out to Michelle Vo, her family and friends, and the other victims of the Las Vegas shooting. I am heartbroken and angry about the events in Las Vegas. These incidents are far too common in our country, and it is my sincere hope that Congress takes action to lessen these types of tragic events.

OUR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS RUN TO DANGER, NOT AWAY FROM IT

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation stands in mourning over the tragedy in Las Vegas. No one ever wants to be in that situation. But it, once again, reminds us that, when there is danger, our law enforcement officers run to it, not away from it.

We are going to hear many stories from that tragedy in Las Vegas, but many of them will concern those brave law enforcement officers who, at the risk of their own life, protected and saved the lives of many, many others.

So, as we mourn the tragedy in Las Vegas, let us always remember and be thankful for those law enforcement officers who protect us each and every day.

DREAMERS ARE AMERICANS TOO

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

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the story of Leonardo Reyes of Salem, Oregon, and urge Speaker RYAN to put forth a clean Dream Act bill.

Leo is an undocumented Oregonian. His mother brought Leo and his siblings to Oregon when he was 10 years old. His mother was a victim of domestic violence and felt she needed to get as far away from her husband as possible to keep Leo and his siblings safe. His mother left everything she knew in Mexico in order to pursue a better life for her children.

Leo has attended Davis Elementary School, Reynolds Middle School, McKay High School, graduated from Chemeketa Community College, and is currently pursuing a bachelor's degree in interdisciplinary studies at Western Oregon University.

He works full-time helping senior citizens and individuals with disabilities access healthcare and food benefits. Additionally, Leo was a cofounder of the Oregon DACA Coalition, which raises awareness in the community by empowering Oregon youth to engage in our democratic process.

Leo considers himself an American, and I do too. He believes that being an American is a set of values and ideals which we all hold dear.

We need to pass a clean Dream Act bill that will recognize Leo and over 800,000 DREAMers as equal members in our community.

COMBATING HUMAN TRAFFICKING

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is time we go after the perpetrators of online sex trafficking. A recent investigation revealed what I have been saying for years, that websites like backpage.com knowingly facilitate human trafficking due to existing law which has been wrongly interpreted and allows these sites to get away without criminal liability.

That is why I am cosponsoring legislation to specifically allow States to investigate and prosecute websites that facilitate sex trafficking. H.R. 1855 is bipartisan legislation that will empower law enforcement to combat online sex trafficking more effectively.

This is an important step forward in the fight to end the suffering of 12-, 13-, and 14-year-old girls and boys—children—who are the victims of sex trafficking.

So, Mr. Speaker, law enforcement needs more tools to put an end to the heinous practice of exploitation and modern-day slavery, and clamping down on backpage.com's ability to advertise young girls for sex is crucial and critical to holding them accountable.

IT IS TIME TO REAUTHORIZE THE CHILDREN’S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, in 1997, with a very, very bipartisan budget agreement, we passed a magnificent statement about this Nation’s commitment to children, and that was the Children’s Health Insurance Program that all of us were so very proud of. It started in 1997 as the first real health reform since Medicare and Medicaid, and millions of children were able to get healthcare. Maybe at that time their parents could not, but they could be covered: children with sickle cell, children with heart defects, children with various hereditary or genetic diseases who were impacted, children with cancer, leukemia, all of these children, or children injured on a playing field, children could be covered.

It is time to reauthorize the Children’s Health Insurance Program. In fact, it is upon the leadership to be able to establish martial law so that we can pass the reauthorization of the Children’s Health Insurance Program coming this week before we go home.

The Democrats have been pushing. The leadership of the Democrats have been pushing. They have been asking for the passage of the Children’s Health Insurance Program.

I can tell you that those, Mr. Speaker, impacted by the hurricanes, they need that healthcare. I ask for its passage.

VIRGIN ISLANDERS ARE AMERICANS TOO

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, Hurricane Irma and Maria have wreaked havoc on the U.S. Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and numerous Caribbean nations. Although the full extent of the two hurricanes’ impact has yet to be assessed, it is clear that the damage from these storms is unparalleled.

The people of the Virgin Islands have lost their homes and possessions. Business has been lost, along with hope and a future.

In the coming months, I ask that all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle approve the full amount of funding and support needed for short- and long-term relief.

For example, tomorrow, the Energy and Commerce Committee will consider legislation to extend the Children’s Health Insurance Program for 5 years. I ask my colleagues to remember the people and children of the Virgin Islands.

Just over one-third of the children of the Virgin Islands lived below the poverty level even prior to Hurricanes Irma and Maria. After the hurricanes, our antipoverty needs will grow exponentially.

We need Medicaid and CHIP provisions to provide the Virgin Islands with additional funding and higher rates of Federal matching funds so that poor Americans and children in the Virgin Islands can remain covered. This, in addition to further changes to Federal program requirements, will help the Virgin Islands with the resources it needs to build.

So I urge my colleagues to please remember that Virgin Islanders are Americans too, just the same as constituents elsewhere across the country.

GOING FORWARD AS AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAST). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, there are so many things on the minds of Americans: three hurricanes in a month, disasters in Florida, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands. We just heard our colleague from the Virgin Islands speak of the problems that that island has. Millions of Americans harmed in so many ways, lives lost, homes destroyed, yesterday, the tragedy in Las Vegas.

It is hard not to focus only on those issues, but in many, many ways, Las
We are very proud of the maritime industry. And in the State of Washington, and in my district, the Seventh Congressional District of Washington State, sometimes people know about us for Boeing airplanes, but they really should know us for our national deep-water port and all of the maritime that we have there.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, since Hurricane Maria hit Puerto Rico last month, residents have been without power. Many of them have not had access to food and water. Many have lost their lives. It has been heartbreaking to watch. We all stand united in pushing this administration to do everything possible to ensure that the people of Puerto Rico have access to relief supplies and that the administration is doing everything it can to assist and rebuild.

These are American citizens, and we have an obligation to do everything we can to help after this devastating hurricane.

The reason I am here today is to join my colleagues, the gentleman from California, because in the wake of Hurricane Maria, we did see a false narrative spreading through the media and social media about what caused it. It caused us to reflect on the fact that perhaps not everybody knows the history of the Jones Act. Not everybody understands exactly what it does and how it supports so strongly American jobs that benefit so many communities.

There are people who thought that perhaps the Jones Act was to blame for the fact that supplies were not making it out of the ports and into Puerto Rico, and so I am very grateful to the gentleman from California, and Republican colleague across the aisle, Representative Hunter, for holding an informal hearing on this very topic and inviting in shipbuilders, shipping companies, as well as the maritime labor unions, in order to tell us a little bit about what was happening in Puerto Rico.

And so this is an opportunity, really, for us to talk about what the Jones Act means, because when you are talking about better wages, better jobs, and a better deal for the American public, then the Jones Act, in many ways, is the epitome of exactly that.

The Jones Act has been in effect for nearly 100 years and inspired by cabotage laws that were in place since the first session of Congress in 1789. The law requires that when goods are shipped via water between two points in the United States, they must be shipped on U.S.-made vessels that are owned and operated by Americans.

This is where the critical industry comes in. In terms of Puerto Rico, the Jones Act is not the reason that the distribution of relief supplies has been slow to move in Puerto Rico. In fact, reports are that thousands of containers containing fuel, emergency housing, food, water, and other essentials are trapped at the Port of San
Jian. To date, at least 11,300 containers with millions of pounds of relief supplies have been delivered.

To put this in perspective, just one such state-of-the-art container ship arrived in Puerto Rico just 3 days after Hurricane Maria, delivering more than 35 million pounds of cargo, the equivalent of about 1,900 cargo planes. You can see here on the chart that the Jones Act current capacity is 22,000 TEUs with a maximum carrying capacity of 1.079 billion pounds.

So just imagine that the additional surge capacity, as of now, is 5,430 TEUs with a max carrying capacity of 258 million pounds. So the issue has not been that ships are not delivering. Our American ships are delivering supplies. But unfortunately, because of the infrastructure, the lack of infrastructure, the destruction to the roads, and the issues around refrigeration across the island—unfortunately, warehouses have been laid to waste—there is nowhere to store those products, and there is no refrigeration.

So what we are seeing is the capacity at the docks continuing to increase. So over the next 2 weeks alone, Jones Act vessels are expected to deliver more than 9,000 containers to Puerto Rico, including at least 3,300 FEMA loads full of relief cargo.

So despite these volumes, the residents of Puerto Rico are suffering, not because ships are not being able to deliver there, but because of the lack of infrastructure that I mentioned, lack of refrigeration, all of those things.

So currently, the point that is very important, I think, for everybody to understand is that American flagships have the capacity to meet Puerto Rico’s relief cargo needs, and the emphasis needs to be on moving cargo from the Port of San Juan into the island, and focusing on rebuilding the infrastructure that has suffered because of this devastating hurricane.

Mr. Speaker, some have called for an outright repeal of the Jones Act despite these facts. Why should Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle support the Jones Act? Because it is incredibly important to our country’s economy and to the maritime industry, which supports nearly 500,000 jobs and is responsible for over $92 billion in gross economic output each year.

So in my district, Washington’s Seventh Congressional District, the Jones Act directly supports nearly 2,000 jobs, and indirectly supports more than 6,500 related jobs. And to be clear, everywhere in the country where we have Jones Act jobs, they are better jobs, better wages, and a better future for our Americans across the country.

Shipyard jobs pay incredibly well. They earn workers about 45 percent more than the national average for private sector jobs. And this is an area, as you can see, my constituents and others know that was hard. This is an area where business and maritime labor, our merchant marines, are proud to work together to make sure that we provide for the national security of our country through the Jones Act.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that we have to invest in Puerto Rico by providing comprehensive relief, including water and food and housing and medical care, and we have to do everything we can to rebuild the infrastructure. But at the same time, we must make sure that we continue bipartisan support for this bedrock maritime law. And I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from the State of Washington for very clearly laying out why the Jones Act is good for all of us.

We held a hearing today, an extensive hearing on the maritime industry and on the Jones Act in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee, and it was laid out with facts and figures, many of those behind you on the chart. There has been a lot of talk about the Jones Act somehow hurting Puerto Rico. The fact is, the truth is exactly the opposite.

The Jones Act allows for three American shipping companies to carry cargo to Puerto Rico, that American ships were delivering twice a week—each of those companies twice a week on what amounts to a milk run from Jacksonville, Florida, to Puerto Rico, all the goods and services that they need. With the hurricane having happened, these three companies are providing all of the FEMA, all of the emergency aid, and they have additional capacity that has not yet been used in delivering the goods and services that Puerto Rico needs in the wake of the hurricane.

In addition to that, the Jones Act is not just between the islands of Puerto Rico, Guam, and Hawaii. It is the inland waterways of America—the great Mississippi River system, all of the barges and tug service. And the Jones Act didn’t exist, we would have companies, mariners, and sailors operating in the heart of our country from everywhere in the world. This is a major national security issue beyond what we will talk about.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Ms. Jayapal) so very much for participating in this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Vasey) to carry on with these issues.

Mr. VASEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. Garamendi) for yielding. He has done a great job of really making Congress aware and the American public aware of just how important the Jones Act is to our country.

There have been a lot of misconceptions out there, and I think that if we just spend a quick second on that we can debunk a lot of these things on a sound bite. But the fact of the matter is, when you talk about trade, when you talk about taxes, labor, and other things that you have added, national security, it is the Jones Act that is keeping all of those things going strong in America. I just really appreciate the gentleman doing that.

When we talk about middle class jobs in this country, there has been a lot of talk in this country about how we have lost a lot of middle class jobs over the last 20 years.

So currently, the point that is very important, I think, for everybody to understand is that American flagships have the capacity to meet Puerto Rico’s relief cargo needs, and the emphasis needs to be on moving cargo from the Port of San Juan into the island, and focusing on rebuilding the infrastructure that has suffered because of this devastating hurricane.

Mr. Speaker, some have called for an outright repeal of the Jones Act despite these facts. Why should Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle support the Jones Act? Because it is incredibly important to our country’s economy and to the maritime industry, which supports nearly 500,000 jobs and is responsible for over $92 billion in gross economic output each year.

So in my district, Washington’s Seventh Congressional District, the Jones Act directly supports nearly 2,000 jobs, and indirectly supports more than 6,500 related jobs. And to be clear, everywhere in the country where we have Jones Act jobs, they are better jobs, better wages, and a better future for our Americans across the country.

Shipyard jobs pay incredibly well. They earn workers about 45 percent more than the national average for private sector jobs. And this is an area, as you can see, my constituents and others know that was hard. This is an area where business and maritime labor, our merchant marines, are proud to work together to make sure that we provide for the national security of our country through the Jones Act.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that we have to invest in Puerto Rico by providing comprehensive relief, including water and food and housing and medical care, and we have to do everything we can to rebuild the infrastructure. But at the same time, we must make sure that we continue bipartisan support for this bedrock maritime law. And I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the State of Washington for very clearly laying out why the Jones Act is good for all of us.

We held a hearing today, an extensive hearing on the maritime industry and on the Jones Act in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee, and it was laid out with facts and figures, many of those behind you on the chart. There has been a lot of talk about the Jones Act somehow harming Puerto Rico. The fact is, the truth is exactly the opposite.

The Jones Act allows for three American shipping companies to carry cargo to Puerto Rico, that American ships were delivering twice a week—each of those companies twice a week on what amounts to a milk run from Jacksonville, Florida, to Puerto Rico, all the goods and services that they need. With the hurricane having happened, these three companies are providing all of the FEMA, all of the emergency aid, and they have additional capacity that has not yet been used in delivering the goods and services that Puerto Rico needs in the wake of the hurricane.

In addition to that, the Jones Act is not just between the islands of Puerto Rico, Guam, or Hawaii. It is the inland waterways of America—the great Mississippi River system, all of the barges and tug service. And the Jones Act didn’t exist, we would have companies, mariners, and sailors operating in the heart of our country from everywhere in the world. This is a major national security issue beyond what we will talk about.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. Jayapal) so very much for participating in this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Vasey) to carry on with these issues.

Mr. VASEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. Garamendi) for yielding. He has done a great job of really making Congress aware and the American public aware of just how important the Jones Act is to our country.

There have been a lot of misconceptions out there, and I think that if we just spend a quick second on that we can debunk a lot of these things on a sound bite. But the fact of the matter is, when you talk about trade, when you talk about taxes, labor, and other things that you have added, national security, it is the Jones Act that is keeping all of those things going strong in America. I just really appreciate the gentleman doing that.

When we talk about middle class jobs in this country, there has been a lot of talk in this country about how we have lost a lot of middle class jobs over the last 20 years.

These jobs, because of the Jones Act, have been protected, and we need to make sure that we keep those jobs here in America going strong.

I am so glad that the gentleman also cleared up the confusion about what was really going on in relation to Puerto Rico. And the Senate is doing what they were supposed to be doing, and that there were other issues on why people weren’t getting supplies. The American public needs to know that.

When the gentleman starts talking about minimum wage, middle class wages, obviously, the Merchant Marines, the mariners out there who worked on these cargo and container ships, help keep that middle class strong in America.

One of the reasons why they are able to do that is because many of those jobs related to the Jones Act, as the gentleman knows, are union jobs. The people who run those unions work very hard to make sure people have good wages and that they have good benefits so they can take care of their families and be able to send them to college.

As the gentleman knows, I have talked with the gentleman before, and he heard Representative Boyle earlier, who is also the co-chair of the Blue Collar Caucus, talk about how important these issues are to us, and I know as well as Mr. Garamendi and everyone else within our caucus.

I just want to point this out very briefly. According to the Center for Economic and Policy Research, unionized workers are compared to their nonunionized counterparts in showing that their wages are 14 percent higher on average. Again, if you have jobs that are paying 14 percent higher on average, we need to protect those jobs because we want people to have more spending power to be able to make our economy strong and great, not less spending power.

The union wage premium is even larger for some demographic groups that, on average, receive lower pay, including workers of color and those without a college education. According
Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Chicago, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, who said she wanted to talk about taxes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) to talk about taxes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to just pick up on something that Congressman VEASEY said, but first let me just thank the gentleman from California for his relentless push to make sure that we have good jobs in America, that is part of our better deal. We are not just talking about jobs. We are talking about good jobs.

I wanted to just say that when it comes to women, if women want equal pay for equal work now, join a union. There aren’t any union contracts that say: Oh, we are going to pay men up here and women over here, not 79 cents on the dollar for a woman in a labor union.

So I encourage my friends—my sisters—to join a union.

Mr. BOYLE and VEASEY to introduce—H.R. 3925. It is a first step toward fixing the Blue Collar Caucus. I am part of it. Notice my blue collar today.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, the gentlegu- men BOYLE and VEASEY to introduce—

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I am a proud member of that caucus because workers, as we know, are just not getting a fair deal right now in today’s economy. The U.S. is the richest country in the world and the history of the world. We are not richer than we have ever been. Now, most people don’t actually feel that because the ordinary worker has not seen any wage growth in the last 2, maybe 21⁄2 or 3 decades. The income gap between top executives and the average worker is bigger than ever. At the same time, corporations are raking in record profits as they ship jobs overseas.

So, obviously, it is time for us to fix the economy that is rigged against America’s working families. We can start with our Tax Code or end with our Tax Code or in the middle with our Tax Code. We need to do something about our Tax Code.

So today I am joining with Congressmen BOYLE and VEASEY to introduce—the Patriot Employer Act, and that is H.R. 3925. It is a first step toward fixing a broken tax system. Instead of giving tax breaks to companies that offshore jobs and that pay poverty wages, our bill encourages businesses to create good jobs here at home.

Here is how the bill works. We reward employer businesses with a tax credit for each employee’s wages. To qualify for the employer taxpayers’ tax credit, a business must fulfill the following checklist:

One, invest in American jobs, no offshore or tax inversion schemes;

Two, pay living wages;

Three, contribute to workers’ retirement security through a defined benefit or defined contribution plan;

Four, provide quality health insurance;

Five, provide paid leave;

Six, and lastly, have practices in place to support employment of our troops, our veterans, and people with disabilities.

There is a companion bill that was introduced by Senator SHEEROD BRROWN, and I am sure he will get more cosponsors.

Small businesses, under 50 employees, can qualify for the tax credits by meeting only some of these criteria.

Unlike the Trump-GOP tax giveaway plan, our bill is responsible. It pays for the new tax credits by closing existing tax loopholes that incentivize corporations to invest overseas. I think most Americans get that there is actually an advantage now for companies who decide to take their jobs out of the United States.

Under the current Tax Code, multinational corporations get to defer taxes on overseas earnings until they bring those profits back to the United States. Through creative accounting, corporations essentially get to avoid taxes in perpetuity. That is forever.

At the same time, those corporations can deduct interest expenses on investments overseas, such as building a new manufacturing plant somewhere. That is backwards. We are rewarding corporations that are avoiding U.S. taxes and offshoring American jobs.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, excuse me for a moment, forgive me for interrupting, but the gentlewoman said something that caught my attention.

American corporations that build a factory in China are able to deduct that cost of that factory against their American taxes?

Unbelievable. Unbelievable.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, the lady is exactly right. Mr. Speaker. If a corporation deducts interest expenses on investments overseas, and that would include building a new manufacturing plant offshore somewhere.

So we don’t want to be rewarding corporations that are avoiding U.S. taxes and offshoring American jobs and giving them benefits. So the Patriot Employer Act fixes that. It raises taxes on corporations that offshore and rewards taxes on businesses that invest in good, American jobs.

The President talks about America first. This is exactly the kind of thing that we should be doing. Let’s not create incentives to take those jobs away.

But still, the Trump-GOP tax plan is a betrayal of American workers. I don’t know if he knows that. It does nothing to raise wages. In fact, 80 percent of the plan’s tax cuts would go to the top 1 percent of earners.

At the same time, 20 percent of middle class families—$50,000 to $150,000—would actually see a tax increase under the plan.

As for corporate taxes, it doubles down on the problem in the current Tax Code. While our current Tax Code lets multinationals put off paying taxes on offshore profits, the new Republican plan would give permanent tax breaks for offshoring.

The Republican tax plan means less revenue for investments that grow the middle class, like education and infrastructure, which we need so badly, which he said he wanted to do. We want to do it with him. It means more
jobs shipped abroad. For many middle class families, it would mean a smaller paycheck.

So we are offering a different path. The Patriot Employer Act, together with stronger unions and greater public investment, offers a real solution to the great inequality in our country.

There are responsible businesses in our country. If a business pays fair wages and provides good benefits, we should support that. We shouldn't make them compete with corporations that don't.

In the end, it is a question of whose side are you on: the offshoring corporation or the American worker?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my House colleagues to reject tax cuts for millionaires, billionaires, and multinational corporations, and to invest in American workers and not offshoring.

So I just want to thank the gentlewoman from Washington, Ms. JAYAPAL, and the gentleman from Washington, Mr. O'ROURKE, for their leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Washington, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, for her leadership on this issue. I am going to come to the gentleman right now and get his signature.

Mr. GARAMENDI. As a proud member of the Blue Collar Caucus, I thank the gentlewoman for both wearing blue and bringing a message from that caucus. It is extremely important.

The Make It In America agenda, which we have been talking about here for at least the last 8 or 9 years, has all of these pieces. The gentlewoman talked about trade, taxes, infrastructure, education, and labor—all the pieces of this puzzle.

As we discussed today, there are programs that are clearly going to be at risk. If the Jones Act somehow gets repealed or gets waived or otherwise is made less effective, there are 400,000 jobs in American shipyards that will be lost. These are shipyards in Philadelphia, the Gulf Coast, and out in the West, as we heard Ms. JAYAPAL talk about Seattle.

San Diego has a major shipyard, the NASSCO shipyard. These are pieces where the Jones Act allows for American ships to be built not in China, but rather, in America. Make It In America, The Jones Act does that.

Mr. Speaker, I will give you a couple of examples. One of the companies that ships goods from Jacksonville, Florida, to Puerto Rico is the TOTE shipping company. They recently spent nearly $400 million on two of the most advanced clean energy ships anywhere in the world.

These ships were built in San Diego. They are LNG-powered, natural gas-powered ships, and they are now plying the Jacksonville-Puerto Rico trade twice a week, back and forth. Crowley is another company operating in that same area, again, twice a week, back and forth. They, too, will soon have LNG-powered ships operating in that area—ships built in America with American workers and American steel, American engines, and the rest.

So this is critically important. There are 100,000 jobs in the shipyards. If we repeal the Jones Act, they are gone and, along with it, the ability of the American shipbuilding industry to supply commercial ships to move critical national security men and equipment wherever it needs to go in the world.

The U.S. military is dependent on the American merchant marine system to move 90 percent of the personnel, equipment, supplies, tanks, artillery, and all the rest around the world. We have huge ships that are essential. We see those operating in Puerto Rico now. But they are not supplying the great mass of goods and services that are needed.

So the plea from all of us who understand what the Jones Act is really about is to say don't do away with this critical piece of America's infrastructure.

At the hearing today, I heard my Republican colleague, Mr. HUNTER, chairman of the committee, quote the great free market idol, Adam Smith.

All too often, the free marketeers of the world read those paragraphs that serve their purposes, but if they were to read the next few paragraphs in Adam Smith's work, "The Wealth of Nations," they would read that Adam Smith said very clearly at the period of time he was writing that it was absolutely essential for the British Government to protect the British merchant marine and the British maritime industry.

That same admonition should come to the American Congress the same way: protect this vital industry, protect the merchant marines.

We do not want and we cannot have foreign ships, foreign tugboats, foreign barges operating up and down the Mississippi River.

What are they carrying? They are carrying gasoline, diesel oil, natural gas, volatile substances. They are carrying cement. They are carrying grain.

Do you want to have Yemeni sailors on the Mississippi? Do you want to have ships owned by China, tugboats, barges owned by China on the Mississippi River?

If that is what you want, then do away with the Jones Act, because that is exactly what would happen. If you want good American wages with good American mariners operating on the inland waterways through the Gulf Coast and up the East Coast, if that is what you want, then you better keep the Jones Act.

If you do away with the Jones Act, it is guaranteed we will have the elimination of the American maritime industry.

If you want American ships operating on the West Coast from Seattle to Anchorage, then you better keep the Jones Act, similarly with Hawaii and Guam.

Most of all, do you want to have the United States military phone China and say: We need to ship a few things to the South China Sea to deal with your encroachment on the islands in the South China Sea; gee, Mr. China, would you please send us some ships so that we can put the military equipment on those ships? Is that what we want?

For those men and women here in Congress and the Senate that want to do away with the Jones Act, think about it. If you do away with the Jones Act, you do away with the American merchant marine. Then this country relies upon China, the largest ship-owning nation in the world, or maybe somewhere else, for what background would they have?

So let's pay attention here. Adam Smith said to the British Government: Maintain the cabotage laws. Do not allow the maritime industry for Great Britain to go away.

So we should be paying attention to the master of the free market system, who wasn't totally for the free market but understood the necessity of protecting certain industries that are critical to the future of a country.

One more thing is on my mind. Two years ago, the Congress of the United States decided that we ought to, for the first time in some 50 years, export our crude oil. We have been exporting natural gas in the form of liquefied natural gas for some time. We added to that the export of oil.

Is that strategic national asset on American ships with American sailors? The answer is no. But if we passed a couple of paragraphs of law and required, as we once did with the North Slope oil when that opened up in the sixties, that that oil be transported on American-built ships with American sailors, if we were to reinstitute that for the first time in some 50 years, export our crude oil, we have been exporting natural gas in the form of liquefied natural gas for some time. We added to that the export of oil.

Is that strategic national asset on American ships with American sailors? The answer is no. But if we passed a couple of paragraphs of law and required, as we once did with the North Slope oil when that opened up in the sixties, that that oil be transported on American-built ships with American sailors, if we were to reinstitute that for the first time in some 50 years, export our crude oil, we have been exporting natural gas in the form of liquefied natural gas for some time. We added to that the export of oil.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring this Chamber’s attention to the devastating wildfires that have ravaged the Nation this year.

The National Interagency Fire Center reports that there have been 49,563 fires that have burned 8,422,251 acres so far in 2017. Wow. Another 80 million acres throughout the country are at high risk status, including one-quarter of the 193 million-acre National Forest System.

Though the Forest Service has spent a record $2.3 billion to fight fires in 2017, these resources are being spent on the back end.

Mr. Speaker, the country has literally been on fire, particularly Western communities. It is far past time that this Chamber pass H.R. 2936 and get serious about combating catastrophic wildfires before they get started.

Mr. WESTERMAN’s bipartisan bill adopts a forward-thinking, active management strategy and also provides allocation reforms that would cease the practice of fire borrowing.

I will likely have more comments later, but we have a few folks pressed for time, so I am going to end my comments there.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), my friend.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the gentleman’s efforts to bring this important matter before the Chamber.

In June, the Brian Head fire burned 189,000 acres in Utah, about $70 million in damage. And in October, the CZU fire burned 156,000 acres in California, about $30 million in damage.

In California, the CZU fire is not an isolated case. It is part of a trend of large fires this year.

This year, the U.S. Forest Service has had to fight wildfires in 13 states at the same time. This is the worst wildfire season on record.

We will soon be introducing a bill called the Energizing American Maritime Act. Using a strategic national asset that we are now able to export, natural gas and oil, we require that a small percentage of that—not 50 percent, not 70 percent, not even 40 percent, but maybe 20 percent—be on American ships with American sailors.

There are many, many things we can do to create good-paying jobs in America. The Jones Act is one such law that has been in place for nearly a century. It served America well and will continue to serve America well if we maintain it and if we don’t allow waivers that simply blow holes in that law, and if we take a strong Make It In America agenda and President’s office likes to talk about it, but talk is cheap. Legislation makes that talk real.

Trade policy, taxes: We just heard about the patriot tax encouraging American businesses with real tax incentives and discouraging American businesses that want to offshore the jobs.

Energy policy: I think I just talked about energy policy a moment ago. Put that oil and natural gas on American ships.

Labor: Good-paying jobs in the shipyards, good-paying jobs on the ships.

Education: The maritime academies provide the education that is necessary to do that.

Infrastructure: Freight movement, the ports, channels deepening, maintaining the locks on the Mississippi and the Ohio. Infrastructure, again, good-paying jobs.

We can do a lot. It takes laws and it takes men and women on the Democratic side and the Republican side that come together and say: We can do that with men and women on the Democratic side. The ports, channels deepening, maintaining the locks on the Mississippi and the Ohio. Infrastructure, again, good-paying jobs.

Energy policy: I think I just talked about energy policy a moment ago. Put that oil and natural gas on American ships.

Labor: Good-paying jobs in the shipyards, good-paying jobs on the ships.

Education: The maritime academies provide the education that is necessary to do that.

Infrastructure: Freight movement, the ports, channels deepening, maintaining the locks on the Mississippi and the Ohio. Infrastructure, again, good-paying jobs.

We can do a lot. It takes laws and it takes men and women on the Democratic side and the Republican side that come together and say: We can do this. We can do this for America and for America’s workers.

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

WESTERN CAUCUS: WILDFIRES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members may have 5 legislative days in which to restate and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the topic of my Special Order.

On the forest management front, we must shift money from non-firefighting efforts to about 55 percent of the entire budget.

You would think that firefighting wouldn’t be the biggest line item in the agency’s annual budget. It is by far the biggest line item in the agency’s annual budget.

It is my hope that we can continue to bring more attention to wildfires that are burning across the West and the impacts they are having on our communities, and also that we can work together to advance policies that better support forest management and fire prevention and suppression efforts and forest health.

On the forest management front, we must shift money from non-firefighting efforts to about 55 percent of the entire budget.

Wildfire season is a part of life in the West, but this year’s fire season is shaping up to be the worst in history. Years of mismanagement of our national forests have led to conditions where fires are burning longer and hotter than ever before.

We need to address this problem on two fronts: one, through better forest management; and, two, by updating wildfire response so it is more in line with the Federal response to other natural disasters.

On the forest management front, we need to give the Forest Service the tools to engage in actual forest management. This means removing the dead and downed timber that serves as a fuel source for either man-made or naturally occurring fires, empowering local foresters and land managers to identify and designate areas of high risk, and supporting collaboration between all levels of government.

These principles are laid out in the Resilient Federal Forests Act by my colleague, Mr. WESTERMAN from Arkansas. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation.

We must also reform the Federal budgeting process for wildfire prevention and the suppression efforts. For too long, the process the Federal Government has used to allocate money to fight catastrophic wildfires has undermined forest management efforts that could prevent these types of fires from igniting in the first place.

Under current law, if firefighting costs exceed an agency’s budget, it must shift money from non-firefighting accounts to make up the difference.

Last year, the Forest Service had to transfer $700 million from other budgets to line items to cover firefighting costs, which brought the agency’s total firefighting efforts to about 55 percent of the entire budget.

You would think that firefighting wouldn’t be the biggest line item in the agency’s annual budget. It is by far the biggest line item in the agency’s annual budget.

It is my hope that we can continue to bring more attention to wildfires that are burning across the West and the impacts they are having on our communities, and also that we can work together to advance policies that better support forest management and fire prevention and suppression efforts and forest health.
the damage and to try to find a solution. The images I saw as I toured this fire were truly heartbreaking. Dozens of evacuated homes, burned homes, ruined forests, firefighters and volunteers who were working day and night to try to contain the fire, ash-filled lakes.

I thought about a helicopter to fly around the circumference of this fire. As I was flying around looking down, thinking about, among other things, the wildlife that had been devastated by this fire, I wondered: How can we help to recover from this, for this beautiful landscape to recover? And I can promise you this, it will not happen in my lifetime.

My family owns a ranch, and almost 70 years ago, we had a similar fire. You can still see the scars from that fire, which is several generations now.

One incident manager told me: “In 29 years of fighting fires, I have never seen a fire move so fast, burn so quickly and so hot that it could not be controlled or fought head-on.”

You have to wonder: Why is that? The answer is very unfortunate. It is due to mismanagement.

Current mismanagement—and it is mismanagement—has left our forests vulnerable to insects and disease that make for a ripe forest for catastrophic fires. These heavy-handed regulations paralyze forest managers so they can’t accomplish the critical tasks that are necessary for proper forest management.

This failure to treat high-risk areas and to remove hazardous buildup has left our land susceptible to fires that grow in size, severity, and cost.

So you have to ask yourself: What is the answer? How do we stop this? How do we stop it from happening again?

And the answer is really quite simple. Federal policies have contributed to recent catastrophic fires, and wildlife. The Order today begins with proper land management.

That is why I support Representative WESTERMAN’s bipartisan Resilient Federal Forests Act, which allows agencies to do this work so that we can prevent these catastrophic wildfires.

I look forward to the House passing this important legislation. Let us bring back the beauty of our forests. Let us bring back the health of our forests. Let us prevent these catastrophic fires that are occurring.

I thank Mr. Gosar for bringing this again to the floor.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Utah, who has seen the challenging aspects and destruction from the fires, for his remarks.

I also now want to acknowledge my friend from Montana, who is actually still seeing the ravaging of the fires. In fact, Seeley Lake, Montana, set a record for the worst air quality ever recorded there, 18 times greater than the EPA safe particulate limit. Wow, that is a record that we have got to stop.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE).

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for bringing the attention of the House to this important matter.

This summer, we had catastrophic wildfires in Montana. We burned 1.2 million acres. That is the equivalent of the size of the State of Delaware. I have seen this destruction firsthand. I visited with incident commanders and firefighters on five separate wildfires this summer.

In Lincoln County, the air quality was so unhealthy that teachers provided masks to the kids in school so they could breathe.

In August, I had Secretary Zinke and Secretary Perdue come to Montana and tour the Lolo Peak fire, one of the most expensive fires that was fought this summer.

I have worked to bring relief to Montana. In July, emergency relief for farmers and ranchers was provided by opening up the C.M. Russell recreation area to grazing. We had hungry cows left from pasture being consumed and grass available. It was a commonsense solution to put together.

Also in July, we successfully urged FEMA Director Brock Long to reconsider their denial of one of our fires and declare Montana eligible for emergency funds. For these two things, I am thankful.

So the negative impact has been severe. And while there has been some relief, including welcome rain and snow, we can’t rely on that. Again, this summer, over a million acres burned in Montana and two fire fighters; livelihoods were threatened; wildlife habitats were destroyed; smoke hung in the air; and ash rained down on our homes and our cars.

Air quality reached dangerous levels in our communities. In fact, Blue Cross Blue Shield of Montana donated 150 air filters to our schools so our children could breathe.

I have also seen firsthand the positive results of managed forests. Just 2 weeks ago, I toured a BLM forest near Miles City, Montana, and showed the effect of treating and managing forests. A fire burned in 2015 through a forest through the crowns, and when it reached a forest that had been managed, the fire quickly dropped into the undergrowth, burned through the grass, but none of the trees were lost.

In the untreated forest, there is just dead trees that won’t recover in our lifetime. In the treated area, all of the trees survived. In fact, when an overgrown forest is thinned, more surface water came back, there is better habitat for wildlife, and we just have a better result.

I saw that also on the Roaring Lion fire, which occurred in the Bitterroot Valley in 2016, where, there, private property owners had managed their private property. When the fire on public land reached there, it was quickly extinguished and hundreds of homes were saved.

So the benefits of properly managed forests are clear. We have healthier forests. There is more wildlife, more hunting, more recreational opportunities, more good-paying jobs, and wildfires are less severe.

One of the biggest problems we have is litigation. We need more collaborative projects, but litigation is one of the greatest problems. Parties come to the table in good faith, they work collaboratively only to be overturned by court action by radical environmental extremists.

The Stonewall Vegetation Project in Lincoln, Montana, is a good example. Here, the Forest Service worked together with local landowners over a 8-year period to develop a collaborative forest management project. Once it was approved a year ago, the lawyers swooped in, arguing the project would disrupt lynx habitat. The judge overturned the decision. Fires raged this summer. Now there is no more habitat for lynx, and all that carbon has been released into atmosphere.

Benefits of forest management are clear. As I have mentioned, healthier forests, more wildlife, more hunting, jobs, and less severe fires. It is time to act. We can’t control the weather, but we can control how we manage our forest. This is time to reform our forest management by passing BRUCE WESTERMAN’s Resilient Federal Forests Act, and we also must put commonsense guardrails on the Endangered Species Act to reduce frivolous lawsuits.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Montana, who I am sorry to see have such a hard time this year in forest management, for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCLINTOCK), my friend and colleague.

Mr. MCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman GOSAR of the Western Caucus for arranging this Special Order tonight and especially for his exemplary leadership as chairman of the Western Caucus.

The wildfire crisis facing our forests across the West comes down to a very simple adage. Excess timber comes out of the forest one way or the other. It is either carried out or it burns out, but it comes out.

When we carried out our excess timber, we had healthy resilient forests and we had thriving, prosperous communities. Excess timber sales from Federal lands not only generated revenues for our mountain communities, but created thousands of job.

But in the 1970s, we adopted laws like the National Environmental Policy Act and the Endangered Species Act that have resulted in endlessly time-consuming and cost-prohibitive restrictions and requirements that have made the scientific management of our forests virtually impossible.

Timber sales from our Federal lands has dropped 80 percent in the intervening years, with a concomitant increase in forest fires. In California alone, the number of saw mills has...
dropped from 149 in 1981 to just 27 today.

Timber that once had room to grow healthy and strong now fights for its life against other trees trying to occupy the same ground.

Averaged tree density in the Sierra Nevada is three to four times the density that the land can actually support. In this weakened condition, trees lose their natural defenses to drought and disease and pestilence, and they ultimately succumb to catastrophic wildfire.

Three years ago, an estimated 25 million trees in the Sierra fell victim to these stressors. Two years ago, that number doubled to 50 million trees. Last year, more than 100 million dead trees are now waiting to burn in the Sierra.

Well, after 45 years of experience with these environmental laws—all passed with the promise that they would improve our forest environment—here we are entitled to ask: How’s the forest environment doing?

All around us the answer is damming. These laws have not only failed to improve our forest environment, but they are literally killing our forests.

The same politicians responsible for these failed laws have recently jumbled up two new excuses. One is climate change. The other is that we are putting out too many fires.

Putting out too many fires?

That invites an important question: Exactly which fires did they propose that we allow to burn?

Perhaps the King fire that almost wiped out the towns of Georgetown and Foresthill on its way to Lake Tahoe in 2014?

Or maybe the Detwiler fire this year that almost wiped out the town of Mariposa on its way to the Yosemite Valley?

Or any one of the more than 1,000 fires in the Sierra that CAL FIRE has put out this year, any one of which could have grown into a megafire but for the vigilance and competence of our fire agencies?

Which of these fires would they allow to burn into a conflagration?

True, controlled burns play an important role in clearing out underbrush, but as firefighters bitterly complained to me at the command center at the Detwiler fire this year, these same laws make it impossible to get permits to do the controlled burns.

The other reason that we hear is climate change. Well, let’s put that to the smell test. Throughout our vast forests, it is often very easy to visually identify the property lines between well-managed private forests and the neglected Federal lands.

Now, I have seen it myself on aerial inspections. The private managed forests are green, healthy, and thriving. The neglected Federal forests are dense and crowded and often scarred by fire because we can’t even salvage the fire-killed timber while it still has value. You can literally tell from the condition of the forest where the property line is. How clever of our climatologists to know exactly what is the boundary line between private and government lands.

And if carbon dioxide is the problem, doesn’t it make sense to mill fully grown trees, sell the carbon and replace them with young, growing trees that absorb much higher levels of carbon?

But, again, these same laws prevent this.

This is not complicated. Our forests are catastrophically overgrown. Drought is a catalyst. It is not the cause. In overgrown forests, much snow evaporates in dense canopies and cannot reach the ground. The transpiration volume in an overgrown forest is a big problem in a normal rain year; in a drought, it becomes lethal.

Pestilence is a catalyst; it is not a cause. Healthy trees can naturally resist bark beetles; stressed trees cannot.

A properly managed forest matches the tree density to the ability of the land to support it, but we cannot properly manage forests because of the laws now in place.

Mr. WESTERMAN’s Resilient Federal Forests Act and other measures will re-store proper scientific management of our national forests, but we are running out of time to save.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank the gentleman for yielding today, I thank him for his leadership, and I thank him for arranging this hour tonight.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his thoughts. He brought up some specific facts that need reiteration just because they are so plentiful.

The Forest Service only harvested 2.5 billion board feet this year in Oregon at a cost of $678,000 acres, half a million acres. The carbon dioxide emitted during that fire amounted to almost one-quarter of the carbon dioxide emitted in the entire State of Oregon this year.

By the way, we have burned 678,000 acres this year in Oregon at a cost of more than $340 million to fight those fires, State, local, and Federal costs, mostly Federal.

Tomorrow, the Energy and Commerce Committee, on which I chair, will hold a hearing to take a look at the air impact of fires, in part because I have constituents who have seen that, in some cases, fires are not aggressively fought if they are in certain federally designated areas, wilderness areas. There is a temptation, apparently, to not use all our tools, and to instead let them burn. That doesn’t take into account what happens to air quality and the health of our citizens when fires are allowed to rage and burn.

So we will take a look at these issues involving air quality and pollutants emitted into the atmosphere and discuss how better management of our
forests could help prevent catastrophic fires and actually protect our airsheds and our health.

Each of us today faces a similar situation. Devastating fires ignite across the West as fuel loads build across our public lands. The Columbia River Gorge, where I grew up right near here, I can’t remember a time the freeway was closed as long as it was this year. We had two fires burning across the river to Washington to our good friends on Highway 14. All the freeway traffic was diverted there, and there is still one lane here that can’t pass, because now we are worried about mudslides and rockslides and trees coming down the hillsides.

We need to get back to positive, active management in our Federal forests.

Five years in a row, the U.S. House has enacted legislation, sent it over to the Senate, that would give our professional foresters, our scientists, the tools that they clamor for and need to better manage our forests and reduce the overloading of debris, of dead and dying trees, open up these stands to what they should be naturally, get back in balance with nature. Every year this goes over to the other body, and somehow it never comes back. That has to change.

So tonight, I thank my friend from Arizona who organized this. He knows what forest fires are like in Arizona. My colleague from Washington, my colleague from California, myself, our colleagues in Montana, we have dealt with this year after year after year. Now, more than half of the Forest Service budget is spent fighting fire. That is not what we should do as a matter of bad policy.

We need to change Federal policy. We need to let our scientists manage these forests, restore jobs to our forested communities, protect our airsheds, our watersheds, and get back in balance. So I commend my colleagues in the Western Caucus for moving this forward.

I just finished a very positive meeting with the Speaker of the House, who is committed to helping us on this matter. I look forward to us having the opportunity to vote on the Resilient Federal Forests bill and get our Senate colleagues on board as well.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman so greatly for his indulgence in coming down and expressing the problems that have been faced in Oregon and thank him for the timely hearing tomorrow in Energy and Commerce. We certainly appreciate it.

We need to enlighten all Americans as to the tragedy that is going on in our public Western lands.

Mr. WALDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSAR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I hope they will tune in tomorrow and watch the testimony at that hearing. I think they will get a better understanding of what the people in our districts have faced. For a month this summer, schools had to be closed, festivals canceled, people choking, going to the hospitals. This is serious stuff, and we need to address it.

Mr. GOSAR. I want to highlight one thing that the gentleman actually brought to attention. Catastrophic fires also cause significant damage to our environment. Robust data from NASA has concluded that one catastrophic wildfire can emit more carbon emissions in a few days than total vehicle emissions in an entire State over the course of the year. Phenomenal. We just have to make sure people understand.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. WALDEN. We appreciate it.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), my dear friend.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Arizona, my good friend, Mr. GOSAR, for holding this Special Order and for giving us the opportunity not only to address the House on this very important issue, but also to address our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this year alone, over 8 million acres have burned across our country. And get this: ten times that, another 80 million acres, are considered high risk to threat of catastrophic wildfires.

If this doesn’t amount to a national disaster, nothing does. If we don’t acknowledge that it does, this will only continue to devastate our rural communities across the Nation.

The previous speaker, my friend from Oregon, talked about the impact of the health to people living in these communities. I could attest to you myself, living in central Washington, we had smoke where the visibility was less than a quarter of a mile for weeks at a time. I knew people who had chronic coughs as a result of this smoke. Myself, get this: I had to come back to our Nation’s Capital for my cough to clear up over our August break. The air was that bad.

So, Mr. Speaker, this evening, as you have heard from my colleagues from across the Western United States, as we gather to draw attention to this devastation, to these catastrophic wildfires, what they pose to our communities, so States from Arkansas to Arizona, from Colorado to California, Montana to New Mexico, from Wyoming, from Oregon, to the great State of Washington, we are here to stress the importance of addressing the broken funding systems as well as the lack of resources that are necessary to adequately prevent and then suppress and fight these wildfires.

So we gather to highlight the dire need to reform the mismanagement of our Federal forests, which leads to the exacerbation of this devastation. Mr. Speaker, we gather to give voice to our often forgotten communities and our constituents.

Now, you have heard these Special Orders before. We hope this Congress take action to try and protect and become good stewards of our national forest land, but this picture tells you what we faced. The Columbia Gorge, where I grew up right near here, I can’t remember a time the freeway was closed as long as it was this year. We had two fires burning across the river to Washington to our good friends on Highway 14. All the freeway traffic was diverted there, and...
So this evening, I rise in support and urge support of two provisions originating right here in Congress, the people's House, to address these issues.

First of all, H.R. 2936, the Resilient Federal Forests Act, which is sponsored by my good friend from the State of Arkansas, Mr. WESTERMAN, which addresses the disastrous consequences of catastrophic wildfires by utilizing tools the Forest Service and other agencies can use to reduce the threats that are posed by wildfires, by diseases, by overgrowth, and dangerous old forest overgrowth that serve as a tinderbox for wildfires.

This legislation would enable the necessary management techniques to address our forest health crises and significantly improve the resiliency of our Nation's forests.

On top of that, H.R. 167, the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act, which is sponsored by my good friend and colleague from Idaho, Mr. SIMPSON, fixes the way that the Forest Service and other agencies are forced to borrow funding from accounts outside of their fire fighting in order to address these fire suppression costs. This has become known as fire borrowing. This tool was intended to be an extraordinary measure, but in the past 8 of the last 12 years, the Forest Service has had to move money from other operating accounts to fight these fires.

Mr. Speaker, this problem is systemic, it is dire, and we must address it.

The Wildfire Disaster Funding Act is a necessary solution to solve the crisis.

Mr. Speaker, the fourth district of the State of Washington, which I am proud to call my home, has been devastated by wildfires in recent years, from the Carlton Complex Fire of 2014, which at the time was the largest in State history, to the Okanagan Complex Fire, which only the next year surpassed that record. In addition to that, we lost three firefighters in the process.

Our communities know what it means to live with the overwhelming consequences of continual disastrous wildfires year after year after year, and it doesn't have to be this way. We can solve this problem.

My colleagues and I gather tonight to shed light on this problem and to offer solutions and to let our constituents know that we will not give up in this effort.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. Speaker, the two speakers have now brought up the issue that the House has repeatedly passed resolutions and ideas in regards to funding and taking care and mitigating our forest tragedy. There is an old adage around here that the Democrats may be the opposition, but the Senate is always the enemy. What we are here to do is light a fire under the Senate. Their talk is cheap; their actions speak. So let's light a fire.

To do that, I now yield to the gentleman whose Resilient Federal Forests Act is the topic for this evening, H.R. 2936.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) for his leadership in setting up this Special Order on the importance of proper forest management, proper forest management on our Nation's Federal lands. I would also like to thank him for his unwavering support of my bill, H.R. 2936, the Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2017.

It is my sincere hope that we see H.R. 2936 move off the floor of the House with strong bipartisan support and then move through the Senate and get it on the President's desk so he can sign this and we can start the process of reversing something that has been going on for years.

As a person educated in forestry, I can tell you that forests grow slowly. We almost don't recognize the change in the forest because it happens so slowly. But given enough years, we see what has happened to our timberland out West. I have a map here of all the forest fires that we have seen out West this summer.

We didn't just get to this point overnight. It has happened over a series of years. It happened when, back in the 1990s, I believe, we had an overreaction to probably some forest management practices that weren't the best that they could be. The pendulum swung way too far, and we got in a position where, what I say is, we were loving our trees to death, and we stopped managing our trees.

But we kept putting fires out, and fire is returning. Fire is returned to manage overgrown forests. So what we have seen happen over time is we have seen more insects and disease infestations. As these trees grow closer together and fill the growing space, they start competing for water; they start competing for sunlight; they compete for nutrients; they become weak, and they become susceptible to insect attacks; they become susceptible to disease; and then they die. We get lightning strikes or we get fires-started, and then we are dealing with a catastrophic event.

But it doesn't have to be this way. If we would employ sound forest management practices, we can do a lot to mitigate the intensity and the number of these fires.

As we look at issues that are created with these fires, we know that this has been the worst fire season on record, but it broke the record that was set in 2013 as the worst fire season on record. I predict that if we don't start managing our forests now, in the next coming years we are going to see new worst fire seasons on record.

This is a process that will continue to get worse unless we address the problem. It is to the point where it is going to take time to reverse what has happened and to get the forest back into a healthy state.

I notified this week about a sheep farmer down here in southeast Wyoming, in Torrington, who was a young guy getting into the business, and he lost five sheep. He took them to the veterinarian to do a postmortem analysis and found out they died from smoke inhalation.

Now, the fire that was creating the smoke that was drifting down there was about 800 miles away in Montana. If it is causing that kind of health risk to sheep, what is it doing to the residents that live out here? I know that there have been schools closed, there have been people who have to stay indoors, but this creates a health risk. It is more than just a risk to healthy forests. It is a risk to healthy humans.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), and this shows the smoke drift on a particular day. I believe this was September 14. This is a map that was produced by NOAA, and you can see where the fires were, and you can see how the wind carried the smoke. This shows the most intense areas of smoke, the lighter green the intermediate, and then the darker green shows where the least smoke intensity was.

This map really illustrates how fires in certain areas, the smoke gets picked up by the wind and gets carried to different places across the country.

When I look at this map of the Western United States—and me being from Arkansas, some might ask: How do these fires affect forestry in Arkansas?

Well, we have talked about fire borrowing. When we take money from one account in the Forest Service budget and put it in the firefighting account, that takes money away from management practices because it places a greater emphasis on the forest in Arkansas and other places to the east where we don't have as many catastrophic fires. On top of that, we see how the smoke drift affects many, many parts of the country.

When we think about the smoke, what is that smoke? It is mainly carbon. One of the main purposes of a healthy forest is to fulfill the cycle of photosynthesis, where it pulls carbon dioxide out of the atmosphere, takes it through the leaves, converts it into sugars, and releases oxygen back into the air. The forests clean the air except when they are burning at the rate that they are burning right now, at 8.5 million acres of our Federal timberland that went up in smoke, putting hundreds of millions tons of tons of carbon into the atmosphere. If we want to talk about taking carbon out of the atmosphere, the solution to that is a healthy forest.

But not only do forests clean the atmosphere, they clean the water. The more ground cover we have, the more water gets filtered as it goes into the ground, as it goes into streams.
But overstocked forests can also prevent water from actually getting into the ground table and getting into streams. In areas in the West where we are having water shortage problems, proper management of forests can help to alleviate those problems.

We are not talking about clear-cutting. I get so tired of people saying, “All they want to do is clear-cut our Federal forests.” We don’t want to clear-cut the Federal forests. We want to manage them. We want to use practices from below, where we take out small stock, where we take out the smaller trees. Some of it is merchantable; some of it is not. We can produce timber that can be used in the rural areas where it is grown to help the economies out there.

But the end goal is to have a healthy forest with larger trees spaced further apart without all the fuel ladders going down to the ground so that, when a fire moves through these areas, it burns at a low intensity through the ground. And guess what. That creates great wildlife habitats when we do that.

There are so many benefits of having a healthy forest, and as a forester, a forester who was trained at a school that was started by Gifford Pinchot, who is the father, along with Teddy Roosevelt, of our Federal forests, it is embarrassing to me what has happened to our Federal lands across this country.

Roosevelt and Pinchot talked about conservation. They talked about leaving our resources in better shape than we found them in. Right now, we are not doing that. We are allowing the lack of management to destroy these resources for future generations. We are allowing the lack of management to emit hundreds of millions of tons of carbon into the atmosphere and also take that vegetation away that provides wildlife habitat, that provides a filter for our water, and that provides timber that is pulling carbon out of the atmosphere.

We can do better than this. We have provisions in the Resilient Federal Forests Act to allow the Forest Service to actually manage the timber. We require them to do a no-management analysis, because when you look at the dynamic nature of a forest, if you say, “We are not going to do anything,” well, you just made a management decision.

Again, the trees are living, growing organisms. Even though the Forest Service says, “We are not managing it,” they are going to continue to grow. They are going to fill the growing space. If we continue to suppress fire, the fuel load is going to get worse, and we are going to have more and more forests subject to catastrophic wildfire of, I believe it is, 192 million acres of Federal timberland in this country. About 80 million acres right now, according to the Forest Service, is subject to catastrophic wildfire.

It is time to act. We have waited too long, and the problem continues to get worse. It will continue to get more severe as time moves on if we don’t start intervening now.

Mr. GOSAR. I want to again thank you for putting this together, for the efforts that you are putting forth so that we have a sufficient chance to make not only our air cleaner by not having all these catastrophic wildfires, but to conserve our forests so that they are healthy, so that they are functioning in the way that they should be.

And guess what. That creates great wildlife habitats when we do that.

Listen, folks, I made a comment. Around here in Washington, D.C., we talk about the Democrats being the opposition and the Senate being the problem. Well, as you know, this is a very bipartisan bill. He is very modest.

Let’s go back to what H.R. 2936, the Resilient Federal Forests Act, actually does.

It allows for the streamlined review of projects up to 30,000 acres if the timber management strategy is put forward by all collaborative stakeholders. Imagine that, something so simple.

It also requires litigants opposing active management projects to propose an alternative proposal as opposed to just saying “no.” “No” isn’t a solution. It is what you are for.

It removes incentives for extreme special interest groups to file frivolous lawsuits—boy, once again, coming to the table with a solution.

It empowers local stakeholders and decisionmakers. So often we overlook the people on the ground, on Main Street, who have to live with the consequences for bad policy decisions.

It also empowers Tribal communities to be part of the solution and to help reduce the risk of wildfire. We see this time and again, that the Native Tribes that are in charge of their forests have pristinely management practices.

H.R. 2936 also maintains current protections for our environmentally sensitive areas, including wilderness and roadless areas. What a concession.

We need to be clear about larger risk areas and get to these in a more timely manner that we really want to handle. This bill is good for forest-dependent species as it allows for improvements to their habitat.

This bill adopts a forward-thinking, active management strategy that combats dangerous wildfires before they get started, which includes reforms that would end the practice of fire borrowing.

I want to thank the gentleman for his excellent piece of legislation. It is time that it moves forward.

Once again, it is not the House that is the problem, but our colleagues across the street. Once again, talk is cheap; actions speak. Americans need help.

The fact that these disasters are quite natural might lead one to think they are inevitable, but according to federal officials and experts, it is our standard Federal forest management and underfunded and misallocated Forest Service accounts that are to blame.

Our system is broken. These fires start naturally and decimate our natural ecosystems, but the ultimate cause at the level of their severity and recurrence is manmade.

The facts about the relationship between management and wildfires speak for themselves. Forest Service data indicates that active forest management reduces wildfire intensity, while improving forest health. In spite of this, only 1 to 2 percent of high risk areas are actively treated and subject to forest management.

The United States Forest Service expends too many resources fighting fires after they break out to work to prevent them in any significant way before they start. By doing routine thinning, culling hazardous fuels on the forest floors, and conducting controlled burns, they could accomplish exactly that, but such a course of action would require ample resources and wildfire prevention, which, you would guess, my professional diagnosis is that both of those are in short supply.

I hope my friends on the other side of the aisle are able to hear what I say next. If you care about carbon emissions, you should care deeply about this issue, no matter where you live in the country, no matter where you live.

NASA data shows that one wildfire can emit more carbon in a few days than total vehicle emissions in a State for the whole year. To put it in perspective, controlled burning reduces roughly 10 percent as much, and is only one part of an overall active management strategy.

So the correct choice in this situation is obvious: we spend a little more on the front end so that we can save ourselves much of the economic, environmental, and familial displacement costs on the back end. These costs are year after year, and they are catastrophic when they are left untreated. The treatment is the right course of action, but it requires a little bit of planning, due diligence, and yes, action on our part. I know Congress is a big fan of the word, but when you look at the track record, Congress isn’t a big fan of actually acting.

In response to this dire situation, Members of Congress from across the country will be sharing their thoughts and experiences within their home States. They will be discussing this during the year, and this past year of catastrophic wildfires. These are stories that need to be recounted.

They will also be speaking about the solutions that we have come together
with, for forestry officials and stakeholders across the country. Tackling this problem has become a collaborative and holistic national policy effort, and the policy proposals we have produced are reflective of this fact. They are also bipartisan.

But Mr. Speaker, we can’t let this just be a rhetorical exercise. We are united in demanding Congress do something. This Chamber has the knowledge and aptitude to deliver policy solutions. Now we need the political will to turn knowledge into congressional action. Only then will huge portions of the country finally see some relief from these disasters.

When your home is on fire, it is straightforward, it is a nonpartisan issue. You call the fire department, and after the problem is dealt with, you make sure that you eliminate what caused the fire so that you don’t see it again.

Speaker, our Nation was on fire this year, and I demand that we, as this Chamber, unite in the same spirit of decisive problem solving as we do for our natural disasters. Let’s put these fires out, and then let’s stop the brunt for next year’s fires before they start.

In my four terms as a Congressman from Arizona, I have had to witness the largest catastrophic fire in Arizona history, and also the most catastrophic life-taking, the Yarnell fire. The first was the Wild Well fire in northeast Arizona, and now was the Yarnell fire that is now in the movie theaters that took the lives of 19 firefighters. That is a travesty.

This is something that gives when it is managed right. The people back home know the right answer. Let’s give them the tools, the working power, and the policy that allows them, instead of being victims, to be stalwart solutions for a policy that gives back.

As the gentleman from Arkansas said, as Teddy Roosevelt said: Leave our natural resources better than we found them.
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to her legacy. One of the things that everyone loves to quote is Ms. Hamer’s words that she is “sick and tired of being sick and tired.” Well, that goes a long way, especially given the administration we are being challenged with here in Washington now. Hopefully, Ms. Hamer’s spirit will live on.

Congresswoman KAREN BASS and myself visited Ms. Hamer’s grave this past Saturday in Ruleville, Mississippi, and it was very touching. The community, in her death, has really embraced not only the fact that her husband, Pat, and created a monument downtown Ruleville to her memory.

When I was a freshman Member of this body, I named the post office in Ruleville, Mississippi, after Ms. Hamer, and I am happy to say that the mayor of Ruleville, Mississippi, now is an African-American female.

So Ms. Hamer’s legacy, her involvement with SNCC, her involvement with the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, all those things have made not just Mississippi, but this country a better place—affordable housing, all those things that she wanted, access to not only healthcare, but access to affordable healthcare, many of those items that she talked about.

As a Christian woman, she believed in nonviolence, but she also believed in direct action. She was assaulted in the Winona, Mississippi, jail for advocating the right to vote.

In spite of what she encountered, she served as a shining example of what a truly committed individual can accomplish.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I did not ever have the pleasure and honor of meeting her in person, but I remember watching television during that Democratic National Convention, which was taking place in my home State in the great city of Atlantic City.

I remember the conscious bearing energy that evolved around all of that activity, and it made me very proud. And I would say that, indeed, Fannie Lou Hamer’s work has not gone, has not been in vain. But she also is smiling down knowing that what she started, you are continuing on, and that you are serving in the very district that she loved enough to fight for way back when.

It is my honor to know you, and to know that you have been touched by her. So that means that with less than 6 degrees of separation, I have been touched by her, and that is my blessing.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say to the gentlewoman that that 1964 Atlantic City Democratic National Convention set the tone for opening up the Democratic Party to people of all races and colors because Mrs. Hamer challenged the all-White makeup of the Mississippi delegation by saying Black people couldn’t participate. They were systematically excluded from the selection process, and that appealed to that convention to do better.

I am happy, as you know, to report that the convention heard Mrs. Hamer and decided that an all-White delegation from the State with the highest percentage of African Americans in the country could not be justified. So the delegation was not only integrated at the convention, but, for a time, we shared the chairmanships of the party. We had a co-chair that was White and a co-chair that was African American. So Mrs. Hamer’s spirit still lives on.

One of the real issues that really touches most of our hearts is that she was a very humble person. She had the kind of spirit in her delivery that you had to stop and pay attention to. She had the aura when she walked in a room that whatever you were doing, you had to stop and pay attention to this very simple person who came in. But every time she opened her mouth, something very prophetically would come out.

So for a lot of individuals who think that Fannie Lou Hamer’s time has come and gone, I think it is fitting and proper that at this 100th birthday celebration, we recommit ourselves to many of the things that Mrs. Hamer stood for: inclusion; not leaving people out because they don’t live in the big house on the hill; to make sure that our children receive the best education possible. All of those things Mrs. Hamer was noted for.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I think it is vitally important on this 100th anniversary of Ms. Hamer’s birth to also recognize that we have to stop and pay attention to this very simple person who came in. But every time she opened her mouth, something very prophetically would come out.

In closing for me, I want to just say that I thank the gentleman so very much for doing this because I know that there are people who listen to these moments of Special Orders hours on C-SPAN, or catch it in some other form. It is important for our communities to recognize just how significant this woman’s role was in ensuring that they have the access to the things that they have access to today, and to demand their right to vote, and to exercise that right to vote every chance they get.

I am very grateful for the gentleman carrying this message this evening.
gentlewoman has some closing comments or something she would like to add, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just like to note that there was an amazing demonstration of people in front of the Supreme Court demanding that we do something about gerrymandering because that is another way of negatively impacting the impact of one and one vote.

So it is, again, fitting to be honoring this woman who gave her life’s work to ensuring that everybody who was eligible to vote was given the right to vote; to eliminate any obstacles that were placed in their way so that we could open up opportunities to elect people who would be fair in the policies that are important; to ensure that there is equality of opportunity in this country for all people, predicated upon their ability to think and use their willingness to work hard, therefore, the content of their character versus the color of their skin. So it is indeed an honor to have shared this moment with you. Thank you for the invitation.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Thank you very much Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN for your participation.

The last point I would like to make is, in Mrs. Hamer’s day, it was poll tax. It was: How many bubbles are in a bar of soap? How many grains of sand are on the beach?

Now it is moving the polls in the interest of saving money, but you are disenfranchising people who don’t have the ability to go further. It is the gerrymandering of districts so that you have the richest people in an area in the same district as the poorest people in that area. There are no real communities of interest.

If I am worried about paying the light bill or the rent, or the electricity or the water bill, then there is a great possibility that I won’t go vote. But if I own a house and own a car and know where my next meal is coming from, I will go vote. So we have what we call communities of interest, and Mrs. Hamer talked about that.

So, again, we wanted to make sure that this week did not go by without giving Mrs. Hamer her due recognition for her 100th birthday. There will be a lot of other activities after this Special Order, but, I yield to the memory of Mrs. Hamer.

We have a movie that will be produced talking about her life and legacy and her contribution to this great country of ours. I look forward to that as well as making sure that our children and grandchildren understand who this great woman was and what she meant to this country of ours and so many of us who pattern after her. So, again, thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to President Trump’s lack of concern for the thousands of Americans affected by the hurricanes throughout the U.S. and most recently in the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, which has reminded us of the devastation Hurricane Katrina caused. Instead of showing compassion to those suffering, the president and his administration have condemned African-American athletes and a Black, female sports commentator for exercising their constitutional right to protest and voice their opinions.

Today, I stand with the athletes who choose to take a knee during the national anthem and those who speak out fighting against racial inequality that still persists throughout this country.

I suggest President Trump spends less time tweeting about his legal troubles and more time focusing on the issues of our country.

Tonight, I recognize a civil rights hero whose work is no small part of the reason I and many other African-American members of Congress are able to stand before you today. Ms. Fannie Lou Hamer was born in 1917 in Montgomery County, Mississippi. During the civil rights era, Ms. Hamer, at the age of just 6-years-old joined her family picking cotton on the plantation of W.D. Marlow in Sunflower County, Mississippi.

Though, she began to pick cotton at a young age, Ms. Hamer was able to complete many years in school learning how to read and write, which helped her serve hundreds of African-Americans throughout her life.

In the 1960s, Ms. Hamer joined the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, an organization committed to the opportunity to register to vote. Ms. Hamer taught Black Mississippians how to read and write in order for them to pass discriminatory literacy tests designed to prevent Black Americans from registering to vote.

In 1962, Ms. Hamer along with 17 Black Mississippians traveled by bus from Ruleville, Mississippi, to Indianaola, Mississippi, to register to vote. Upon arrival, the group was blocked from entry by local law enforcement. But, Ms. Hamer and one of her fellow travelers were able to fill out a voter application and take the literacy test, but due to discrimination the two were unable to register. This did not deter Ms. Hamer’s passion and willingness to fight racism throughout Mississippi.

On the group’s way back to Ruleville, the bus was stopped by local police officers and the driver was arrested. In that very moment of racism and trial, Ms. Hamer began to sing Negro spirituals leaving a clear message to her oppressors that she would never give up.

Her leadership was a beacon of hope for so many Black Mississippians that in 1964, Ms. Hamer ran for Congress to represent Mississippi’s Second Congressional District as a Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party candidate, a party which she founded to promote equal rights for African-Americans in Mississippi.

During the 1960s, very few women especially women of color threw their hat into the ring for a Congressional bid. Her willingness to run in Mississippi at that time was and continues to be a powerful act in itself. Though she was unsuccessful, her speeches, messages and visits to African-Americans around the state resonated.

Ms. Hamer provided inspiration for me to work for the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, while I attended Tougaloo College continuing Ms. Hamer’s work to get African-Americans across Mississippi registered to vote. I remember volunteering for Ms. Hamer’s Congressional campaign and getting inspired to serve the people of Mississippi. Today, I represent Mississippi’s Second Congressional District, and I cannot help but think that Ms. Hamer is smiling down on me. Her courage and brilliance is one of the reasons I stand on this floor today.

I am honored to be able to give time to honor a legend and civil rights icon. Ms. Fannie Lou Hamer’s legacy will forever live on, and I stand here today along with my colleagues to pay homage to a true hero.

THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.
The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles:

August 2, 2017:
H.R. 3841. An Act to provide congressional review and to counter aggression by the Governments of Iran, the Russian Federation, and North Korea, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3298. An Act to authorize the Capitol Police Board to make payments from the United States Capitol Police Memorial Fund to employees of the United States Capitol Police who have sustained serious line-of-duty injuries, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2210. An Act to designate the community living center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Butler Township, Butler County, Pennsylvania, as the “Sergeant Joseph George Kusick VA Community Living Center”.

H.R. 2218. An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

August 16, 2017:
H.R. 374. An Act to remove the sunset provision of section 203 of Public Law 105-384, and for other purposes.

H.R. 510. An Act to establish a system for integration of Rapid DNA instruments for use by law enforcement to reduce violent crime and reduce the current DNA analysis backlog.

H.R. 873. An Act to authorize the Global War on Terror Memorial Foundation to establish the National Global War on Terrorism Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

August 17, 2017:
H.R. 2430. An Act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs, medical devices, generic drugs, and biologics and biological products, and for other purposes.

August 22, 2017:
H.J. Res. 76. A joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress for the Commonwealth of Virginia, the State of Maryland, and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact relating to the establishment of the Washington Metrorail Safety Commission.

H.R. 339. An Act to amend Public Law 94-241 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands.

August 23, 2017:
H.R. 2298. An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first, second, and third quarters of 2017, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem 1</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Bill Huizenga</td>
<td>9/14</td>
<td>9/16</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>799.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>799.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jeff Duncan</td>
<td>9/14</td>
<td>9/16</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>799.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>799.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Greg Walden</td>
<td>9/14</td>
<td>9/16</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>799.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>799.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raed Hallad</td>
<td>9/14</td>
<td>9/16</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>799.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>799.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

September 8, 2017:
H.R. 601. An Act making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes.

September 12, 2017:
H.R. 3732. An Act to amend section 1113 of the Social Security Act to provide authority for increased fiscal year 2017 and 2018 payments for temporary assistance to United States citizens returned from foreign countries.

September 15, 2017:
H.R. 624. An Act to restrict the inclusion of social security account numbers on Federal documents sent by mail, and for other purposes.

September 27, 2017:

September 29, 2017:
H.R. 3819. An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring provisions of law administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3823. An Act to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to provide disaster tax relief, and for other purposes.

SENIOR BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 396. An act to make technical amendments to certain marine fish conservation statutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on September 28, 2017, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3819. To amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring provisions of law administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.
**REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO CANADA, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 14 AND SEPT. 16, 2017—Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
3 Military air transportation.

**HON. BILL HUIZENGA, Sept. 26, 2017.**

**REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO CHILE, PERU, AND GUATEMALA, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 15 AND SEPT. 22, 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
3 Military air transportation.

**HON. PETER J. ROSKAM, Sept. 26, 2017.**

**REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

**HON. WILL BHUISEN, Chairman, Sept. 15, 2017.**

**REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUN. 30, 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
3 Military air transportation.
EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2744. A letter from the Acting Director, Program Development and Regulation Analysis, Rural Utilities Service, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Water and Wastewater Loans and Grants (RIN: 0572-AF1) received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2745. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRDL, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department’s interim final rule — Establishment of TRICARE Select and Other TRICARE Reforms (Docket ID: DOD-2017-HA-0039) (RIN: 0720-AB70) received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2746. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2016 report on mining activities, pursuant to the Mine Improvement and New Emergency Response Act of 2006; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.


2748. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s direct final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Refrigerant Management Regulations for Small Cans of Motor Vehicle Refrigerant (EPA-HQ-OAR-2017-0213; FRL-9988-68-OAR) (RIN: 2060-AT43) received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2749. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Oxathiyipirin: Pesticide Tolerance (EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0049; FRL-9966-68) received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2750. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Interstate Transport of

2751. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the AGENCY’s final rule — Fluoxastin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0577; FRL-9966-59] received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2752. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the AGENCY’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Removal of Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) Trading Programs [EPA-R02-OAR-2017-0029] (RIN: 2060-AH111) received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2759. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the AGENCY’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Revisions to Ozone Offset Requirements in Davis and Salt Lake Counties [EPA-R08-OAR-2016-0001; Region 8] received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2760. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the AGENCY’s direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Nonattainment New Source Review Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2017-0398; FRL-9966-51-Region 3] received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2766. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s final rule — 340B Drug Pricing Program Ceiling Price and Manufacturer Civil Monetary Penalties Regulation (RIN: 0906-AB11) received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2770. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the AGENCY’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New York; Regional Haze Five-Year Progress Report State Implementation Plan [EPA-R02-OAR-2015-0498; (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s final rule — 40 CFR Part 66—National Primary and Secondary Ambient Air Quality Standards; State of Florida [EPA-R08-OAR-2017-0163; FRL-9966-60] received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2771. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the AGENCY’s direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New York; Regional Haze Five-Year Progress Report State Implementation Plan [EPA-R02-OAR-2015-0498; (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Prohibition Against Certain Flights in Damascus (OSITT) Flight Information Region (FIR) [Docket No.: FAA-2016-2911; Amendment No. 9-A75] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2773. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the AGENCY’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Enhanced Monitoring; California [EPA-R08-OAR-2017-0411; FRL-9966-61] received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2775. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the AGENCY’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Enhanced Monitoring; Washington [EPA-R08-OAR-2017-0562; Region 10] received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2776. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the AGENCY’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Enhanced Monitoring; Arizona [EPA-R08-OAR-2017-0562; Region 9] received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2778. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the AGENCY’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Enhanced Monitoring; California [EPA-R08-OAR-2017-0411; FRL-9966-61] received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2789. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the AGENCY’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Enhanced Monitoring; California [EPA-R08-OAR-2017-0411; FRL-9966-61] received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2790. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the AGENCY’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Enhanced Monitoring; California [EPA-R08-OAR-2017-0411; FRL-9966-61] received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2791. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the AGENCY’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Enhanced Monitoring; California [EPA-R08-OAR-2017-0411; FRL-9966-61] received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WOODALL. Committee on Rules.
House Resolution 553. Resolution providing for

for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the annual revenue and expenditure levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027 (Rept. 115-389). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. McKinley (for himself, Mr. Welch, Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania, Mr. Ro Khanna, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Ms. Kaptur, Mr. Ryan of Ohio, Mr. Yarmuth, Mr. Michael F. Doyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Mr. Norcross, Mr. Mooney of West Virginia, Mr. Jenkins of West Virginia, Mr. Johnson of Ohio, and Mrs. Bustos):

H.R. 3913. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to transfer certain funds to the 1974 Mine Workers of America Pension Plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. Marshall, Ms. Jenkins of Kansas, and Mr. Yoder:

H.R. 3914. A bill to remove the limitation imposed by section 521 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act of 1991 on the use of funds of the Land and Water Conservation Fund on the conversion of Lake Afton Park in Sedgwick County, Kansas, to a use other than public outdoor recreation; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. Lucas (for himself and Mr. Heck):

H.R. 3915. A bill to clarify membership requirements for the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. Biggs (for himself, Mr. LaMalfa, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Costa, and Mr. Valadao):

H.R. 3916. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to vest in the Secretary of the Interior functions under that Act with respect to species of fish that spawn in fresh or estuarine waters and migrate to ocean waters, and species of fish that spawn in ocean waters and migrate to fresh waters; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. Mullen (for himself and Mr. Hurd):

H.R. 3917. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend funding for the special diabetes program for Indians; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. Courtney (for himself, Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania, Ms. Blunt Rochester, Ms. DeLauro, Mr. Donaldson, Mr. Evans, Mr. Fitzpatrick, Mr. Himes, Mr. Lance, Mr. McKinley, Mr. Pallone, Mr. Pascrell, Mr. Payne, Mr. Ryan of Ohio, Mr. Sires, Mrs. Watson Coleman, Mr. LoBono, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Ms. Esty of Connecticut, and Mr. Soto):

H.R. 3918. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend public safety officers’ death benefits to fire police officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. Black (for herself and Mr. Thompson of California):

H.R. 3919. A bill to streamline the employer reporting process and strengthen the eligibility verification process for the premium assistance tax credit and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, 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. G. K. Butterfield:

H.R. 3920. A bill to establish a Medicare demonstration program on the use of third-party interest-free payment arrangements to reduce Medicare hospital part A bad debt claims; 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 Mr. Burgess:

H.R. 3921. A bill to extend funding for the Children’s Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Washington (for himself, Ms. Blumenauer, Ms. Judy Chu of California, Mr. Cicilline, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Cummings, Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois, Mr. Eshoo, Mr. Espallardo, Mr. Foster, Mr. Gallego, Mr. Gutierrez, Ms. Hanabusa, Ms. Jackson Lee, Mr. Jeffries, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Mr. kidney, Mr. Lawrence of Massachusetts, Mr. Lee, Mr. Lofgren, Mr. McGovern, Ms. Moore, Mr. Nadler, Mr. Norton, Mr. Payne, Mr. Quigley, Mr. Raskin, Ms. Batchock Fleming, Mr. Schakowsky, Mr. Veasey, Mr. Maxine Waters of California, Mr. Watson Coleman, Mr. Polis, Mr. Del Bueno, Mr. Mrs. Barragan, Miss Rice of New York, Mr. Gomez, Ms. Pinzler, Mrs. Napolitano, Mr. Lewis of Georgia, Ms. McCollum, Mr. Doggett, Mr. Serrano, and Mr. Geilalva):

H.R. 3922. A bill to provide standards for facilities at which aliens in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security are detained, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Mrs. Brooks of Indiana (for herself, Ms. Degette, and Mr. Reed):

H.R. 3923. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend funding for the special diabetes program for type 1 diabetes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Mrs. Brooks of Indiana (for herself, Ms. DeGette, and Mr. Reed):

H.R. 3924. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code by providing a tax credit to Patriot employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. Bilirakis (for himself and Ms. Stefanick):

H.R. 3926. A bill to provide for an extension for community health centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. Bilirakis:

H.R. 3927. A bill to amend title XXI to allow for the blending of risk pools of children’s health insurance buy-in programs with the risk pools of State child health insurance programs for such purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. Bucshon (for himself and Mr. David Scott of Georgia):

H.R. 3928. A bill to ensure that patients reconstitute programs to improve access to quality health care and to protect the purchasing power and purchasing power of patients; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. Courtney (for himself and Mr. Wilson):

H.R. 3929. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to carry out a program to provide payments to communities near a nuclear power plant that has ceased generating electricity and that stores spent nuclear fuel onsite is located, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. Jackson Lee (for herself, Mr. O’Rourke, Ms. Vela, Mr. Nadler, Mr. Krishnamoorthi, Mr. Veasey, Ms. Sheila Jackson Lee of Texas, Mr. Gene Green of Texas, Mr. Castro of Texas, Mr. Richmond, Mr. Alan Green of Texas, Ms. Eddie Burke of Virginia, Ms. Johnson of Texas, Ms. C Aurelia of Alabama, and Mr. C. Aurelia of Alabama):

H.R. 3930. A bill to establish the Office of Hurricane Harvey Small Business Recovery Grants in the Small Business Administration to compensate certain small business concerns for substantial economic injury suffered by the result of Hurricane Harvey in August 2017; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. Lance (for himself and Ms. Matsui):

H.R. 3931. A bill to increase the number of States that may conduct Medicaid demonstration programs to improve access to community mental health services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. Lance of South Carolina, Ms. Sánchez-González-Colón of Puerto Rico:

H.R. 3932. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to provide for increased Puerto Rico grants under such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. Renacci (for himself and Mr. Kildee):

H.R. 3933. A bill to establish and reinstate certain reporting requirements regarding efforts to recruit, hire, and retain health care professionals for the Department of Health and Human Services; to the Administration; to the Veterans on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. Rohrabacher (for himself, Mr. Duncan of South Carolina, Mr. Jones, Mr. Bilirakis, Mr. Massie, Mr. Broeks of Alabama, Mr. Conway, and Mr. Carnahan):

H.R. 3934. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to exclude from creditable
wages and self-employment income wages earned for services by aliens illegally performed in the United States and self-employment income wages earned for services by aliens illegally performed in the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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. McKinley:
H.R. 3913.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. Estes of Kansas:
H.R. 3914.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution states that Congress shall have the power "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution states that Congress shall have the 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 Office thereof."

By Mr. Calvert:
H.R. 3916.
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 and clause 18.

By Mr. Mullin:
H.R. 3917.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. LANCE:
H.R. 3919.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Constitution which states the Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imports, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. LANCE:
H.R. 3923.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Constitution which states the Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imports, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. LANCE:
H.R. 3927.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Constitution which states the Congress shall have the 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 Office thereof.

By Mr. LANCE:
H.R. 3935.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the United States Constitution which states, "(t)he 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." Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Constitution which states the Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imports, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. Renacci:
H.R. 3939.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18. 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 Office thereof.

By Mr. Rohrabacher:
H.R. 3944.
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 Ms. Maxine Waters of California:
H.R. 3956.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 and Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 102: Mr. Raskin.
H.R. 163: Mr. Raskin.
H.R. 113: Mr. Wittman, Mr. Vargas, Mr. Pascrell, Ms. Wilson of Florida, and Mr. Pelmutter.
H.R. 173: Mr. Smith of Washington, Mr. Ben Ray Lujan of New Mexico, and Mr. Moulton.
H.R. 184: Mr. Norman.
H.R. 233: Mr. Newhouse, Mr. Crist, and Ms. Besen.
H.R. 392: Mrs. Torres, Mr. Poliquin, and Mr. Gene Green of Texas.
H.R. 431: Mr. Norman.
H.R. 445: Mr. Blumenauer.
H.R. 502: Mr. Donovan, Mr. Vargas, Mrs. Demings, and Mr. Carson of Indiana.
H.R. 535: Mr. Moulton.
H.R. 564: Mr. Gallagher.
H.R. 638: Ms. Eshoo and Mr. Garamendi.
H.R. 673: Mr. Norman.
H.R. 714: Mr. Gianforte.
H.R. 747: Mr. Loe.
H.R. 788: Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania and Mr. Gohmert.
H.R. 792: Mr. Gene Green of Texas.
H.R. 807: Mr. McNerney and Miss Rice of New York.
H.R. 810: Mr. Blumenauer.
H.R. 820: Mr. Fortenberry, Mrs. Dingell, and Mr. Bergman.
H.R. 821: Mr. Panetta.
H.R. 1028: Mr. Collin of New York and Ms. Stefanik.
H.R. 927: Mr. Himes and Mrs. Radewagen.
H.R. 1017: Mrs. Lawrence, Mr. Poliquin, Mr. Kuster of New Hampshire, Mr. Himes, and Ms. Stefanik.
H.R. 1036: Mr. Valadao.
H.R. 1038: Mr. Rice of New York.
H.R. 1046: Mr. Cooper and Mrs. Noem.
H.R. 1090: Mrs. Brooks of Indiana.
H.R. 1109: Mr. Polis.
H.R. 1116: Mr. Cole.
H.R. 1133: Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Denham, and Mr. Taylor.
H.R. 1148: Mr. Costello of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1225: Mr. Pingree.
H.R. 1267: Mr. Moon of West Virginia.
H.R. 1278: Mr. Khanna.
H.R. 1279: Ms. Lofgren and Ms. Laughlin.
H.R. 1291: Mr. Himes.
H.R. 1292: Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Young of Alabama, Mr. Weber of Texas, Mr. Roskam, and Ms. Blunt Rochester.
H.R. 1299: Mr. Kennedy.
H.R. 1316: Mr. King of New York and Miss Rice of New York.
H.R. 1374: Mr. Price of North Carolina.
H.R. 1409: Ms. Hartler of Missouri, Mr. Tonko, Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania, Mr. Schiff, Mr. Bergman, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Costello of Pennsylvania, Ms. Shea-Porter, Mrs. Napolitano, and Mr. Fitzpatrick.
H.R. 1456: Ms. Hanabusa, Mr. Nolan, and Mr. Perlmutter.
H.R. 1475: Ms. Tenney.
H.R. 1472: Mr. Carson of Indiana.
H.R. 1478: Mrs. Beatty.
H.R. 1494: Mr. MacArthur, Mr. Vargas, and Mr. Pascrell.
H.R. 1539: Mr. Evans.
H.R. 1626: Mr. Hultgren.
H.R. 1655: Mr. Cole.
H.R. 1730: Mr. Kildee, Mr. Cummings.
H.R. 1731: Mr. Costello of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1734: Mr. Young of Alaska.
H.R. 1735: Mr. Polis.
H.R. 1762: Mr. Sensenbrenner.
H.R. 1773: Mr. Norman.
H.R. 1810: Ms. Lee.
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