



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 2017

No. 158

House of Representatives

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

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H7675

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 nonprofit 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.

Further, any changes to access to airports or airspace would be subject to extensive government review and approval.

Additional funding is provided to community airports to assist them to continue to grow and be vibrant in our communities.

Critics would have you believe that general aviation will not have a seat at the table. Again, not true. The nonprofit board of directors designates a seat for community airports, as it designates a seat for general aviation, lease pilots, airlines, and air cargo.

The FAA, in a hearing, indicated it would take another 10 years and \$30 billion to update an air traffic control system from the archaic system we have now. When asked, they said that they hoped they would have it accomplished in 10 years. Hope is not a plan.

The Trump administration supports the 21st Century AIRR Act. Air traffic controllers support the 21st Century AIRR Act. Airline pilots support it. The airlines support it, and air cargo supports it. We can go through a long list, yet we continue to deal with myths being spun out there that somehow this is adverse to aviation.

We have an archaic air traffic control system that is hurting our Nation and that is damaging our economy. It is time to move beyond fear and myths.

Madam Speaker, I urge colleagues to move beyond those myths and see the 21st Century AIRR Act will benefit all users. Let's bring the bill to the floor, let's have a vote, and let's move the air traffic control system back.

PUERTO RICO, YOU ARE NOT ALONE

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Madam Speaker, I just returned from Puerto Rico, and to start my remarks, I would like to say a few words in Spanish, the language of Puerto Rico, and then I will switch back to English.

I will provide a translation to the desk.

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

My beloved Puerto Rico, you are not alone. We hear your cries for help and the full strength of the American government and military is finally coming to help.

It has been slow and no one has been as frustrated as I am that the response

did not happen with the urgency and priority that Puerto Ricans—and every human being who is suffering—deserve.

I tell my colleagues what I saw and what you told me while I was there. I will work with them immediately, and make sure that this Congress treats Puerto Rico fairly and generously.

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.

Cities and towns, Mayors and Governors from across the country are making their communities available to you so that you have a safe place to be while the rescue and recovery and rebuilding continues.

And standing with the Mayor of Chicago just yesterday, he said he wants the City of Chicago to be a place where any and all Puerto Ricans who need a safe place can come and we will help you resettle.

You are not alone.

Mi amado Puerto Rico, no estás solo. Oímos tus peticiones de ayuda, y la fuerza del gobierno y milicia estadounidense finalmente vienen a ayudar.

Ha sido despacio, y comparto tu frustración sobre una respuesta que no se dió con la urgencia y prioridad que los Puertorriqueños—y cualquier ser humano que está sufriendo—se merecen.

Les digo a mis colegas lo que he visto, y lo que me has dicho cuando estuve ahí. Trabajaré con ellos inmediatamente para asegurar que este Congreso trate a Puerto Rico justa y generosamente.

Y no soy el único. Otros Puertorriqueños, y el Caucus Hispano están trabajando con el liderazgo de la Cámara para conformar un programa de ayuda.

Ciudades y pueblos, alcaldes y gobernadores a través del país, están abriéndote las puertas de sus comunidades para que tengas un lugar seguro mientras el rescate, la recuperación y la reconstrucción continúan.

Y ayer, presente con el alcalde de Chicago, él me dijo que quiere que la ciudad de Chicago sea un lugar en el cual todo Puertorriqueño que necesite un lugar seguro pueda llegar y reestablecerse.

Madam Speaker, I flew to Puerto Rico on Friday to see what was happening on the ground with my own eyes. Madam Speaker, it was worse than I imagined, and it broke my heart to see my beloved island so destroyed and so scared for its future and feeling so alone and isolated.

There were dead animals all over the place, and people were so desperate for food and water. Anyone who is sick or elderly is finding it hard or impossible to get medicine and medical care.

Things are improving day by day, and the number of helicopters flying missions of mercy to the interior of the island is increasing. But almost every-

one has no electrical power. Almost everyone has little or no food and trouble finding it. Almost everyone has no water, and some are seeking water from unreliable or possibly contaminated sources.

At the same time, I also saw an amazing unity and toughness, a can-do spirit that my fellow Puerto Ricans have the ability to make a way where there is no way, to improvise, and, most importantly, to work together.

Any divisions of party or class that are right on the surface on a typical day in Puerto Rico, this faction versus that faction, all of that was blown away. The only status issue that matters for Puerto Ricans right now is the status of the SOS, save our souls. We need help, and plenty of it, now.

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 Control, 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 the 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—a 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 Puerto Rico and 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 again—will take years and 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 welcome 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 historic feats.

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 the pilot of that 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 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 this 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.

□ 1015

The interesting thing about this is that the air speed record had been set on November 18, 1966, by the same pilot and broken just 10 months later. That flight has now stood for 50 years.

If that pilot was here today, he would say that it is a travesty that that air speed record has stood for 50 years. In fact, I was standing with him on the 30th anniversary and he said just those same words: Why are we stuck where we were in the sixties? Why haven't we continued to push forward?

I believe he was right and I believe he would be right today. I hope that I am not standing here on the 60th anniversary talking about the same issue.

The great men of that era did some phenomenal things. They pushed the limits. They knew that the sky was no limit and that it was actually just a boundary that we needed to push forward.

There were 12 pilots in the X-15 program. I grew up with many of them or their kids. There was General Rushworth, Neil Armstrong, Bob White, Joe Walker, Bill Dana, Joe Engle, Scott Crossfield, John McKay, Milton Thompson, and Forrest Petersen. Mike Adams lost his life in the X-15 program in November 1967—the only one to lose his life in that program.

The pilot of the October 3, 1967, flight was my father, Pete Knight. He flew the aircraft 16 times, setting the air speed record several times, breaking it, and then achieving 4,520 miles an hour on October 3, 1967, which still stands today.

I think the lesson is that we have got to keep pushing. Technology is not out there for no reason. It is out there for us to grab and continue to achieve. Those records are made to be broken. We must continue to push in aerospace and in every endeavor we encounter. That is what America does and that is what we do for all of mankind.

I think this record was a great achievement, and I can tell you one quick story. I knew of this record when I was a small kid because my father pulled that Machmeter out of the X-15 after he set the record. That Machmeter sat on our television for every year of my life, until he was on his death bed. He said: I want that Machmeter to go to the Smithsonian. Which is exactly where we sent it.

This was something that was an achievement by many engineers, pilots, mothership pilots, and chase pilots, but it is something that is now 50 years old, and we need to continue to push.

DEVASTATION AND HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (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 GUTIÉRREZ.

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 GUTIÉRREZ, 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 Yulín Cruz and the Governor, are compromised with the well-being of the Puerto Rican people. I saw firefighters 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 sus hermanos; algo que me ha conmovido y que entiendo que el pueblo puertorriqueño tiene un corazón muy grande y una solidaridad humana inmensa.

Madam Speaker, I met with Puerto Rico Governor Ricardo Rossello and San Juan Mayor Carmen Yulín Cruz. It bewilders me how someone could criticize the mayor of San Juan, Puerto Rico, from a cozy clubhouse in a well-heeled golf course when she was chest deep in water contaminated with toxic fuels and human excrement, bringing help to those who need it in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

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 the 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 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York will provide a translation of his remarks to the Clerk.

POLITICAL COURTS

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, the new term of the U.S. Supreme Court begins this week. I was a judge for 7½ years before I came to Congress, so I have great interest in their proceedings. It seems to me that our courts have become far too political over the last many years.

Up until the mid-1930s, most Federal courts seemed to try to stay out of politics and paid great deference to actions by Federal and State legislative bodies as being expressions of the will of the people.

For many years now, though, some Federal judges believe they should have been elected to Congress or to State legislatures. One of many examples involves the drawing of congressional, legislative, and local government voting districts. The word “gerrymandering” came into use in 1812, but it really has only been in very recent years that the Federal courts have become heavily involved in drawing specific lines in so many States.

If the court has a liberal judge, he or she will seemingly go to great lengths to throw out any lines that seem to benefit conservatives.

I was at the U.S. Supreme Court recently to introduce some lawyers from Knoxville. That day, the Court was hearing a challenge to some lines drawn by the Virginia Legislature. This is something that the Federal courts should really stay out of and leave to the State legislatures.

Also, opinions now are much longer than in the first 150 years or so, as some judges seem to believe they know almost everything.

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 freedom 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. It seems that 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 throw its weight against 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 many 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.

Madam Speaker, on an unrelated topic, because we are dealing with the budget proposals this week, I think it is ironic that the only President in the last 70 or 80 years who has tried to rein in defense spending is the only one who spent his career in the military: President Eisenhower.

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 every general who 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 sup-

porting the troops. But, Madam Speaker, we need to wake up and realize that there is waste even in the Defense Department.

ENTERPRISE CARRIERS FROM MEXICO

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 enterprise 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 attract and disqualify drivers who 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 800 Mexican enterprise 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 trucks ranging about here in 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 enterprise 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.

□ 1030

They had over 900 violations per driver that cannot read or speak the English language sufficiently to respond to official inquiries, a violation of the law; over 800 violations for brake-related issues—worn brake hoses, defective brakes, et cetera; and hundreds of other violations for tire treads, exhaust leaks, and oil leaks. One company was fined \$40,000.

There is only one way to solve this issue, and that is to modify the NAFTA agreement. Remember, this was authorized. They were given national treatment; that is, Mexico is treated the same as the U.S. They won, in one of those secret tribunals, a huge judgment against the United States.

The Obama administration caved in and allowed the door to be opened to

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 will not give them 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 what 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 earning 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. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. 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 United States economy, 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 convinced that manufacturing provides careers that are interesting and rewarding; 64 percent were more motivated to pursue careers in manu-

facturing; and 71 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 that 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 country's industrial revolution 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 resume includes fully refurbishing streetcars 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.

Zippo Manufacturing Company, makers of the world famous Zippo windproof lighter, owns Case Knives today. Zippo is another family-owned business, based in the city of Bradford, McKean County, since 1936.

Major leaguers have been swinging our fine Pennsylvania hardwoods thanks to Jefferson County company BWP Bats. BWP's slogan is "Built With Pride."

Huntingdon County's Bonney 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 scores 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. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today heartbroken and bone weary from the gun violence that continues to wrack our country. Just this year alone there have been 273 mass shootings, shootings with four or more victims. Every day we read of another child tragically lost.

Our Nation awoke yesterday to the horrifying news of yet another mass shooting, this time in Las Vegas. It is once more now the worst shooting in our Nation's history. This violence sears our hearts and leaves countless families forever tragically changed.

I extend my sincere condolences to all those who lost loved ones and send prayers of recovery to those wounded. Please know that the American people are grieving with you.

I am incredibly grateful for the extraordinary professionalism and bravery of law enforcement and first responders during this attack. But our words and prayers are not sufficient for the people of Las Vegas or the other victims of daily gun violence across our country. We owe them more. We must come together to tackle this epidemic with action. Enough is enough.

There is no one single solution to the gun violence now, nor are there any easy answers, but that must not stop us from making progress where we can. Incredibly, however, this body is set to consider rolling back some of the commonsense regulations we already have in place for gun safety.

It is inconceivable to me that this House is preparing to vote on legislation to weaken restrictions on the sale of silencers. Such sound suppressors make it more difficult for law enforcement officers to identify the point source of a weapon and to react to protect our public.

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 other 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 I invite my colleagues to join me in passing this bill as well.

These are but 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, that is why it is time to reform the FAA.

With my Republican and Democratic colleagues, I have 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 colleagues and I, including 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 rural community and the 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 rural 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 flatlined 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.

□ 1045

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. I 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, a bill that will transform 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 gentlewoman 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 527 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 our 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 compassion, and it is drowning out common sense.

Many say there is nothing to be done. There is a falsehood that any common-sense solution will lead directly to Americans losing their guns and their Second Amendment rights. This is as pernicious as it is cowardly. This is the United States Congress. Americans think that we are strong enough to have this debate on reducing gun violence. Why don't we?

Don't shrug off the loss of life. Don't be complicit in the daily carnage of gun violence.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for each of us to stand up, to do our jobs, to come together and debate solutions, and to bring them to a vote. American families are counting on us, and they are watching.

BE A VOICE FOR UNBORN AMERICANS

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

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

As a father of three, a grandfather of three, and as a man of faith, I firmly believe that life begins at conception. As a surgeon and a scientist, I know that unborn children feel pain at 20 weeks, at the very latest at 20 weeks.

Scientific studies have found that a baby's first sensory receptors for pain are developed in the first 7 weeks. By 20 weeks, an unborn baby is so developed that they can hear music and respond to sounds, but, most importantly, a substantial body of medical evidence shows that he or she can feel and respond to pain.

Let there be no mistake: late-term abortion practices are gruesome and painful. These babies are dismembered limb from limb, yet the United States is one of only seven nations in the world that allows for elective late-term abortions. We are joining nations like North Korea and China that allow for elective late-term abortions. It is shocking to the conscience.

By passing the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act and banning late-term abortions after 20 weeks, we stand up to protect the innocent and the defenseless.

The Psalm says: "Children are a gift from the Lord." If we here today do not protect this gift, who will? If we do not shield unborn Americans from a death so painful and unimaginable, who will?

The responsibility falls to us. Let us embrace this solemn duty.

I spent my medical career doing everything I could to save the lives 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 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 what is just so that we hardly blink 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 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 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 gunman 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 \$50 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 more 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.

□ 1100

The framework roughly doubles the standard deduction so that typical middle class families will keep more of their paycheck. It also significantly increases the child 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 taxable event. It is important that we not tax people, particularly farmers and small businesses, at the death of a businessowner or farmowner.

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 and workers 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 hard those of us 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 face, 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 do 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 interest in at least two things that have 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 it will not be brought 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 be some limit on the firepower and 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.

□ 1200

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, 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 disasters. 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 I, 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 propping 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 Wizorek 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 by providing basic healthcare to about 9 million children and pregnant mothers, including thousands of Oregonians.

The providers and families in our States deserve certainty that that funding for these programs will be there when they need it. The lapse of these programs is already hurting our constituents and our communities.

At Virginia Garcia, a teaching health center in my district, payments for their residency program stopped abruptly. The clinic's executive director said that they cannot, in good conscience, stop these residencies, but they are very nervous about spending precious reserves when they had anticipated these grants would be fully funded.

There is no excuse for delay when it comes to the health of our children and families. We must continue common-sense investments in our Nation's health by reauthorizing 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 genetics 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.

Sandy 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 entire community. It truly is a gem of Penns Valley that all residents treasure.

ENDING GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday night, in mere minutes, one man took at least 59 lives, forever altered hundreds more, and left invisible, incurable scars on thousands.

On Monday morning, our Nation welcomed all of them into America's fastest growing community: families left with a gaping hole in their hearts caused by a bullet; a community that does not have the luxury of moving on from gun violence after TV cameras leave, after the front pages fill with news stories; a community that includes families Black and White, rich and poor, big and small, Democrat and Republican.

Ending gun violence isn't political. It is personal. So we are now powerless. We are not helpless. We are not hostages to some political organization. We are not bystanders, as bullets tear through our concerts, prayer circles, elementary school classrooms, nightclubs, military compounds, and quiet neighborhoods.

This is up to us, every single American. This is our country, our home, and our families. We can decide that one person's right to bear arms does not come at the expense of a neighbor's right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We must say, "No more."

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 seven 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 small 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.

□ 1215

WORKING TO PROTECT DREAMERS

(Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, instead of working to protect DREAMers, enacting commonsense gun safety legislation, or reforming our tax system to benefit hard-working Americans and not just the wealthy, I have to stand here and speak out against H.R. 36, another radical assault against women's health and reproductive rights, a bill that would deny care to women in the most desperate of circumstances, a bill designed to restrict a woman's access to a full range of healthcare services, and a blatant attempt to chip away at a woman's right to choose.

Congressional Republicans failed in their numerous attempts to strip healthcare away from everyone, so they will settle for just taking health decisions away from women.

We settled this issue 40 years ago. Women have the constitutionally protected right to manage their own bodies. I will continue to defend the woman's right to choose and vigorously oppose any and all attacks against that.

URGING SUPPORT OF MICAH'S LAW

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, at 20 weeks into a pregnancy, babies can hear music, respond to human voices, and, most importantly, they can feel pain. These are our children at their most vulnerable, yet current law continues to allow for abortions to take place even after this point in a pregnancy.

That is why I have been a strong supporter of Micah's Law, which is legislation that would prohibit abortion after 20 weeks.

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 Americans 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 say: Don't lose hope. You have the support of the vast majority of the American people, and we are fighting every day to get the Dream Act to the House floor.

CELEBRATING NATIONAL 4-H WEEK

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the first week of October marks the celebration of an organization very near and dear to my parents' hearts, as well as many friends. It is National 4-H Week. It is a time to reflect on the importance of youth development and mentoring within our communities. 4-H was founded to be focused on youth within rural and agricultural areas. It teaches essential skills and the importance of community service.

Today, 4-H has evolved into a global network covering over 50 countries. As

the Nation's largest youth leadership organization, 4-H exemplifies the kind of learning, engagement, and leadership that is needed in our country. Their many programs focus on health, science, agriculture, and citizenship in a positive mentoring environment. The experience teaches young people leadership lessons, as well as the value of practical skills and hands-on learning.

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, where 40-plus nationalities 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, the resilience of Nevadans, brave and caring, is in sharp contrast to the murdering of innocent victims we just witnessed.

Our hearts go out to the families of the victims throughout our country who were only interested in a peaceful and joyful evening.

One of those was Jennifer Irvine, a young San Diego lawyer who was killed in the attack. Let's also recognize the heroes, like Tyler Winston, a San Diegan who saved dozens of victims at the concert by driving a makeshift ambulance and taking people to the hospital. Every single life lost to gun violence should elicit sorrow and action.

Mr. Speaker, then why is it so hard for us to talk about this? Why can't we come together in a bipartisan, bicameral way? Where is the concern?

We have had too many moments of silence in this Chamber for mass shootings.

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 my inward parts; you knit 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 to honor the lives of Palm Springs Police Officers Jose "Gil" Vega and Lesley Zerebny, who were tragically shot and killed 1 year ago in the line of duty.

Officer Vega lived by the mantra of "To Serve and Protect." He served our community for nearly 35 years and was just 2 months away from retirement when he was taken from his family and our community.

Officer Lesley Zerebny had recently returned to work following the birth of her daughter, 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.

IN SUPPORT OF TAX REFORM

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of H. Con. Res. 71. It has been said frequently that our Federal Tax Code today is more than 60 times longer than the Bible, and it contains none of the good news.

It has been more than 30 years since we updated our tax system, and many Americans are struggling to make ends meet, to find decent paying jobs and prepare for retirement.

No matter where I travel in my district, Mr. Speaker, Louisiana's Fourth District, I hear story after story about how our excessive Tax Code and burdensome regulations continue to hinder our businesses and stunt our economic growth.

Congress must act now and deliver a Tax Code that meets the current demands of the 21st century economy.

Fortunately, my Republican colleagues and I have put forth a framework to do exactly that. Our plan will create more jobs, fairer taxes, and bigger paychecks for working class Americans and small businesses.

When the people are allowed to keep more of their hard-earned dollars instead of turning them over to an already bloated Federal Government, we will unleash the free market again.

It is well past time we get our economy back on track, and passing meaningful tax reform is a crucial first step in completing that mission.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO RICHARD THELEN

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

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. 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 318 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 this body that I am prepared to introduce legislation to honor Mr. Thelen of Lansing, Michigan, and the rest of his shipmates, with the Congressional Gold Medal award.

As we remember the survivors of this terrible tragedy, those we lost, and the recent finding of the ship itself, we thank you, Mr. Thelen, for your valiant service to our country.

□ 1230

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 health 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 showing 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 New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 548, which provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

This important bill protects and extends compassion to the most vulnerable among us, the unborn, by prohibiting abortions, with limited exceptions, after the point at which scientific evidence shows that an unborn child can feel pain.

Mr. Speaker, this really should be called Micah's bill in honor of a little boy named Micah Pickering, who was here on the Hill last week with his mom. He was born at 20 weeks old. And we saw, and we see from babies like Micah, that with the right medical care, babies born at 20 weeks can survive and grow into healthy adults.

Micah's mother spoke last week about her experiences: "When Micah was born, his eyes were still fused shut. His bones were not hardened yet. He couldn't breathe on his own. He was medicated to stay comfortable from pain. We were told not to touch his skin, as his skin was so sensitive it could hurt him and tear the skin. I was there to see his first set of hiccups, his first sneezes, and his first drop of milk placed on his lips. His first smile, his first laugh. He was alive. He was fighting. He wanted to live."

Today, Mr. Speaker, Micah is a healthy 5-year-old boy.

Babies like Micah at 20 weeks have well developed brains and central nervous systems, developed enough so that medical evidence has increasingly confirmed these babies feel pain, and not only pain, but intense and possibly excruciating pain.

Research also indicates that, after 20 weeks, an unborn baby's responses to painful stimuli are similar to adult responses, to the extent that when surgeons, Mr. Speaker, are performing in-utero surgery, corrective procedures on these unborn children, surgeons have seen babies flinch, jerk, and recoil from those sharp objects and incisions.

In response to this, Mr. Speaker, surgeons routinely now administer anesthesia to unborn children in the womb before performing surgery. This anesthesia has been associated with a sig-

nificant increase in babies' stress hormone levels during medical procedures.

Mr. Speaker, late-term abortions, usually performed by inducing labor after the fetus has been injected with a lethal pharmacological agent or by the horrific practice of dismemberment, causing babies intense pain, should be illegal, and that is what this bill ensures.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this bill also takes important steps to protect women, providing exceptions for those cases of rape, and incest, and the life of the mother.

H.R. 36 also provides women with a cause of action, allowing them to sue abortionists who don't provide protection for aborted babies who are born alive.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act protects the sanctity of life by ensuring protection from pain for the most vulnerable among us.

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 puts a woman in even 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 is a firewall 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 with this medical decision.

This is the only medical procedure that Congress has made an attempt to regulate, the only one, 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 "attempts 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 sponsors this bill, who admitted 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, as to 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 who is up and who is down in the polls.

This bill 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.

Meanwhile, every Federal court that has reached a decision on bans like this in States has blocked it every time. This includes rulings striking down bans in States like Arizona, Idaho, Arkansas, North Dakota.

Mr. Speaker, this bill before us is nothing more than the latest attempt by the majority 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 community health services, 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 20 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.

I don't know anything else to call that but pure hypocrisy: We love it until it is born, and then it is somebody else's problem.

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 fund 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 the only procedure 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.

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

□ 1245

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 any 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 are against this bill also will choose to anesthetize those same babies in the womb because of their reaction 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 life and 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 understand that, 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 wife that she was not worth 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, today I rise for 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 delivery.

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 for her.

On behalf of Kerri, New Jerseyans, 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.

Preemies, 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 of America's children. 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. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. 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 painful 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.

Eighteen weeks into her pregnancy, she and her husband discovered that their baby had a birth defect, a lethal skeletal dysplasia, and was incompatible with life. The baby would never be able to breathe on its own. The baby would either die in utero or 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 gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 36, Micah's Law, which I proudly co-sponsored. It is said that nations are

judged by how we care for our weakest members. There are no more vulnerable than a preborn child, whom, unfortunately, we fail to protect.

The United States is one of only seven nations that allow elective abortions after 20 weeks of pregnancy, when science confirms that the babies feel pain. Accompanying us on this list are China and North Korea, nations with disturbing records of human rights violations.

Mr. Speaker, this is not simply about a medical procedure. It is about life. Micah Pickering was born at 22 weeks. He is now a happy, healthy kindergartner. There is a lot of talk around here about life. This bill is about life. It is not about being lucky enough to have a birthday. It is about giving every child the opportunity to grow, and we are responsible for them. We should take that action seriously.

I cosponsor the bill, I vote for the bill, and I urge everyone support Micah's Law.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise for my constituent, Allie, because we should not be playing politics in Congress with women's health choices and with the family decisionmaking rights of all Americans.

Last spring, Allie and her husband were thrilled to learn that she was pregnant with their second child. A few months later, they found themselves heartbroken in a doctor's office in order to terminate a pregnancy that they had so badly wanted.

Everything had gone smoothly until about 12 weeks, when a routine test returned with extremely abnormal results. Allie and her husband hoped for the best and waited several more weeks until they could perform an amnio.

Sadly, the results of the amnio were unbearable. They found that the fetus had grown from a compromised cell line. There were multiple genetic anomalies that would result if the pregnancy continued to term in a child with extraordinarily grave and untreatable physical, cognitive, and developmental problems.

The news was crushing and the decision was agonizing, but Allie knew the path forward for her family was clear. She would become part of the tiny group of women having abortions after 20 weeks, less than 2 percent of all abortions.

But Allie's story doesn't end with the decision that she and her husband made. Because she is a Federal employee, the Hyde amendment prevented her insurance from covering her abortion services. Fortunately, Maryland is a State where we respect women's choices, and Allie was able to go to a clinic and she paid \$900 out of pocket.

Allie recovered quickly from the procedure and she was able to get pregnant shortly thereafter. This summer, Allie and her husband were thrilled to welcome a beloved second child into their family.

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, dies 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."

Dr. Colleen Malloy, a professor at the Division of Neonatology at Northwestern, in her testimony before the House Judiciary Committee said: "When we speak of infants at 20 weeks post-fertilization, we no longer have to rely on inference or ultrasound imagery because such premature patients are kicking, moving, and reacting and developing right before our eyes in the neonatal intensive care unit."

Again, these children are there being assisted, and if you touch them, if you try to dismember them once they are born, they will feel the pain. In like manner, an unborn child at 20 weeks' gestation will feel the pain. She points out that she would never, ever commit such cruelty to a child.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this legislation, H.R. 36.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding and for her leadership on this issue.

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 common-sense 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. This has been confirmed by 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).

□ 1300

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 tear up our lives that 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 a cardiac anomaly, and would 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 patients, 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. ROTHFUS).

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

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, or Micah's Law, is of utmost importance. Not only does the bill recognize the 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 gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise for Jessica. This is her story.

Jessica's second pregnancy was difficult. At about 12 weeks, she discovered she was bleeding. After weeks of calls with midwives, visits to specialists, and numerous tests, it wasn't until 22 weeks, 5 days into her pregnancy when she was told the tragic news that her baby had a rare birth defect and would likely not survive through the two surgeries she would have needed. Jessica made the difficult, heartbreaking decision to end her pregnancy.

Under this bill, there would be nowhere for Jessica to turn. Jessica wants lawmakers to know, in her own

words: "I am so incredibly thankful that my daughter never had to suffer. . . . I am still grieving and I think I always will be. Having an abortion was the most compassionate choice I had available to me. My daughter deserved compassion."

A decision like Jessica's should be between the woman and her doctor, no one else. 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 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, those who are rushing to 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 what we are doing to these children. These are little boys and little girls waiting to be born.

If we do not stand for them, who will stand for them?

If we are not the first responders, who will be the first responders?

If it is not us in the people's House who go beyond the hypocrisy of a political statement and go about the reason we are here—it is the people's House because we defend those people—let us be the first responders when it comes to pain and suffering. Let us pass this bill and stop this inhuman activity that we are doing.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman 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 divided into two 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 an abortion ban. 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).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think we should talk about pain 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. That is a natural gift. That is a gift of 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 fetal 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 in support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, which I was among one of the first cosponsors. 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 doctor said 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 bans.

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

I think that 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.

□ 1315

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 assessed that this bill itself would save 2,750 lives 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 acknowledging 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. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. 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 protection 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 shameful bill.

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

Let me just say, 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. RUIZ), a doctor.

Mr. RUIZ. 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. RUIZ. 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 cannot 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 bipartisan, 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 request 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 U.S. 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 came to 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's economy. Since its implementation, 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 \$460 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 contributing 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 set 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).

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: "We simply have to decide 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 take the women's personal decision and put it in someone else's hands. Over the years, they have tried to allow bosses to make the healthcare decisions for their employees. They pushed a bill that would allow women to die if an emergency room employee coming to her aid had a "conscientious objection" to performing an abortion that would save her life.

Today, they are trying to pass an abortion ban that would put up even more obstacles and prevent women from receiving safe and legal abortion, which is protected by the Constitution.

The bill before us today strikes at the heart of Roe v. Wade. Opponents of the Supreme Court decision have been clear and outspoken that that is precisely their goal. The ban on abortions after 20 weeks does not contain reasonable exceptions for victims of rape and incest. The legislation flies in the face of what the American people—women and men—want us to be doing.

The majority must have quickly forgotten the national Women's March that took place in January. Millions of persons across the country and around the globe marched in the largest day of protest in our Nation's history. More than half a million people took to the streets right here in the Nation's Capital. They sent a message to the majority to respect their rights, including their right to choose.

If people sometimes ask women why we are still marching and calling and writing about the four decades after the Supreme Court's Roe v. Wade decision, which it has since upheld, it is because of bills like this. We constantly have to refight the battles our mothers and grandmothers won for us. This legislation, again, is proof of that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question to the rule and the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona for his work on this issue and for introducing this important bill. It is undeniable that we have a much better understanding today of life inside the womb than we did at the time of the passage of Roe v. Wade.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle express a commitment to science in all cases except where it matters most, in those cases that involve the preservation of human life. They don't want to talk about babies. They don't want to talk about the horrific procedures that we are dealing with today, and we have to. It is our obligation to.

Mr. Speaker, our country has banned partial-birth abortion in a decision that was upheld by the Supreme Court, and I would just urge my colleagues to look at the decision in that opinion, *Gonzales v. Carhart*, the decision written by Justice Kennedy: talking in specific, quoting a nurse, talking about the reaction of a 26-week-old baby who was a victim of partial-birth abortion, what their physical reaction is, the mother of little babies reading that, and the description of what happens to a baby when they are 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 sections:

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 cancellation 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 shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments 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 XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) 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 vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member con-

trolling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

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

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

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

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

[Roll No. 546]

YEAS—233

Abraham	Calvert	Farenthold
Aderholt	Carter (GA)	Faso
Allen	Carter (TX)	Ferguson
Amash	Chabot	Fitzpatrick
Amodei	Cheney	Fleischmann
Arrington	Coffman	Flores
Babin	Cole	Fortenberry
Bacon	Collins (GA)	Foxx
Banks (IN)	Collins (NY)	Franks (AZ)
Barletta	Comer	Frelinghuysen
Barr	Comstock	Gaetz
Barton	Conaway	Gallagher
Bergman	Cook	Gianforte
Biggs	Costello (PA)	Gibbs
Bilirakis	Cramer	Gohmert
Bishop (MI)	Crawford	Goodlatte
Bishop (UT)	Culberson	Gosar
Black	Curbelo (FL)	Gowdy
Blackburn	Davidson	Granger
Blum	David, Rodney	Graves (GA)
Bost	Denham	Graves (LA)
Brady (TX)	Dent	Graves (MO)
Brat	DeSantis	Griffith
Brooks (AL)	Diaz-Balart	Grothman
Brooks (IN)	Donovan	Guthrie
Buchanan	Duffy	Handel
Buck	Duncan (SC)	Harper
Bucshon	Duncan (TN)	Harris
Budd	Dunn	Hartzer
Burgess	Emmer	Hensarling
Byrne	Estes (KS)	Herrera Beutler

Hice, Jody B.	McMorris	Scalise
Higgins (LA)	Rodgers	Schweikert
Hill	McSally	Scott, Austin
Holding	Meadows	Sensenbrenner
Hollingsworth	Meehan	Sessions
Hudson	Messer	Shimkus
Huizenga	Mitchell	Shuster
Hultgren	Moolenaar	Simpson
Hunter	Mooney (WV)	Smith (MO)
Hurd	Mullin	Smith (NE)
Issa	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Jenkins (KS)	Newhouse	Smith (TX)
Jenkins (WV)	Noem	Smucker
Johnson (LA)	Norman	Stefanik
Johnson, Sam	Nunes	Stewart
Jones	Olson	Stivers
Jordan	Palazzo	Taylor
Joyce (OH)	Palmer	Tenney
Katko	Paulsen	Thompson (PA)
Kelly (MS)	Pearce	Thornberry
Kelly (PA)	Perry	Tiberi
King (IA)	Pittenger	Tipton
King (NY)	Poe (TX)	Trott
Kinzinger	Poliquin	Turner
Knight	Posey	Upton
Kustoff (TN)	Ratcliffe	Reed
Labrador	Reed	Valadao
LaHood	Reichert	Wagner
LaMalfa	Renacci	Walberg
Lamborn	Rice (SC)	Walden
Lance	Roby	Walker
Latta	Roe (TN)	Walorski
Lewis (MN)	Rogers (AL)	Walters, Mimi
LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)	Weber (TX)
Love	Rohrabacher	Webster (FL)
Lucas	Rokita	Wenstrup
Luetkemeyer	Rooney, Francis	Westerman
MacArthur	Rooney, Thomas	Williams
Marchant	J.	Wilson (SC)
Marino	Ros-Lehtinen	Wittman
Marshall	Roskam	Womack
Massie	Ross	Woodall
Mast	Rothfus	Yoder
McCarthy	Rouzer	Yoho
McCaul	Royce (CA)	Young (AK)
McClintock	Russell	Young (IA)
McHenry	Rutherford	Zeldin
McKinley	Sanford	

NAYS—184

Adams	Demings	Lawson (FL)
Aguilar	DeSaulnier	Lee
Barragan	Dingell	Levin
Bass	Doggett	Lewis (GA)
Beatty	Doyle, Michael	Lieu, Ted
Bera	F.	Lipinski
Beyer	Ellison	Loeb sack
Bishop (GA)	Engel	Lofgren
Blumenauer	Eshoo	Lowenthal
Blunt Rochester	Espallat	Lowe y
Bonamici	Esty (CT)	Lujan Grisham,
Boyle, Brendan	Evans	M.
F.	Foster	Lujan, Ben Ray
Brady (PA)	Frankel (FL)	Lynch
Brown (MD)	Fudge	Maloney
Brownley (CA)	Gabbard	Carolyn B.
Bustos	Gallego	Maloney, Sean
Butterfield	Garamendi	Matsui
Capuano	Gomez	McCollum
Carbajal	Gonzalez (TX)	McEachin
Cárdenas	Gottheimer	McGovern
Carson (IN)	Green, Al	McNerney
Cartwright	Green, Gene	Meeks
Castor (FL)	Grijalva	Meng
Castro (TX)	Hanabusa	Moore
Chu, Judy	Hastings	Moulton
Cicilline	Heck	Murphy (FL)
Clark (MA)	Higgins (NY)	Nadler
Clarke (NY)	Himes	Napolitano
Clay	Hoyer	Neal
Cleaver	Huffman	Nolan
Clyburn	Jackson Lee	Norcross
Cohen	Jayapal	O'Halleran
Connolly	Jeffries	O'Rourke
Conyers	Johnson (GA)	Pallone
Cooper	Kaptur	Panetta
Correa	Keating	Pascrell
Costa	Kelly (IL)	Payne
Courtney	Kennedy	Pelosi
Crist	Khanna	Perlmutter
Cuellar	Kildee	Peters
Cummings	Kilmer	Peterson
Davis (CA)	Kind	Pingree
Davis, Danny	Krishnamoorthi	Pocan
DeFazio	Kuster (NH)	Polis
DeGette	Langevin	Price (NC)
Delaney	Larsen (WA)	Quigley
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Raskin
DeBene	Lawrence	Rice (NY)

Roybal-Allard	Sewell (AL)	Tsongas	Joyce (OH)	Newhouse	Shimkus	Sinema	Thompson (CA)	Visclosky
Ruiz	Shea-Porter	Vargas	Katko	Noem	Shuster	Sires	Thompson (MS)	Walz
Ruppersberger	Sherman	Veasey	Kelly (MS)	Norman	Simpson	Slaughter	Tonko	Wasserman
Rush	Sinema	Vela	Kelly (PA)	Nunes	Smith (MO)	Smith (WA)	Torres	Schultz
Ryan (OH)	Sires	Velázquez	King (IA)	Olson	Smith (NE)	Soto	Tsongas	Waters, Maxine
Sánchez	Slaughter	Visclosky	King (NY)	Palazzo	Smith (NJ)	Speier	Vargas	Watson Coleman
Sarbanes	Smith (WA)	Walz	Kinzinger	Palmer	Smith (TX)	Suozi	Veasey	Welch
Schakowsky	Soto	Wasserman	Knight	Paulsen	Stefanik	Swalwell (CA)	Vela	Wilson (FL)
Schiff	Suozi	Schultz	Kustoff (TN)	Pearce	Stewart	Takano	Velázquez	Yarmuth
Schneider	Swalwell (CA)	Waters, Maxine	Labrador	Perry	Stivers			
Schrader	Takano	Watson Coleman	LaHood	Pittenger	Taylor			
Scott (VA)	Thompson (CA)	Welch	LaMalfa	Poe (TX)	Tenney	Bridenstine	Johnson, E. B.	Rosen
Scott, David	Tonko	Wilson (FL)	Lamborn	Poliquin	Thompson (PA)	Crowley	Kihuen	Smucker
Serrano	Torres	Yarmuth	Lance	Posey	Thornberry	DesJarlais	Long	Titus
			Latta	Ratcliffe	Tiberi	Deutch	Loudermilk	
			Lewis (MN)	Reed	Tipton	Johnson (OH)	Marchant	

NOT VOTING—16

Bridenstine	Johnson (OH)	Rosen
Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	Speier
DesJarlais	Kihuen	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Long	Titus
Garrett	Loudermilk	
Gutiérrez	Richmond	

□ 1353

Messrs. TED LIEU of California, O'HALLERAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut, CARSON of Indiana, CARBAJAL, TAKANO, GARAMENDI, and RUSH changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 546.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 187, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 547]

YEAS—233

Abraham	Cole	Garrett
Aderholt	Collins (GA)	Gianforte
Allen	Collins (NY)	Gibbs
Amash	Comer	Gohmert
Amodei	Comstock	Goodlatte
Arrington	Conaway	Gosar
Babin	Cook	Gowdy
Bacon	Costello (PA)	Granger
Banks (IN)	Cramer	Graves (GA)
Barletta	Crawford	Graves (LA)
Barr	Culberson	Graves (MO)
Barton	Curbelo (FL)	Griffith
Bergman	Davidson	Grothman
Biggs	Davis, Rodney	Guthrie
Bilirakis	Denham	Handel
Bishop (MI)	Dent	Harper
Bishop (UT)	DeSantis	Harris
Black	Diaz-Balart	Hartzler
Blackburn	Donovan	Hensarling
Blum	Duffy	Herrera Beutler
Bost	Duncan (SC)	Hice, Jody B.
Brady (TX)	Duncan (TN)	Higgins (LA)
Brat	Dunn	Hill
Brooks (AL)	Emmer	Holding
Brooks (IN)	Estes (KS)	Hollingsworth
Buchanan	Farenthold	Hudson
Buck	Faso	Huizenga
Bucshon	Ferguson	Hultgren
Budd	Fitzpatrick	Hunter
Burgess	Fleischmann	Hurd
Byrne	Flores	Issa
Calvert	Fortenberry	Jenkins (KS)
Carter (GA)	Fox	Jenkins (WV)
Carter (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Johnson (LA)
Chabot	Frelinghuysen	Johnson, Sam
Cheney	Gaetz	Jones
Coffman	Gallagher	Jordan

Katko	Kelly (MS)	Kelly (PA)	King (IA)	King (NY)	Kinzinger	Knight	Kustoff (TN)	Labrador	LaHood	LaMalfa	Lamborn	Lance	Latta	Lewis (MN)	Lipinski	LoBiondo	Love	Lucas	Luetkemeyer	MacArthur	Marino	Marshall	Massie	Mast	McCarthy	McCaul	McClintock	McHenry	McKinley	McMorris	Rodgers	McSally	Meadows	Meehan	Messer	Mitchell	Moolenaar	Mooney (WV)	Mullin	Murphy (PA)
-------	------------	------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	--------	--------------	----------	--------	---------	---------	-------	-------	------------	----------	----------	------	-------	-------------	-----------	--------	----------	--------	------	----------	--------	------------	---------	----------	----------	---------	---------	---------	--------	--------	----------	-----------	-------------	--------	-------------

NAYS—187

Adams	Ellison	Luján, Ben Ray
Aguliar	Engel	Lynch
Barragán	Eshoo	Maloney
Bass	Españillat	Carolyn B.
Beatty	Esty (CT)	Maloney, Sean
Bera	Evans	Matsui
Beyer	Foster	McCollum
Bishop (GA)	Frankel (FL)	McEachin
Blumenauer	Fudge	McGovern
Blunt Rochester	Gabbard	McNerney
Bonamici	Gallego	Meeks
Boyle, Brendan F.	Garamendi	Meng
Brady (PA)	Gomez	Moore
Brown (MD)	Gonzalez (TX)	Moulton
Brownley (CA)	Gottheimer	Murphy (FL)
Bustos	Green, Al	Nadler
Butterfield	Green, Gene	Napolitano
Capuano	Grijalva	Neal
Carbajal	Gutiérrez	Nolan
Cárdenas	Hanabusa	Norcross
Carson (IN)	Hastings	O'Halleran
Cartwright	Heck	O'Rourke
Castor (FL)	Higgins (NY)	Pallone
Castro (TX)	Himes	Panetta
Chu, Judy	Hoyer	Pascarell
Cicilline	Huffman	Payne
Clark (MA)	Jackson Lee	Pelosi
Clarke (NY)	Jayapal	Perlmutter
Clay	Jeffries	Peters
Cleaver	Johnson (GA)	Peterson
Clyburn	Kaptur	Pingree
Cohen	Keating	Pocan
Connolly	Kelly (IL)	Polis
Conyers	Kennedy	Price (NC)
Cooper	Khanna	Quigley
Correa	Kildee	Raskin
Costa	Kilmer	Rice (NY)
Courtney	Kind	Richmond
Crist	Krishnamoorthi	Roybal-Allard
Cuellar	Kuster (NH)	Ruiz
Cummings	Langevin	Ruppersberger
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Rush
Davis, Danny	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
DeFazio	Lawrence	Sánchez
DeGette	Lawson (FL)	Sarbanes
Delaney	Lee	Schakowsky
DeLauro	Levin	Schiff
DelBene	Lewis (GA)	Schneider
Demings	Lieu, Ted	Schrader
DeSaulnier	Loeb sack	Scott (VA)
Dingell	Lofgren	Scott, David
Doggett	Lowenthal	Serrano
Doyle, Michael F.	Lowe y	Sewell (AL)
	Lujan Grisham,	Shea-Porter
	M.	Sherman

NOT VOTING—13

Bridenstine	Johnson, E. B.	Rosen
Crowley	Kihuen	Smucker
DesJarlais	Long	Titus
Deutch	Loudermilk	
Johnson (OH)	Marchant	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1359

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 547.

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.

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:

S. 652

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 "Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Act of 2017".

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:

"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) in the subsection heading, by striking "NEWBORN AND INFANT" and inserting "NEWBORN, 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) in the first sentence—

(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 “medical, and communication (or language acquisition) interventions (including family support), for children identified as deaf or hard-of-hearing, consistent with the following:”;

(B) in 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 “programs mandated” 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”;

(iv) by striking “hard of hearing” and all that follows through the period and inserting “hard-of-hearing children.”;

(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 supports.”;

(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 resource centers, to assist in further developing and enhancing State early hearing detection and intervention programs.”;

(5) by 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. 280g-1(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence—

(A) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”;

(B) by striking “to complement an intramural program and” and inserting the following: “or designated entities of States—

“(i) to develop, maintain, and improve data collection systems 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 “sharing” and inserting “integration and interoperability”; and

(ii) by striking “with State-based” and all that follows through the period and inserting “across multiple sources to increase the flow of information between clinical care and public health settings, including the ability of States and territories to exchange and share data.”.

(d) COORDINATION AND COLLABORATION.—Section 399M(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-1(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “consult with” and inserting “consult with—”;

(B) by striking “other Federal” and inserting the following:

“(A) other Federal”;

(C) by striking “State and local agencies, including those” and inserting the following:

“(B) State and local agencies, including agencies”;

(D) by striking “consumer groups of and that serve” and inserting the following:

“(C) consumer groups of, and that serve,”;

(E) by striking “appropriate national” and inserting the following:

“(D) appropriate national”;

(F) by striking “persons who are deaf and” and inserting the following:

“(E) individuals who are deaf or”;

(G) by striking “other qualified” and inserting the following:

“(F) other qualified”;

(H) by striking “newborns, infants, toddlers, children,” and inserting “children,”;

(I) 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: “States—

“(A) to establish newborn, infant, and young child”;

(B) by inserting a semicolon after “subsection (a)”;

(C) by striking “to develop” and inserting the following:

“(B) to develop”.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION; RELIGIOUS ACCOMMODATION.—Section 399M(d) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-1(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking “which” and inserting “that”;

(2) by striking “newborn infants or young”;

(3) by striking “parents” and inserting “parent’s”.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—Section 399M(e) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-1(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “(1)” and all that follows through “to procedures” and inserting the following:

“(1) The term ‘audiologic’, when used in connection with evaluation, means procedures—”;

(B) by striking “to assess” and inserting the following:

“(A) to assess”;

(C) 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 “linkage” and inserting the following: “options, including—

“(i) linkage”;

(G) by striking “appropriate agencies,” and all that follows through “national” and inserting the following: “appropriate agencies;

“(ii) medical evaluation;

“(iii) assessment for the full range of assistive hearing technologies appropriate for newborns, infants, and young children;

“(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”;

(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”;

(D) by striking “language and communication options and are given” and inserting the following: “language acquisition in oral and visual modalities; and

“(ii) given”; and

(E) by striking “their child” and inserting “the child”;

(5) in paragraph (3) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection), by striking “(3)” and all that follows through “decision making” and inserting “The term ‘medical evaluation’ means key components performed by a physician including history, examination, and medical decisionmaking”;

(6) in paragraph (4) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection)—

(A) by striking “refers to” and inserting “means”;

(B) by striking “and/or surgical” and inserting “or surgical”; and

(C) by striking “of hearing” and all that follows through “disorder” and inserting “for hearing loss or other medical disorders”; and

(7) in paragraph (5) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection)—

(A) by striking “(5)” and all that follows through “refers to” and inserting “(5) The term ‘newborn, infant, and young child hearing screening’ means”; and

(B) by striking “and infants” and inserting “, infants, and young children under 3 years of age”.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 399M(f) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g–1(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “such sums” and all that follows through the period and inserting “\$17,818,000 for fiscal year 2018, \$18,173,800 for fiscal year 2019, \$18,628,145 for fiscal year 2020, \$19,056,592 for fiscal year 2021, and \$19,522,758 for fiscal year 2022.”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “such sums” and all that follows through the period and inserting “\$10,800,000 for fiscal year 2018, \$11,026,800 for fiscal year 2019, \$11,302,470 for fiscal year 2020, \$11,562,427 for fiscal year 2021, and \$11,851,488 for fiscal year 2022.”.

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.

GENERAL LEAVE

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 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I really want to thank our Members on both sides of the aisle, and especially the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), who has an identical bill, the House companion bill to this one.

S. 652 revises the Public Health Service Act’s expanding access to critical resources for the deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns and young children. It will boost training of healthcare professionals in helping these young par-

ents and ensure that, in turn, they can help educate the patient’s family members.

This bill will also deliver relief to parents and caretakers of young children that have hearing loss, granting them important resources to aid in their care.

Again, the Health Subcommittee vice chair, BRETT GUTHRIE, is the author of the House companion. When the House today approves this legislation, which I assume it will, that means this bill will go to the President’s desk and be signed into law. This is really important work that the Energy and Commerce Committee is doing, once again, in a big and bipartisan way. It is an important bill that will expand access to critical resources for deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns and young children.

By updating and reauthorizing HRSA and CDC grants to help States treat children with hearing loss, we are doing our work to achieve better outcomes for patients.

I am particularly pleased about the potential to harness new and improved data collection systems to improve access. You know, if we can better understand what is happening with patients on the ground, we can make better decisions about where to allocate resources to help recruit more providers and improve coordination of care for children with hearing loss.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted with the work of the Health Subcommittee and the Members who have put so much into this legislation, and I look forward to the House passing it.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. 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. BRETT GUTHRIE from Kentucky and Ms. DORIS 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 the Health Resources and Services Administration to run a grant initiative and allow the Centers for Disease Control to conduct hearing loss research.

According to data from the CDC, 1.4 babies out of every—I don’t know how you get 1.4—but 1.4 babies out of 1,000 that were screened were found to have a prevalence of hearing loss. And as a mother, I know how important it is to determine if your child has any level of hearing loss as early as possible so that a parent can determine the best treatment to allow their child to live a full and happy life.

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 detect any 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 S. 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 BRETT 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 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 California (Ms. MATSUI), the primary cosponsor of the bill. And I thank her for championing the healthcare of children across America.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1539, the Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Act of 2017, which I coauthored with my colleague, Congressman GUTHRIE.

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 the 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 receiving 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 to work 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 big 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 she 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.

□ 1415

So I was driving back, and part of what Governor Patton of Kentucky had proposed was screening, eyesight 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, if you were born and you can't hear well, then isn't 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 hear well, then you have lost those first 3 to 5 years of ability and lost language ability for a lifetime.

So for the small amount of money that it actually costs, we passed and authorized, in Kentucky, mandated screenings. One is for eyesight, which my son got caught in going into kindergarten. That is the first time 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 rose to over 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 Congresswoman MATSUI. I want to thank Senator KAINE from Virginia and Senator PORTMAN from Ohio for taking the bipartisan lead in the Senate. I thank them for their hard work.

I am proud to say, when we take this vote today, it doesn't go back to the Senate. It goes to the President, and we look forward to his signature and continuing this in moving forward. I have been honored to be part of this.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman BURGESS for yielding.

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.

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.

We want to give these children 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.

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

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.

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 question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 652.

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.

PROTECTING GIRLS' ACCESS TO EDUCATION IN VULNERABLE SETTINGS ACT

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2408) to enhance the transparency, improve the coordination, and intensify the impact of assistance to support access to primary and secondary education for displaced children and persons, including women and girls, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2408

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 "Protecting Girls' Access to Education in Vulnerable Settings Act" or the "Protecting Girls' Access to Education Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) At the start of 2017, more than 65,000,000 people have been displaced by disasters and conflicts around the world, the highest number recorded since the end of World War II, of which more than 21,000,000 people are refugees.

(2) More than half of the population of displaced people are children and, according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, nearly 4,000,000 school-aged displaced children lack access to primary education.

(3) Education offers socioeconomic opportunities, psychological stability, and physical protection for displaced people, particularly for women and girls, who might otherwise be vulnerable to 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))), child marriage, sexual exploitation, or economic disenfranchisement, and contributes to long-term recovery and economic opportunities for displaced people and for the communities hosting them.

(4) Displaced children face considerable barriers to accessing educational services and, because the duration of such displacement is, on average, 20 years, such children may spend the entirety of their childhood without access to such services.

(5) Despite the rising need for such services, less than two percent of global emergency aid was directed toward educational services in 2016.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is critical to ensure that children, particularly girls, displaced by conflicts overseas are able to access educational services because such access can combat extremism and reduce exploitation and poverty; and

(2) the educational needs of vulnerable women and girls should be considered in the design, implementation, and evaluation of related United States foreign assistance policies and programs.

SEC. 4. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to—

(1) partner with and encourage other countries, public and private multilateral institutions, and nongovernmental and civil society organizations, including faith-based organizations and organizations representing par-

ents and children, to support efforts to ensure that displaced children have access to safe primary and secondary education;

(2) work with donors to enhance training and capacity-building for the governments of countries hosting significant numbers of displaced people to design, implement, and monitor programs to effectively address barriers to such education;

(3) incorporate into the design and implementation of such programs measures to evaluate the impact of the programs on girls, with respect to the reduction of 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 more children to be educated by extending the hours of schooling and expanding the number of teachers.

SEC. 5. UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE TO SUPPORT 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 displaced people to prevent discrimination against displaced children, especially displaced girls, who seek access to such education; and

(3) help increase the access of displaced children, especially displaced girls, to educational, economic, and entrepreneurial opportunities, including through the governmental authorities responsible for educational or youth services in such host countries.

(b) COORDINATION WITH MULTILATERAL ORGANIZATIONS.—The Secretary and the Administrator are authorized to coordinate with the World Bank, appropriate agencies of the United Nations, 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 work with 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 relating to a foreign assistance program for natural or manmade disaster relief or response the following information (to the extent practicable and appropriate):

(1) A breakdown of the beneficiaries of such program by location, age, gender, marital status, and school enrollment status.

(2) A description of how such program benefits displaced people.

(3) A description of any primary or secondary educational services supported by

such program that specifically address the needs of displaced girls.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

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, first, I would like to recognize Congressman STEVE CHABOT and Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY on the Foreign Affairs Committee for their work on this important issue of protecting girls and protecting their access to education, especially in vulnerable settings.

We all know that education is a critical driver of upward social mobility for these young girls, for economic growth, for overall stability in terms of a society. As we confront an increasing number of conflicts around this globe, education has got to remain a very key component of U.S. foreign assistance.

Around the world today, there are 27 million children who are out of school in conflict zones. Half of all children in refugee camps do not have access to primary education.

With many recent conflicts that have lasted, now, a decade, we are now seeing entire generations of children that fail to receive even the most basic education; and even if they are eventually able to return home, they carry back those deficits in terms of what they have not learned, and those deficits can last a lifetime. So this is a humanitarian crisis with real strategic implications.

In Syria, for example, an estimated 4 million children are out of school in an environment warped by constant violence. Refugee children outside of Syria are placing tremendous strains on the educational systems, and I have seen this in countries like Jordan, in Lebanon, in Turkey.

As we have seen in crisis situations around the world, the lack of stable educational opportunities make these children more vulnerable: more vulnerable, especially for girls, to exploitation; more vulnerable, especially for boys, to radicalization.

Girls face unique barriers to education in conflict zones. In these afflicted countries, girls are 2½ times more likely than young boys to be out of school. They frequently encounter cultural barriers that prevent them from seeking an education, and they often lack safe routes to that little school and back home from that school.

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 on 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 consume.

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, no matter 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 has taken steps 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.

□ 1430

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 on this.

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 18 years of age. They are children and 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 offers safety and shelter 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, along with ROBIN KELLY from Illinois. I again want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL for their leadership in this area.

This bipartisan 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 all the refugees.

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 vibrant 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?

Around 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 refugee camps 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 3 minutes to the gentleman 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 real leader in Congress when it comes to ensuring that girls around the world have the opportunity to achieve a better future for themselves through access to education.

Mr. Speaker, I am a former Florida certified teacher. I understand the value of education. Mr. SIRES from New Jersey is also a former teacher. We heard from Mr. CHABOT, who is also a former teacher. We understand how important education is to future success.

Right now, sadly, Mr. Speaker, there are 65 million displaced people around the world, and about half of that population is under 18. This bill before us prioritizes State and USAID efforts to support access to primary and secondary education for displaced children, with a specificity to helping displaced girls.

Unfortunately, sometimes young girls fall victim to exploitation, to

trafficking, or they get married off, sold off, without having the opportunity to determine their own future; something that we might take for granted in this glorious country. That is why Mr. CHABOT's bill is so important. We need to reach out to those young girls. We need to have them have access to primary and secondary education so that they can increase their own chances for a prosperous future, Mr. Speaker.

Access to education, I know, empowers young people, and it will especially empower young girls. It will offer them a chance at socioeconomic opportunities that heretofore have been closed to them. It offers them stability. It offers them empowerment.

Mr. Speaker, we have got to pass Mr. CHABOT's bill. We have got to do more to ensure that displaced people, 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 am also a former certified teacher, and expanding access to education is critical in combating terrorism. When we increase opportunities through education, we help more girls and boys by giving them the tools to think critically and resist those who mean to harm us. We are helping to give these children an alternative with the possibility of positioning them to make further positive impact on their communities and their countries.

Time and time again we have seen the results of what happens when children are not provided a better path: extremism, radicalism, and terrorism.

This is one of our best opportunities to provide a more safe and secure world not only for them, but also for us, too.

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank Congressman CHABOT and Congresswoman KELLY for their hard work. I support this bill, and I urge all Members to do the same.

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.

Mr. Speaker, we are surrounded here by former teachers today who have brought this bill, who have worked with us to bring this bill to the House floor, and we understand their impulse to reach out to these young children and try to see to it that they have an equal chance out in the world.

This is something that teachers do, and this focus on young girls, especially young girls in the most vulnerable situation, as a result of conflict in those regions making them at risk for trafficking, for exploitation or being

child brides, these former teachers understand the importance of having a program directed specifically to this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT); the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY); certainly, ALBIO SIRES, our ranking member on the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee; and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, of course, as chairman, for helping to ensure that international humanitarian efforts are prioritizing this issue of access to education for girls.

By improving coordination between the State Department, USAID, the private sector, and multilateral organizations, what this bill is going to do is to improve the chances that these young lives will be able to blossom above the ashes of war, above these conflicts that rage in these spots around the world, so that they might reach their full potential. If they do, they will be able to help the next generation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask every Member for their support, 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. 2408.

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.

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. 1918) to oppose loans at international financial institutions for the Government of Nicaragua unless the Government of Nicaragua is taking 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. 1918

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 poll watchers to ensure 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 Nicaraguan civil society groups, Nicaragua’s recent elections were not conducted in a transparent and impartial manner, and the entire electoral process was marred by significant irregularities. The elections marked a setback to democracy in Nicaragua and undermined the ability of Nicaraguans to hold their government accountable.”

(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 and 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 Saavedra of the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN) in elections that international and domestic observers characterized as seriously flawed. International and domestic organizations raised concerns regarding the constitutional legitimacy of Ortega’s re-election. The 2011 elections also provided the ruling party with a supermajority in the National Assembly, allowing for changes in the constitution, including extending the reach of executive branch power and the elimination of restrictions on re-election for executive branch officials and mayors. Observers noted serious flaws during the 2012 municipal elections and March 2014 regional elections.”

(6) According to the Department of State’s Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2015 in Nicaragua: “The principal human rights abuses were restrictions on citizens’ right to vote; obstacles to freedom of speech and press, including government intimidation and harassment of journalists and independent media, as well as increased restriction of access to public information, including national statistics from public offices; and increased government harassment and intimidation of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society organizations.”

(7) The same 2015 report stated: “Additional significant human rights abuses included considerably biased policies to promote single-party dominance; arbitrary police arrest and detention of suspects, including abuse during detention; harsh and life-threatening prison conditions with arbitrary and lengthy pretrial detention; discrimination against ethnic minorities and indigenous persons and communities.”

(8) On June 7, 2016, the Department of State’s Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor posted on social media: “Disappointed government of Nicaragua said it will deny electoral observers requested by Nicaraguan citizens, church, and private sector . . . We continue to encourage the government of Nicaragua to allow electoral observers as requested by Nicaraguans.”

(9) On June 14, 2016, President Ortega expelled three United States Government officials (two officials from U.S. Customs and Border Protection and one professor from

the National Defense University) from Nicaragua.

(10) On August 1, 2016, the Department of State issued a press release to express grave concern over the Nicaraguan government limiting democratic space leading up to the elections in November and stated that “[o]n June 8, the Nicaraguan Supreme Court stripped the opposition Independent Liberal Party (PLI) from its long recognized leader. The Supreme Court took similar action on June 17 when it invalidated the leadership of the Citizen Action Party, the only remaining 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.”

(11) On November 7, 2016, the Department of State issued a press release stating: “The United States is deeply concerned by the flawed presidential and legislative electoral process in Nicaragua, which precluded the possibility of a free and fair election on November 6. In advance of the elections, the Nicaraguan government sidelined opposition candidates for president, limited domestic observation at the polls and access to voting credentials, and took other actions to deny democratic space in the process. The decision by the Nicaraguan government not to invite independent international electoral observers further degraded the legitimacy of the election.”

(12) In November and December of 2016, the Board of Executive Directors of the Inter-American Development Bank postponed consideration of a policy based loan of \$65 million to the Government of Nicaragua due to the efforts of the United States mission that expressed serious concerns of the absence of transparency, systemic corruption, and the lack of free and fair elections in Nicaragua.

(13) According to the Department of State’s Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2016: “[A]ctions by the ruling Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN) party resulted in de facto concentration of power in a single party, with an authoritarian executive branch exercising significant control over the legislative, judicial, and electoral functions.”

(14) According to the Department of State’s Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2016 in Nicaragua, “The November 6 elections for president, vice president, national assembly members, and representatives for the Central American parliament did not meet the conditions of being free and fair . . . The November 6 presidential and legislative elections were marred by allegations of institutional fraud and the absence of independent opposition political parties. National observers and opposition leaders claimed rates of abstention from 60 to 70 percent.”

(15) According to the Department of State’s Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2016: “Companies reported that bribery of public officials, unlawful seizures, and arbitrary assessments by customs and tax authorities were common . . . The courts remained particularly susceptible to bribes, manipulation, and other forms of corruption, especially by the FSLN, giving the sense that the FSLN heavily influenced CSJ and lower-level court actions.”

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to support—

(1) the rule of law and an independent judiciary and electoral council in Nicaragua;

(2) independent pro-democracy organizations in Nicaragua;

(3) free, fair, and transparent elections under international and domestic observers in Nicaragua; and

(4) anti-corruption and transparency efforts in Nicaragua.

SEC. 4. INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall instruct the United States Executive Director at each international financial institution to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to oppose any loan for the benefit of the Government of Nicaragua, other than to address basic human needs or promote democracy, unless the Secretary of State certifies and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that the Government of Nicaragua is taking effective steps to—

(1) hold free, fair, and transparent elections overseen by credible domestic and international electoral observers;

(2) promote democracy, as well as an independent judicial system and electoral council;

(3) strengthen the rule of law;

(4) respect the right to freedom of association and expression;

(5) combat corruption, including investigating and prosecuting government officials that are credibly alleged to be corrupt; and

(6) protect the right of political opposition parties, journalists, trade unionists, human rights defenders, and other civil society activists to operate without interference.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a written report assessing—

(1) the effectiveness of the international financial institutions in enforcing applicable program safeguards in Nicaragua; and

(2) the effects of the matters described in section 2 on long-term prospects for positive development outcomes in Nicaragua.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(2) INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term “international financial institution” means the International Monetary Fund, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, International Development Association, International Finance Corporation, Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency, African Development Bank, African Development Fund, Asian Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, Bank for Economic Cooperation and Development in the Middle East and North Africa, and Inter-American Investment Corporation.

(d) TERMINATION.—This section shall terminate on the day after the earlier of—

(1) the date on which the Secretary of State certifies and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that the requirements of subsection (a) are met; or

(2) 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) WAIVER.—The President may waive this section if the President determines that such a waiver is in the national interest of the United States.

SEC. 5. ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES.

The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the OAS to use the voice, vote, and influence of

the United States at the OAS to strongly advocate for an Electoral Observation Mission to be sent to Nicaragua in 2017 to observe the possibility of credible elections.

SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

The Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development should prioritize foreign assistance to the people of Nicaragua to assist civil society in democracy and governance programs, including human rights documentation.

SEC. 7. REPORT ON CORRUPTION IN NICARAGUA.

(a) **REPORT REQUIREMENT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the intelligence community (as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)), shall submit to Congress a report on the involvement of senior Nicaraguan government officials, including members of the Supreme Electoral Council, the National Assembly, and the judicial system, in acts of public corruption or human rights violations in Nicaragua.

(b) **FORM.**—The report required in subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex. The unclassified portion of the report shall be made available to the public.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

General Leave

Mr. ROYCE of California. 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 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 destabilize 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 Nicaraguans freedom of expression and freedom of association.

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

□ 1445

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 line the pockets of 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 we 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 the measure.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, October 3, 2017.

HON. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing concerning H.R. 1918, the Nicaraguan Investment Conditionality Act (NICA) of 2017, as amended.

As a result of your having consulted with the Committee on Financial Services concerning provisions in the bill that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to forgo action on the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor. The Committee on Financial Services takes this action with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1918, as amended, at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1918, as amended, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, October 3, 2017.

HON. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1918, the Nicaragua Investment Conditionality Act, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 1918 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 1918, the Nicaraguan Investment Conditionality Act, also known as the NICA Act.

I want to start by thanking Chairman ROYCE, Ranking Member ENGEL, and my chairman on the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, JEFF DUNCAN, for their efforts to bring this bill to the floor.

I also would like to thank my good friend from Florida, ILEANA ROSLEHTINEN, who has worked tirelessly for decades and never backs down when it comes to standing up against authoritarian regimes and human rights violators.

We are here today to stand up against Daniel Ortega and his constant pursuit of gaining absolute political control over the Nicaraguan people. Daniel Ortega and his family continue to amass wealth while the Nicaraguans remain the second poorest country in the Western Hemisphere.

Ortega has spent years winning sham elections, eliminating political opposition, and now has his wife take the role of Vice President. If you need any more convincing of his intentions, Ortega continues to strongly defend Nicolas Maduro, the Venezuelan dictator whose regime shoots unarmed protestors in the streets, jails the opposition, dissolved Congress, and has brought what should be one of the richest countries in Latin America to the brink of collapse.

Being a corrupt democracy in name only cannot go without consequences. This bipartisan legislation makes it clear that the U.S. will not stand by and watch Ortega trample the people's human rights defenders and stomp all over democracy, while getting rich at the expense of the Nicaraguan people.

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.

Congress and 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 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 at any of the 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 our 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, whether it helps the people of those countries.

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

To promote democracy. Promoting democracy, promoting an independent judicial system. Those are wonderful values. Promoting an independent electoral council, so that the ruling party doesn't steal elections;

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

Fighting corruption, including investigating and prosecuting government officials who are credibly alleged to be corrupt, who go against the people of Nicaragua and further enrich 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. We 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 are going to 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 as the Nicaraguan military is 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 Managua, 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 his dictatorial 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 have done 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.

Has it 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.

□ 1500

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.

NICA could strain our alliance with Nicaragua, and it could lead to instability, irregular immigration to 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 shut 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 myself 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 or-

ganization 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, 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 as we go forward that there 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 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 before issuing 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:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 3, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, 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 9:28 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 396.
That the Senate passed with amendment H.R. 1616.

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 (y); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(aa) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN MUNICIPAL OBLIGATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of the final rule titled ‘Liquidity Coverage Ratio: Liquidity Risk Measurement Standards; Final Rule’ (79 Fed. Reg. 61439; published October 10, 2014) (the ‘Final Rule’) and any other regulation which incorporates a definition of the term ‘high-quality liquid asset’, the appropriate Federal banking agencies shall treat a municipal obligation that is both liquid and readily marketable (as defined in the Final Rule) and investment grade as of the calculation date as a high-quality liquid asset that is no lower than a level 2B liquid asset.

“(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

“(A) INVESTMENT GRADE.—With respect to an obligation, the term ‘investment grade’ has the meaning given that term under part 1 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(B) MUNICIPAL OBLIGATION.—The term ‘municipal obligation’ means an obligation of a State or any political subdivision thereof, or any agency or instrumentality of a State or any political subdivision thereof.”

(b) AMENDMENT TO LIQUIDITY COVERAGE RATIO REGULATIONS.—Not later than the end of the 3-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Comptroller of the Currency shall amend the final rule titled ‘Liquidity Coverage Ratio: Liquidity Risk Measurement Standards; Final Rule’ (79 Fed. Reg. 61439; published October 10, 2014) to implement the amendments made by this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of much-needed legislation that would simply fix a 2014 rule by financial regulators and allow municipal bonds to be considered as level 2B liquid assets, at a minimum, for purposes of calculating total high-quality liquid assets, or HQLAs, under the liquidity coverage ratio. The Municipal Finance Support Act is a bipartisan piece of legislation that passed unanimously out of committee, showing its clear need.

Municipal securities are frequently issued by the transportation, housing, and healthcare authorities of State and local governments to raise funds to pay for projects ranging from bridges and schools to hospitals and recreational facilities. Excluding municipal securities from treatment as HQLAs will result in higher borrowing costs for State and local governments during times of economic stress.

Furthermore, there is no reason why high-quality liquid bonds issued by the United States and municipalities

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 securities 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 securities 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, H.R. 1624, offered by Mr. MESSER and Mrs. MALONEY, represents a bipartisan effort to ensure that certain financial institutions will continue to hold municipal securities, while also supporting the spirit of an important bank guardrail in the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

Bank regulators promulgated the liquidity coverage rule to ensure that megabanks have a minimum number of assets that they could sell, even in the worst markets. The rule permits banks to count assets like Treasury securities, GSE debt, and investment-grade corporate securities towards the pool. Regulators found that these securities could be sold even in stressed environments, thereby allowing a megabank to weather the storm of an economic crisis. This rule, known as the liquidity coverage rule, is an important tool for banking regulators to guard against the type of contagion we saw during the financial crisis.

However, the bank regulators excluded all municipal securities because they concluded that municipal securities, as a class, are difficult to sell in stressed markets. This may be generally true, but the investment-grade debt of my State of California has lots of buyers and sellers and has a liquidity profile similar to many corporate securities. So it makes sense that, if there are municipal securities like California’s debt that meet the same eligibility standards as other corporate securities, they should also be counted toward a bank’s liquid assets under the rule.

The Federal Reserve quickly recognized this problem and has since adopted a correction to permit bank holding companies under its jurisdiction to treat municipal securities that are liquid, market ready, and investment grade the same as similar corporate securities.

This bill, as amended, takes the relief adopted by the Federal Reserve and extends it to banks regulated by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. It isn’t clear to me just how many municipalities will benefit from this legislation, and I imagine most would not, but even if only a handful of our States and cities qualify, the bill is worth passing because it could help to reduce financing costs for those governments.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mrs. MALONEY’s hard work and bipartisan efforts on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. MESSER. 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 and schools. President Trump has made rebuilding our infrastructure a priority for our Nation, and this bipartisan bill paves the way for this type of investment by lowering the price tag for roads and bridges.

H.R. 1624 reverses a backwards banking regulation that makes 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.

H.R. 1624 will help blue States and red States alike, and that is why you have seen such overwhelming bipartisan support for this in the Halls of Congress. The bill passed the Financial

Services Committee unanimously this summer, and very similar legislation passed the Chamber by a voice vote last year.

□ 1515

Still we have got more work to do, and there is now momentum in the Senate to get H.R. 1624 across the finish line.

The bill is also supported by numerous outside advocacy groups, including the National Governors Association, the Government Finance Officers Association, the National League of Cities, the National Association of State Treasurers, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and even the State treasurer from my home State of Indiana, my good friend, Kelly Mitchell.

Mr. Speaker, today we take the first step in this process in the House toward reversing this backwards regulation, and I urge all my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank Mr. MESSER for his leadership on this legislation.

He is absolutely correct. He worked very closely with Mrs. MALONEY. This is a bipartisan bill. He correctly stated that we do sometimes get together and work on issues in ways that we can be helpful, not only to our constituents in general but to cities and towns. We have talked an awful lot about wanting to improve our infrastructures, and this is one way that it certainly can be done.

I would like to point out again the Federal Reserve's role in this because of the way that they recognized the problem and what they did to adopt a correction to the problem. So this bill again, as amended, takes the relief adopted by the Federal Reserve.

Again, this is a case where we had Members who understood this problem, moved forward on it, and recognized that the Federal Reserve also recognized the problem. When you have several entities who have recognized a problem, it certainly makes good sense and good public policy for everybody to come together to correct it. So with the Federal Reserve having come forward and adopting this relief, it means that it is extended to banks regulated by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Again, I wish I could say that every city in the United States would benefit from it, but not all will. Not all need it. But for those who do, I think it is important for us to recognize that when we have the opportunity to come together and to help any part of our country, and when it is very easy to do so, I think we should do it. So I am very pleased that we have been able to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), who is the lead Democratic cosponsor of this bill.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding and for her leadership on this issue and so many others.

I strongly support the bill, and I would like to thank my good friend from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) for his leadership.

We introduced this bill in order to level the playing field for our cities and States by requiring the banking regulators to treat certain municipal bonds as liquid assets, just like corporate bonds, stocks, and other assets.

As a former member of the city council in New York, I know firsthand the importance of municipal bonds. They allow States and cities to finance infrastructure, build schools, pave roads, and build subways. They are all financed with municipal bonds.

Unfortunately, in the banking regulators' liquidity rule—which requires banks to hold a minimum amount of liquid assets—they chose to allow corporate bonds to qualify as liquid assets, but completely excluded municipal bonds—even municipal bonds that are just as liquid and high-grade as corporate bonds.

This makes no sense, and it effectively discriminates against municipal bonds and cities. A municipal bond that is just as liquid as the most liquid corporate bond would not be counted as a liquid asset under the rule just because it was issued by a municipality rather than a corporation.

The Fed has already recognized this error and has amended its rule to fix the problem. But the OCC, which regulates national banks, is still refusing to amend its rule and insists on favoring corporations over municipalities. So Mr. MESSER and I introduced this bill because this kind of arbitrary discrimination against municipalities cannot be allowed to continue.

So in sum, this bill levels the playing field for cities and States in a way that maintains the safety and soundness of our banking system. The bill passed the Financial Services Committee 60-0 in July, and last Congress the bill passed the full House by a voice vote.

So I urge my colleagues to, once again, support this bipartisan legislation which is critically important for our States and our cities.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1624. I commend my ranking member from the Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities, and Investments, Mrs. MALONEY, as well as the work from my colleague from Indiana.

This is a commonsense, no-nonsense, bipartisan solution to a mistake that was made by regulators. We need to grant clarity and harmony to those who are borrowing those dollars, those municipalities, States, and cities, as well as the investors and those who hold these bonds.

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:

S. 782

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 "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.

Title I of the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008 (42 U.S.C. 17601 et seq.) is amended in section 107(a)(10) (42 U.S.C. 17617(a)(10)), by striking "fiscal year 2018" and inserting "each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022".

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.

GENERAL LEAVE

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 Prosectorial 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 absolutely 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 589,000 law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and other professionals have been trained on techniques to investigate and prosecute ICAC-related cases. More than 709,000 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 sextortion, that create 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 I signed regarding asserting jurisdiction on 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 as 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.

□ 1530

The task force program creates a coordinated group of investigative task forces representing 3,500 Federal, State, and local 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 would 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 vic-

tim 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 our 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 to our young people and that we must take action against other victimization of children that can occur online. This legislation is, in fact, a key element of that. Although we still have work to do to address these problems, this bill is a good start.

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 Force Program creates a coordinated group of investigative task forces representing 3,500 federal, state and local 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 Forces aid local and state law enforcement in creating and implementing effective responses to technologically facilitated child sexual exploitation and 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 eradicate 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 colleague 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 youths.

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. I miss it 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 healthy, prosperous, bright, secure, 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 not forget that 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 found Alicia because 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.

I remember Alicia's testimony like it was yesterday because it moved 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 lend 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, the following year, passed its 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 the most dangerous offenders 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 arrests 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 by allowing 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 every year.

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 any of our children, 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 for yet another 5 years for this critical issue. I urge my colleagues to support the PROTECT Our Children Act reauthorization.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the full committee and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for very instructive and important statements, particularly the plea that Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ made that we must reauthorize and, more importantly, fund these task forces, because they do, in fact, save lives.

Let me acknowledge the chairman of this committee for the collaboration on this bill, and let me again emphasize that we must make sure that it is authorized at the amount of money needed.

If there is ever an unfortunate and tragic example, it is that of the story of Alicia. She represents the Johnnys and Marys and Tommys and Shirleys and Quamis and Lateshas and others across the Nation who fall victim to this kind of cruel and almost inhuman attack on our children, innocent as they are, smart as they are, using the internet as they do online for any number of reasons, but then wooed by a dastardly person who wants to do them harm.

The task forces that are now based upon knowledge, expertise, commitment, passion, and with number of staffing that they need, can really be for not only prevention, but the intervention to stop our children from falling victim.

So I ask my colleagues to support S. 782, the Providing Resources, Officers, and Technology to Eradicate Cyber Threats to Our Children Act of 2017—or the PROTECT Our Children Act—as quickly as possible so that it can move to the President's desk and, as well, that we continue the pathway not only of intervention and prevention, but completely ceasing the online violence against our children because we have been able to ensure that these individuals, in large numbers, are brought to justice. By that very point, they cease to survive and thrive on the internet.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for support of S. 782, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1545

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 southwest 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.

Sec. 202. Effective interagency coordination 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 ELDER ABUSE PROSECUTION ACT OF 2017

Sec. 401. Short title.

Sec. 402. Enhanced penalty for telemarketing and email marketing fraud directed at elders.

Sec. 403. Training and technical assistance for States.

Sec. 404. Interstate initiatives.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 501. Court-appointed guardianship oversight activities under the Elder Justice Act of 2009.

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 “neglect” have the meanings given those terms in section 2011 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397j);

(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 designate 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.

(2) **INVESTIGATIVE SUPPORT.**—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall, with respect to crimes relating to elder abuse, ensure the implementation of a regular and comprehensive training program to train agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the investigation and prosecution of such crimes and the enforcement of laws related to elder abuse, which shall include—

(A) specialized strategies for communicating with and assisting elder abuse victims; and

(B) relevant forensic training relating to elder abuse.

(3) **RESOURCE GROUP.**—The Attorney General, through the Executive Office for United States Attorneys, shall ensure the operation of a resource group to facilitate the sharing of knowledge, experience, sample pleadings and other case documents, training materials, and any other resources to assist prosecutors throughout the United States in pursuing cases relating to elder abuse.

(4) **DESIGNATED ELDER JUSTICE WORKING GROUP OR SUBCOMMITTEE TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Executive Office for United States Attorneys, shall establish a subcommittee or working group to the Attorney General's Advisory Committee of United States Attorneys, as established under section 0.10 of title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto, for the purposes of advising the Attorney General on policies of the Department of Justice relating to elder abuse.

(b) **DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ELDER JUSTICE COORDINATOR.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall designate an Elder Justice Coordinator within the Department of Justice who, in addition to any other responsibilities, shall be responsible for—

(1) coordinating and supporting the law enforcement efforts and policy activities for the Department of Justice on elder justice issues;

(2) evaluating training models to determine best practices and creating or compiling and making publicly available replication guides and training materials for law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judges, emergency responders, individuals working in victim services, adult protective services, social services, and public safety, medical personnel, mental health personnel, financial services personnel, and any other individuals whose work may bring them in contact with elder abuse regarding how to—

(A) conduct investigations in elder abuse cases;

(B) address evidentiary issues and other legal issues; and

(C) appropriately assess, respond to, and interact with victims and witnesses in elder abuse cases, including in administrative, civil, and criminal judicial proceedings; and

(3) carrying out such other duties as the Attorney General determines necessary in connection with enhancing the understanding, prevention, and detection of, and response to, elder abuse.

(c) **FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.**—

(1) **FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ELDER JUSTICE COORDINATOR.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission shall designate within the Bureau of Consumer Protection of the Federal Trade Commission an Elder Justice Coordinator who, in

addition to any other responsibilities, shall be responsible for—

(A) coordinating and supporting the enforcement and consumer education efforts and policy activities of the Federal Trade Commission on elder justice issues; and

(B) serving as, or ensuring the availability of, a central point of contact for individuals, units of local government, States, and other Federal agencies on matters relating to the enforcement and consumer education efforts and policy activities of the Federal Trade Commission on elder justice issues.

(2) **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.

(d) **USE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS.**—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section.

TITLE II—IMPROVED DATA COLLECTION AND FEDERAL COORDINATION

SEC. 201. ESTABLISHMENT OF BEST PRACTICES FOR LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL DATA COLLECTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Attorney General, in consultation with Federal, State, and local 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 the best practices established under subsection (a)(1) on the website of the Department of Justice in a publicly accessible manner.

(c) **LIMITATION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require or 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) the total number of investigations initiated by Federal law enforcement agencies, other agencies as appropriate, and Federal prosecutors' offices related to elder abuse;

(2) the total number and types of elder abuse cases filed in Federal courts; and

(3) for each case described in paragraph (2)—

(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 act or acts giving rise to the elder abuse;

(D) in the case of a scheme or scam, a description of such scheme or scam giving rise to the elder abuse;

(E) information about each alleged perpetrator of the elder abuse; and

(F) the outcome of the case.

(c) **HHS REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall, on an annual basis, provide to the Attorney General statistical data collected by the Secretary relating to elder abuse cases investigated by adult protective services, which shall be included in the summary published under subsection (a)(2).

(d) **PROHIBITION ON INDIVIDUAL DATA.**—None of the information reported under this section shall include specific individually identifiable data.

TITLE III—ENHANCED VICTIM ASSISTANCE TO ELDER ABUSE SURVIVORS

SEC. 301. SENSE OF THE SENATE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The vast majority of cases of abuse, neglect, and exploitation of older adults in the United States go unidentified and unreported.

(2) Not less than \$2,900,000,000 is taken from older adults each year due to financial abuse and exploitation.

(3) Elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation have no boundaries and cross all racial, social, class, gender, and geographic lines.

(4) Older adults who are abused are 3 times more likely to die earlier than older adults of the same age who are not abused.

(5) Up to half of all older adults with dementia will experience abuse.

(b) **SENSE OF THE SENATE.**—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) elder abuse involves the exploitation of potentially vulnerable individuals with devastating physical, mental, emotional, and financial consequences to the victims and their loved ones;

(2) to combat this affront to America's older adults, we must do everything possible to both support victims of elder abuse and prevent the abuse from occurring in the first place; and

(3) the Senate supports 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 such crimes to justice.

SEC. 302. REPORT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the collection of statistical data under section 202(a)(1) begins and once each year thereafter, the Director of the Office for Victims of Crime shall submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives that addresses, to the extent data are available, the nature, extent, and amount of funding under the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10601 et seq.) for victims of crime who are elders.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an analysis of victims' assistance, victims' compensation, and discretionary grants under which elder abuse victims (including elder victims of financial abuse, financial exploitation, and fraud) received assistance; and

(2) recommendations for improving services for victims of elder abuse.

TITLE IV—ROBERT MATAVA ELDER ABUSE PROSECUTION ACT OF 2017

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Robert Matava Elder Abuse Prosecution Act of 2017".

SEC. 402. ENHANCED PENALTY FOR TELE-MARKETING AND EMAIL MARKETING FRAUD DIRECTED AT ELDERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 113A of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the chapter heading, by inserting "AND EMAIL MARKETING" after "TELE-MARKETING";

(2) by striking section 2325 and inserting the following:

“§ 2325. Definition

“In this chapter, the term ‘telemarketing or email marketing’—

“(1) means a plan, program, promotion, or campaign that is conducted to induce—

“(A) purchases of goods or services;

“(B) participation in a contest or sweepstakes;

“(C) a charitable contribution, donation, or gift of money or any other thing of value;

“(D) investment for financial profit;

“(E) participation in a business opportunity;

“(F) commitment to a loan; or

“(G) participation in a fraudulent medical study, research study, or pilot study,

by use of one or more interstate telephone calls, emails, text messages, or electronic instant messages initiated either by a person who is conducting the plan, program, promotion, or campaign or by a prospective purchaser or contest or sweepstakes participant or charitable contributor, donor, or investor; and

“(2) does not include the solicitation through the posting, publication, or mailing of a catalog or brochure that—

“(A) contains a written description or illustration of the goods, services, or other opportunities being offered;

“(B) includes the business address of the solicitor;

“(C) includes multiple pages of written material or illustration; and

“(D) has been issued not less frequently than once a year,

if the person making the solicitation does not solicit customers by telephone, email, text message, or electronic instant message, but only receives interstate telephone calls, emails, text messages, or electronic instant messages initiated by customers in response to the written materials, whether in hard copy or digital format, and in response to those interstate telephone calls, emails, text messages, or electronic instant messages does not conduct further solicitation.”;

(3) in section 2326, in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “or 1344” and inserting “1344, or 1347 or section 1128B of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320a-7b)”; and

(B) by inserting “or email marketing” after “telemarketing”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“§ 2328. Mandatory forfeiture

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The court, in imposing sentence on a person who is convicted of any offense for which an enhanced penalty is provided under section 2326, shall order that the defendant forfeit to the United States—

“(1) any property, real or personal, constituting or traceable to gross proceeds obtained from such offense; and

“(2) any equipment, software, or other technology used or intended to be used to commit or to 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 all stages of a criminal forfeiture proceeding under this section.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(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:

“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.

SEC. 404. INTERSTATE INITIATIVES.

(a) INTERSTATE AGREEMENTS AND COMPACTS.—The consent of Congress is given to any two or more States (acting through State agencies with jurisdiction over adult protective services) to enter into agreements or compacts for cooperative effort and mutual assistance—

(1) in promoting the safety and well-being of elders; and

(2) in enforcing their respective laws and policies to promote such safety and well-being.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS ON INTERSTATE COMMUNICATION.—The Executive Director of the State Justice Institute, in consultation with State or local adult protective services, aging, social, and human services and law enforcement agencies, nationally recognized nonprofit associations with expertise in data sharing among criminal justice agencies and familiarity with the issues raised in elder abuse cases, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall submit to Congress legislative proposals relating to the facilitation of interstate agreements and compacts.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 501. COURT-APPOINTED GUARDIANSHIP OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES UNDER THE ELDER JUSTICE ACT OF 2009.

Section 2042(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397m-1(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “(and, in the case of demonstration programs described in paragraph (2)(E), to the highest courts of States)” after “States”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “(and the highest courts of States, in the case of demonstration programs described in subparagraph (E))” after “local units of government”;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking “or” after the semicolon;

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (F); and

(D) by inserting after subparagraph (D), the following new subparagraph:

“(E) subject to paragraph (3), programs to assess the fairness, effectiveness, timeliness, safety, integrity, and accessibility of adult guardianship and conservatorship proceedings, including the appointment and the monitoring of the performance of court-appointed guardians and conservators, and to implement changes deemed necessary as a result of the assessments such as mandating background checks for all potential guardians and conservators, and implementing systems to enable the annual accountings and other required conservatorship and guardianship filings to be completed, filed, and reviewed electronically in order to simplify the filing process for conservators and guardians and better enable courts to identify discrepancies and detect fraud and the exploitation of protected persons; or”;

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (4), (5), and (6), respectively;

(4) by inserting after paragraph (2), the following new paragraph:

“(3) REQUIREMENTS FOR COURT-APPOINTED GUARDIANSHIP OVERSIGHT DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—

“(A) AWARD OF GRANTS.—In awarding grants to the highest courts of States for demonstration programs described in paragraph (2)(E), the Secretary shall consider the recommendations of the Attorney General and the State Justice Institute, as established by section 203 of the State Justice Institute Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10702).

“(B) COLLABORATION.—The highest court of a State awarded a grant to conduct a demonstration program described in paragraph (2)(E) shall collaborate with the State Unit on Aging for the State and the Adult Protective Services agency for the State in conducting the demonstration program.”;

(5) in paragraph (4) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this section), by inserting “(and, in the case of demonstration programs described in paragraph (2)(E), the highest court of a State)” after “a State”; and

(6) in paragraph (5) (as so redesignated), by inserting “(or, in the case of demonstration programs described in paragraph (2)(E), the highest court of a State)” after “State” each place it appears.

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 in the 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 ABUSE AND INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL ENTERPRISES.—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—

(A) the exploitation of older adults of 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 pending in the United States; and

(2) the results of intervention by the United States with foreign officials on behalf of citizens of the United States who are elder abuse victims in international criminal enterprises.

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 will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

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. 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, but only 1 in 23 cases of 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 devastating 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 all 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.

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 elders.

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 older 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 FINDINGS 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 harmful 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 of this type 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 predominately rests on the assumption that the ability to experience pain depends on the cerebral cortex and requires nerve connections between the thalamus and the cortex. However, 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 hydranencephaly, 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 position, 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 anesthesia to prevent the unborn child from 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 the purpose of the Congress to assert a 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, knowledgeable about the case and the medical conditions involved, would consider necessary to make an accurate determination of post-fertilization age.

“(2) PROHIBITION ON PERFORMANCE OF CERTAIN ABORTIONS.—

“(A) GENERALLY FOR UNBORN CHILDREN 20 WEEKS OR OLDER.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the abortion shall not be 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 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 or incest 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 PERFORMED.—Notwithstanding the definitions of ‘abortion’ and ‘attempt an abortion’ in this section, a physician terminating or attempting to terminate a pregnancy under 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 in accordance 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 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 to perform 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 licensed by the State or operated under authority of a Federal agency, a medical clinic licensed by the State or operated under authority of a Federal agency, from a personal 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)(iii) 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) CONSENT FORM REQUIRED.—The physician who intends to perform or attempt to perform an abortion under the provisions of

subparagraph (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 presented in person 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 fetal age only if the mother’s life is endangered by a physical disorder, physical illness, or physical injury, when the pregnancy was the 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 child to 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 these 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 filled out the informed consent form to the best of their knowledge and understands the information contained in the form.

“(iii) SIGNATORIES REQUIRED.—The Informed Consent Authorization form shall be signed in person by the woman seeking the abortion, 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 (j)(2) of section 164.530 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, shall apply to documentation required to be placed in a patient’s medical file pursuant to subparagraph (F) of subsection (b)(2) 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, compliance with such paragraphs would pose a greater risk of—

“(I) the death of the pregnant woman; or

“(II) the substantial and irreversible physical impairment of a major bodily function, not including psychological or emotional conditions, of the pregnant woman.

“(ii) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN FACILITIES.—Notwithstanding the definitions of the terms ‘medical treatment’ and ‘counseling’ in subsection (g), the counseling or medical treatment described in subparagraph (B)(ii) may not be provided by a facility that performs abortions (unless that facility is a hospital).

“(iii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION IN CASES OF REPORTS TO LAW ENFORCEMENT.—The requirements of subparagraph (B)(ii) do not apply if the rape 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.—

“(I) 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) shall comply with such applicable State laws that are in effect as the State’s Attorney General may designate, regarding reporting requirements in cases of rape or incest.

“(II) STATE LAWS REGARDING PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT.—The physician who intends to perform an abortion on a minor under an exception provided by subparagraph (B) shall comply with any applicable State laws requiring parental involvement in a minor’s decision to have an abortion.

“(c) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—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 under, 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 under an exception provided for in 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.

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

“(A) objectively verifiable money damages for all injuries, psychological and physical, occasioned by the violation;

“(B) statutory damages equal to three times the cost of the abortion; and

“(C) punitive damages.

“(4) 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.

“(5) 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.

“(6) AWARDS AGAINST WOMAN.—Except under paragraph (5), in a civil action under this subsection, no damages, attorney’s fee or other monetary relief may be assessed against the woman upon whom the abortion was performed or attempted.

“(f) 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 (hereinafter 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) CONTENTS 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;

“(D) the exception under subsection (b)(2)(B) under which the abortion was conducted; and

“(E) any incident of live birth resulting from the abortion.

“(3) EXCLUSIONS FROM DATA SUBMISSIONS.—A summary required under this subsection shall not contain any information identifying the woman whose pregnancy was terminated and shall be submitted consistent with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (42 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 included in the public reports 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 of the calendar year 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—

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

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

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

“(ii) to remove a dead unborn child.

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

“(3) COUNSELING.—The term ‘counseling’ means counseling provided by a counselor licensed by the State, or a victims rights advocate provided by a law enforcement agency.

“(4) 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.

“(5) FERTILIZATION.—The term ‘fertilization’ means the fusion of human spermatozoon with a human ovum.

“(6) 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 from a personal physician licensed by the State.

“(7) MINOR.—The term ‘minor’ means an individual who has not attained the age of 18 years.

“(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.

“(9) PHYSICIAN.—The term ‘physician’ means a person licensed to practice medicine and surgery or osteopathic medicine and surgery, or otherwise legally authorized to perform an abortion.

“(10) POST-FERTILIZATION AGE.—The term ‘post-fertilization age’ means the age of the unborn child as calculated from the fusion of a human spermatozoon with a human ovum.

“(11) PROBABLE POST-FERTILIZATION AGE OF THE UNBORN CHILD.—The term ‘probable post-fertilization age of the unborn child’ means what, in reasonable medical judgment, will with reasonable probability be the post-fertilization age of the unborn child at the time the abortion is planned to be performed or induced.

“(12) REASONABLE MEDICAL JUDGMENT.—The term ‘reasonable medical judgment’ means a medical judgment that would be made by a reasonably prudent physician, knowledgeable about the case and the treatment possibilities with respect to the medical conditions involved.

“(13) UNBORN CHILD.—The term ‘unborn child’ means an individual organism of the species homo sapiens, beginning at fertilization, until the point of being born alive as defined in section 8(b) of title 1.

“(14) WOMAN.—The term ‘woman’ means a female human being whether or not she has reached the age of majority.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“1532. Pain-capable unborn child protection.”

(c) CHAPTER HEADING AMENDMENTS.—

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

(2) TABLE OF CHAPTERS FOR PART I.—The item relating to chapter 74 in the table of chapters at the beginning of part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “**Partial-Birth Abortions**” and inserting “**Abortions**”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 548, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. HANDEL) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HANDEL. 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 H.R. 36.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, also known as Micah’s Law.

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 in-

cludes 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, there is broad consensus within the medical community babies at 5 months in the womb are not only able to feel pain, they can hear music. They can even respond to human voices.

America is one of only seven countries in the world that still allows elective late-term abortions, joining North Korea and China.

Today, we understand so much more about a baby’s development during a pregnancy. Voluntarily terminating the life of an innocent baby when we know that baby can feel pain can no longer be acceptable, and a majority of Americans agree.

Hearts and minds are changing. How many of us have marveled at the vivid sonogram images of a soon-to-be-born son, niece, or grandchild? How many of us have been amazed and so very grateful that babies born early, as early as 20 weeks, have a very real chance of survival?

□ 1600

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 59 individuals 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 spending today pushing a 20-week abortion ban that will disproportionately hurt women and families who face some of the most medically complex situations imaginable.

So it is with great pleasure that I oppose H.R. 36, because it is a dangerous and far-reaching attack on a woman’s constitutional right to choose whether or not to terminate a pregnancy.

Roe v. Wade’s basic holding is that a woman has a constitutional right to have an abortion prior to the fetus’ viability, which is generally considered by the experts to be around 24 weeks from fertilization. By banning previability abortions, H.R. 36 is a direct challenge to Roe.

Another serious flaw, in my view, of H.R. 36 is that its narrow rape exception completely misconstrues the difficult challenges that survivors of sexual assault face and the very real reasons why a rape or incest may go unreported. So by requiring that a rape or incest survivor provide documentation to corroborate her statement that she was raped, the bill’s sponsors seem to be saying that maybe women cannot be trusted to tell the truth about sexual assault, and they certainly cannot be trusted to make their own private healthcare decisions.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this dangerous and mean-spirited legislation.

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

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), my esteemed colleague, the Judiciary Committee chairman.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, since the Supreme Court’s decision in Roe v. Wade, medical knowledge regarding the development of unborn babies and their capacities at various stages of growth has advanced dramatically.

To give you a sense of how much technology has advanced, the issue of The New York Times announcing the Roe v. Wade decision, in 1973, contained ads for the latest in technology, including a computer the size of a file cabinet that you could rent for \$3,000 a month that only had a fraction, thousandths, of the memory of a modern cellphone, and a basic AM radio that was as big as your hand.

At the time, there was nothing like the stunningly detailed images of unborn children that are so commonly celebrated on social media today.

Close to 45 years later, in the age of ultrasound pictures, the same newspaper reported on the latest research on the pain experienced by unborn children, focusing on that of Dr. Sunny Anand, an Oxford-trained neonatal pediatrician who held an appointment at Harvard Medical School.

As Dr. Anand has testified regarding abortions: “If the fetus is beyond 20 weeks of gestation, I would assume that there will be pain caused to the fetus. And I believe it will be severe and excruciating pain.”

Congress has the power, and the responsibility, to acknowledge these developments in our understanding of the ability of unborn children to feel pain by prohibiting abortions after 20 weeks’ pregnancy postfertilization, the point at which scientific evidence shows the unborn can experience great suffering. The bill before us does just that, and, in doing so, it saves lives.

In fact, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office is so confident that this bill would save lives that it took the rare step of estimating the number of lives that would be saved if this bill is enacted. The CBO conservatively estimates that this bill would

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 support this legislation.

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 shows a New York Times ad. 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 adopted, and 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 you get me an ad from 1791, 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 them 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 the CBO estimates will cost us from \$65 million to \$335 million over 10 years. Their concern about the budget goes out the window.

The truth of the matter is this goes back to the Rules Committee debate on this bill. We were told: It is popular; the polls show people want this.

This is a political bill that has had no hearing in the Judiciary Committee, had no markup in the Judiciary Committee. That is called regular order, something we were promised by the Speaker, a new day in Congress. We were going to have opportunities for both sides to debate, the kind of things JOHN MCCAIN, a great American hero,

sees as wrong in the Senate, which is just as wrong in the House: two sides coming together to debate, to vote, to amend, to discuss. No.

It comes straight to the floor because it is politically popular, more politically popular this week than having a bill to allow for silencers for weapons, which was going to be the bill du jour for this week, but it was pulled.

Instead, we got this unconstitutional law that flies in the face of Roe v. Wade, takes rights away from women and treats them without exceptions that are necessary to make a law proper concerning rape and incest.

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

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

Thomas Jefferson, whose words marked the beginning of this Nation, said: “The care of human life and 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 these, 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.

□ 1615

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 courage 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

from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), the co-chair of the Pro-Choice Caucus.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman and also Ms. JAYAPAL for allowing me to speak today.

Madam Speaker, I rise for my former district director Chris and his wife, Bridget. This is their story.

Bridget was pregnant with their very much-wanted second child. After the 20th week, they were stunned to learn that the brain stem of the fetus was not attached, and if the baby even survived, then the newborn would likely die within hours. Doctors told the family, if they wanted more children, it would be a good idea to end the pregnancy. After consulting with their minister, they decided to do so.

The happy ending is that a year or so later another child was born, and she is happy and healthy today.

As co-chair of the Pro-Choice Caucus, I know that difficult circumstances always surround these highly personal decisions, and I don't think that the U.S. Congress is the body that should impose its opinion.

Just imagine the horrible choices families would have to make if H.R. 36 became law. Ninety-nine percent of abortions are conducted before the 20-week mark. Virtually all the rest are just like this situation.

Madam Speaker, I urge the body to reject this bill and to move on to important issues that are facing this country.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I thank her for her leadership.

I would also say to the last speaker, this affects that 1 percent that she was referring to.

Madam Speaker, life is precious. We are reminded of this in ways wonderful; we are reminded of this in ways difficult. Today, I rise in support of life. I rise in support of Micah's Law. I rise in recognition that advancements in technology today both reveal more about the stages of life as well as show us the promise for preserving it.

As unpleasant as it may be, technology reveals something to us about suffering. It now shows us that the unborn can feel pain inside the womb.

The science is in and the science is real. At 20 weeks old, ultrasound images reveal that unborn babies respond to unwanted stimuli—to pain—the same exact way adults do: they recoil; they contract.

In cases of abortion, these unborn babies are feeling pain. They suffer. That is really hard to hear, and it is really hard to say. But now that we are seeing scientific evidence and proof that these babies are in pain, the question is: What do we do about it?

We can't claim ignorance. Their pain is no longer invisible to us, and we can-

not say, as a society, with a good and upright conscience, that we can just continue to ignore it.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, sponsored by our colleague TRENT FRANKS, protects these babies by restricting abortion to 20 weeks after fertilization occurs, the point at which science has proven a baby can feel pain.

It is easy to turn a blind eye to the pain of others. For a moment, you think that if we just ignore it, it will go away and it doesn't exist. But our hearts and our minds are always going to remind us.

We cannot stop the pain of the world by turning away from it. We must not turn away from the pain of the most vulnerable among us, the ones who have nowhere to run to.

Madam Speaker, our humanity shines brightest when we stand up for those who are suffering, when we protect people from pain. I simply ask my colleagues, I implore my fellow Americans, let's be moved by this suffering. Let's also be inspired by life.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I rise to strongly urge a "no" vote on H.R. 36, and I rise today for Gina.

Gina, who lives in Seattle, found out at her 20-week ultrasound that the baby had multiple fetal anomalies, both cardiac and brain, that were fatal. The baby would either die before birth or within the first few days or weeks of life.

Gina decided to end the pregnancy, her constitutional right to make decisions about her own body. If Gina were in a different State with restrictive laws, she would not have been able to get the evidence-based and compassionate care that she deserved. This important, very personal decision was made between Gina and her doctor.

The Supreme Court has made it clear that it is her right, and yet our Republican colleagues continue to try to take that right away from Gina and other women in her position.

This bill not only takes healthcare decisions out of the hands of patients, but, Madam Speaker, it could penalize doctors with up to 5 years in prison for performing these abortions. This is unconscionable.

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

Mr. CONYERS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, Gina and all women deserve to have access to care that is comprehensive and compassionate. Madam Speaker, on their behalf, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 36. We must stop these bans and support women like Gina to continue to have their constitutional rights and to make decisions about their own bodies.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman

from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), chairwoman of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Georgia for her leadership on this issue.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

The United States currently stands alongside North Korea, China, and Vietnam as one of only seven countries that allow elective abortion to occur after 20 weeks postfertilization.

At this point in their life, unborn babies have a well-developed brain and nervous system as well as pain receptors. This fetal development is observed by surgeons who routinely see these unborn children react to pain. In fact, doctors administer anesthesia to these children in the womb during fetal surgeries.

I am proud to support this bill, also known as Micah's Law, because we must care for these unborn children, not cruelly inflict pain and deny them their inherent dignity by treating them as objects.

One day, I hope that a cultural life will take hold in the United States and that all children will be protected under the law. However, until that day comes, it remains my solemn duty to stand up for life. Regardless of the length of this journey, I will continue to speak for those who cannot.

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, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), a senior member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. DEUTCH. 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 of American 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. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.)

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Georgia 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 Micah Act is life-affirming legislation that shows compassion for the baby and the mom.

Ten years ago, I received tough news that our son had Down syndrome, 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 protects the sanctity of life, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), 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 Supreme Court 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 imminent risk, in 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 heart-breaking 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.

□ 1630

I will close with Danielle's words: "What my husband and I experienced was just so horrible. Unless people have walked in my 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 and physician from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, as a proud cosponsor, I rise today in support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

Before coming to Congress, I worked as an OB/GYN physician for over 30 years, where I had the tremendous privilege to see life at all stages of development. Today's technology, like 3-D and 4-D ultrasound, has given us a window into that miracle that shows the unborn child is a living, feeling human being.

Due to medical achievements, premature babies are surviving and thriving after being born earlier and earlier, including babies born at or before 20 weeks, the 20-week cutoff by this bill. I can give you case after case. I have watched these children grow up in my hometown.

As a physician who has delivered almost 5,000 babies, it is unconscionable to me that our government allows innocent lives capable of feeling pain and enjoying life to be terminated. It is our responsibility as legislators to stand up and protect these lives who do not have a voice. This bill is an important step toward that goal, and I vote for life.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, today I rise for Stephanie from my district. This is her story.

Stephanie and her husband were building their family. They had one beautiful daughter when she got pregnant for the second time, a planned and wanted pregnancy.

But at 19 weeks, Stephanie got heart-breaking news. Her fetus had a devastating fatal 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 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 do on each 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 because 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 the miracles that we need to put this country in the right condition?

Sixty-five percent of the babies 22 to 26 weeks old survive that are born premature. As I said, we know they feel pain.

So 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. 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 very difficult. There was not a single doctor in Virginia she could go to.

Denise, as a grieving mother in the middle of an absolutely emotional crisis, found herself 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. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. 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. Mr. 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 drive from 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 her 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 would 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. Science increasingly shows 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, Patten’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 voiceless, 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 defense-

less, 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 are visible testaments of their lives.

These children need love. Their mothers need love. Let’s end the pain. These children are suffering, so 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.

□ 1645

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 inside, squeeze on 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 against children, and it is inhumane. 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 abortionist 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 with rows of ridges 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 hard—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 Kennedy gets it. 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 torn limb from limb. 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.” Justice Kennedy added in the Court's 2007 opinion in *Gonzales v. Carhart* that D&E abortions are “laden with the power to devalue human life . . .”

Even if pain wasn't present, dismembering a child is violence against children and inhumane. But these babies actually suffer.

Dr. Robert White, professor of neurosurgery at Case Western Reserve University said an unborn child at 20 weeks gestation “is fully capable of experiencing pain . . . without question, (abortion) is a dreadfully painful experience . . .”

In an expert report prepared for the U.S. Justice Department, Dr. Kanwaljeet S. Anand, a pediatrician specializing in the care of critically ill newborns and children who has conducted intensive research of pain and stress in the human newborn and fetus said: “. . . the human fetus possesses the ability to experi-

ence pain from 20 weeks gestation, if not earlier, and the pain perceived by the fetus is possibly more intense than that perceived by term newborns or older children . . .” Why? Dr. Anand points out that “the highest density of pain receptors per square inch of skin in human development occurs in utero from 20 to 30 weeks gestation . . . Thus, a fetus at 20 to 32 weeks of gestation would experience a much more intense pain than older infants or children or adults.”

Dr. Colleen Malloy, assistant professor, Division of Neonatology at the Northwestern University, in her testimony before the House Judiciary Committee said: “When we speak of infants at 20 weeks post-fertilization we no longer have to rely on inferences or ultrasound imagery, because such premature patients are kicking, moving and reacting and developing right before our eyes in the neonatal intensive care unit.”

Dr. Malloy went on to say, “in today's medical arena, we resuscitate patients at this age and are able to witness their ex-utero growth.” She says “I could never imagine subjecting my tiny patients to horrific procedures such as those that involve limb detachment or cardiac injection”

In an undercover video released by David Daleidan, a Planned Parenthood Medical Director explains that before beginning a late abortion she completes a clinical documentation form that says “I intend to utilize dismemberment techniques for this procedure.”

Notice the words—“dismemberment techniques”—in order to “extract the fetus in multiple parts.”

But seriously, we've known much of this for years. In 2006 I authored the Unborn Child Pain Awareness Act that garnered 250 votes in favor—including 40 Democrats—to 162 against. I remember thinking on the day of the vote: “how can anyone vote to refuse to make child pain information part of informed consent?”

Congressman TRENT FRANKS has authored four extraordinarily important bills over the years to actually protect pain-capable babies in federal law from the violence of abortion including Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Acts that passed the House of Representatives in 2013 and again in 2015. Tragically, President Obama vowed to veto this child protection legislation and the Senate failed to even pass it. However, should the House pass H.R. 36 today and if the Senate passes it as well, President Trump has said he would sign it.

Not only will babies be protected by federal law at five months and the pain suffered by these babies averted, but H.R. 36 requires that a late abortion permitted under limited circumstances provide the “best opportunity for the unborn child to survive” and that “a second physician trained in neonatal resuscitation” be “present and prepared to provide care to a child” to the same degree as the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002.

Thus, “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.”

Moreover, “following the care required to be rendered . . . the child born alive shall be im-

mediately transported and admitted to the hospital.”

Sixteen states have enacted pain-capable unborn child laws that closely parallel the bill before us today. These include Ohio, Texas, Nebraska, Idaho, Oklahoma, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Arkansas, North Dakota, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, South Carolina, Kentucky and Kansas.

Madam Speaker, I respectfully ask that my colleagues respect unborn children as our nation's littlest patients who like any other patient may need diagnosis and benign interventions to treat disability or disease.

And preemies are surviving earlier and healthier as technology and medical science advance. Micah Pickering is a healthy 5 year old today. He was born prematurely at 20 weeks and was the size of this M&M candy bag. Micah is the face of the pro-life movement. That is why the bill before us today is “Micah's Law.”

A recent study of nearly 5,000 babies published in the *New England Journal of Medicine* confirmed that nearly a quarter of the premature babies born at 22 weeks survived. (Let me note that the 22 weeks gestational age referred to in the study is equivalent to 20 weeks fetal age using the age dating system employed by H.R. 36).

Researchers at Children's Hospital of Philadelphia (CHOP) are developing a technology that they hope—in a decade—will be the new standard of care for extremely premature infants. Building a bridge between the mother's womb and the outside world, the artificial wombs provide 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 news of 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 indicating that “connections from the periphery to the cortex is not intact until 24 weeks. The cortex is necessary for pain perception.”

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 her 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 gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, Maddie Brinckerhoff was an early feminist author and lecturer from the Midwest, where I live, and she had this to say about abortion: “It is evidence that either by education or circumstances that she”—the woman—“has been greatly wronged.”

In this spirit, Madam Speaker, I think there is an opportunity here to perhaps bring Congress together around a humane proposition that requires thoughtful but necessary reflection on the deepest meanings of pain.

We all know pain. But pain teaches us profound lessons about suffering, sacrifice, patience, and the redemptive healing possibilities of encountering one another in our vulnerability as humans living in the interdependency of community. Pain is something from which we naturally recoil, but it also enables us to build compassion toward those who are weak, or dependent, or alone.

Madam Speaker, in letting our natural impulse to respond to another who is in pain, we can grasp what it means to be truly ourselves, to be truly human, and to care deeply about everyone, and to really internalize what is at issue here.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 36, which is a nationwide 20-week abortion ban. I would like to share a story about Lindsey, a woman from California.

Lindsey ended her pregnancy at 24 weeks, after a devastating diagnosis. When Lindsey had her 12-week

ultrasound, everything looked completely normal. But the picture was different at the 21-month anatomy scan. Lindsey and her husband learned that their baby girl had lethal skeletal dysplasia. Lindsey sought out additional opinions from three maternal-fetal specialists. They all agreed that her lungs were not developing properly and she would not survive. Lindsey and her husband chose to end the pregnancy at 24 weeks.

Lindsey wants lawmakers to know: “If I had to carry her to term, she would not have survived. As her mother, it is my right to spare her suffering, and that is what I did.”

The cruel ban on the floor today would only make these heart-wrenching situations worse for families like Lindsey’s. On behalf of Lindsey, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on H.R. 36. Republicans should stop playing politics 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, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. 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 inside the womb.

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 Georgia has 10½ 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 story: no one was 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 make 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 gentleman 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—abilities they will use to serve others and make a difference.

Let me 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 are 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:

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 pregnant agony with no hope for the 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 despicable 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 precious 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 to join me in supporting 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.

□ 1700

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.

Instead of 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 must stop efforts to stand between 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 brain and 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 what Americans want, it violates science, and it violates our country’s most enduring values.

Madam Speaker, I urge passage of Micah’s Law, H.R. 36.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ 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 really 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 especially painful about this bill is that there is an exception in this bill for rape victims only when they report to law enforcement offi-

cial, thus resurrecting the debunked legitimate rape argument.

Many women can’t report rape for a variety of reasons, probably also including the sanctimonious social stigma that their Congressman or Congresswoman would place upon them. So this bill underhandedly revictimizes vulnerable rape survivors.

Madam Speaker, I am a survivor of rape. That is painful. This bill is a cruel and ruthless attempt to undermine women and attack our rights to govern our bodies, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote against this unconstitutional bill.

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.

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 beg many of my colleagues to support a bill like this when it is scientifically proven that unborn babies feel pain after 5 months. Premature infants in the NICU are protected from pain. Children in the womb should be protected from pain also.

I will always fight for the right to life, and I believe we have a responsibility to defend all innocent lives. In fact, this is close to home. I have four children: one son and three daughters. I have had to see both my wife and each one of my daughters experience difficult pregnancies and make difficult choices. I can’t imagine life without my four children and my 12 beautiful grandchildren.

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 as newlyweds that Katie 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 heart-breaking, 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 horrific 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 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 Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection 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 colleagues time 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.

Today, if a physician 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 medication 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 they recoil from sharp objects.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this legislation 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 constitutional rights. I can see as clear as I can see you, Madam 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 guaranteed right of privacy, and it diverts attention 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 of 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 pregnancy 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 because you frighten these women. The idea of Jeni, in my home State, where they had a 2-day waiting period listening to a mandatory script about abortion and a sign-off from two separate doctors. Once you start this, you are taking it away from women who have sought their faith 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 possession. That is what we need to fight to save lives, not this bill that undermines the rights of women and their faith and their doctor.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 36, the "Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act" and the underlying 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

build the ravaged communities hit by hurricanes 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.

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

The one thing we should not be doing is debating irresponsible "messaging bills" that abridge the rights of women and poses a nationwide threat to the health and wellbeing of American women and a direct challenge to the Supreme Court's ruling in *Roe v. Wade*.

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

It is these women who receive the 1.5 percent of abortions that occur after 20 weeks.

Women like Jeni from Texas, who, at 21 weeks, was told that her fetus had multiple severe defects.

Jeni could end the pregnancy or wait for the fetus to miscarry or die.

There was no way that the pregnancy would end in a live, healthy baby.

Jeni and her husband chose to terminate the pregnancy, but because they live in Texas, they were forced to endure several cruel restrictions: 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 different.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I also strongly oppose H.R. 36 because it lacks the necessary exceptions to protect the health and life of the mother.

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

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

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

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

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

I strongly oppose H.R. 36 and urge all Members to join me in voting against this unwise measure that put the lives and health of women 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. He would never be able to breathe on his own. If she carried the pregnancy to term and he was born alive, he would die shortly after of suffocation. April hoped the news 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 the soonest 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 for labor and delivery. 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 everything we can to save the life of that baby, calling in pediatricians 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 one room, and just down the road there are people killing that baby, tearing it apart limb by limb and decapitating it? What type of a world do we live in these days? How can both of those situations exist in this same country?

We have to ban these late-term abortions.

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

Mrs. HANDEL, Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

Our Nation has long recognized that we are all endowed by our creator with certain inalienable rights, chief among them is the right to life. I am unapologetically pro-life because all human life has dignity and should be protected, especially the lives of defenseless unborn children.

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.

Currently, 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 important bill is a big step forward towards that goal.

Mr. CONYERS, Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

□ 1715

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 grieve 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 anomalies. This 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 serve to punish women who are already suffering, and 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 my 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 society 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?

The 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, I rise towards the end of this long debate to reiterate 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 every one 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 noted in a letter to Members opposing 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 the balance of 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. We have 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 and a miracle, within 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 a just 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 a woman'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 limb from 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, in both chambers to do the same. Thank you Mr. FRANKS for introducing this important piece of legislation.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, today, I rise for Dr. Liz. This is her story. Laura and Mark, a couple in Connecticut, sought prenatal care from Dr. Liz. When Laura was 20 weeks pregnant, they came in for an ultrasound.

The couple was devastated when the scan showed that their baby was affected by anencephaly, meaning absence of brain development. Dr. Liz remembers watching the joy and laughter leave Laura and Mark as they absorbed this news.

They sought refuge with their families and clergy, and jointly made the difficult decision to end the pregnancy rather than endure 20 more weeks, a delivery, and the certain death of the child soon thereafter.

Every family should be able to make their own decisions about reproductive health. Instead, this bill puts the federal government squarely between a woman and her doctor. It even threatens providers like Dr. Liz with five years in jail if they perform a legal, constitutional, and sometimes medically necessary procedure.

H.R. 36 is nothing more than a cruel attempt to deny women their constitutional rights. The Ninth Circuit struck down Idaho's 20-week ban in 2015, and also struck down a similar law from Arizona in 2013.

We must stop the attacks on women's health. I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 36.

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This bill would prohibit late term abortions on unborn babies who can feel pain. As we now know, babies can feel pain as early as 20 weeks. This means during dismemberment abortion and induction abortions, babies feel the pain from these procedures, while in the womb. We are one of seven countries that still allows late term abortions, putting us in the company with North Korea and China.

In fact, one of my staffers great niece was born at 26 weeks, weighing just 2 lbs, 11 oz. It's unconscionable that we allow babies such as her niece to be aborted. This bill is one step closer to achieving our goal of protecting these innocent lives. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and to protect the sanctity of life.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 548, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMEND

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommend at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I am in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Brownley of California moves to recommend the bill H.R. 36 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 6, line 21, insert after "life" the following: "or health".

Page 6, beginning on line 22, strike "whose" and all that follows through "conditions" on page 7, ending in line 3.

Page 11, line 20, insert after "life" the following: "or health".

Page 11, beginning on line 21, strike "by" and all that follows through "injury" on line 22 and insert "or".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Madam Speaker, this is the final amendment to H.R. 36, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Madam Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, I am a mom. I have two wonderful children. I am so very proud of them because both of them have decided to pursue careers that will save lives. My daughter, Hannah, currently lives in Africa, working for an NGO to fight poverty and AIDS. My son, Fred, is a doctor at Northwestern.

Looking around this room, I see many other moms. We know the amazing joy that comes with parenthood. Most of us have been fortunate that our children were born without complications. Unfortunately, for some women, this is not always the case.

Throughout this debate, Members have been sharing the stories of women who wanted to be moms, but who found themselves in unimaginable situations and who were forced to make one of the most gut-wrenching decisions of their lives—whether to terminate her pregnancy due to health risks.

This is much like one woman from Michigan, who I will call Pam.

Pam was already raising children and was excited and proud to be pregnant with another child. But Pam's pregnancy was causing her heart to fail. She consulted with multiple specialists, who all told her that her own health was in jeopardy if the pregnancy continued.

Pam's doctors advised her that the safest option was to terminate the pregnancy. But it was a very difficult decision for Pam and her family to make, as anyone in this room can surely imagine.

Pam, of course, had to think about her children, her family, and her own life. Imagine what that decision must be like. Just take a moment and think about that.

Now, imagine finding out that politicians in Washington, D.C., have told Pam that she was not allowed to make that decision on her own, with her family. Imagine that: politicians putting her health in jeopardy, telling a woman and her family that the government was going to criminalize a doctor providing her care, that her children might not have a mother while growing up. That is what this bill would do.

As currently written, H.R. 36 shows no concern for the long-term health of the mother, her future ability to bear children, or her ability to care for her family. This bill would force women to carry pregnancies to term, even when their health is at risk. Even if the fetus has no chance of survival, this bill would require a woman to go to full term. Imagine what that would be like.

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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman 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 was named for: Micah Pickering. As many of you know, he was born at 22 weeks and spent 4 long months in intensive care.

□ 1730

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? How can one be 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.

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. 782.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 187, nays 238, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 548]

YEAS—187

Adams	Doyle, Michael	Lujan, Ben Ray
Aguilar	F.	Lynch
Barragan	Ellison	Maloney
Bass	Engel	Carolyn B.
Beatty	Eshoo	Maloney, Sean
Bera	Espallat	Matsui
Beyer	Esty (CT)	McCollum
Bishop (GA)	Evans	McEachin
Blumenauer	Frankel (FL)	McGovern
Blunt Rochester	Fudge	McNerney
Bonamici	Gabbard	Meeks
Boyle, Brendan	Gallego	Meng
F.	Garamendi	Moore
Brady (PA)	Gomez	Moulton
Brown (MD)	Gonzalez (TX)	Murphy (FL)
Brownley (CA)	Gottheimer	Nadler
Bustos	Green, Al	Napolitano
Butterfield	Green, Gene	Neal
Capuano	Grijalva	Nolan
Carbajal	Gutiérrez	Norcross
Cárdenas	Hanabusa	O'Halleran
Carson (IN)	Hastings	O'Rourke
Cartwright	Heck	Pallone
Castor (FL)	Higgins (NY)	Panetta
Castro (TX)	Hoyer	Pascarell
Chu, Judy	Huffman	Payne
Ciilline	Jackson Lee	Pelosi
Clark (MA)	Jayapal	Perlmutter
Clarke (NY)	Jeffries	Peters
Clay	Johnson (GA)	Pingree
Cleaver	Johnson, E. B.	Pocan
Clyburn	Kaptur	Polis
Cohen	Keating	Price (NC)
Connolly	Kelly (IL)	Quigley
Conyers	Kennedy	Raskin
Cooper	Khanna	Rice (NY)
Correa	Kildee	Richmond
Costa	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Courtney	Kind	Ruiz
Crist	Krishnamoorthi	Ruppersberger
Crowley	Kuster (NH)	Rush
Cuellar	Langevin	Ryan (OH)
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes
Davis, Danny	Lawrence	Schakowsky
DeFazio	Lawson (FL)	Schiff
DeGette	Lee	Schneider
Delaney	Levin	Schrader
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Scott (VA)
DeBene	Lieu, Ted	Scott, David
Demings	Loeb sack	Serrano
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Sewell (AL)
Deutch	Lowenthal	Shea-Porter
Dingell	Lowey	Sherman
Doggett	Lujan Grisham,	Sinema
	M.	Sires

Slaughter Smith (WA) Soto Speier Suezzi Swalwell (CA) Takano Thompson (CA) Thompson (MS) Tonko Torres Tsongas Vargas Veasey Vela Velázquez Visclosky Walz

Wasserman Schultz Waters, Maxine Watson Coleman Welch Wilson (FL) Yarmuth

□ 1755

Messrs. BUCSHON, 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—ayes 237, noes 189, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 549]

AYES—237

Abraham Aderholt Allen Amash Amodi Arrington Babin Bacon Banks (IN) Barletta Barr Barton Bergman Biggs Bilirakis Bishop (MI) Bishop (UT) Black Blackburn Blum Bost Brady (TX) Brat Brooks (AL) Brooks (IN) Buchanan Buck Buechon Budd Burgess Byrne Calvert Carter (GA) Carter (TX) Chabot Cheney Coffman Cole Collins (GA) Collins (NY) Comer Comstock Conaway Cook Costello (PA) Cramer Crawford Culberson Curbelo (FL) Davidson Davis, Rodney Denham Dent DeSantis DesJarlais Diaz-Balart Donovan Duffy Duncan (SC) Duncan (TN) Dunn Emmer Estes (KS) Farenthold Faso Ferguson Fitzpatrick Fleischmann Flores Fortenberry Foxx Franks (AZ) Frelinghuysen Gaetz Gallagher Garrett Gianforte Gibbs Gohmert Goodlatte Gosar Gowdy Granger Graves (GA) Graves (LA) Graves (MO) Griffith Grothman Guthrie Handel Harper Harris Hartzler Hensarling Herrera Beutler Hice, Jody B. Higgins (LA) Hill Holding Hollingsworth Hudson Huizenga Hultgren Hunter Hurd Issa Jenkins (KS) Jenkins (WV) Johnson (LA) Johnson (OH) Johnson, Sam Jones Jordan Joyce (OH) Katko Kelly (MS) Kelly (PA) King (IA) King (NY) Kinzinger Knight Kustoff (TN) Labrador LaHood LaMalfa Lamborn Lance LaMalfa Lamborn Latta Lewis (MN) Lipinski LoBiondo Love Lucas Luetkemeyer MacArthur Marchant Marino Marshall Mast McCarthy McCaul McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mitchell Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Murphy (PA) Newhouse Noem Norman Nunes Olson Palazzo Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Poe (TX) Poliquin Posey Ratcliffe Reed Reichert Renacci Rice (SC) Rice (KY) Roby Roe (TN) Rogers (AL) Rogers (KY) Rohrabacher Rokita Rooney, Francis Rooney, Thomas J. Ros-Lehtinen Roskam Ross Rothfus Rouzer Royce (CA) Russell Rutherford Sanford Scalise Schweikert Scott, Austin

Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Poe (TX) Poliquin Posey Ratcliffe Reed Reichert Renacci Rice (SC) Roby Roe (TN) Rogers (AL) Rogers (KY) Rohrabacher Rokita Rooney, Francis Rooney, Thomas J. Ros-Lehtinen Roskam Ross Rothfus Rouzer Royce (CA) Russell Rutherford Sanford Scalise Schweikert Scott, Austin Sensenbrenner Shimkus Shuster Simpson Smith (MO) Smith (NE) Smith (NJ) Smith (TX) Smucker Stefanik Stewart Stivers Taylor Tenney Thompson (PA) Thornberry Tiberi Tipton Trott Turner Upton Valadao Wagner Walberg Walden Walker Walorski Walters, Mimi Weber (TX) Webster (FL) Wenstrup Westerman Williams Wilson (SC) Wittman Womack Woodall Yoder Yoho Young (AK) Young (IA) Zeldin

Abraham Duncan (SC) King (IA) Aderholt Duncan (TN) King (NY) Allen Kinzinger Amash Emmer Knight Amodei Estes (KS) Kustoff (TN) Arrington Farenthold Labrador LaHood LaMalfa Lamborn Fergusson Fitzpatrick Lamborn Barr Flores Latta Fortenberry Lewis (MN) Bergman Foxx Lipinski Biggs Franks (AZ) LoBiondo Gaetz Love Gallagher Lucas Luetkemeyer MacArthur Meadows Marchant Marino Marshall Massie Mast Brat Granger McCarthy Graves (GA) McCaul McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mitchell Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Murphy (PA) Newhouse Noem Norman Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Poe (TX) Poliquin Posey Ratcliffe Reed Reichert Renacci

Rice (SC) Roby Roe (TN) Rogers (AL) Rogers (KY) Rohrabacher Rokita Rooney, Francis Rooney, Thomas J. Ros-Lehtinen Roskam Ross Rothfus Rouzer Royce (CA) Russell Rutherford Sanford Scalise Schweikert Scott, Austin

Sensenbrenner Sessions Shimkus Shuster Simpson Smith (MO) Smith (NE) Smith (NJ) Smith (TX) Smucker Stefanik Stewart Stivers Taylor Tenney Thompson (PA) Thornberry Tiberi Tipton Trott Turner Upton

Valadao Wagner Walberg Walden Walker Walorski Walters, Mimi Weber (TX) Webster (FL) Wenstrup Westerman Williams Wilson (SC) Wittman Womack Woodall Yoder Yoho Young (AK) Young (IA) Zeldin

NOES—189

Adams Aguilar Barragan Bass Beatty Bera Beyer Bishop (GA) Blumenauer Blunt Rochester Bonamici Boyle, Brendan F. Brady (PA) Brown (MD) Brownley (CA) Bustos Butterfield Capuano Carbajal Cardenas Carson (IN) Cartwright Castor (FL) Castro (TX) Chu, Judy Cicilline Clark (MA) Clarke (NY) Clay Cleaver Clyburn Cohen Connolly Conyers Cooper Correa Costa Courtney Crist Crowley Cummings Davis (CA) Davis, Danny DeFazio DeGette Delaney DeLauro DelBene Demings Dent DeSaulnier Deutch Dingell Doggett Doyle, Michael F. Ellison Engel Eshoo Espallat Esty (CT) Evans Foster Frankel (FL)

Frelinghuysen Fudge Gabbard Gallego Garamendi Gomez Gonzalez (TX) Gottheimer Green, Al Green, Gene Grijalva Gutierrez Hanabusa Hastings Heck Higgins (NY) Hoyer Huffman Jackson Lee Jayapal Jeffries Johnson (GA) Johnson, E. B. Kaptur Keating Kelly (IL) Kennedy Khanna Kildee Kilmer Kind Krishnamoorthi Kuster (NH) Langevin Larsen (WA) Larson (CT) Lawrence Lawson (FL) Lee Levin Lewis (GA) Lieu, Ted Loeb sack Lofgren Lowenthal Lowey Lujan Grisham, M. Lujan, Ben Ray Lynch Maloney, Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean Matsui McCollum McEachin McGovern McNerney Meeks Meng Moore Moulton Murphy (FL) Nadler Napolitano

Neal Nolan Norcross O'Halleran O'Rourke Pallone Panetta Pascarell Payne Pelosi Perlmutter Peters Pingree Pocan Polis Price (NC) Quigley Raskin Rice (NY) Richmond Roybal-Allard Ruiz Ruppberger Rush Ryan (OH) Sanchez Sarbanes Schakowsky Schiff Schneider Schrader Scott (VA) Scott, David Serrano Sewell (AL) Shea-Porter Sherman Sinema Sires Slaughter Smith (WA) Soto Speier Suezzi Swalwell (CA) Takano Thompson (CA) Thompson (MS) Tonko Torres Tsongas Vargas Veasey Vela Velázquez Visclosky Walz Wasserman Schultz Waters, Maxine Watson Coleman Welch Wilson (FL) Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Bridenstine Himes Kihuen

Long Loudermilk Rosen

□ 1802

So the bill was passed.

NOT VOTING—8
Bridenstine Foster Himes Kihuen Long Loudermilk

Rosen Titus

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 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, 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
Aderholt Calvert
Aguilar Capuano
Allen Carbajal
Amodei Cárdenas
Arrington Carson (IN)
Babin Carter (GA)
Bacon Carter (TX)
Banks (IN) Cartwright
Barletta Castor (FL)
Barr Castro (TX)
Barragán Chabot
Barton Cheney
Bass Chu, Judy
Beatty Cicilline
Bera Clark (MA)
Bergman Clarke (NY)
Beyer Clay
Bilirakis Cleaver
Bishop (GA) Clyburn
Bishop (MI) Coffman
Bishop (UT) Cohen
Black Cole
Blackburn Collins (GA)
Blum Collins (NY)
Blumenauer Comer
Blunt Rochester Comstock
Bonamici Conaway
Bost Connolly
Boyle, Brendan Conyers
F. Cook
Brady (PA) Cooper
Brady (TX) Correa
Brat Costa
Brooks (AL) Costello (PA)
Brooks (IN) Courtney
Brown (MD) Cramer
Brownley (CA) Crawford
Buchanan Crist
Buck Crowley
Bucshon Cuellar
Budd Culberson
Burgess Cummings
Bustos Curbelo (FL)

Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Clay
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
Engel
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo

Loebsack
Lofgren
Love
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross

Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—3

Amash
Hastings
Massie
NOT VOTING—13
Biggs
Bridenstine
Hanabusa
Himes
Jones
Kihuen
Long
Loudermilk
Meeks
Rooney, Francis

□ 1810

So (two-thirds being 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 vote 546, "Nay" on rollcall vote 547, "Yea" on rollcall vote 548, "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.

□ 1815

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, of the 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, and Nick 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 1934.

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 Astabula 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 bestow on like-minded members of Congress our most prestigious award, the Golden Triangle. Rep. Kaptur has received it more than 25 years running, more than any other legislator; and we are grateful for her support.

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 American farmers soon produced massive surpluses, interest rates, inflation and input costs skyrocketed, prices plummeted and competing countries developed their own farming techniques. The farm crises of the 80's began and lasted for the next 25 years. Farm program payments accounted for 50% of farm income. The mantra was that profit came in "economies of scale", and we must "get big or get out". Many family farmers and ranchers did exactly that, some by choice, many by the force of the bank.

Trade agreement seeds were planted and gathered momentum in the 80's.

NAFTA was the poster child. 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 rosey assumptions and predictions did not play out in reality like they did on paper. American workers lost their manufacturing jobs to low wage Mexican workers who were also decimated 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 consistently enjoyed trade surpluses primarily from corn and soy exports. Unfortunately though, family farmers, ranchers, and consumers 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 reveals vertically integrated 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 and reduced research and development. An example of the latter is herbicide weed resistance.

For decades Country of Origin Labelling, "COOL" has been the signature issue the Farmers Union. We pushed for its passage with great vigor because it benefits producers and 95% of consumers support it. Simply, it requires beef pork and poultry to be labeled with the country from which these products came. Rep. Kaptur has been indefatigable 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 requirement 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 efforts paid off in 2002, when COOL was included in the Farm Bill. Unfortunately, special interests, uncaring about its popularity and practicality, lobbied to prevent its funding and the measure was not implemented. Our efforts continued and in the 2008 Farm Bill COOL was mandatory and it became law of the land.

Again special interests went to work to derail 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 clearly stacked against us, our case was lost and Congress, under bogus threats of economic reprisals repealed COOL.

For NAFTA to be meaningfully renegotiated, re-instating COOL must be a high priority for the benefit of farmers and consumers.

Food production and its safety are national security issues as well as an economic ones. Trade agreements have led to reduced border inspections of food imports. Further, these agreements have deemed other countries less stringent safety regulations adequate for our import inspections. This relaxing of regulations puts our farmers and ranchers at a disadvantage because our products are routinely of higher quality.

Currency manipulation and the overvalued U.S. dollar makes our exports more expensive relegating us to the supplies of last resort which also adds to the trade deficit.

Farmers and ranchers were not helped by America's withdrawal from the Paris Climate Agreement. Farmers are poised to help mitigate climate change both here and around the world through conservation, carbon sequestration and other initiatives to assure sustainability for decades to come. Climate 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 trade is a critical component of world economics. We do, however, believe that trade deals should benefit farmers and workers in all counties. Living wages, competitive markets, with safety and welfare in the work place 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

TESTIMONY OF NICK "SONNY" NARDI, 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 jobs in Bedford Heights, The Mr. Coffee Filter Division

—115 jobs at Blue Coral Car Wax in Maple Heights

These were all good paying jobs with benefits and many were inner city jobs, workers could walk to work and had much tenure.

Most of these guys, because their production jobs were simply shifted to Mexican plants, were eligible for some federal benefits 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 imports 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 program certifies only the manufacturing jobs that we have lost because of NAFTA—not the services jobs that depend on a strong manufacturing base.

So, when you factor in those jobs, as well as the manufacturing jobs Ohio has lost due to our flawed and failed so-called "free

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 decimated, the way 416 has, by NAFTA.

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 had no better friend, no greater ally, than Congresswoman Marcy Kaptur.

Some folks here are probably too young to remember the NAFTA Accountability Act back in the mid-90s. That was Marcy 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 I want to spend 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 in a thorough way that works for 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 upgrade that puts in interests of working families first and foremost.

To achieve this goal, the top priority has to be 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 fundamental labor rights must be enforceable by the same or better trade sanctions that protect commercial interests.

Moreover, a truly modernized NAFTA should establish a process to determine basic 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 refused to include enforceable disciplines against currency manipulation.

America has learned the hard way how our trading partners manage their currencies against the dollar to increase their exports to us (and limit imports from us), which increases our trade deficits, which costs American jobs. We're not saying that Mexico or Canada is currently manipulating their currencies. But we are saying that a replace-

ment trade model that we will support must finally address the issue of currency misalignment.

Let me finish by mentioning a couple bad NAFTA provisions that must come out during renegotiation.

The first is Government Procurement, which is NAFTA chapter 10. It has undermined "Buy American" laws by requiring the federal government to treat foreign bidders as if they were US bidders. To Buy American is to Hire American; that's how it works, and we want our jobs back and our tax dollars spent at home.

Going into these new NAFTA talks, the U.S. should retract all procurement commitments that undermine responsible bidding standards and all domestic or local preferences. Teamsters and taxpayers from both sides of the partisan divide support "Buy American"—and we don't want the new NAFTA to weaken that economic policy, especially as we look forward to the infrastructure investment that this country needs so badly.

The second thing that must come out is the controversial system of private corporate courts that protect foreign investors. NAFTA's chapter 11 introduced so-called "investor-state dispute settlement" (ISDS) into our "free trade" deals, giving foreign companies superior rights over U.S. firms.

ISDS undermines the rule of law and facilitates offshoring by creating unique privileges and secretive arbitration chambers in which foreign investors, but not American firms, can challenge laws the claim will cut profits.

A third bad provision, of particular interest to the Teamsters, is in Chapter 12, which deals with trade in services. The old NAFTA opened up American highways to unsafe Mexican-domiciled long-haul carriers.

We and our allies like Advocates for Highway Safety, the Sierra Club and the Owner-Operator Independent Truckers, have fought for many years, in the Congress and in the courts, to keep that provision from being fully implemented.

The original intent of the NAFTA negotiators was to keep US interstates closed to Mexican carries until the safety of the trucks and drivers could be certified. That never happened. Accordingly, we call on the new NAFTA RE-negotiators to end this controversy once and for all. The new NAFTA should require Mexican-domiciled trucks to transfer their loads to US trucks in the 20 mile wide border commercial zone.

In conclusion, I have named two new chapters that must be included in NAFTA 2.0 and three bad aspects that must come out—five reforms that will keep and create middle class jobs and help America lead the way towards a new trade policy program, a template for all future international commercial agreements.

But, seeing as we are enjoying the hospitality of our UAW brothers and sisters here in Local 1250, I want to mention one last NAFTA fix.

The Rules of Origin for autos and auto parts should be beefed up. The "regional value content" should be raised and all loopholes closed. In order to enjoy the low tariffs and NAFTA market access, all cars and trucks that are made in the three countries should not have components that are made in other countries where wages are suppressed by companies that oppress workers and pay them less than their labor is worth.

That solidarity is what this opportunity is all about. Autoworkers and Steelworkers and Machinists and Teamsters, the labor unions that have had the worst experience under NAFTA and now have the greatest stake in real overhaul in its renegotiation. We must stand in solidarity with our broth-

ers and sisters in the independent unions in Canada and Mexico. And, in turn, all of labor must stand in solidarity with environmental activists, consumer advocates and the family farmers.

Together, we have been fighting NAFTA and its expansion for a generation. Now we can work together, with our allies in Congress, to finally fix it.

Thank You

HONORING JIM POWELL ON HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Jim Powell, of Johnson City, Tennessee, for his 80th birthday.

In addition to being a successful businessman, Jim has devoted his life to many worthy endeavors, such as helping students achieve their dreams of attending college.

Growing up, Jim never dreamed of going to college until a teacher helped him apply for a scholarship to the University of Tennessee. Eleven years later, Jim and his wife, Sandy, opened Powell Construction Company, which has been successfully operating for the past 48 years and employs more than 500 people.

All of this wouldn't have been possible without the kind encouragement of Jim's teacher. In an effort to pay that kindness forward, Jim created the Powell Foundation, which has provided over 4,000 scholarships to the University of Tennessee and to East Tennessee State University.

Our community is a better place to live and work because of Jim and Sandy Powell. Jim exemplifies the Volunteer spirit. I commend him for his selfless contributions to east Tennessee, and wish him nothing but the best on his 80th birthday.

Happy birthday, Jim.

HONORING THE VICTIMS OF THE LAS VEGAS SHOOTING

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

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of one of my constituents, Michelle Vo, who lost her life in Sunday's mass shooting in Las Vegas.

Michelle was described by her friends and family as an ambitious, hard worker, known for her charisma and fierce independence. She embodied the American Dream in every single way. Her middle name, My, means "America" in Vietnamese.

Her mother emigrated from Vietnam and raised Michelle and her sisters near San Jose. Michelle would go on to graduate from UC Davis before moving to Eagle Rock, in my district, to work as an insurance agent in nearby Pasadena.

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 on-line 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 on-line 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 reconciliation deal, 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, I call 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, Hurricanes 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 hospitals, schools, and utility systems.

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 Houston, 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, just yesterday, the tragedy in Las Vegas.

It is hard not to focus only on those issues, but in many, many ways, Las

Vegas aside, the issue of the hurricanes and what we will do as Americans going forward is on my mind and, I suspect, on the minds of many.

As we review and as we figure out how to deal with those disasters and how we rebuild, I would like us all to keep in mind that our goal, in addition to bringing these economies back together again, putting people back in their homes, their businesses, and the infrastructure, that we keep in mind that we ought to be looking for better jobs and better wages for all Americans—and certainly for those in the low- and middle-income brackets—and a better future.

We think about Puerto Rico and their future. How do we make it a better future? Well, we certainly know that there is a problem in much of America, stagnation of wages, so higher pay becomes critically important.

We need to deal with the cost issues that go into this, and we need to make sure that all Americans, wherever they may be, in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or Washington, Virginia, wherever, that they have the tools to compete.

So today we are going to take 1 hour, and we are going to talk about ideas that need to be discussed here in the House of Representatives: legislation, existing programs such as the Jones Act, shipbuilding, and the like.

□ 1830

I would like to ask my colleague, BRENDAN BOYLE, to begin the discussion with a bill that he and his colleagues, or our colleagues, are introducing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE).

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Before I have the opportunity to speak about that, I just want to say briefly what a contrast we see between the Republican tax plan that was released last week and the bill that my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY), and I will be talking about.

The Republican tax plan that was released last week, I think everyone has acknowledged by now that it is a massive giveaway to the wealthiest 1 percent. The nonpartisan Tax Policy Center estimates that 79.7 percent of the top 1 percent would get the benefit.

But what most people don't realize is that, under that same tax plan, many middle class families and working class families would see their taxes go up, not down. The same nonpartisan Tax Policy Center estimates that 30 percent of middle class families would see their taxes go up.

We did an estimate of my district in northeast Philadelphia, and suburban Philadelphia. A majority of middle class and working class families in my district would see their taxes go up, all

to pay for a massive tax cut for the wealthiest 1 percent. That is wrong.

Now, contrast that approach with what we are introducing this week, and I especially praise the leadership of my colleague, Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY, who was the first one to introduce this idea. We are introducing the Patriot Employer Tax Credit Act. It has always bothered me, as someone who has seen jobs leave my district and go overseas and go abroad, that our Tax Code gives an incentive for that sort of behavior; that a company like Mondelez International that closed the factory that existed for more than half a century in Philadelphia, and shipped over 300 jobs to Mexico, that they are able to claim a few tax deductions while doing that.

The Patriot Employer Tax Credit Act closes those deductions, and it takes the money and devotes 100 percent of it to benefit those responsible employers, those companies that are providing jobs here at home in America, that are well paid with good benefits.

Now, my colleague, Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY, will go into greater detail about some of the aspects of the Patriot Employer Tax Credit Act. But I really think that this should be a bipartisan bill. It is a chance for our colleagues on the other side, even this administration, that says it is concerned about losing American jobs overseas, to join with us on the Democratic side of the aisle. Support the Patriot Employer Tax Credit Act and reject the sort of Wall Street-driven tax cockamamie ideas that give a massive tax cut to the wealthiest 1 percent and require working class and middle class families to pay for it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE) for his thoughts. I started off with a better deal, better wages, better jobs, or jobs at all. The Make It In America agenda, which we have been talking about here for 5 or 6 years, long before President Trump came along, involves tax policy. I am bringing to our attention tonight a tax issue that will create jobs in America and, frankly, no longer promote the offshoring of jobs.

Another piece of our puzzle on making it in America, and better wages, better jobs, and better future, is something that has been much discussed in recent days, particularly with regard to the Puerto Rican situation, and that is the Jones Act.

Joining me tonight to discuss the Jones Act, why it is important to America, why it is a major job opportunity and continuation for American mariners, American shipowners, as well as America's shipyards, is Ms. JAYAPAL.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding. It was wonderful to see the gentleman out in Seattle exploring our maritime sector.

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 relief supplies, including 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 colleague, the gentleman from California, because in the wake of Hurricane Maria, we did see a false narrative spreading through the media and social channels about the Jones Act. 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 of us.

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 docks 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 industry 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 Make It In America, 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

Juan. 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 made landfall, carrying 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 destroyed—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 will 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 aren't 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 home State of Washington, which ranks sixth in the country for Jones Act jobs, this law supports over 16,000 jobs and helps generate approximately \$1.1 billion in labor income. More than 19 million tons of cargo originate from my home State of Washington every year, and the State imports more than 28 million tons annually. Without these jobs, our economy would suffer tremendously.

In my district, Washington's Seventh Congressional District, the Jones Act directly supports nearly 2,000 jobs, 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.

Shipyards 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 we saw in the hearing that was had, 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, and also that we provide these deep investments in good-paying union jobs.

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.

Mr. GARAMENDI. 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 using American ships with American mariners to deliver 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 tugs and the rest. If 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. VEASEY) to carry on with these issues.

Mr. VEASEY. 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, a lot of reports on the news that were just quick to pick up 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.

□ 1845

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, that American ships were 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 work 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

to the Center for American Progress Action Fund, unions increase workers' benefits really substantially. Ninety-four percent of union workers have access to retirement benefits while only 65 percent of nonunion workers do.

As the gentleman knows, we discuss Social Security in this Chamber quite often, and how we are going into our retirement years and whether or not we are going to be able to take care of ourselves when we are no longer able to perform certain physical functions is obviously something that is very important.

Union workers are 28 percent more likely to have health insurance and pay a lower share of premiums for it. They are also 54 percent more likely to have a retirement plan than nonunion workers at workplaces. Union women in the United States are more likely to take parental leave, which is also more likely to be paid.

Again, whether it is the Jones Act or Davis-Bacon, we need to make sure that in this country we keep these jobs going strong and that we keep the conversation going in that direction.

Again, I just want to thank the gentleman for the work that he has done to raise awareness on this issue. We need to continue to talk about this just so the American public understands just how important this is to our economy and to our society as we continue to grow our workforce into the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. VEASEY very much for bringing to our attention the role of the unions in maintaining wages throughout the United States. If we are looking for a better deal, better jobs, better wages, and a better future, certainly the union members in the maritime industry will—and have been able to—achieve that.

The great risk is legislation may be moving through the Senate and the House that would terminate the Jones Act and, along with it, some 400,000 jobs in the United States, 100,000 of those directly in the shipyards that are building these American-built ships for the intercoastal and for the brown water, the river transportation, as well as the open ocean transportation.

So we have got something here that is very important, and that is Make It In America, a better deal for Americans comes through the Jones Act.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. VEASEY very much for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I notice that my colleague from Chicago, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, is here once again to pick up on something we talked about earlier in our Make It In America agenda. If she would look here, number two on the Make It In America agenda is taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman 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 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.

MARC VEASEY and BRENDAN BOYLE are both the co-chairs of what we call the Blue Collar Caucus. I am part of it. Notice my blue collar today.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is properly dressed for the Blue Collar Caucus.

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 in the history of the world. We are 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 2½ 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—we introduced just a few minutes ago—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 patriot employers with a tax credit for each employee's wages. To qualify for the patriot employers tax credit, a business must fulfill the following checklist:

One, invest in American jobs, no offshoring 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 SHERROD

BROWN, 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 proposal, 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 totally backward. 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 gentleman 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.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. That 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 reduces 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, 30 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 growing inequity 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 gentleman from California so much for letting me come today and talk about this new bill that was introduced. I think it is totally consistent with our better deal, better wages, better future, and better jobs for America. I thank Congressman GARAMENDI so much for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman so very much for bringing the voice of Chicago to the floor on a very good piece of legislation. I believe that has already gone across the desk, and I didn't get a chance to sign on it before the gentlewoman put it across the desk, but I will forgive the gentlewoman for that.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, 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, then there are some 400,000 jobs in American shipyards across the Nation 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 places 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 ad-

vanced clean energy ships anywhere in the world.

□ 1900

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 airplanes. They 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 marketers 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 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 this 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 sailors from wherever. 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 law for just a small percentage of the strategic national asset, crude oil and natural gas, just a small percentage of that on American-built ships with American sailors, we could build ships in America. Not just a few ships, but over the course of the next 20 or 30 years, 50 or 60 ships, providing thousands upon thousands of jobs in our American shipyards.

Right now, where are those ships built? China, Japan, and Korea, but not in America. We ought to pay attention to the 1960 law that opened up the North Slope of Alaska that required that oil from Alaska be on American-built ships with American sailors. That

lasted for almost 40 years. Then slowly, slowly it was set aside. Now that oil is on ships that are built in China, Korea, and Japan.

If we want good-paying jobs in America, if we want a better future, if we want better jobs, if we want an opportunity for Americans to earn a good middle class wage in the shipyards on the ships, then maintain the Jones Act and think seriously about a law that would create even more jobs in American shipyards.

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. The President 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 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 revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the topic of my Special Order.

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 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 be able to highlight the threat from wildfires that we are having in the West.

Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, the aftermath of Hurricanes Harvey and Irma have dominated our news cycles. Our hearts certainly go out to the people who have been impacted as they rebuild their lives and continue to work to ensure that they have the resources they need.

When we hear the term "natural disaster," most of us probably think of hurricanes, tornadoes, or earthquakes. Unless you come from the Western United States, you probably don't think of wildfires as a natural disaster. But they are, and they have devastating effects.

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 budgeted 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 budget for an agency tasked with maintaining healthy forests. It is critical that we treat wildfires like other natural disasters after an agency's wildfire suppression funds are exhausted. The cost of any extraordinary firefighting that goes beyond the agency's annual budget should be funded through a budget cap adjustment similar to what is used by FEMA for other natural disasters.

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.

□ 1915

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the vice chairman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Arizona, who I consider a friend and one of the great leaders in the Congress, for leading this Special Order and for bringing this important matter before the Chamber.

2017 will go down as the worst wildfire season in history. My home State of Utah has definitely felt the effects. In June, the Brian Head fire burned more than 71,000 acres in my State. It burned for nearly a month, creating more than \$36 million in damage. And that doesn't count the millions—indeed tens of millions of dollars it took to fight the fire.

While the fire was burning through my district, I was able to meet with local, State, and Federal leaders to take a tour of the fire and to survey

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 took more than an hour in 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 long will it take for us 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 management 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 rage out of control.

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 Montanans. 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 those two 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 alone; we lost two firefighters; 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 forests. It 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. McCLINTOCK), my friend and colleague.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. 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.

Average 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—I think we are entitled to ask: How's the forest environment doing?

All around us the answer is damning. 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 conjured 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 perhaps 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 virtually 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 densely overcrowded 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 climate 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 to sequester 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.

□ 1930

A properly managed forest matches the tree density to the ability of the land to support it, but we cannot properly manage our forests because of the laws now in place.

Mr. WESTERMAN's Resilient Federal Forests Act and other measures will restore proper scientific management of our national forests, but we are running out of time to enact them, because we are running out of forests 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 in 2016, compared to over 10 billion board feet in 1990. To make matters worse, litigation and other challenges have caused a significant reduction in active sawmills nationwide from over 1,300 in 1995, to just over 220 today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding and for his leadership on this, and to my other colleagues from the West, who understand what we face, the problems we face, and what has happened to our forests.

I stand united with all of you in the Western Caucus, because this is something we have done some work on in the past and then we have been stalled out, especially in the last 8 years. I know that President Trump stands with us, wanting to pass legislation, get it down to his desk so he can sign it so we can begin to be better stewards of our great public forests, these public forest lands important to all of us.

As we saw painfully this summer, smoke chokes our citizens, it chokes

children. Literally, in my district, elementary school children had to be sent home because of the smoke in their schools because of forest fires.

In Oregon, we have seen some of the worst fires in our State's history. It seemed as if every day came with new reports of more fire, more smoke. While this year's fire season has been particularly intense and devastating, images like these are nothing new for Oregonians. Each summer, smoke has filled our skies in Oregon year after year after year. Vast swaths of our land in our beautiful State are charred.

Unlike private forest owners, the State of Oregon, which I am very proud to be a resident of, and our forest policy and tribal lands and county lands, after a fire, they go in and clean it up, they replant, they get a new, healthy, young forest growing, which if you are concerned about reducing carbon emissions, you want healthy trees, because they actually sequester carbon. Burned, dead, decaying old trees actually emit carbon.

So we can do good things for the ecology of our world by planting new trees after a fire. We will talk about that in a minute.

Smoke inhalation has become a health hazard for Oregonians in their communities. I can't tell you how many in my communities, day after day after day, were given warnings by our health authority that the air was too dangerous to breathe, that it was unhealthy to breathe.

A recent study found that wildfires contribute three times as much fine particulate matter into the air as previously thought, and this definitely can cause respiratory problems and make it difficult to breathe, as the citizens of our great State found this summer.

Wildfires also pollute our atmosphere with carbon. In 2002, the Biscuit fire in southwest Oregon burned more than 500,000 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, 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 ravage and burn.

So we will take a look at the 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 airshed 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—Mr. MCCLINTOCK did a great job laying that out—while broken Federal forest policy stands in the way of better management, healthier air, protection of our habitat and our watersheds and our streams and our forested communities.

8.2 million acres burned this year. By the way, my colleagues, that is an area larger than Maryland, it is three-and-a-half or so times the size of, I believe, Puerto Rico, which has been wiped out. We talk about the devastation and disaster there and in the Virgin Islands and every other place, but somehow we sort of overlook the fact that we lose this almost every year in our West and in our forested land.

Communities watched their mills close, meanwhile, as Federal policy and lawsuits and litigation has prevented proper management of our forests. So we have lost our jobs, we have lost our infrastructure, we have lost the revenues for our schools, and, in some cases, for basic services like law enforcement.

Now, promises that somehow recreation and outdoor activities would replace those good family-wage jobs, tourism, they are falling short, because guess what, events are being canceled because now the fires are destroying the airshed.

Constituents of mine have been sending photos this year about some of the fires. This one right here is from Mike, who was returning from a hunting trip just a few weeks ago. This was the Eagle Creek fire burning in the scenic Columbia River Gorge area between Cascade Locks and where I live in Hood River.

We had an evacuation notice within a half a mile of where I live on Rand Road. It was level 1, but they had them higher than that as you got closer to this fire.

Meanwhile, events like Cycle Oregon, its 30th anniversary, canceled because of the smoke; Sisters Folk Festival canceled because of the smoke. Down in Ashland, the Oregon Shakespeare Theater, world-renowned festival, they had to cancel nine of their shows at a cost of \$400,000 direct revenue loss, not to mention the concerns they have about indirect loss, people who didn't show up for other performances, and might even affect their annual sales.

People are really tired of this. They expect this Congress to 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 summer. We had to go over 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 colleague from 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. GOSAR. 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 the environment. Robust data from NASA has concluded that one catastrophic wildfire can emit more carbon emissions in a few days than total ve-

hicle 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, 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 as Members of Congress take these good opportunities to simply speak about a problem and bring light to its actuality, to let people know about it, but tonight is different, because my colleagues and I are here not just to talk about this, not just to highlight the major problem of wildfires across the country, but, in fact, we bring good news as well. We offer solutions to this important issue.

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 insects, by disease infestation, 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 we budget for wildfire suppression by treating these catastrophic wildfires like any other natural disaster, which they are.

Currently, agencies like the Forest Service are forced to borrow funding from accounts outside of their firefighting 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 funds from other operating accounts to fight these fires.

Mr. Speaker, this problem is systemic, it is dire, and we must address it.

□ 1945

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 Okanogan 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 many 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 over time. 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 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 nature's natural way 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 to get out, 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 2015 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 was 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.

We have got another map here, 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 winds carry the smoke. The red 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 that could take place 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 that in 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 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 like thinning 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 temperature 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 clean 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 60 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 can take a proactive stance 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 the way that they should be.

I want to thank you again for all that you are doing, the work for the Western Caucus and all the members here, realizing, on both sides of the aisle, how important it is that we do the right thing, that we pass H.R. 2936, and that we start addressing this problem now.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his excellent leadership. He is very modest.

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 through 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 management strategy is put forward by 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 pristine 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 forestry officials and experts, it is our stunted Federal forestry management and underfunded and misallocated Forest Service accounts that are to blame.

□ 2000

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 performing 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 wise allocation. As you could 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 releases 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.

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 terrible 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 that 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.

Mr. 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 the second 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.

Mr. Speaker, the speakers tonight shared their stories. We want America to hear those loud and clear. These are natural disasters no different than hurricanes, but these, in one case, are different. They are manmade.

Let's bring this commonsense policy that Mr. WESTERMAN has put forward. He is a true advocate and smart in regards to those reforms; that is why we want to make sure that H.R. 2936 gets moved through this Chamber, and then put the onus back on the Senate, so that we actually reward the people for good policy and making sure that the victims are turned upside down and made stalwart solution makers.

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

COMMEMORATING THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF FANNIE LOU HAMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January

3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) for 30 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, tonight, I am privileged to rise in support of recognizing a true hero in not only the State of Mississippi, but this country as a whole. Her name is Fannie Lou Hamer. Fannie Lou Hamer will be 100 years old this week. I am happy to say that part of who I am can be attributed to my association with Ms. Hamer.

Mr. Speaker, before I get into my message, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague and my friend, Mr. BENNIE THOMPSON, for organizing this important Special Order hour honoring his fellow Mississippian, Ms. Fannie Lou Hamer.

Yesterday, *Cosmopolitan* published an article written by Zerlina Maxwell, aptly titled "Trust Black Women." In the article, Maxwell, a fellow New Jerseyan, quoted her colleague, who said: "Black women have been a part of every great movement that has happened in this country. We always show up."

Tonight, we celebrate the birth of Fannie Lou Hamer, a black woman who, like many of us, always showed up. In 1964, Fannie Lou Hamer showed up at the Democratic National Convention to speak on behalf of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party and highlight the hurdles, both physical and political, that were preventing Blacks in the South from showing up at the ballot box.

During her testimony, she recounted her 26-mile journey to Indianola, Mississippi, to register to vote at the county courthouse where seven other men and women were looking to do the same. On the way, they encountered coordinated opposition from local and State law enforcement and men and women who sought to deter them from exercising their right to vote.

Upon returning home, Fannie Lou Hamer found that she had been fired from her job. According to *The New York Times*, she said: "They kicked me off the plantation; they set me free. It is the best thing that could happen. Now I can work for my people."

That same year, Fannie Lou Hamer ran for Congress as a candidate from Mississippi's Second Congressional District. And even in her defeat, Ms. Hamer continued to show up and work for her people.

In 2014, 50 years after her testimony and her run for Congress, residents in New Jersey's 12th Congressional District elected me, the State's first ever African-American woman to represent them here in the House of Representatives.

During my freshman term, I joined my two amazing colleagues, Representative ROBIN KELLY of Illinois and Representative YVETTE CLARKE of New York, to form the first ever Congres-

sional Caucus on Black Women and Girls, a body of elected officials who work to ensure that Congress shows up for us.

And in 2016, I stood at the Democratic National Convention, standing on the shoulders of Ms. Hamer's legacy, and proudly told America that this Nation is stronger when everyone has a chance to succeed.

Ms. Hamer would beam with pride knowing that my colleagues and I continue to beat back hurdles placed at the feet of minorities and the poor that restrict their access to the vote.

Ms. Hamer, however, would be very sad to know that, instead of being fired for trying to exercise the right to vote, they change polling places or amend requirements for valid identification. It is the same game, she would recognize, it is just different tactics.

I am honored to stand here to honor the birthday of Ms. Fannie Lou Hamer, walk alongside her footsteps of greatness and, like she so often did, lift as I climb. We as women, and women of color, have to be the standard bearers we have been and continue to be. We have always and will continue to fight for what is right and what is necessary, even if we must do this alone.

As we battle back against the racism, the sexism, and the bigotry that runneth over in this administration, we must always be awake, alert, and to show up.

Today, in honoring the birthday of Fannie Lou Hamer, we simultaneously celebrate the strength of women, the ways we can encourage one another to be our sisters' keepers, and continue to build a future for the next generation of women ready and waiting to show up and to lead.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I will tell the gentlewoman from New Jersey that I had the opportunity to meet Ms. Hamer as a young college student at Tougaloo College. Facts about it, one of the first campaigns I worked on as a college student was Ms. Hamer's campaign for Congress, even though, as the gentlewoman indicated, she lost. But I now represent the Second District of Mississippi, and it was Ms. Hamer's spirit that still lives on.

In Sunflower County, Mississippi, the majority of the population is African American. At the time she registered to vote, we had no African Americans elected officials in Sunflower County. I am happy to report to you now that the sheriff is African American; the chancery clerk, the circuit clerk, four of the five county supervisors are African American; so Ms. Hamer's work has not been in vain.

As you also indicated, the Devil is busy creating tricks to disenfranchise people—voter ID, closing voting polls, making it more difficult for people in rural areas to get to the polls to vote, especially in areas where you don't have public transportation.

So, Ms. Hamer's 100th birthday should be spent rededicating ourselves

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 she, but 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 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.

□ 2015

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. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. 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 Demo-

cratic 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 she 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 just had to 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 prophetic 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. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is vitally important on this 100th anniversary of Ms. Hamer's birth to also recognize that we are still fighting for the unfettered access to the vote, and that here in Congress, we have the opportunity to eliminate barriers and to fix the problems with the Civil Rights Act that just negatively impacts access and unfettered access to voting. There are just so many fundamental things that we could be doing today that honor the work that she did and that she gave her life's work to.

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.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for the very kind comments. But to talk about Mrs. Hamer and her work is easy. It speaks for itself. I am very privileged, as I indicated, to have known her, to have participated in a number of meetings.

One of the other things that I realized, she didn't—as we used to say, there were no big Is and little yous. She saw everyone the same. It didn't matter whether you belonged to the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, or the Black Panther Party, or the Deacons for Defense and Justice. You still had room at the table under Mrs. Hamer's tutelage. Many of us are privileged to have known her in that way, and we try to pattern our lives after her.

The National Council of Negro Women really worked very hard with Mrs. Hamer in producing affordable housing and to making sure that farmers cooperatives could be developed in the Mississippi Delta. Because as some would choose to forget, Mrs. Hamer was put off the plantation that she lived on because she was encouraging people to register and vote.

But those were the times that we all lived in, and we saw it. When I ran for Congress, there were people who worked on farms who were required to work overtime so that they couldn't go to the polls before they closed. So there are a lot of things that we saw during Mrs. Hamer's time. The tricks are still being played.

So it is in the spirit of Fannie Lou that we pay tribute tonight to her. It is in that spirit of Fannie Lou that we wish her a happy 100th birthday. But it is also in her spirit that, as they say in South Africa, "the struggle continues," "a luta continua."

I know in the Congressional Black Caucus we call ourselves the conscience of Congress. We have to be. If we don't speak up for many of the people that Mrs. Hamer loved the most, who will? We were sent here to care for the opposition on behalf of the people who can't afford to hire lobbyists; on behalf of the people who can't get on a plane and fly to Washington and talk to their congressperson; on behalf of the little child who not only is struggling to get into the Head Start program, but whose parents are having a hard time.

So our representation as members of the Congressional Black Caucus is predicated on many of the things that Mrs. Hamer stood for in her lifetime. We can't ever forget her spirit. We can't ever forget her energy. And even though we have the opportunity as Members of Congress to meet people from all over the world, one of the things that she used to say is: "You know, I walked among kings, but I have always kept the common touch."

It is in that spirit that I appreciate the gentlewoman helping me carry forth this time for Mrs. Hamer as she celebrates here 100th birthday. If the

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 man 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 do the intellect and 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, 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 hour in 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 discriminatory comments 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 providing African-Americans 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 Indianola, 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 trail, 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, let me first begin by thanking my friend and colleague Rep. BENNIE THOMPSON for leading today's effort in honoring the life and legacy of Fannie Lou Hamer. October 6th marks the 100th anniversary of her birth in Montgomery County, Mississippi.

An honorary member of Delta Sigma Theta, Fannie Lou Hamer dedicated her life to the fight for civil rights. Born in 1917, she was the daughter of sharecroppers and the youngest of 20 siblings. By the age of six, she was helping her family in the cotton fields.

Fannie Lou Hamer was a woman of courage. She used her voice to raise awareness about the plight of African Americans in the Mississippi Delta. She was a woman of strength who was able to channel the injustices committed against her into activism.

Working for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, Hamer helped African Americans register to vote and worked to end segregation.

After attempting to register to vote herself in August 1962, Hamer lost her job and was kicked out of her home. The following year, she and fellow activists returning from a training workshop were unjustly jailed and severely beaten. While the beating left permanent damage, the officers were later acquitted by an all-white jury.

Hamer was also a trailblazing political activist. She helped to found the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party and the National Women's Political Caucus. She almost derailed the re-election of President Lyndon Johnson and changed the Democratic Party's delegate selection process. In 1968, she would become the first African American to serve as an official delegate at a national-party convention since Reconstruction and the first woman ever from Mississippi.

Although unsuccessful in her bids for elected office, Hamer remained committed to voting rights and antipoverty efforts. She filed a lawsuit to push forward desegregation efforts in local schools, led the cotton pickers resistance movement and helped to bring a Head Start program to her community.

Fannie Lou Hamer's contributions to the American Civil Rights movement and our nation are undeniable. As then UN Ambassador Andrew Young eulogized at her funeral, "None of us would be where we are now had she not been there then." His words still ring true 40 years later.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

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. 3364. 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.

August 4, 2017:
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.

August 16, 2017:
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. 3218. 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 18, 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.

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 biosimilar 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. 2288. 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.

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:
H.R. 3110. An Act to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to modify the term of the independent member of the Financial Stability Oversight Council.

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.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

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 Senate of the following titles:

August 12, 2017:
S. 114. An Act to authorize appropriations and to appropriate amounts for the Veterans Choice Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to improve hiring authorities of the Department, to authorize major medical facility leases, and for other purposes.

September 14, 2017:
S.J. Res. 49. A joint resolution condemning the violence and domestic terrorist attack that took place during events between August 11 and August 12, 2017, in Charlottesville, Virginia, recognizing the first responders who lost their lives while monitoring the events, offering deepest condolences to the families and friends of those individuals who were killed and deepest sympathies and support to those individuals who were injured by the violence, expressing support for the Charlottesville community, rejecting White nationalists, White supremacists, the Ku Klux Klan, neo-Nazis, and other hate groups, and urging the President and the President's Cabinet to use all available resources to address the threats posed by those groups.

September 15, 2017:
S. 1616. An Act to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Bob Dole, in recognition for his service to the nation as a soldier, legislator, and statesman.

September 29, 2017:
S. 1866. An Act to provide the Secretary of Education with waiver authority for the re-allocation rules and authority to extend the deadline by which funds have to be reallocated in the campus-based aid programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965 due to Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Irma, and Hurricane Maria, to provide equitable services to children and teachers in private schools, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. ROSEN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and tomorrow on account of work in district relating to tragic shooting in Las Vegas.

SENATE 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.

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:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO CANADA, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 14 AND SEPT. 16, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Bill Huizenga	9/14	9/16	Canada		739.00						739.00
Hon. Jeff Duncan	9/14	9/16	Canada		739.00						739.00
Hon. Gregory Meeks	9/14	9/16	Canada		739.00						739.00
Raeed Haddad	9/14	9/16	Canada		739.00						739.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO CANADA, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 14 AND SEPT. 16, 2017—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Rebecca Ulrich	9/14	9/16	Canada		739.00						739.00
Brian Skretny	9/14	9/16	Canada		739.00						739.00
Claire Figel	9/14	9/16	Canada		739.00						739.00
Committee total					5,173.00						5,173.00

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. 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

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Peter Roskam	9/15	9/17	Chile		1,026.00		(3)				1,026.00
Hon. David Price	9/15	9/17	Chile		1,026.00		(3)				1,026.00
Hon. Bill Flores	9/15	9/17	Chile		1,026.00		(3)				1,026.00
Hon. Susan Davis	9/15	9/17	Chile		1,026.00		(3)				1,026.00
Hon. Dina Titus	9/15	9/17	Chile		1,026.00		(3)				1,026.00
Hon. Tom Rice	9/15	9/17	Chile		1,026.00		(3)				1,026.00
Hon. Steve Knight	9/15	9/17	Chile		1,026.00		(3)				1,026.00
Hon. Norma Torres	9/15	9/17	Chile		1,026.00		(3)				1,026.00
Hon. Lucille Roybal-Allard	9/15	9/17	Chile		1,026.00		(3)				1,026.00
Janice Robinson	9/15	9/17	Chile		1,026.00		(3)				1,026.00
Mark Epley	9/15	9/17	Chile		1,026.00		(3)				1,026.00
Jeff Billman	9/15	9/17	Chile		1,026.00		(3)				1,026.00
Justin Wein	9/15	9/17	Chile		1,026.00		(3)				1,026.00
Hon. Peter Roskam	9/17	9/20	Peru		1,081.00		(3)				1,081.00
Hon. David Price	9/17	9/20	Peru		1,081.00		(3)				1,081.00
Hon. Bill Flores	9/17	9/20	Peru		1,081.00		(3)				1,081.00
Hon. Susan Davis	9/17	9/20	Peru		1,081.00		(3)				1,081.00
Hon. Dina Titus	9/17	9/20	Peru		1,081.00		(3)				1,081.00
Hon. Tom Rice	9/17	9/20	Peru		1,081.00		(3)				1,081.00
Hon. Steve Knight	9/17	9/20	Peru		1,081.00		(3)				1,081.00
Hon. Norma Torres	9/17	9/20	Peru		1,081.00		(3)				1,081.00
Hon. Lucille Roybal-Allard	9/17	9/20	Peru		1,081.00		(3)				1,081.00
Janice Robinson	9/17	9/20	Peru		1,081.00		(3)				1,081.00
Mark Epley	9/17	9/20	Peru		1,081.00		(3)				1,081.00
Jeff Billman	9/17	9/20	Peru		1,081.00		(3)				1,081.00
Justin Wein	9/17	9/20	Peru		1,081.00		(3)				1,081.00
Hon. Peter Roskam	9/20	9/22	Guatemala		575.96		(3)				575.96
Hon. David Price	9/20	9/22	Guatemala		575.96		(3)				575.96
Hon. Bill Flores	9/20	9/22	Guatemala		575.96		(3)				575.96
Hon. Susan Davis	9/20	9/22	Guatemala		575.96		(3)				575.96
Hon. Dina Titus	9/20	9/22	Guatemala		575.96		(3)				575.96
Hon. Tom Rice	9/20	9/22	Guatemala		575.96		(3)				575.96
Hon. Steve Knight	9/20	9/22	Guatemala		575.96		(3)				575.96
Hon. Norma Torres	9/20	9/22	Guatemala		575.96		(3)				575.96
Hon. Lucille Roybal-Allard	9/20	9/22	Guatemala		575.96		(3)				575.96
Janice Robinson	9/20	9/22	Guatemala		575.96		(3)				575.96
Mark Epley	9/20	9/22	Guatemala		575.96		(3)				575.96
Jeff Billman	9/20	9/22	Guatemala		575.96		(3)				575.96
Justin Wein	9/20	9/22	Guatemala		575.96		(3)				575.96
Committee total					2,184.00		2,605.68				4,789.68

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. 28, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. William F. Shuster	3/30	3/31	Canada		312.00						312.00
Hon. Bruce Westerman	3/30	3/31	Canada		312.00						312.00
Hon. Robert Woodall	3/30	3/31	Canada		312.00						312.00
Fleming Legg	3/30	3/31	Canada		312.00		976.06				1,288.06
Holly Lyons	3/30	3/31	Canada		312.00		814.81				1,126.81
Mathew Sturges	3/30	3/31	Canada		312.00						312.00
Chris Vieson	3/30	3/31	Canada		312.00		814.81				1,126.81
Committee total					2,184.00		2,605.68				4,789.68

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. BILL SHUSTER, 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

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Alex Burkett	4/7	4/8	France		449.00						449.00
Hon. Blake Farenthold	4/7	4/8	France		449.00						449.00
Hon. Garret Graves	4/7	4/8	France		449.00						449.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUN. 30, 2017—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Sam Graves	4/7	4/8	France		449.00						449.00
Keith Hall	4/7	4/8	France		449.00						449.00
Justin Harclerode	4/7	4/8	France		449.00						449.00
Fleming Legg	4/7	4/8	France		449.00						449.00
Caryn Lund	4/7	4/8	France		449.00						449.00
Collin McCune	4/7	4/8	France		449.00						449.00
Hon. Mark Sanford	4/7	4/8	France		449.00						449.00
Hon. William F. Shuster	4/7	4/8	France		449.00						449.00
Hon. Albio Sires	4/7	4/8	France		449.00						449.00
Hon. Randy Weber	4/7	4/8	France		449.00						449.00
CMTE Expenses							4,287.00		5,801.00		10,088.00
Alex Burkett	4/8	4/10	Latvia		479.87						479.87
Hon. Blake Farenthold	4/8	4/10	Latvia		479.87						479.87
Hon. Garret Graves	4/8	4/10	Latvia		479.87						479.87
Hon. Sam Graves	4/8	4/10	Latvia		479.87						479.87
Keith Hall	4/8	4/10	Latvia		479.87						479.87
Justin Harclerode	4/8	4/10	Latvia		479.87						479.87
Fleming Legg	4/8	4/10	Latvia		479.87						479.87
Caryn Lund	4/8	4/10	Latvia		479.87						479.87
Collin McCune	4/8	4/10	Latvia		479.87						479.87
Hon. Mark Sanford	4/8	4/10	Latvia		479.87						479.87
Hon. William F. Shuster	4/8	4/10	Latvia		479.87						479.87
Hon. Albio Sires	4/8	4/10	Latvia		479.87						479.87
Hon. Randy Weber	4/8	4/10	Latvia		479.87						479.87
CMTE Expenses							802.77		874.46		1,677.23
Alex Burkett	4/10	4/12	Poland		569.92		60.12				630.04
Hon. Blake Farenthold	4/10	4/12	Poland		569.92		60.12				630.04
Hon. Garret Graves	4/10	4/12	Poland		569.92		4,782.78				5,352.70
Hon. Sam Graves	4/10	4/12	Poland		569.92		60.12				630.04
Keith Hall	4/10	4/12	Poland		569.92		60.12				630.04
Justin Harclerode	4/10	4/12	Poland		569.92		60.12				630.04
Hon. Duncan Hunter	4/9	4/12	Poland		762.92		9,436.42				10,199.34
Fleming Legg	4/10	4/12	Poland		569.92		60.12				630.04
Caryn Lund	4/10	4/12	Poland		569.92		60.12				630.04
Collin McCune	4/10	4/12	Poland		569.92		60.12				630.04
Hon. Mark Sanford	4/10	4/12	Poland		569.92		60.12				630.04
Hon. William F. Shuster	4/10	4/12	Poland		569.92		60.12				630.04
Hon. Albio Sires	4/10	4/12	Poland		569.92		60.12				630.04
Hon. Randy Weber	4/10	4/12	Poland		569.92		60.12				630.04
CMTE Expenses							1,527.07		4,745.25		6,272.32
Alex Burkett	4/12	4/14	Netherlands		736.92						736.92
Hon. Blake Farenthold	4/12	4/14	Netherlands		736.92						736.92
Hon. Sam Graves	4/12	4/14	Netherlands		736.92						736.92
Keith Hall	4/12	4/14	Netherlands		736.92						736.92
Justin Harclerode	4/12	4/14	Netherlands		736.92						736.92
Duncan Hunter	4/12	4/14	Netherlands		736.92						736.92
Fleming Legg	4/12	4/14	Netherlands		736.92						736.92
Caryn Lund	4/12	4/14	Netherlands		736.92						736.92
Collin McCune	4/12	4/14	Netherlands		736.92						736.92
Hon. Mark Sanford	4/12	4/14	Netherlands		736.92						736.92
Hon. William F. Shuster	4/12	4/14	Netherlands		736.92						736.92
Hon. Albio Sires	4/12	4/14	Netherlands		736.92						736.92
Hon. Randy Weber	4/12	4/14	Netherlands		736.92						736.92
Hon. Peter DeFazio	5/7	5/15	Greece, Bosnia, Albania, Macedonia, Kosovo, Italy,		3,022.38						3,022.38
Hon. Mike Bost	5/25	5/26	Ottawa, Canada		360.00						360.00
Norman Alex Burkette	5/25	5/26	Ottawa, Canada		360.00						360.00
Hon. Barbara Comstock	5/25	5/26	Ottawa, Canada		360.00						360.00
Hon. Rodney Davis	5/25	5/26	Ottawa, Canada		360.00						360.00
Kathy Dedrick	5/25	5/26	Ottawa, Canada		360.00						360.00
Hon. Peter A. DeFazio	5/25	5/26	Ottawa, Canada		360.00						360.00
Hon. Jeff Denham	5/25	5/26	Ottawa, Canada		360.00						360.00
Hon. Blake Farenthold	5/25	5/26	Ottawa, Canada		360.00						360.00
Hon. John Faso	5/25	5/26	Ottawa, Canada		360.00						360.00
Hon. Drew Ferguson	5/25	5/26	Ottawa, Canada		360.00						360.00
Hon. Garret Neal Graves	5/25	5/26	Ottawa, Canada		360.00						360.00
Committee total											74,542.72

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. BILL SHUSTER, Chairman, Sept. 15, 2017.

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 Waste Loans and Grants (RIN: 0572-AC36) 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 FRLO, 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 Sep-

tember 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 Education and the Workforce.

2747. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Regulatory Affairs Division, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Safety Standard for Infant Bouncer Seats [Docket No.: CPSC-2015-0028] 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 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-9968-68-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 — Oxathiapiprolin; 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

Fine Particulate Matter: Revision of Federal Implementation Plan Requirements for Texas [EPA-HQ-OAR-2016-0598; FRL-9968-46-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT16) 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.

2751. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluoxastrobin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0727; FRL-9966-09] 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 — Fluazifop-P-Butyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0878; FRL-9966-67] 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.

2753. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval of Iowa Air Quality Implementation Plans; Elements of the Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2012 Annual Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) [EPA-R07-OAR-2017-0517; FRL-9968-66-Region 7] 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.

2754. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa; Elements of the Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) [EPA-R07-OAR-2017-0267; FRL-9968-62-Region 7] 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.

2755. 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; FRL-9968-64-Region 2] 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.

2756. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Jersey; Regional Haze Five-Year Progress Report State Implementation Plan [EPA-R02-OAR-2016-0413; FRL-9968-63-Region 2] 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.

2757. 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-R09-OAR-2017-0411; FRL-9968-38-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.

2758. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agen-

cy's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Removal of Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) Trading Programs [EPA-R03-OAR-2017-0215; FRL-9968-34-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.

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-2016-0620; FRL-9968-74-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-9968-51-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.

2761. 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; 2011 Base Year Inventory for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard for the Baltimore, Maryland Nonattainment Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2017-0396; FRL-9968-54-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.

2762. 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 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 Energy and Commerce.

2763. A letter from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting two (2) notifications of a federal vacancy, designation of acting officer, or discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2764. A letter from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting three (3) notifications of a designation of acting officer, nomination, or discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2765. A letter from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting two (2) notifications of a designation of acting officer, nomination, or discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2766. A letter from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and

Human Services, transmitting two (2) notifications of a designation of acting officer, nomination, or discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2767. A letter from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting two (2) notifications of a designation of acting officer, nomination, or discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2768. A letter from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting three (3) notifications of a designation of acting officer, nomination, or discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2769. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a notification of an action on nomination and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2770. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a notification of a designation of acting officer and action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2771. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9184; Product Identifier 2016-NM-060-AD; Amendment 39-19032; AD 2017-19-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) 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 Transportation and Infrastructure.

2772. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0524; Product Identifier 2016-NM-122-AD; Amendment 39-19034; AD 2017-19-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) 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 Transportation and Infrastructure.

2773. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Prohibition Against Certain Flights in Damascus (OSTT) Flight Information Region (FIR) [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0768; Amendment No.: 91-?] (RIN: 2120-AL07) 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 Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WOODALL: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 553. Resolution 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 (Rept. 115-339). 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. POCAN, 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 United 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. ESTES of Kansas (for himself, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. YODER):

H.R. 3914. A bill to remove the limitation imposed as a result of receiving funding under 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. CALVERT (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. MULLIN (for himself and Mr. RUIZ):

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. DONOVAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SRES, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 3918. A bill to amend 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 subsidy; 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 Mrs. WALORSKI:

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. WALDEN:

H.R. 3922. A bill to extend funding for certain public health programs, 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. JAYAPAL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. POLIS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BARRAGAN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 3923. 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 Homeland Security, 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 Public Health Service Act to extend funding for the special diabetes program for type I diabetes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 3925. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit to Patriot employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Ms. STEFANK):

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 plans under such title, 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. BUCSHON (for himself and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 3928. A bill to ensure that patients receive accurate health care information by prohibiting misleading and deceptive advertising or representation in the provision of health care services, to require the identification of the license of health care professionals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 3929. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to carry out a program to provide payments to communities in which a nuclear power plant that has ceased generating electricity and that stores spent nuclear fuel on-site is located, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. VELA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. CUELLAR):

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 as a 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. MATSUO):

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 (for himself and Miss 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 Medicaid payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 3933. A bill to establish and reinstate certain reporting requirements regarding efforts to recruit, hire, and retain health care professionals for the Veterans Health Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. JONES, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. SESSIONS):

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 derived from a trade or business illegally conducted in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 3935. A bill to provide for an extension of funding for the National Health Service Corps; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 3936. A bill to forgive the indebtedness of the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 554. A resolution recognizing the life and legacy of Richard (Dick) Gregory and honoring his contributions to the civil rights movement and to American comedy; 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: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation 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 IV, Section 3, clause 2
Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 3915.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, 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 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 or Officer 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:

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 3

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 3918.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 3919.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. 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."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 "Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the indian tribes."

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 3920.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 3921.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 3922.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 3923.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana:

H.R. 3924.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 3925.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 3926.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 3927.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 3928.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 3929.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 3930.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 3931.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the United States Constitution which states the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 3932.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the United States Constitution which states the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 3933.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, 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 Officer thereof.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 3934.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 3935.

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. 3936.

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. 103: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 113: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

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. ROSEN.

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. 741: Mr. GHANFORTE.

H.R. 747: Mr. KILMER.

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. 866: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 897: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 927: Mr. HIMES and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H.R. 1017: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. POLIQUIN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. HIMES, and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 1036: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 1038: Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 1046: Mr. COOPER and Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 1090: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 1099: 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. 1155: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. DENT, and Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 1158: Mr. TONKO and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 1178: Mr. BRAT.
H.R. 1204: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1225: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 1267: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 1278: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 1279: Ms. LOFGREN and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1284: Miss RICE of New York and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1291: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1295: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, 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. 1378: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 1409: Mrs. HARTZLER, 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. 1457: Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 1472: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1478: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1494: Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. PASCARELL.
H.R. 1539: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 1626: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 1655: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1730: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1731: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1734: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1753: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1762: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 1773: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 1810: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1815: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1847: Mr. VARGAS, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. PASCARELL.
H.R. 1865: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 1872: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1874: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1889: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1896: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1897: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1898: Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 1951: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1953: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 1955: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 1957: Mr. PASCARELL.
H.R. 1991: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 2023: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.
H.R. 2051: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2054: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2095: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2123: Mr. BERGMAN and Mr. ARRINGTON.
H.R. 2147: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2148: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
H.R. 2206: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2228: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
H.R. 2310: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 2327: Mrs. DEMINGS and Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 2388: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2391: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 2408: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2418: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2432: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 2434: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2482: Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 2587: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 2591: Mr. HILL.
H.R. 2598: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 2623: Mr. NORMAN and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.
H.R. 2633: Mr. EVANS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ESPALLAT, Ms. LEE, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2641: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 2663: Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 2666: Mr. BERGMAN.
H.R. 2739: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KEATING, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 2748: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2790: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 2856: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 2865: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2887: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 2899: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 2901: Mr. PASCARELL.
H.R. 2938: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 2957: Mr. HURD.
H.R. 2996: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. PALMER, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 2999: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 3006: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 3030: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 3042: Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 3108: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3138: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 3145: Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 3153: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
H.R. 3165: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 3174: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 3199: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 3220: Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 3238: Ms. NORTON and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 3271: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3282: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 3316: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 3320: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 3331: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 3342: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 3347: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 3365: Mr. PALMER.
H.R. 3395: Mr. LOBIONDO and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 3397: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 3400: Mr. POLIS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BEYER, and Mrs. LOVE.
H.R. 3441: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. BUDD, and Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 3452: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 3467: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 3472: Mr. MACARTHUR and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 3513: Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 3528: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 3529: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 3530: Ms. MOORE and Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 3533: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 3548: Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BACON, Mr. KINZINGER, and Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 3552: Ms. NORTON and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 3588: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.
H.R. 3596: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 3606: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 3622: Mr. BROWN of Maryland and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 3623: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 3632: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 3635: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. UPTON, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 3679: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3680: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 3703: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 3711: Mr. NORMAN and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 3739: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 3744: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 3751: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 3758: Mr. HIMES, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 3759: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MENG, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. KATKO, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3767: Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. YODER.
H.R. 3770: Ms. ADAMS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. BERGMAN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 3774: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 3784: Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3792: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 3798: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 3806: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 3810: Mr. BERA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 3817: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 3822: Mr. BABIN and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 3827: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 3832: Mr. BOST, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 3847: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 3852: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 3862: Mr. HECK, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 3875: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. VELA.
H.R. 3878: Mr. LOBSACK, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 3882: Mr. PALLONE.
H.J. Res. 31: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.J. Res. 53: Mr. COOPER.
H.J. Res. 74: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H. Res. 129: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. KINZINGER.
H. Res. 142: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H. Res. 220: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H. Res. 276: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY and Ms. LOFGREN.
H. Res. 283: Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 359: Miss RICE of New York.
H. Res. 361: Mrs. BEATTY.
H. Res. 367: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. DELANEY.

H. Res. 370: Mr. KHANNA.
H. Res. 466: Mr. COLE and Ms. ESHOO.
H. Res. 490: Mr. LANCE.

H. Res. 529: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. VEASEY,
and Mr. BERGMAN.

H. Res. 550: Mr. KENNEDY.