United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 22, 2013 No. 7

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 22, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM McCLINTOCK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, 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, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

THE FUTURE OF CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. It was exciting to hear the President make climate change a major focus of his inaugural address, and appropriately so. Mr. Obama's first term provided stark evidence of the peril to the planet: record-breaking heat waves, drought, hurricanes, forest fires, disappearing polar ice, all in accord with a prediction of the climate scientists, but the effects were happening faster and more severely than predicted.

The good news is that you don't have to believe the climate scientists to reduce carbon pollution and energy waste while reasserting American global energy leadership. Even balancing the budget could be made easier with this initiative.

Congress and the administration should begin serious conversation about a broad-based carbon tax. This would give the right signals on energy sources and use. It could raise money to reduce the deficit, restore our badly damaged infrastructure, speed and finance conservation while cushioning the impact on lower-income families and small business.

There are a number of other commonsense steps that would make progress on carbon pollution and energy conservation goals much more significant. First, the EPA should stop dragging its feet, permitting old, polluting, inefficient coal plants to continue to spew forth toxic waste harming not just the environment but the health of our citizens. It's past time that the Clean Air Act should be enforced. We should make sure there are proper safeguards for the fracking technology for gas and petroleum and making sure this vast reservoir of inexpensive gas does not undercut the critical addition of renewables to our energy portfolio: solar, wind, geothermal, perhaps even tidal energy.

We need global leadership on these technologies for a balanced energy portfolio and, ultimately, to reduce our carbon footprint. At each step, we should be looking to enhance energy conservation, because the cheapest kilowatt hour is one that you don't have to generate and use.

We should have a 10-year glide path in our support of renewable energy. The wind energy industry has already signaled receptivity to phasing out its subsidy, just giving it enough time to come to scale and then stand on its own. It's such a good idea, we should do the same thing for the petroleum industry. After 100 years, the most profitable commodity on the planet is mature and will be able to survive and even thrive without additional tax incentives.

Finally, and most important, we should have the Federal Government lead by example. The Department of Energy's management of four large power marketing agencies should be the gold standard for integrating renewables into the grid, upgrading transmission capacity, and leading on conservation. The GSA, with over 300 million square feet of Federal office space should demand that all our facilities, every square foot we lease, buy, or build, should be of the highest energy efficiency.

The Federal fleet should be on the cutting edge of fuel efficiency standards.

Finally, the Department of Defense, the largest consumer of energy in the world, needs to redouble its efforts. The Pentagon is already moving in the right direction. But it's not just about saving money in the long term; it's providing operational flexibility and reducing vulnerability from inefficient and dangerous fossil fuels. Those fuel tanker trucks in Afghanistan and Iraq might as well have had great big bull's eyes on them for terrorists. The military knows this, and we should give maximum support even in a time of gradually reducing Pentagon budgets. This will pay dividends for defense and to our family's budget if the Pentagon gets it right.

It's clear that America is ready and equal to this challenge. The President has signaled his interest and leadership. The question is whether Congress is equal to the challenge, ready with innovation, cooperation, and leadership.

Printed on recycled paper.

VICTOR LOVELADY, TEXAN, KILLED IN TERRORIST ATTACK

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in a remote region of Algeria at an oil and gas facility, in the dark of night before the sun rose, workers from all over the world were getting ready to sit down for breakfast when suddenly gun-wielding Islamic radicals stormed the facility.

Some of the workers were killed; some were able to escape; some were taken hostage. One of the hostages killed in this attack was a member of my congressional district, Victor Lovelady.

Victor was a native of southeast Texas. He was originally from Nederland, Texas, a town of primarily hardworking, blue collar folks centered around the energy industry. Victor had recently moved to Atascocita, Texas, his home not far from where I live. He was 57 years of age.

When he died, he was on a contract assignment for ENGlobal, an energy company in Algeria. According to his family, Victor waited to take that contract until his children had finished school so he could attend their sporting events. This was not surprising for someone who was described as a ''dedicated family man and a fantastic coworker.'' Although it was hard to be so far away from his family, Victor was excited to take the contract assignment so he could ensure a secure future for his family. That's just the kind of father and husband he was.

The deal for this contract was 28 days on, 28 days off, and he was just 10 days in with only 18 days left to go. He was scheduled to come home to Texas the day after his daughter's birthday. His life was stolen by those who seek to destroy Americans, the radicals who inflict terror on all who believe in freedom.

Victor is survived by a loving family, including his wife, Maureen; daughter, Erin; and their son, Grant. Over the holidays, the close Lovelady family expressed concern for the safety of Victor, but he reassured them saying, ''It's so safe. We have protection.'' It's hard for people to understand such unspeakable evil.

I spoke with Victor's brother, Mike, throughout the crisis and as did Congressman RANDY WEBER. Yesterday, after we heard the terrible news, Mike told me:

> I can associate with my brother getting in a car wreck or having cancer. But terrorism and Nederland, Texas, don't go together.

He was described as ''a great family man and a fantastic coworker'' and ''a leader who mentored countless individuals during his tenure.'' He was also known for his spontaneous wit. Victor moved from Nederland, Texas, to Atascocita to be closer to work, but he went back and forth so that his children could finish school there.

Mr. Speaker, Victor was killed not just because of what he did; he was killed because of who he was. He was killed because he was an American. A radical Islamic al Qaeda group by the name of the Signatories in Blood claimed responsibility for this terrorist attack, those who seek to destroy us and kill indiscriminately.

□ 1010

They hate us for who we are and what we stand for. Diplomacy is not in their vocabulary.

Two other Americans were also killed in this attack. Their names were Gordon Lee Rowan of Sumpter, Oregon, and Frederick Buttaccio of Katy, Texas.

The Algerian military retook the compound after 3 days, and they found that 34 other hostages had been killed, as well as dozens of terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, our thoughts, prayers, and concerns are with the Lovelady, Rowan, and Buttaccio families today.

Secretary Panetta said that America must respond to these murders. That is correct. We should go after these killers who have malice and evil in their hearts, that kill Americans because they are Americans. That would be justice, and justice is what we do in this country.

And that's just the way it is.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, 3 years have passed since the Supreme Court's dreadful Citizens United decision, and we have seen the dramatic increase in the amount of corporate money flowing into our elections, drowning out the voices of ordinary American citizens eager to participate in the political process.

Citizens United also epitomizes the so-called ''corporate personhood'' movement in which some now say that corporations are people. The fact is, corporations are not people, and the Constitution was never intended to give corporations the same rights as the American people. Corporations don't breathe, they don't have kids, and they don't die in wars.

My constituents continue to express concern about the growing influence of corporations in our political discourse. They're also demanding action on campaign finance reform because they are repulsed by the large amount of money in our campaigns. Quite frankly, they want elected officials to spend more time on policy, deliberating and debating on issues, and less time dialing for dollars.

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership in the House has failed to address these pressing issues during the past 2 years. They have been indifferent. We haven't had the opportunity to vote on any legislation to curb the influence of unlimited and sometimes secret corporate money flowing into our elections. We haven't even had the opportunity to address these issues in committee hearings or markups.

Recently, I joined 18 of my colleagues in a letter to Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member CONYERS of the Judiciary Committee requesting a hearing to explore constitutional amendment proposals in response to Citizens United and related cases. I hope that we will have an opportunity to discuss these issues in the coming weeks and months. This is, after all, the people's House, and this is the place where we ought to discuss the concerns of the people.

Members of the Democratic Caucus have been working to reform our campaign finance system and restore the rights of the American people that were undermined by the Citizens United decision. We have sponsored and cosponsored legislation to address the growing influence of money in our democratic process.

As a member of the task force on elections reform, I'm proud to join my colleagues in working to rein in corporate spending and address unregulated money flowing into our elections.

Today, I'm introducing two constitutional amendments. The people's rights amendment would overturn Citizens United and put a stop to the growing trend of corporations claiming First Amendment rights. This amendment not only addresses corporate rights as they pertain to campaign finance, but is broader in scope to clarify that corporations are not people with constitutional rights. Importantly, my amendment clearly protects the people's rights of freedom of speech, freedom of press, free exercise of religion, freedom of association, and all other such rights of the people.

My second amendment advances the fundamental principle of political equality for all by empowering Congress and the States with the right to regulate political spending. It will allow Congress to pass campaign finance reform legislation that will withstand constitutional challenges.

Mr. Speaker, we need to empower people, not corporations or Big Money special interests. Our current system has been corrupted. It undermines the rights of ordinary citizens, and it undermines our democracy. Surely, this is not the system our Founders envisioned. The preamble to the Constitution is ''We the people.'' Let us hope that this Congress doesn't forget that.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting these important bills to reform our campaign finance laws and assure that corporate rights do not trump people's rights.

IN HONOR OF VIRGINIA STATE POLICE TROOPERS JAY FERLAND AND PHILIP BATTEL

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

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise and submit remarks in

honor of Virginia State Trooper Jay Ferland, a devoted public servant, who along with Trooper Philip Battel saved a family of three from a house fire in Saltville, Virginia.

When I first learned of their bravery, news reports failed to mention Trooper Ferland's involvement. On January 2, I spoke of this incident and only mentioned Trooper Battel. However, both men are deserving of our recognition.

To recap, in the early hours of Friday, December 28, 2012, Trooper Ferland and Trooper Battel were in search of a stolen car that had been involved in an earlier police chase when they noticed off in the distance an orange hue. They decided to investigate. When they reached the area in question, much to their surprise, Troopers Ferland and Battel saw a home engulfed in flames. They banged on the door, but when there was no answer, they made the selfless decision to enter the home and investigate.

Their actions in the house awoke its three residents who had no idea that their home was burning down around them, leading to their ultimate escape from the burning house and from the fire. Because of their bravery, the family was saved, and all are in good health. Their lives were saved, and the lives of two of their pets were also saved. The heroic actions of Trooper Ferland and Trooper Battel in service to the community are to be commended, and I am honored to be here today to pay tribute to them.

Please join me in thanking Trooper Jay Ferland and Trooper Philip Battel for all they have done for the people of southwest Virginia. The Virginia State Police, as my experience has shown over the years, always respond in fine fashion and rise to the occasion. Trooper Ferland and Trooper Battel are among just two of the many law enforcement officers to note in the long and proud history of the Virginia State Police.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Virginia State Police, Trooper Ferland, Trooper Battel, and the good work and heroism of all the officers in the Virginia State Police.

PARITY FOR PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I will reintroduce two bills: the first to extend the SSI program to Puerto Rico, and the second to provide fair treatment to Puerto Rico under TANF.

SSI provides assistance to blind, disabled, and elderly individuals with low incomes. Congress has chosen not to extend the program to Puerto Rico, which instead receives a limited block grant. The average SSI payment to residents of the States is $500 a month, while the average payment to residents of Puerto Rico is just $70.

The TANF program provides payments to needy families with children. The territories are not eligible for certain TANF grants. Moreover, Federal law imposes a cap on the aggregate funding that a territory can receive under a combination of safety net programs, including TANF. My legislation would eliminate this cap, which has not been increased since 1996, and make the territories eligible for TANF grants they do not currently receive. Equality under TANF would mean at least $40 million in additional funding for Puerto Rico each year.

Those who seek evidence of how Puerto Rico is harmed by its territory status need look no further than the treatment it receives under SSI and TANF. I will fight to secure parity under these two programs. But as long as Puerto Rico remains a territory, it will be an uphill battle.

Mr. Speaker, Puerto Rico recently held a referendum on its political status. Under the current status, the 3.7 million American citizens living in Puerto Rico cannot vote for the leaders who make their national laws and are treated unequally under those laws, as the examples of SSI and TANF well illustrate.

The ballot had two questions. On the first question, voters were asked if they wanted Puerto Rico to remain a territory. Of 1.8 million voters, 54 percent said they do not want the current status to continue, while 46 percent say they do.

On the second question, voters were asked to express their preference among the alternatives to the current status. Of the 1.4 million people who chose an option, 61 percent voted for statehood, 33 percent for free association, and 5.5 percent for independence.

□ 1020

The 834,000 votes for statehood on the second question exceeded the 828,000 for the current status on the first question. For the first time ever, more people in Puerto Rico want to be a state than to continue as a territory.

True to form, defenders of the status quo have tried to distort the results of this referendum, making claims that are intellectually dishonest and divorced from the facts. These critics ignore the results of the first question and argue that, because close to 500,000 people left the second question blank, statehood did not prevail in the referendum.

Let me be clear so there is no confusion. A majority of voters in Puerto Rico soundly rejected the current status. Among the three alternatives, statehood won a decisive victory, and statehood obtained a greater number of votes than any other status option, including the current status.

Mr. Speaker, at yesterday's inauguration, President Obama invoked the Declaration of Independence:

> 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.

President Obama then emphasized, while these truths may be self-evident, they have never been self-executing; that while freedom is a gift from God, it must be secured by His people here on Earth.

To uphold this Nation's core principles and values, the President and Congress must respond to the democratic expression of their fellow citizens in Puerto Rico, who have withdrawn their consent to a political status that makes them second-class citizens and who have made clear that they aspire to have full democratic rights and full equality under the law. None of my stateside colleagues in Congress would accept territory status for their own constituents, so they must recognize and they must respect that the American citizens I represent no longer accept it either.

THE DEBT CEILING

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, then-chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Michael Mullen testified before the House Armed Services Committee that America ''is maintaining nearly historic fiscal deficits and national debt. Indeed, I believe that our debt is the greatest threat to our national security. If we as a country do not address our fiscal imbalances in the near term, our national power will erode, and the costs to our ability to maintain and sustain influence could be great.''

Admiral Mullen is right: debt caused sequestration. Debt and sequestration will slash our uniformed personnel to their lowest levels since before World War II; will reduce our Navy to the smallest number of operational vessels since World War I; and will cut our Air Force to the smallest number of operational aircraft in its history. In sum, debt is putting America's national security at risk.

Last week, on January 17, the Comptroller General of the United States delivered to President Obama a Government Accountability Office report on America's financial health. I have reviewed many government audits and financial statements during my three decades in public office. I have never seen warnings as stark as those given by the GAO to President Obama. Some lowlights of the GAO report are striking and deserve emphasis.

In fiscal year 2012, the Federal National Mortgage Association and Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, commonly known as Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, reported about $85 billion in net valuation losses. The Federal Government's Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation's liabilities exceeded its assets by about $34 billion. The Postal Service ''finished the year with

a reported net loss of almost $16 billion.'' The Federal Housing Administration reported that its liabilities exceeded its assets by about $15 billion.

Mr. Speaker, America is on a path to insolvency and bankruptcy, an event that will debilitate our country. America has incurred four consecutive, unsustainable trillion-dollar deficits and is in the midst of a fifth consecutive trillion-dollar deficit. America's national debt exceeds $16 trillion. Interest on our debt is well in excess of $200 billion per year. To put our debt service burden in perspective, that is more than four times what the Federal Government spends on all highway and transportation infrastructure projects in America each year. Unless Washington becomes financially responsible, future debt service will escalate and even more money will be spent on debt service rather than on programs that serve Americans.

America's Comptroller General issued a stern warning to President Obama:

> The comprehensive, long-term fiscal projections show that, absent policy changes, the Federal Government continues to face an unsustainable path. Over the long term, the structural imbalance between spending and revenue will lead to the continued growth of debt held by the public as a share of GDP. This means the current structure of the Federal budget is unsustainable.

America's current path and Federal budget are unsustainable. Absent changes, Federal Government insolvency and bankruptcy are certain to result and cause an economic disaster unrivaled in America's history. This week, the House of Representatives faces a vote to increase America's debt ceiling. Pending legislation raises the debt ceiling by roughly $300 to $400 billion. What protection from the risk of insolvency and bankruptcy does America get in return?

Are there any spending cuts? No.

Are there policies that spur economic growth and result in revenue increases? No.

Does this proposal help fix in any way the trillion-dollar deficits that threaten America with financial ruin? No.

Mr. Speaker, I can only speak for me. I will not vote to raise the debt ceiling unless significant efforts are made to fix the underlying problem of deficits and accumulated debt that force debt ceiling votes and risk America's future. I will not vote to raise the debt ceiling unless, first, Congress passes a substantive balanced-budget constitutional amendment that solves the debt problem for future generations or, second, we implement sizable spending cuts that help get our financial affairs in order.

I take this stance full well knowing the adverse economic effects of a failure to raise the debt ceiling but also knowing, Mr. Speaker, that those effects pale in comparison to an insolvency and bankruptcy of the America I love.

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 10 o'clock and 27 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

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Thank You, God, for giving us another day.

The people's House gathers today after a day of celebrating the greatness of our American experiment of self-government, and as the administration gathers for prayer even now at the National Cathedral, we gather here to ask Your blessing.

The difficult work of governing now resumes. Bless the Members of this assembly with wisdom, patience, and good will as they tackle the ongoing issues challenging our Nation.

We thank You again for the inspiration of our Nation's Founders and the legacy they left us with. May the Members of this assembly, and all Americans, be worthy of that legacy. And may all that is done this day be done for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida 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.

REMEMBERING THE HEROES OF APOLLO ''1''

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, on September 12, 1962, at Rice University, President John Kennedy committed America to put a man on the Moon by the end of the decade.

Unfortunately, tragedy struck America at 6:31 p.m. on January 27, 1967. During a ground test of the *Apollo* crew module, a fire broke out. Within a few minutes, three brave space pioneers had lost their lives.

We lost Roger Chaffee, who was training for his first mission into space. We lost Gus Grissom, the second American in space behind Alan Shepard; and we lost Ed White, the first American to do a space walk, and the man my elementary school in Houston was named after.

Two-and-a-half years after the *Apollo 1* fire, Neil Armstrong put his left foot on the Moon. It was a giant leap for mankind, one that would not have happened without the sacrifice of the *Apollo 1* crew. May the world always remember these heroes.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROE V. WADE

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to rise today to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the landmark Roe v. Wade decision by the Supreme Court. This decision is the firewall that protects women's health and the turning point that moved women's health forward.

On this 40th anniversary of Roe v. Wade, we reaffirm the constitutionally protected right of every woman to safe and legal health care. Women are nurturers, but when life places a woman in the most difficult of circumstances, the choices she needs to make should be free from government interference.

Over the years, I have been proud to stand with many of my colleagues as we have beaten back repeated attempts to chip away at women's rights set forth in Roe v. Wade. Over the last 2 years, we have seen the most extreme and repeated attempts to take away a woman's right to her health care.

In the most recent Congress, we found ourselves defending a woman's right to access contraception. We opposed a bill that would have allowed women to die if the emergency room employee who came to her aid had a

''conscientious objection'' to performing an abortion that would save her life, without even being required to refer her elsewhere for help.

We have insisted that politicians not place themselves in the operating room to judge the motives of a woman seeking a constitutionally protected medical procedure if they thought her decision may have been based on the gender or race of the fetus.

Mr. Speaker, we stand on the shoulders of giants of women who went before us on this, and we take up the cudgel to keep it safe and legal.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROE V. WADE

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reflect on 40 years since the ruling of the United States Supreme Court in Roe v. Wade.

Our President, in his inaugural address yesterday, recognized the fact that this Nation has long understood that we are all endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights. Chief among them is the right to life and the recognition that it's rooted in, that every life is precious and deserving of dignity.

Today, I took the first of what will be many steps in my congressional service to protect life by cosponsoring H.R. 217, the Title X Abortion Provider Prohibition Act, to ensure that family planning grants are used for their intended purposes and not by organizations like Planned Parenthood to provide abortions.

Mr. Speaker, as a Nation, we must do better. Our children deserve better. My hope is that with hard work, persuasion, and prayer we will once again become a Nation that recognizes the dignity of every human being and recognizes again our God-given unalienable right to life.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROE V. WADE

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 40th anniversary of Roe v. Wade and the freedom of reproductive choice that this historic decision provides for all women in America. This is a very personal and private choice.

When I gave birth to my son, Ben, it was the most precious moment in my life. His life has brought me great joys and great responsibilities. The decision to bring Ben into this world was made by his father and me. It was our choice. We didn't call the Governor. We didn't call the Congress. It was our choice.

And so today, I proudly honor the 40th anniversary of Roe v. Wade and thank those who have fought so bravely to ensure that women have the right to make those life-changing personal decisions that affect them and their families. As we celebrate, we must be mindful that there is more work to be done to protect reproductive choice for our daughters and our granddaughters.

□ 1210

HONORING COACH TODD McDOUGALL

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

Mr. HECK of Washington. My wife, Paula, and I live about 500 yards from Olympia High School and its baseball field, and every spring we wander over and watch the team play. For the past 20 years, it's been coached by Todd McDougall, and he's a great coach.

Todd's just 42 years old. He's taught his entire career at Olympia High School. He is one of those—and we all know them—great teachers, as is his wife, Julie, a middle school science teacher.

So you can imagine the community heartbreak a few weeks ago when he was diagnosed with glioblastoma grade 4 brain cancer. Coach McDougall could use our prayers right now, as could Julie, their 11-year-old daughter, Marlee, and their twin 9-year-old sons, Andrew and Dylan.

I hope you'll find out more about this remarkable man at Friends for Todd McDougall on Facebook.

ALAMEDA COUNTY FAMILY JUSTICE CENTER

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the great work done by the Alameda County Family Justice Center, a nonprofit organization in California's East Bay, which represents my district.

I was an Alameda County prosecutor, and it was during my tenure that the Justice Center was founded by my former boss, Alameda County District Attorney Nancy O'Malley. Prior to its existence, people in my area subjected to domestic violence, human trafficking, or sexual assault had to navigate a complicated bureaucracy and go to many different places to obtain much-needed services.

The Justice Center changed that by coordinating and centralizing critical programs in just one place. It operates as a one-place location for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and human trafficking, offering services like counseling, job training, and housing. Those suffering at the hands of abusers now have a place to rest, recover, and restore their lives.

As a prosecutor, I saw the horrible damage that these crimes cause, and I am grateful that the traumatized victims of the East Bay have the Justice Center to which they can turn.

In a few days it's holding its sixth annual fundraising gala called One. I want to take this opportunity to wish everyone involved good luck with the event and continued success in helping all victims of the East Bay.

ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, President Obama struck several important themes. None was strategically more vital than making America energy-independent again. Then he referenced the related challenge of climate change and its impact on life on our continent and world. Only fools would fail to pay attention to the necessity of change to meet the needs of a new era.

Our dependence on importing foreign oil cost America over $321 billion last year, racking up a $140 billion trade deficit in petroleum and energy alone. With that lost income comes lost jobs by the hundreds of thousands. So many more people could be employed here at home, developing domestic energy sources rather than defending exploitation and extraction abroad.

And on climate change, the President recognized the reality of fierce and expensive weather incidents like Hurricane's Sandy and Katrina, or our declining lake levels and river levels, like the Mississippi, or the 2-foot drop in Lake Erie over the last year. We must anticipate and adapt our lives where possible.

Yes, as the 113th Congress begins, our primary aim will be to welcome the challenges of change, not cling to the past. Working together, as the President challenged, America can meet the test of a new day. My brother, Steve, the inventor, innately grasps this challenge. So must we.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROE V. WADE

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to recognize the 40th anniversary of the Supreme Court's Roe v. Wade decision. This landmark decision granted American women the right to make their own personal health decisions, in consultation with their family and their faith, and without government intrusion.

However, this right has been under steady attack in recent years, with a clear goal: to make it so difficult to obtain a safe and legal abortion that it's become de facto illegal. But I'm among those who remember what it was like when women were pushed into the

shadows to get care, and we cannot go back to that dangerous time.

The truth is, none of us can walk in the shoes of each woman facing an unwanted pregnancy, so let's use this anniversary to renew our commitment to ensuring that every woman in America can make her own decision and walk her own path.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROE V. WADE

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, on December 13, 1971, the United States Supreme Court heard arguments in a case called Roe v. Wade.

Then, 13 months later, 40 years ago today, the United States Supreme Court issued its decision on the case, a case that every law student reads, a case that has defined a woman's right to control her body and her future, and the definitive decision on women's right to choose. And this was delivered by Justice Blackmun for the Court.

I reread that decision on this day and was struck by the statement that the task for the Court is to ''resolve the issue by constitutional measurement, free of emotion and of predilection.''

Justice Blackmun went on to quote Justice Holmes in Lochner v. New York, and he said:

> The Constitution is made for people of fundamentally differing views, and the accident of our finding certain opinions natural and familiar or novel and even shocking ought not to conclude our judgment upon the question of whether statutes embodying them conflict with the Constitution of the United States.

Interestingly, it was Chief Justice Roberts who also looked to Justice Holmes in deciding ObamaCare. Both cases on the 14th Amendment, both looking to the Constitution. Forty years later, good law.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROE V. WADE

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago today, Roe v. Wade gave women the right to make their own decisions about reproductive health care. Without it, women's lives would be very different.

History shows us that when abortion is illegal, it does not go away; it becomes dangerous. And that's why it's important to continue to make sure that abortion is legal, rare, regulated, and safe.

Before Roe, more than a million women each year took great risk to access health care they needed. They faced unlicensed and ill-equipped physicians, unsanitary conditions, illness, and death. This is why the Supreme Court ruling was so important 40 years ago. It ensured safe, legal abortions for these women.

Roe v. Wade ensures the basic right of privacy, the freedom to control one's body and one's future. It can be easy to feel complacent today, but the threats against reproductive health care rights are increasing.

There is still work to be done. Today, 40 years later, we must continue to fight so that women's reproductive health care rights are not rolled back.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROE V. WADE

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago today the Supreme Court affirmed the dignity and independence of each American woman. The result of the decision was an understanding that our Constitution guaranteed decisions about a woman's own body should be left up to that woman, in consultation with her doctor, her family, and her religion, not the Federal Government.

There is now a generation of women who do not remember the time before Roe v. Wade, a time when men assumed they could say what women could and could not do about their personal private health care and reproduction.

We still have a lot of work to do. Unfortunately, over the past 40 years there have been numerous legislative attempts to deny this right to women and treat women who exercise control over their own bodies as criminals.

We have to make sure that we defend also Title X, maternal and child health care programs, public access to reproductive health care, and that we reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act. But we must remember the time before Roe v. Wade and what is at stake.

□ 1220

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROE V. WADE

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Yesterday, in his inaugural address, our President reminded us of the founding principle of our Nation—that all Americans are created equal. For the women of this great country, there can be no greater means of equality than the right to reproductive choice.

Today, on the 40th anniversary of Roe v. Wade, I come to the floor to reflect on that landmark decision that allowed American women the freedom to make health care decisions on their own, in consultation with their family and doctors.

I don't know the story of every woman who's had to make a difficult decision, but I can tell you this: each one is unique. Each woman's story is her own. As a politician, I'm not going to tell women when to get checkups or when to get mammograms. And no politician, now or ever, should tell a woman how to handle her pregnancy.

Just this morning, The Wall Street Journal issued a poll that showed Americans agree with this; 7 in 10 Americans believe Roe v. Wade should stand. And I think everybody who tries to reverse this fundamental right should keep that in mind.

Thank you to everybody who fights every day for the rights of women. Today is a day to be grateful and to celebrate and to commit to hard work in the future.

NO BUDGET, NO PAY

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

Mr. TIPTON. As we begin the 113th Congress, it is time that this Congress does what hardworking families and small businesses across our country do every day: balance our budget and actually work within a budget. We have families right now that are struggling. The impacts of this Congress and its inability to be able to have its fiscal house in order cannot be overstated when it comes to hurting those families and small businesses.

We're going to be putting forward legislation to make sure that that debt ceiling will be increased for a temporary period of time, but with the requirement that this House and our counterparts in the United States Senate actually pass a budget for the American people. If we can't do that, then we as Members of Congress don't deserve to be paid. No budget, no pay. This is common sense—to stand up for the American people to make sure that we are getting this fiscal house in order and looking out for our children and for our grandchildren.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROE V. WADE

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, we mark the 40th anniversary of Roe v. Wade, the landmark decision which enshrined a realm of personal privacy that is deeply connected to the personal freedoms that we hold dear in this country. As one Justice put it, it's the simple right to be left alone.

The right to choose is meaningless without access to choose. Yet the Republican-led Congress has chipped away at access, voting 10 times to limit access in the last Congress to a woman's basic right. Last year, there were 43 laws that were passed in 19 States that would restrict access to a woman's right to choose.

This past election, women made it loud and clear that the right to choose is one that they believe in, and that is

a basic right that the majority of Americans hold dear and will uphold with their votes in every election.

FREEDOM IS A GIFT OF GOD

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a magnificent day: the coming together for the second inauguration of Barack Obama and the honoring of Dr. Martin Luther King. In his speech, President Obama said something potent and powerful, and that is that freedom is a gift from God, but it is one that is not self-executing. A gentleman that I know very well, Dr. Reverend Samuel Smith of the Mount Horeb Baptist Church, knows about fighting for freedom.

Today, I rise to again affirm Roe v. Wade, which speaks about individual freedom, and to indicate that even as we discuss budget talks and the debt ceiling, we must recognize the freedom of the vulnerable to be safe and secure and to have the support to be able to have food and clothing and a home. That is freedom as well, my friends.

And so as we debate the questions of the debt ceiling and whether we have a budget, let us be reminded that freedom is a gift of God and that it should not be denied to those who are most vulnerable, those who are the weak, those who cannot stand for themselves. And the President made it very clear that freedom is not to the powerful. It is for all of us. We all are created equal, with certain unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROE V. WADE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Today marks the 40th anniversary of Roe v. Wade. Ultimately decisions about whether to choose adoption, end a pregnancy, or raise a child must be left to a woman, her family, and her faith, with the counsel of her doctor or health care provider.

Roe v. Wade prevents politicians from interfering with a woman's personal decision. Were Roe ever to be overturned, it could have ripple effects. Our laws and traditions afford constitutional protections to personal decisions relating to, among other things, marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, childrearing, and intimacy. The right to privacy, strengthened by Roe, supports each of these areas.

Overturning Roe could thus potentially erode the ability of individuals to make highly personal decisions free from intrusive government regulations and harm the overall right to privacy.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROE V. WADE

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

Mr. FARR. It was a very historic time in Washington, D.C., yesterday, with not only the swearing in of the President of the United States, but doing it on the occasion that marks Martin Luther King's birthday holiday here in the United States. What a day for hundreds of thousands of youth from around this country to see their Capital in action and today visiting the Congress itself.

Today, we also celebrate the historic enactment of Roe v. Wade. What an absolute honor and privilege it is to live in a country that does not deny access to health care. I was a Peace Corps volunteer in Latin America, and my sister died on the operating table because there was not adequate health care. When you don't have it, you can't get it, no matter what. And so this country protects women's rights to see a doctor in their own privacy and discuss what their needs may be. No Congress should stand in the way of denying people access to health care, including the right to an abortion.

So let's protect what the Supreme Court has honored and celebrate on this historic day all kinds of great things in this great country, including Roe v. Wade, America's anniversary of the right to health care for women.

NO BUDGET, NO PAY

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

Mr. LAMALFA. For almost 4 years, the Democrat-controlled Senate has failed to pass a budget—the most basic responsibility of governing. This shameful record must end this year. We must set up a broader debate about spending that forces the Senate to finally join the House in confronting the government's spending problem. The House and Senate must each pass a budget. If they fail, Member pay should be withheld. The principle is as simple as the bill: no budget, no pay.

I'm a California legislator, having served in our State legislature for 8 years. The people of California finally got tired of late, ineffective budgets and passed legislation on their own via the initiative process to force the State legislature to get the job done. The first time that happened, right after that election, the budget got done on time. Amazing.

Therefore, I hope the American people will join the effort the U.S. House Republicans are taking up and force the United States Senate to get the job done to get a budget, as is their responsibility.

□ 1230

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion 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.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

PANDEMIC AND ALL-HAZARDS PREPAREDNESS REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 307) to reauthorize certain programs under the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to public health security and all-hazards preparedness and response, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 307

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 ''Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act of 2013''.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—STRENGTHENING NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE FOR PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCIES

Sec. 101. National Health Security Strategy.
Sec. 102. Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response.
Sec. 103. National Advisory Committee on Children and Disasters.
Sec. 104. Modernization of the National Disaster Medical System.
Sec. 105. Continuing the role of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

TITLE II—OPTIMIZING STATE AND LOCAL ALL-HAZARDS PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE

Sec. 201. Temporary redeployment of federally funded personnel during a public health emergency.
Sec. 202. Improving State and local public health security.
Sec. 203. Hospital preparedness and medical surge capacity.
Sec. 204. Enhancing situational awareness and biosurveillance.
Sec. 205. Eliminating duplicative Project Bioshield reports.

TITLE III—ENHANCING MEDICAL COUNTERMEASURE REVIEW

Sec. 301. Special protocol assessment.
Sec. 302. Authorization for medical products for use in emergencies.
Sec. 303. Definitions.
Sec. 304. Enhancing medical countermeasure activities.
Sec. 305. Regulatory management plans.
Sec. 306. Report.
Sec. 307. Pediatric medical countermeasures.

TITLE IV—ACCELERATING MEDICAL COUNTERMEASURE ADVANCED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Sec. 401. BioShield.

Sec. 402. Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority.
Sec. 403. Strategic National Stockpile.
Sec. 404. National Biodefense Science Board.

TITLE I—STRENGTHENING NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE FOR PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCIES

SEC. 101. NATIONAL HEALTH SECURITY STRATEGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2802 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300hh–1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''2009'' and inserting ''2014''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by inserting '', including drills and exercises to ensure medical surge capacity for events without notice'' after ''exercises''; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking ''facilities), and trauma care'' and inserting ''and ambulatory care facilities and which may include dental health facilities), and trauma care, critical care,''; and

(II) by inserting ''(including related availability, accessibility, and coordination)'' after ''public health emergencies'';

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''and trauma'' after ''medical'';

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''Medical evacuation and fatality management'' and inserting ''Fatality management'';

(iv) by redesignating subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E) as subparagraphs (D), (E), and (F), respectively;

(v) by inserting after subparagraph (B), the following the new subparagraph:

''(C) Coordinated medical triage and evacuation to appropriate medical institutions based on patient medical need, taking into account regionalized systems of care.'';

(vi) in subparagraph (E), as redesignated by clause (iv), by inserting ''(which may include such dental health assets)'' after ''medical assets''; and

(vii) by adding at the end the following:

''(G) Optimizing a coordinated and flexible approach to the medical surge capacity of hospitals, other health care facilities, critical care, and trauma care (which may include trauma centers) and emergency medical systems.'';

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting '', including the unique needs and considerations of individuals with disabilities,'' after ''medical needs of at-risk individuals''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''the'' before ''purpose of this section''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) COUNTERMEASURES.—

''(A) Promoting strategic initiatives to advance countermeasures to diagnose, mitigate, prevent, or treat harm from any biological agent or toxin, chemical, radiological, or nuclear agent or agents, whether naturally occurring, unintentional, or deliberate.

''(B) For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'countermeasures' has the same meaning as the terms 'qualified countermeasures' under section 319F–1, 'qualified pandemic and epidemic products' under section 319F–3, and 'security countermeasures' under section 319F–2.

''(8) MEDICAL AND PUBLIC HEALTH COMMUNITY RESILIENCY.—Strengthening the ability of States, local communities, and tribal communities to prepare for, respond to, and be resilient in the event of public health emergencies, whether naturally occurring, unintentional, or deliberate by—

''(A) optimizing alignment and integration of medical and public health preparedness and response planning and capabilities with and into routine daily activities; and

''(B) promoting familiarity with local medical and public health systems.''.

(b) AT-RISK INDIVIDUALS.—Section 2814 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300hh–16) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (5), (7), and (8);

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking ''2811(b)(3)(B)'' and inserting ''2802(b)(4)(B)'';

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (4) as paragraphs (2) through (5), respectively;

(4) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated), the following:

''(1) monitor emerging issues and concerns as they relate to medical and public health preparedness and response for at-risk individuals in the event of a public health emergency declared by the Secretary under section 319;'';

(5) by amending paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) to read as follows:

''(2) oversee the implementation of the preparedness goals described in section 2802(b) with respect to the public health and medical needs of at-risk individuals in the event of a public health emergency, as described in section 2802(b)(4);''; and

(6) by inserting after paragraph (6), the following:

''(7) disseminate and, as appropriate, update novel and best practices of outreach to and care of at-risk individuals before, during, and following public health emergencies in as timely a manner as is practicable, including from the time a public health threat is identified; and

''(8) ensure that public health and medical information distributed by the Department of Health and Human Services during a public health emergency is delivered in a manner that takes into account the range of communication needs of the intended recipients, including at-risk individuals.''.

SEC. 102. ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2811 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300hh–10) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by inserting '', security countermeasures (as defined in section 319F–2),'' after ''qualified countermeasures (as defined in section 319F–1)'';

(B) in paragraph (4), by adding at the end the following:

''(D) POLICY COORDINATION AND STRATEGIC DIRECTION.—Provide integrated policy coordination and strategic direction with respect to all matters related to Federal public health and medical preparedness and execution and deployment of the Federal response for public health emergencies and incidents covered by the National Response Plan developed pursuant to section 504(6) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, or any successor plan, before, during, and following public health emergencies.

''(E) IDENTIFICATION OF INEFFICIENCIES.—Identify and minimize gaps, duplication, and other inefficiencies in medical and public health preparedness and response activities and the actions necessary to overcome these obstacles.

''(F) COORDINATION OF GRANTS AND AGREEMENTS.—Align and coordinate medical and public health grants and cooperative agreements as applicable to preparedness and response activities authorized under this Act, to the extent possible, including program requirements, timelines, and measurable goals, and in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, to—

''(i) optimize and streamline medical and public health preparedness and response capabilities and the ability of local communities to respond to public health emergencies; and

''(ii) gather and disseminate best practices among grant and cooperative agreement recipients, as appropriate.

''(G) DRILL AND OPERATIONAL EXERCISES.—Carry out drills and operational exercises, in consultation with the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other applicable Federal departments and agencies, as necessary and appropriate, to identify, inform, and address gaps in and policies related to all-hazards medical and public health preparedness and response, including exercises based on—

''(i) identified threats for which countermeasures are available and for which no countermeasures are available; and

''(ii) unknown threats for which no countermeasures are available.

''(H) NATIONAL SECURITY PRIORITY.—On a periodic basis consult with, as applicable and appropriate, the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, to provide an update on, and discuss, medical and public health preparedness and response activities pursuant to this Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, including progress on the development, approval, clearance, and licensure of medical countermeasures.''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) COUNTERMEASURES BUDGET PLAN.—Develop, and update on an annual basis, a coordinated 5-year budget plan based on the medical countermeasure priorities described in subsection (d). Each such plan shall—

''(A) include consideration of the entire medical countermeasures enterprise, including—

''(i) basic research and advanced research and development;

''(ii) approval, clearance, licensure, and authorized uses of products; and

''(iii) procurement, stockpiling, maintenance, and replenishment of all products in the Strategic National Stockpile;

''(B) inform prioritization of resources and include measurable outputs and outcomes to allow for the tracking of the progress made toward identified priorities;

''(C) identify medical countermeasure lifecycle costs to inform planning, budgeting, and anticipated needs within the continuum of the medical countermeasure enterprise consistent with section 319F–2; and

''(D) be made available to the appropriate committees of Congress upon request.'';

(2) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c) FUNCTIONS.—The Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response shall—

''(1) have lead responsibility within the Department of Health and Human Services for emergency preparedness and response policy coordination and strategic direction;

''(2) have authority over and responsibility for—

''(A) the National Disaster Medical System pursuant to section 2812;

''(B) the Hospital Preparedness Cooperative Agreement Program pursuant to section 319C–2;

''(C) the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority pursuant to section 319L;

''(D) the Medical Reserve Corps pursuant to section 2813;

''(E) the Emergency System for Advance Registration of Volunteer Health Professionals pursuant to section 319I; and

''(F) administering grants and related authorities related to trauma care under parts A through C of title XII, such authority to be transferred by the Secretary from the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration to such Assistant Secretary;

''(3) exercise the responsibilities and authorities of the Secretary with respect to the coordination of—

''(A) the Public Health Emergency Preparedness Cooperative Agreement Program pursuant to section 319C–1;

''(B) the Strategic National Stockpile pursuant to section 319F–2; and

''(C) the Cities Readiness Initiative; and

''(4) assume other duties as determined appropriate by the Secretary.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(d) PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY MEDICAL COUNTERMEASURES ENTERPRISE STRATEGY AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, and every year thereafter, the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response shall develop and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a coordinated strategy and accompanying implementation plan for medical countermeasures to address chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear threats. In developing such a plan, the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response shall consult with the Director of the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority, the Director of the National Institutes of Health, the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Commissioner of Food and Drugs. Such strategy and plan shall be known as the 'Public Health Emergency Medical Countermeasures Enterprise Strategy and Implementation Plan'.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The plan under paragraph (1) shall—

''(A) describe the chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear agent or agents that may present a threat to the Nation and the corresponding efforts to develop qualified countermeasures (as defined in section 319F–1), security countermeasures (as defined in section 319F–2), or qualified pandemic or epidemic products (as defined in section 319F–3) for each threat;

''(B) evaluate the progress of all activities with respect to such countermeasures or products, including research, advanced research, development, procurement, stockpiling, deployment, distribution, and utilization;

''(C) identify and prioritize near-, mid-, and long-term needs with respect to such countermeasures or products to address a chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear threat or threats;

''(D) identify, with respect to each category of threat, a summary of all awards and contracts, including advanced research and development and procurement, that includes—

''(i) the time elapsed from the issuance of the initial solicitation or request for a proposal to the adjudication (such as the award, denial of award, or solicitation termination); and

''(ii) an identification of projected timelines, anticipated funding allocations, benchmarks, and milestones for each medical countermeasure priority under subparagraph (C), including projected needs with regard to replenishment of the Strategic National Stockpile;

''(E) be informed by the recommendations of the National Biodefense Science Board pursuant to section 319M;

''(F) evaluate progress made in meeting timelines, allocations, benchmarks, and milestones identified under subparagraph (D)(ii);

''(G) report on the amount of funds available for procurement in the special reserve fund as defined in section 319F–2(h) and the impact this funding will have on meeting the requirements under section 319F–2;

''(H) incorporate input from Federal, State, local, and tribal stakeholders;

''(I) identify the progress made in meeting the medical countermeasure priorities for at-risk individuals (as defined in 2802(b)(4)(B)), as applicable under subparagraph (C), including with regard to the projected needs for related stockpiling and replenishment of the Strategic National Stockpile, including by addressing the needs of pediatric populations with respect to such countermeasures and products in the Strategic National Stockpile, including—

''(i) a list of such countermeasures and products necessary to address the needs of pediatric populations;

''(ii) a description of measures taken to coordinate with the Office of Pediatric Therapeutics of the Food and Drug Administration to maximize the labeling, dosages, and formulations of such countermeasures and products for pediatric populations;

''(iii) a description of existing gaps in the Strategic National Stockpile and the development of such countermeasures and products to address the needs of pediatric populations; and

''(iv) an evaluation of the progress made in addressing priorities identified pursuant to subparagraph (C);

''(J) identify the use of authority and activities undertaken pursuant to sections 319F–1(b)(1), 319F–1(b)(2), 319F–1(b)(3), 319F–1(c), 319F–1(d), 319F–1(e), 319F–2(c)(7)(C)(iii), 319F–2 (c)(7)(C)(iv), and 319F–2(c)(7)(C)(v) of this Act, and subsections (a)(1), (b)(1), and (e) of section 564 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, by summarizing—

''(i) the particular actions that were taken under the authorities specified, including, as applicable, the identification of the threat agent, emergency, or the biomedical countermeasure with respect to which the authority was used;

''(ii) the reasons underlying the decision to use such authorities, including, as applicable, the options that were considered and rejected with respect to the use of such authorities;

''(iii) the number of, nature of, and other information concerning the persons and entities that received a grant, cooperative agreement, or contract pursuant to the use of such authorities, and the persons and entities that were considered and rejected for such a grant, cooperative agreement, or contract, except that the report need not disclose the identity of any such person or entity;

''(iv) whether, with respect to each procurement that is approved by the President under section 319F–2(c)(6), a contract was entered into within one year after such approval by the President; and

''(v) with respect to section 319F–1(d), for the one-year period for which the report is submitted, the number of persons who were paid amounts totaling $100,000 or greater and the number of persons who were paid amounts totaling at least $50,000 but less than $100,000; and

''(K) be made publicly available.

''(3) GAO REPORT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the submission to the Congress of the first Public Health Emergency Medical Countermeasures Enterprise Strategy and Implementation Plan, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an independent evaluation, and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report, concerning such Strategy and Implementation Plan.

''(B) CONTENT.—The report described in subparagraph (A) shall review and assess—

''(i) the near-term, mid-term, and long-term medical countermeasure needs and identified priorities of the Federal Government pursuant to paragraph (2)(C);

''(ii) the activities of the Department of Health and Human Services with respect to advanced research and development pursuant to section 319L; and

''(iii) the progress made toward meeting the timelines, allocations, benchmarks, and milestones identified in the Public Health Emergency Medical Countermeasures Enterprise Strategy and Implementation Plan under this subsection.

''(e) PROTECTION OF NATIONAL SECURITY.—In carrying out subsections (b)(7) and (d), the Secretary shall ensure that information and items that could compromise national security, contain confidential commercial information, or contain proprietary information are not disclosed.''.

(b) INTERAGENCY COORDINATION PLAN.—In the first Public Health Emergency Countermeasures Enterprise Strategy and Implementation Plan submitted under subsection (d) of section 2811 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300hh–10) (as added by subsection (a)(3)), the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall include a description of the manner in which the Department of Health and Human Services is coordinating with the Department of Defense regarding countermeasure activities to address chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear threats. Such report shall include information with respect to—

(1) the research, advanced research, development, procurement, stockpiling, and distribution of countermeasures to meet identified needs; and

(2) the coordination of efforts between the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Defense to address countermeasure needs for various segments of the population.

SEC. 103. NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND DISASTERS.

Subtitle B of title XXVIII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300hh et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 2811 the following:

''SEC. 2811A. NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND DISASTERS.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall establish an advisory committee to be known as the 'National Advisory Committee on Children and Disasters' (referred to in this section as the 'Advisory Committee').

''(b) DUTIES.—The Advisory Committee shall—

''(1) provide advice and consultation with respect to the activities carried out pursuant to section 2814, as applicable and appropriate;

''(2) evaluate and provide input with respect to the medical and public health needs of children as they relate to preparation for, response to, and recovery from all-hazards emergencies; and

''(3) provide advice and consultation with respect to State emergency preparedness and response activities and children, including related drills and exercises pursuant to the preparedness goals under section 2802(b).

''(c) ADDITIONAL DUTIES.—The Advisory Committee may provide advice and recommendations to the Secretary with respect to children and the medical and public health grants and cooperative agreements as applicable to preparedness and response activities authorized under this title and title III.

''(d) MEMBERSHIP.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with such other Secretaries as may be appropriate, shall appoint not to exceed 15

members to the Advisory Committee. In appointing such members, the Secretary shall ensure that the total membership of the Advisory Committee is an odd number.

''(2) REQUIRED MEMBERS.—The Secretary, in consultation with such other Secretaries as may be appropriate, may appoint to the Advisory Committee under paragraph (1) such individuals as may be appropriate to perform the duties described in subsections (b) and (c), which may include—

''(A) the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response;

''(B) the Director of the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority;

''(C) the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention;

''(D) the Commissioner of Food and Drugs;

''(E) the Director of the National Institutes of Health;

''(F) the Assistant Secretary of the Administration for Children and Families;

''(G) the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency;

''(H) at least two non-Federal health care professionals with expertise in pediatric medical disaster planning, preparedness, response, or recovery;

''(I) at least two representatives from State, local, territorial, or tribal agencies with expertise in pediatric disaster planning, preparedness, response, or recovery; and

''(J) representatives from such Federal agencies (such as the Department of Education and the Department of Homeland Security) as determined necessary to fulfill the duties of the Advisory Committee, as established under subsections (b) and (c).

''(e) MEETINGS.—The Advisory Committee shall meet not less than biannually.

''(f) SUNSET.—The Advisory Committee shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act of 2013.''.

SEC. 104. MODERNIZATION OF THE NATIONAL DISASTER MEDICAL SYSTEM.

Section 2812 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300hh–11) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), in clause (i) by inserting '', including at-risk individuals as applicable'' after ''victims of a public health emergency'';

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

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (B), the following:

''(C) CONSIDERATIONS FOR AT-RISK POPULATIONS.—The Secretary shall take steps to ensure that an appropriate specialized and focused range of public health and medical capabilities are represented in the National Disaster Medical System, which take into account the needs of at-risk individuals, in the event of a public health emergency.''.

''(D) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary may determine and pay claims for reimbursement for services under subparagraph (A) directly or through contracts that provide for payment in advance or by way of reimbursement.''; and

(2) in subsection (g), by striking ''such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''$52,700,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017''.

SEC. 105. CONTINUING THE ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

Section 8117(g) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''$155,300,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017 to carry out this section''.

TITLE II—OPTIMIZING STATE AND LOCAL ALL-HAZARDS PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE

SEC. 201. TEMPORARY REDEPLOYMENT OF FEDERALLY FUNDED PERSONNEL DURING A PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY.

Section 319 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) TEMPORARY REDEPLOYMENT OF FEDERALLY FUNDED PERSONNEL DURING A PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY.—

''(1) EMERGENCY REDEPLOYMENT OF FEDERALLY FUNDED PERSONNEL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and subject to paragraph (2), upon request by the Governor of a State or the chief of a tribe or such Governor or chief's designee, the Secretary may authorize the requesting State or tribe to temporarily redeploy, for purposes of immediately addressing a public health emergency in the State or tribe, non-Federal personnel funded in whole or in part through, as appropriate, programs under this Act.

''(2) ACTIVATION OF EMERGENCY REDEPLOYMENT.—

''(A) PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY.—The Secretary may authorize a temporary redeployment of personnel under paragraph (1) only during the period of a public health emergency determined pursuant to subsection (a).

''(B) CONTENTS OF REQUEST.—To seek authority for a temporary redeployment of personnel under paragraph (1), the Governor of a State or the chief of a tribe shall submit to the Secretary a request for such authority and shall include in the request each of the following:

''(i) An assurance that the public health emergency in the geographic area of the requesting State or tribe cannot be adequately and appropriately addressed by the public health workforce otherwise available.

''(ii) An assurance that the public health emergency would be addressed more efficiently and effectively through the requested temporary redeployment of personnel.

''(iii) An assurance that the requested temporary redeployment of personnel is consistent with any applicable All-Hazards Public Health Emergency Preparedness and Response Plan under section 319C–1.

''(iv) An identification of—

''(I) each Federal program from which personnel would be temporarily redeployed pursuant to the requested authority; and

''(II) the number of personnel who would be so redeployed from each such program.

''(v) Such other information and assurances as the Secretary may require.

''(C) CONSIDERATION.—In reviewing a request for temporary redeployment under paragraph (1) of personnel funded through a Federal program, the Secretary shall consider the degree to which the program would be adversely affected by the redeployment.

''(D) TERMINATION AND EXTENSION.—

''(i) TERMINATION.—A State or tribe's authority for a temporary redeployment of personnel under paragraph (1) shall terminate upon the earlier of the following:

''(I) The Secretary's determination that the public health emergency no longer exists.

''(II) Subject to clause (ii), the expiration of the 30-day period following the date on which the Secretary approved the State or tribe's request for such authority.

''(ii) EXTENSION AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may extend the authority to authorize a temporary redeployment of personnel under paragraph (1) beyond the date otherwise applicable under clause (i)(II) if the public health emergency still exists as of such date, but only if—

''(I) the State or tribe that submitted the initial request for authority for a temporary redeployment of personnel submits a request for an extension of such authority; and

''(II) the request for an extension contains the same type of information and assurances necessary for the approval of an initial request for such authority.

''(3) NOTICE TO PERSONNEL OF POSSIBILITY OF REDEPLOYMENT.—The Secretary shall ensure that, if a State or tribe receives Federal funds for personnel who are subject to the Secretary's redeployment authority under this subsection, the State or tribe gives notice to such personnel of the possibility of redeployment—

''(A) at the time of hiring; or

''(B) in the case of personnel hired before the date of the enactment of this subsection, as soon as practicable.

''(4) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall give notice to the Congress in conjunction with the approval under this subsection of—

''(A) any initial request for authority for a temporary redeployment of personnel; and

''(B) any request for an extension of such authority.

''(5) GUIDANCE.—The Secretary shall—

''(A) not later than 6 months after the enactment of this subsection, issue proposed guidance on the temporary redeployment of personnel under this subsection; and

''(B) after providing notice and a 60-day period for public comment, finalize such guidance.

''(6) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act of 2013, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an independent evaluation, and submit to the appropriate committees of the Congress a report, on the Secretary's authority under this subsection, including—

''(A) a description of how, and under what circumstances, such authority has been used by States and tribes;

''(B) an analysis of how such authority has assisted States and tribes in responding to public health emergencies;

''(C) an evaluation of how such authority has improved operational efficiencies in responding to public health emergencies;

''(D) an analysis of the extent to which, if any, Federal programs from which personnel have been temporarily redeployed pursuant to such authority have been adversely affected by the redeployment; and

''(E) recommendations on how such authority could be improved to further assist in responding to public health emergencies.

''(7) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'State' includes, in addition to the entities listed in the definition of such term in section 2, the Freely Associated States.

''(8) SUNSET.—The authority under this subsection shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act of 2013.''.

SEC. 202. IMPROVING STATE AND LOCAL PUBLIC HEALTH SECURITY.

(a) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—Section 319C–1 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–3a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)(C), by striking ''consortium of entities described in subparagraph (A)'' and inserting ''consortium of States'';

(2) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking clauses (i) and (ii) and inserting the following:

''(i) a description of the activities such entity will carry out under the agreement to meet the goals identified under section 2802, including with respect to chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear threats, whether

naturally occurring, unintentional, or deliberate;

''(ii) a description of the activities such entity will carry out with respect to pandemic influenza, as a component of the activities carried out under clause (i), and consistent with the requirements of paragraphs (2) and (5) of subsection (g);'';

(ii) in clause (iv), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(vi) a description of how, as appropriate, the entity may partner with relevant public and private stakeholders in public health emergency preparedness and response;

''(vii) a description of how the entity, as applicable and appropriate, will coordinate with State emergency preparedness and response plans in public health emergency preparedness, including State educational agencies (as defined in section 9101(41) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965) and State child care lead agencies (designated under section 658D of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990);

''(viii) in the case of entities that operate on the United States-Mexico border or the United States-Canada border, a description of the activities such entity will carry out under the agreement that are specific to the border area including disease detection, identification, investigation, and preparedness and response activities related to emerging diseases and infectious disease outbreaks whether naturally occurring or due to bioterrorism, consistent with the requirements of this section; and

''(ix) a description of any activities that such entity will use to analyze real-time clinical specimens for pathogens of public health or bioterrorism significance, including any utilization of poison control centers;''; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by inserting '', including addressing the needs of at-risk individuals,'' after ''capabilities of such entity'';

(3) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by adding ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking paragraph (4);

(4) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) include outcome goals representing operational achievements of the National Preparedness Goals developed under section 2802(b) with respect to all-hazards, including chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear threats; and''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by adding at the end the following: ''The Secretary shall periodically update, as necessary and appropriate, such pandemic influenza plan criteria and shall require the integration of such criteria into the benchmarks and standards described in paragraph (1).'';

(5) by striking subsection (h);

(6) in subsection (i)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking ''$824,000,000 for fiscal year 2007, of which $35,000,000 shall be used to carry out subsection (h),'' and inserting ''$641,900,000 for fiscal year 2013''; and

(II) by striking ''such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2011'' and inserting ''$641,900,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2017'';

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B);

(iii) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) and (D) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively; and

(iv) in subparagraph (C), as so redesignated, by striking ''subparagraph (C)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (B)'';

(B) in subparagraphs (C) and (D) of paragraph (3), by striking ''(1)(A)(i)(I)'' each place it appears and inserting ''(1)(A)'';

(C) in paragraph (4)(B), by striking ''subsection (c)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) AVAILABILITY OF COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT FUNDS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts provided to an eligible entity under a cooperative agreement under subsection (a) for a fiscal year and remaining unobligated at the end of such year shall remain available to such entity for the next fiscal year for the purposes for which such funds were provided.

''(B) FUNDS CONTINGENT ON ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS.—The continued availability of funds under subparagraph (A) with respect to an entity shall be contingent upon such entity achieving the benchmarks and submitting the pandemic influenza plan as described in subsection (g).''; and

(7) in subsection (j), by striking paragraph (3).

(b) VACCINE TRACKING AND DISTRIBUTION.—Section 319A(e) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–1(e)) is amended by striking ''such sums for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''$30,800,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017''.

SEC. 203. HOSPITAL PREPAREDNESS AND MEDICAL SURGE CAPACITY.

(a) ALL-HAZARDS PUBLIC HEALTH AND MEDICAL RESPONSE CURRICULA AND TRAINING.—Section 319F(a)(5)(B) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–6(a)(5)(B)) is amended by striking ''public health or medical'' and inserting ''public health, medical, or dental''.

(b) ENCOURAGING HEALTH PROFESSIONAL VOLUNTEERS.—

(1) EMERGENCY SYSTEM FOR ADVANCE REGISTRATION OF VOLUNTEER HEALTH PROFESSIONALS.—Section 319I(k) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–7b(k)) is amended by striking ''$2,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2003 through 2011'' and inserting ''$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017''.

(2) VOLUNTEERS.—Section 2813 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300hh–15) is amended—

(A) in subsection (d)(2), by adding at the end the following: ''Such training exercises shall, as appropriate and applicable, incorporate the needs of at-risk individuals in the event of a public health emergency.''; and

(B) in subsection (i), by striking ''$22,000,000 for fiscal year 2007, and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2011'' and inserting ''$11,200,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017''.

(c) PARTNERSHIPS FOR STATE AND REGIONAL PREPAREDNESS TO IMPROVE SURGE CAPACITY.—Section 319C–2 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–3b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting '', including capacity and preparedness to address the needs of pediatric and other at-risk populations'' before the period at the end;

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(A)(ii), by striking ''centers, primary'' and inserting ''centers, community health centers, primary'';

(3) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c) USE OF FUNDS.—An award under subsection (a) shall be expended for activities to achieve the preparedness goals described under paragraphs (1), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of section 2802(b) with respect to all-hazards, including chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear threats.'';

(4) by striking subsection (g) and inserting the following:

''(g) COORDINATION.—

''(1) LOCAL RESPONSE CAPABILITIES.—An eligible entity shall, to the extent practicable, ensure that activities carried out under an award under subsection (a) are coordinated with activities of relevant local Metropolitan Medical Response Systems, local Medical Reserve Corps, the local Cities Readiness Initiative, and local emergency plans.

''(2) NATIONAL COLLABORATION.—Partnerships consisting of one or more eligible entities under this section may, to the extent practicable, collaborate with other partnerships consisting of one or more eligible entities under this section for purposes of national coordination and collaboration with respect to activities to achieve the preparedness goals described under paragraphs (1), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of section 2802(b).'';

(5) in subsection (i)—

(A) by striking ''The requirements of'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The requirements of''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) MEETING GOALS OF NATIONAL HEALTH SECURITY STRATEGY.—The Secretary shall implement objective, evidence-based metrics to ensure that entities receiving awards under this section are meeting, to the extent practicable, the applicable goals of the National Health Security Strategy under section 2802.''; and

(6) in subsection (j)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of carrying out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated $374,700,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017.''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) AVAILABILITY OF COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT FUNDS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts provided to an eligible entity under a cooperative agreement under subsection (a) for a fiscal year and remaining unobligated at the end of such year shall remain available to such entity for the next fiscal year for the purposes for which such funds were provided.

''(B) FUNDS CONTINGENT ON ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS.—The continued availability of funds under subparagraph (A) with respect to an entity shall be contingent upon such entity achieving the benchmarks and submitting the pandemic influenza plan as required under subsection (i).''.

SEC. 204. ENHANCING SITUATIONAL AWARENESS AND BIOSURVEILLANCE.

Section 319D of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–4) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting ''poison control centers,'' after ''hospitals,'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', allowing for coordination to maximize all-hazards medical and public health preparedness and response and to minimize duplication of effort''; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''and update such standards as necessary'';

(2) by striking subsection (c); and

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''PUBLIC HEALTH SITUATIONAL AWARENESS'' and inserting ''MODERNIZING PUBLIC HEALTH SITUATIONAL AWARENESS AND BIOSURVEILLANCE'';

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Act'' and inserting ''Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act of 2013''; and

(ii) by inserting '', novel emerging threats,'' after ''disease outbreaks'';

(C) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) STRATEGY AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act of 2013, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a coordinated strategy and an accompanying implementation plan that identifies and demonstrates the measurable steps the Secretary will carry out to—

''(A) develop, implement, and evaluate the network described in paragraph (1), utilizing the elements described in paragraph (3);

''(B) modernize and enhance biosurveillance activities; and

''(C) improve information sharing, coordination, and communication among disparate biosurveillance systems supported by the Department of Health and Human Services.'';

(D) in paragraph (3)(D), by inserting ''community health centers, health centers'' after ''poison control,'';

(E) in paragraph (5), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) utilize applicable interoperability standards as determined by the Secretary, and in consultation with the Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology, through a joint public and private sector process;''; and

(F) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) CONSULTATION WITH THE NATIONAL BIODEFENSE SCIENCE BOARD.—In carrying out this section and consistent with section 319M, the National Biodefense Science Board shall provide expert advice and guidance, including recommendations, regarding the measurable steps the Secretary should take to modernize and enhance biosurveillance activities pursuant to the efforts of the Department of Health and Human Services to ensure comprehensive, real-time, all-hazards biosurveillance capabilities. In complying with the preceding sentence, the National Biodefense Science Board shall—

''(A) identify the steps necessary to achieve a national biosurveillance system for human health, with international connectivity, where appropriate, that is predicated on State, regional, and community level capabilities and creates a networked system to allow for two-way information flow between and among Federal, State, and local government public health authorities and clinical health care providers;

''(B) identify any duplicative surveillance programs under the authority of the Secretary, or changes that are necessary to existing programs, in order to enhance and modernize such activities, minimize duplication, strengthen and streamline such activities under the authority of the Secretary, and achieve real-time and appropriate data that relate to disease activity, both human and zoonotic; and

''(C) coordinate with applicable existing advisory committees of the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, including such advisory committees consisting of representatives from State, local, and tribal public health authorities and appropriate public and private sector health care entities and academic institutions, in order to provide guidance on public health surveillance activities.'';

(4) in subsection (e)(5), by striking ''4 years after the date of enactment of the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Act'' and inserting ''3 years after the date of enactment of the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act of 2013'';

(5) in subsection (g), by striking ''such sums as may be necessary in each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''$138,300,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017''; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

''(h) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section the term 'biosurveillance' means the process of gathering near real-time biological data that relates to human and zoonotic disease activity and threats to human or animal health, in order to achieve early warning and identification of such health threats, early detection and prompt ongoing tracking of health events, and overall situational awareness of disease activity.''.

SEC. 205. ELIMINATING DUPLICATIVE PROJECT BIOSHIELD REPORTS.

Section 5 of the Project Bioshield Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 247d–6c) is repealed.

TITLE III—ENHANCING MEDICAL COUNTERMEASURE REVIEW

SEC. 301. SPECIAL PROTOCOL ASSESSMENT.

Section 505(b)(5)(B) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(b)(5)(B)) is amended by striking ''size of clinical trials intended'' and all that follows through ''. The sponsor or applicant'' and inserting the following: ''size—

''(i)(I) of clinical trials intended to form the primary basis of an effectiveness claim; or

''(II) in the case where human efficacy studies are not ethical or feasible, of animal and any associated clinical trials which, in combination, are intended to form the primary basis of an effectiveness claim; or

''(ii) with respect to an application for approval of a biological product under section 351(k) of the Public Health Service Act, of any necessary clinical study or studies.

The sponsor or applicant''.

SEC. 302. AUTHORIZATION FOR MEDICAL PRODUCTS FOR USE IN EMERGENCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 564 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360bbb–3) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''sections 505, 510(k), and 515 of this Act'' and inserting ''any provision of this Act'';

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''under a provision of law referred to in such paragraph'' and inserting ''under section 505, 510(k), or 515 of this Act or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act''; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking ''a provision of law referred to in such paragraph'' and inserting ''a section of this Act or the Public Health Service Act referred to in paragraph (2)(A)'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''EMERGENCY'' and inserting ''EMERGENCY OR THREAT JUSTIFYING EMERGENCY AUTHORIZED USE'';

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''may declare an emergency'' and inserting ''may make a declaration that the circumstances exist'';

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''specified'';

(iii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking ''specified''; and

(II) by striking ''; or'' and inserting a semicolon;

(iv) by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

''(C) a determination by the Secretary that there is a public health emergency, or a significant potential for a public health emergency, that affects, or has a significant potential to affect, national security or the health and security of United States citizens living abroad, and that involves a biological, chemical, radiological, or nuclear agent or agents, or a disease or condition that may be attributable to such agent or agents; or''; and

(v) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) the identification of a material threat pursuant to section 319F–2 of the Public Health Service Act sufficient to affect national security or the health and security of United States citizens living abroad.'';

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by amending clause (ii) to read as follows:

''(ii) a change in the approval status of the product such that the circumstances described in subsection (a)(2) have ceased to exist.'';

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(iii) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B);

(D) in paragraph (4), by striking ''advance notice of termination, and renewal under this subsection.'' and inserting '', and advance notice of termination under this subsection.''; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) EXPLANATION BY SECRETARY.—If an authorization under this section with respect to an unapproved product or an unapproved use of an approved product has been in effect for more than 1 year, the Secretary shall provide in writing to the sponsor of such product an explanation of the scientific, regulatory, or other obstacles to approval, licensure, or clearance of such product or use, including specific actions to be taken by the Secretary and the sponsor to overcome such obstacles.'';

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting ''the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response,'' after ''consultation with'';

(ii) by striking ''Health and'' and inserting ''Health, and''; and

(iii) by striking ''circumstances of the emergency involved'' and inserting ''applicable circumstances described in subsection (b)(1)'';

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ''specified'' and inserting ''referred to''; and

(C) in paragraph (2)(B), by inserting '', taking into consideration the material threat posed by the agent or agents identified in a declaration under subsection (b)(1)(D), if applicable'' after ''risks of the product'';

(4) in subsection (d)(3), by inserting '', to the extent practicable given the circumstances of the emergency,'' after ''including'';

(5) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ''circumstances of the emergency'' and inserting ''applicable circumstances described in subsection (b)(1)'';

(B) in paragraph (1)(B), by amending clause (iii) to read as follows:

''(iii) Appropriate conditions with respect to collection and analysis of information concerning the safety and effectiveness of the product with respect to the use of such product during the period when the authorization is in effect and a reasonable time following such period.'';

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking ''manufacturer of the product'' and inserting ''person'';

(II) by striking ''circumstances of the emergency'' and inserting ''applicable circumstances described in subsection (b)(1)''; and

(III) by inserting at the end before the period ''or in paragraph (1)(B)'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(i), by inserting before the period at the end '', except as provided in section 564A with respect to authorized changes to the product expiration date''; and

(iii) by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

''(C) In establishing conditions under this paragraph with respect to the distribution and administration of the product for the unapproved use, the Secretary shall not impose

conditions that would restrict distribution or administration of the product when distributed or administered for the approved use.''; and

(D) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

''(3) GOOD MANUFACTURING PRACTICE; PRESCRIPTION.—With respect to the emergency use of a product for which an authorization under this section is issued (whether an unapproved product or an unapproved use of an approved product), the Secretary may waive or limit, to the extent appropriate given the applicable circumstances described in subsection (b)(1)—

''(A) requirements regarding current good manufacturing practice otherwise applicable to the manufacture, processing, packing, or holding of products subject to regulation under this Act, including such requirements established under section 501 or 520(f)(1), and including relevant conditions prescribed with respect to the product by an order under section 520(f)(2);

''(B) requirements established under section 503(b); and

''(C) requirements established under section 520(e).'';

(6) in subsection (g)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by inserting ''REVIEW AND'' before ''REVOCATION'';

(B) in paragraph (1), by inserting after the period at the end the following: ''As part of such review, the Secretary shall regularly review the progress made with respect to the approval, licensure, or clearance of—

''(A) an unapproved product for which an authorization was issued under this section; or

''(B) an unapproved use of an approved product for which an authorization was issued under this section.''; and

(C) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) REVISION AND REVOCATION.—The Secretary may revise or revoke an authorization under this section if—

''(A) the circumstances described under subsection (b)(1) no longer exist;

''(B) the criteria under subsection (c) for issuance of such authorization are no longer met; or

''(C) other circumstances make such revision or revocation appropriate to protect the public health or safety.'';

(7) in subsection (h)(1), by adding after the period at the end the following: ''The Secretary shall make any revisions to an authorization under this section available on the Internet Web site of the Food and Drug Administration.'';

(8) by adding at the end of subsection (j) the following:

''(4) Nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing a delay in the review or other consideration by the Secretary of any application or submission pending before the Food and Drug Administration for a product for which an authorization under this section is issued.''; and

(9) by adding at the end the following:

''(m) CATEGORIZATION OF LABORATORY TESTS ASSOCIATED WITH DEVICES SUBJECT TO AUTHORIZATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In issuing an authorization under this section with respect to a device, the Secretary may, subject to the provisions of this section, determine that a laboratory examination or procedure associated with such device shall be deemed, for purposes of section 353 of the Public Health Service Act, to be in a particular category of examinations and procedures (including the category described by subsection (d)(3) of such section) if, based on the totality of scientific evidence available to the Secretary—

''(A) such categorization would be beneficial to protecting the public health; and

''(B) the known and potential benefits of such categorization under the circumstances of the authorization outweigh the known and potential risks of the categorization.

''(2) CONDITIONS OF DETERMINATION.—The Secretary may establish appropriate conditions on the performance of the examination or procedure pursuant to such determination.

''(3) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—A determination under this subsection shall be effective for purposes of section 353 of the Public Health Service Act notwithstanding any other provision of that section during the effective period of the relevant declaration under subsection (b).''.

(b) EMERGENCY USE OF MEDICAL PRODUCTS.—Subchapter E of chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360bbb et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 564 the following:

''SEC. 564A. EMERGENCY USE OF MEDICAL PRODUCTS.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) ELIGIBLE PRODUCT.—The term 'eligible product' means a product that—

''(A) is approved or cleared under this chapter or licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act;

''(B)(i) is intended for use to prevent, diagnose, or treat a disease or condition involving a biological, chemical, radiological, or nuclear agent or agents; or

''(ii) is intended for use to prevent, diagnose, or treat a serious or life-threatening disease or condition caused by a product described in clause (i); and

''(C) is intended for use during the circumstances under which—

''(i) a determination described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of section 564(b)(1) has been made by the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary, respectively; or

''(ii) the identification of a material threat described in subparagraph (D) of section 564(b)(1) has been made pursuant to section 319F–2 of the Public Health Service Act.

''(2) PRODUCT.—The term 'product' means a drug, device, or biological product.

''(b) EXPIRATION DATING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may extend the expiration date and authorize the introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of an eligible product after the expiration date provided by the manufacturer if—

''(A) the expiration date extension is intended to support the United States ability to protect—

''(i) the public health; or

''(ii) military preparedness and effectiveness; and

''(B) the expiration date extension is supported by an appropriate scientific evaluation that is conducted or accepted by the Secretary.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS AND CONDITIONS.—Any extension of an expiration date under paragraph (1) shall, as part of the extension, identify—

''(A) each specific lot, batch, or other unit of the product for which extended expiration is authorized;

''(B) the duration of the extension; and

''(C) any other requirements or conditions as the Secretary may deem appropriate for the protection of the public health, which may include requirements for, or conditions on, product sampling, storage, packaging or repackaging, transport, labeling, notice to product recipients, recordkeeping, periodic testing or retesting, or product disposition.

''(3) EFFECT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or the Public Health Service Act, an eligible product shall not be considered an unapproved product (as defined in section 564(a)(2)(A)) and shall not be deemed adulterated or misbranded under this Act because, with respect to such product, the Secretary has, under paragraph (1), extended the expiration date and authorized the introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of such product after the expiration date provided by the manufacturer.

''(4) EXPIRATION DATE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'expiration date' means the date established through appropriate stability testing required by the regulations issued by the Secretary to ensure that the product meets applicable standards of identity, strength, quality, and purity at the time of use.

''(c) CURRENT GOOD MANUFACTURING PRACTICE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may, when the circumstances of a domestic, military, or public health emergency or material threat described in subsection (a)(1)(C) so warrant, authorize, with respect to an eligible product, deviations from current good manufacturing practice requirements otherwise applicable to the manufacture, processing, packing, or holding of products subject to regulation under this Act, including requirements under section 501 or 520(f)(1) or applicable conditions prescribed with respect to the eligible product by an order under section 520(f)(2).

''(2) EFFECT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or the Public Health Service Act, an eligible product shall not be considered an unapproved product (as defined in section 564(a)(2)(A)) and shall not be deemed adulterated or misbranded under this Act because, with respect to such product, the Secretary has authorized deviations from current good manufacturing practices under paragraph (1).

''(d) EMERGENCY DISPENSING.—The requirements of sections 503(b) and 520(e) shall not apply to an eligible product, and the product shall not be considered an unapproved product (as defined in section 564(a)(2)(A)) and shall not be deemed adulterated or misbranded under this Act because it is dispensed without an individual prescription, if—

''(1) the product is dispensed during the circumstances described in subsection (a)(1)(C); and

''(2) such dispensing without an individual prescription occurs—

''(A) as permitted under the law of the State in which the product is dispensed; or

''(B) in accordance with an order issued by the Secretary, for the purposes and duration of the circumstances described in subsection (a)(1)(C).

''(e) EMERGENCY USE INSTRUCTIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through an appropriate official within the Department of Health and Human Services, may create and issue emergency use instructions to inform health care providers or individuals to whom an eligible product is to be administered concerning such product's approved, licensed, or cleared conditions of use.

''(2) EFFECT.—Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act or the Public Health Service Act, a product shall not be considered an unapproved product and shall not be deemed adulterated or misbranded under this Act because of the issuance of emergency use instructions under paragraph (1) with respect to such product or the introduction or delivery for introduction of such product into interstate commerce accompanied by such instructions—

''(A) during an emergency response to an actual emergency that is the basis for a determination described in subsection (a)(1)(C)(i); or

''(B) by a government entity (including a Federal, State, local, or tribal government

entity), or a person acting on behalf of such a government entity, in preparation for an emergency response.''.

(c) RISK EVALUATION AND MITIGATION STRATEGIES.—Section 505–1 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355–1), is amended—

(1) in subsection (f), by striking paragraph (7); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(k) WAIVER IN PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCIES.—The Secretary may waive any requirement of this section with respect to a qualified countermeasure (as defined in section 319F–1(a)(2) of the Public Health Service Act) to which a requirement under this section has been applied, if the Secretary determines that such waiver is required to mitigate the effects of, or reduce the severity of, the circumstances under which—

''(1) a determination described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of section 564(b)(1) has been made by the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary, respectively; or

''(2) the identification of a material threat described in subparagraph (D) of section 564(b)(1) has been made pursuant to section 319F–2 of the Public Health Service Act.''.

(d) PRODUCTS HELD FOR EMERGENCY USE.—The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 564A, as added by subsection (b), the following:

''SEC. 564B. PRODUCTS HELD FOR EMERGENCY USE.

''It is not a violation of any section of this Act or of the Public Health Service Act for a government entity (including a Federal, State, local, or tribal government entity), or a person acting on behalf of such a government entity, to introduce into interstate commerce a product (as defined in section 564(a)(4)) intended for emergency use, if that product—

''(1) is intended to be held and not used; and

''(2) is held and not used, unless and until that product—

''(A) is approved, cleared, or licensed under section 505, 510(k), or 515 of this Act or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act;

''(B) is authorized for investigational use under section 505 or 520 of this Act or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act; or

''(C) is authorized for use under section 564.''.

SEC. 303. DEFINITIONS.

Section 565 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360bbb–4) is amended by striking ''The Secretary, in consultation'' and inserting the following:

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'countermeasure' means a qualified countermeasure, a security countermeasure, and a qualified pandemic or epidemic product;

''(2) the term 'qualified countermeasure' has the meaning given such term in section 319F–1 of the Public Health Service Act;

''(3) the term 'security countermeasure' has the meaning given such term in section 319F–2 of such Act; and

''(4) the term 'qualified pandemic or epidemic product' means a product that meets the definition given such term in section 319F–3 of the Public Health Service Act and—

''(A) that has been identified by the Department of Health and Human Services or the Department of Defense as receiving funding directly related to addressing chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear threats, including pandemic influenza; or

''(B) is included under this paragraph pursuant to a determination by the Secretary.

''(b) GENERAL DUTIES.—The Secretary, in consultation''.

SEC. 304. ENHANCING MEDICAL COUNTERMEASURE ACTIVITIES.

Section 565 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360bbb–4), as amended by section 303, is further amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking ''**TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**'' and inserting ''**COUNTERMEASURE DEVELOPMENT, REVIEW, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking the subsection enumerator and all that follows through ''shall establish'' and inserting the following:

''(b) GENERAL DUTIES.—In order to accelerate the development, stockpiling, approval, licensure, and clearance of qualified countermeasures, security countermeasures, and qualified pandemic or epidemic products, the Secretary, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response, shall—

''(1) ensure the appropriate involvement of Food and Drug Administration personnel in interagency activities related to countermeasure advanced research and development, consistent with sections 319F, 319F–1, 319F–2, 319F–3, 319L, and 2811 of the Public Health Service Act;

''(2) ensure the appropriate involvement and consultation of Food and Drug Administration personnel in any flexible manufacturing activities carried out under section 319L of the Public Health Service Act, including with respect to meeting regulatory requirements set forth in this Act;

''(3) promote countermeasure expertise within the Food and Drug Administration by—

''(A) ensuring that Food and Drug Administration personnel involved in reviewing countermeasures for approval, licensure, or clearance are informed by the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response on the material threat assessment conducted under section 319F–2 of the Public Health Service Act for the agent or agents for which the countermeasure under review is intended;

''(B) training Food and Drug Administration personnel regarding review of countermeasures for approval, licensure, or clearance;

''(C) holding public meetings at least twice annually to encourage the exchange of scientific ideas; and

''(D) establishing protocols to ensure that countermeasure reviewers have sufficient training or experience with countermeasures;

''(4) maintain teams, composed of Food and Drug Administration personnel with expertise on countermeasures, including specific countermeasures, populations with special clinical needs (including children and pregnant women that may use countermeasures, as applicable and appropriate), classes or groups of countermeasures, or other countermeasure-related technologies and capabilities, that shall—

''(A) consult with countermeasure experts, including countermeasure sponsors and applicants, to identify and help resolve scientific issues related to the approval, licensure, or clearance of countermeasures, through workshops or public meetings; and

''(B) improve and advance the science relating to the development of new tools, standards, and approaches to assessing and evaluating countermeasures—

''(i) in order to inform the process for countermeasure approval, clearance, and licensure; and

''(ii) with respect to the development of countermeasures for populations with special clinical needs, including children and pregnant women, in order to meet the needs of such populations, as necessary and appropriate; and

''(5) establish''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) FINAL GUIDANCE ON DEVELOPMENT OF ANIMAL MODELS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act of 2013, the Secretary shall provide final guidance to industry regarding the development of animal models to support approval, clearance, or licensure of countermeasures referred to in subsection (a) when human efficacy studies are not ethical or feasible.

''(2) AUTHORITY TO EXTEND DEADLINE.—The Secretary may extend the deadline for providing final guidance under paragraph (1) by not more than 6 months upon submission by the Secretary of a report on the status of such guidance to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate.

''(d) DEVELOPMENT AND ANIMAL MODELING PROCEDURES.—

''(1) AVAILABILITY OF ANIMAL MODEL MEETINGS.—To facilitate the timely development of animal models and support the development, stockpiling, licensure, approval, and clearance of countermeasures, the Secretary shall, not later than 180 days after the enactment of this subsection, establish a procedure by which a sponsor or applicant that is developing a countermeasure for which human efficacy studies are not ethical or practicable, and that has an approved investigational new drug application or investigational device exemption, may request and receive—

''(A) a meeting to discuss proposed animal model development activities; and

''(B) a meeting prior to initiating pivotal animal studies.

''(2) PEDIATRIC MODELS.—To facilitate the development and selection of animal models that could translate to pediatric studies, any meeting conducted under paragraph (1) shall include discussion of animal models for pediatric populations, as appropriate.

''(e) REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF COUNTERMEASURES.—

''(1) MATERIAL THREAT.—When evaluating an application or submission for approval, licensure, or clearance of a countermeasure, the Secretary shall take into account the material threat posed by the chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear agent or agents identified under section 319F–2 of the Public Health Service Act for which the countermeasure under review is intended.

''(2) REVIEW EXPERTISE.—When practicable and appropriate, teams of Food and Drug Administration personnel reviewing applications or submissions described under paragraph (1) shall include a reviewer with sufficient training or experience with countermeasures pursuant to the protocols established under subsection (b)(3)(D).''.

SEC. 305. REGULATORY MANAGEMENT PLANS.

Section 565 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360bbb–4), as amended by section 304, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) REGULATORY MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

''(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'eligible countermeasure' means—

''(A) a security countermeasure with respect to which the Secretary has entered into a procurement contract under section 319F–2(c) of the Public Health Service Act; or

''(B) a countermeasure with respect to which the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority has provided funding under section 319L of the Public Health Service Act for advanced research and development.

''(2) REGULATORY MANAGEMENT PLAN PROCESS.—The Secretary, in consultation with

the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response and the Director of the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority, shall establish a formal process for obtaining scientific feedback and interactions regarding the development and regulatory review of eligible countermeasures by facilitating the development of written regulatory management plans in accordance with this subsection.

''(3) SUBMISSION OF REQUEST AND PROPOSED PLAN BY SPONSOR OR APPLICANT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A sponsor or applicant of an eligible countermeasure may initiate the process described under paragraph (2) upon submission of a written request to the Secretary. Such request shall include a proposed regulatory management plan.

''(B) TIMING OF SUBMISSION.—A sponsor or applicant may submit a written request under subparagraph (A) after the eligible countermeasure has an investigational new drug or investigational device exemption in effect.

''(C) RESPONSE BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall direct the Food and Drug Administration, upon submission of a written request by a sponsor or applicant under subparagraph (A), to work with the sponsor or applicant to agree on a regulatory management plan within a reasonable time not to exceed 90 days. If the Secretary determines that no plan can be agreed upon, the Secretary shall provide to the sponsor or applicant, in writing, the scientific or regulatory rationale why such agreement cannot be reached.

''(4) PLAN.—The content of a regulatory management plan agreed to by the Secretary and a sponsor or applicant shall include—

''(A) an agreement between the Secretary and the sponsor or applicant regarding developmental milestones that will trigger responses by the Secretary as described in subparagraph (B);

''(B) performance targets and goals for timely and appropriate responses by the Secretary to the triggers described under subparagraph (A), including meetings between the Secretary and the sponsor or applicant, written feedback, decisions by the Secretary, and other activities carried out as part of the development and review process; and

''(C) an agreement on how the plan shall be modified, if needed.

''(5) MILESTONES AND PERFORMANCE TARGETS.—The developmental milestones described in paragraph (4)(A) and the performance targets and goals described in paragraph (4)(B) shall include—

''(A) feedback from the Secretary regarding the data required to support the approval, clearance, or licensure of the eligible countermeasure involved;

''(B) feedback from the Secretary regarding the data necessary to inform any authorization under section 564;

''(C) feedback from the Secretary regarding the data necessary to support the positioning and delivery of the eligible countermeasure, including to the Strategic National Stockpile;

''(D) feedback from the Secretary regarding the data necessary to support the submission of protocols for review under section 505(b)(5)(B);

''(E) feedback from the Secretary regarding any gaps in scientific knowledge that will need resolution prior to approval, licensure, or clearance of the eligible countermeasure and plans for conducting the necessary scientific research;

''(F) identification of the population for which the countermeasure sponsor or applicant seeks approval, licensure, or clearance and the population for which desired labeling would not be appropriate, if known; and

''(G) as necessary and appropriate, and to the extent practicable, a plan for demonstrating safety and effectiveness in pediatric populations, and for developing pediatric dosing, formulation, and administration with respect to the eligible countermeasure, provided that such plan would not delay authorization under section 564, approval, licensure, or clearance for adults.

''(6) PRIORITIZATION.—

''(A) PLANS FOR SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES.—The Secretary shall establish regulatory management plans for all security countermeasures for which a request is submitted under paragraph (3)(A).

''(B) PLANS FOR OTHER ELIGIBLE COUNTERMEASURES.—The Secretary shall determine whether resources are available to establish regulatory management plans for eligible countermeasures that are not security countermeasures. If resources are available to establish regulatory management plans for eligible countermeasures that are not security countermeasures, and if resources are not available to establish regulatory management plans for all eligible countermeasures for which requests have been submitted, the Director of the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority, in consultation with the Commissioner, shall prioritize which eligible countermeasures may receive regulatory management plans.''.

SEC. 306. REPORT.

Section 565 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360bbb–4), as amended by section 305, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall make publicly available on the Web site of the Food and Drug Administration a report that details the countermeasure development and review activities of the Food and Drug Administration, including—

''(1) with respect to the development of new tools, standards, and approaches to assess and evaluate countermeasures—

''(A) the identification of the priorities of the Food and Drug Administration and the progress made on such priorities; and

''(B) the identification of scientific gaps that impede the development, approval, licensure, or clearance of countermeasures for populations with special clinical needs, including children and pregnant women, and the progress made on resolving these challenges;

''(2) with respect to countermeasures for which a regulatory management plan has been agreed upon under subsection (f), the extent to which the performance targets and goals set forth in subsection (f)(4)(B) and the regulatory management plan have been met, including, for each such countermeasure—

''(A) whether the regulatory management plan was completed within the required timeframe, and the length of time taken to complete such plan;

''(B) whether the Secretary adhered to the timely and appropriate response times set forth in such plan; and

''(C) explanations for any failure to meet such performance targets and goals;

''(3) the number of regulatory teams established pursuant to subsection (b)(4), the number of products, classes of products, or technologies assigned to each such team, and the number of, type of, and any progress made as a result of consultations carried out under subsection (b)(4)(A);

''(4) an estimate of resources obligated to countermeasure development and regulatory assessment, including—

''(A) Center-specific objectives and accomplishments; and

''(B) the number of full-time equivalent employees of the Food and Drug Administration who directly support the review of countermeasures;

''(5) the number of countermeasure applications and submissions submitted, the number of countermeasures approved, licensed, or cleared, the status of remaining submitted applications and submissions, and the number of each type of authorization issued pursuant to section 564;

''(6) the number of written requests for a regulatory management plan submitted under subsection (f)(3)(A), the number of regulatory management plans developed, and the number of such plans developed for security countermeasures; and

''(7) the number, type, and frequency of meetings between the Food and Drug Administration and—

''(A) sponsors of a countermeasure as defined in subsection (a); or

''(B) another agency engaged in development or management of portfolios for such countermeasures, including the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority, the National Institutes of Health, and the appropriate agencies of the Department of Defense.''.

SEC. 307. PEDIATRIC MEDICAL COUNTERMEASURES.

(a) PEDIATRIC STUDIES OF DRUGS.—Section 505A of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by adding at the end the following:

''(5) CONSULTATION.—With respect to a drug that is a qualified countermeasure (as defined in section 319F–1 of the Public Health Service Act), a security countermeasure (as defined in section 319F–2 of the Public Health Service Act), or a qualified pandemic or epidemic product (as defined in section 319F–3 of the Public Health Service Act), the Secretary shall solicit input from the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response regarding the need for and, from the Director of the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority regarding the conduct of, pediatric studies under this section.''; and

(2) in subsection (n)(1), by adding at the end the following:

''(C) For a drug that is a qualified countermeasure (as defined in section 319F–1 of the Public Health Service Act), a security countermeasure (as defined in section 319F–2 of the Public Health Service Act), or a qualified pandemic or epidemic product (as defined in section 319F–3 of such Act), in addition to any action with respect to such drug under subparagraph (A) or (B), the Secretary shall notify the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response and the Director of the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority of all pediatric studies in the written request issued by the Commissioner of Food and Drugs.''.

(b) ADDITION TO PRIORITY LIST CONSIDERATIONS.—Section 409I of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 284m) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a)(2) and inserting the following:

''(2) CONSIDERATION OF AVAILABLE INFORMATION.—In developing and prioritizing the list under paragraph (1), the Secretary—

''(A) shall consider—

''(i) therapeutic gaps in pediatrics that may include developmental pharmacology, pharmacogenetic determinants of drug response, metabolism of drugs and biologics in children, and pediatric clinical trials;

''(ii) particular pediatric diseases, disorders or conditions where more complete knowledge and testing of therapeutics, including drugs and biologics, may be beneficial in pediatric populations; and

''(iii) the adequacy of necessary infrastructure to conduct pediatric pharmacological research, including research networks and trained pediatric investigators; and

''(B) may consider the availability of qualified countermeasures (as defined in section 319F–1), security countermeasures (as defined in section 319F–2), and qualified pandemic or epidemic products (as defined in section 319F–3) to address the needs of pediatric populations, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response, consistent with the purposes of this section.''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''subsection (a)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (1) and (2)(A) of subsection (a)''.

(c) ADVICE AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PEDIATRIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE REGARDING COUNTERMEASURES FOR PEDIATRIC POPULATIONS.—Subsection (b)(2) of section 14 of the Best Pharmaceuticals for Children Act (42 U.S.C. 284m note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) the development of countermeasures (as defined in section 565(a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act) for pediatric populations.''.

TITLE IV—ACCELERATING MEDICAL COUNTERMEASURE ADVANCED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 401. BIOSHIELD.

(a) PROCUREMENT OF COUNTERMEASURES.—Section 319F–2(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–6b(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B)(i)(III)(bb), by striking ''eight years'' and inserting ''10 years'';

(2) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking ''the designated congressional committees (as defined in paragraph (10))'' and inserting ''the appropriate committees of Congress'';

(3) in paragraph (5)(B)(ii), by striking ''eight years'' and inserting ''10 years'';

(4) in subparagraph (C) of paragraph (6)—

(A) in the subparagraph heading, by striking ''DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES'' and inserting ''APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES''; and

(B) by striking ''the designated congressional committees'' and inserting ''the appropriate congressional committees''; and

(5) in paragraph (7)(C)—

(A) in clause (i)(I), by inserting ''including advanced research and development,'' after ''as may reasonably be required,'';

(B) in clause (ii)—

(i) in subclause (III), by striking ''eight years'' and inserting ''10 years''; and

(ii) by striking subclause (IX) and inserting the following:

''(IX) CONTRACT TERMS.—The Secretary, in any contract for procurement under this section—

''(aa) may specify—

''(AA) the dosing and administration requirements for the countermeasure to be developed and procured;

''(BB) the amount of funding that will be dedicated by the Secretary for advanced research, development, and procurement of the countermeasure; and

''(CC) the specifications the countermeasure must meet to qualify for procurement under a contract under this section; and

''(bb) shall provide a clear statement of defined Government purpose limited to uses related to a security countermeasure, as defined in paragraph (1)(B).''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(viii) FLEXIBILITY.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary may, consistent with the applicable provisions of this section, enter into contracts and other agreements that are in the best interest of the Government in meeting identified security countermeasure needs, including with respect to reimbursement of the cost of advanced research and development as a reasonable, allowable, and allocable direct cost of the contract involved.''.

(b) REAUTHORIZATION OF THE SPECIAL RESERVE FUND.—Section 319F–2 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–6b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking ''special reserve fund under paragraph (10)'' each place it appears and inserting ''special reserve fund as defined in subsection (h)''; and

(B) by striking paragraphs (9) and (10); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(g) SPECIAL RESERVE FUND.—

''(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to amounts appropriated to the special reserve fund prior to the date of the enactment of this subsection, there is authorized to be appropriated, for the procurement of security countermeasures under subsection (c) and for carrying out section 319L (relating to the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority), $2,800,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2018. Amounts appropriated pursuant to the preceding sentence are authorized to remain available until September 30, 2019.

''(2) USE OF SPECIAL RESERVE FUND FOR ADVANCED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary may utilize not more than 50 percent of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1) to carry out section 319L (related to the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority). Amounts authorized to be appropriated under this subsection to carry out section 319L are in addition to amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated to carry out such section.

''(3) RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts in the special reserve fund shall not be used to pay costs other than payments made by the Secretary to a vendor for advanced development (under section 319L) or for procurement of a security countermeasure under subsection (c)(7).

''(4) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after any date on which the Secretary determines that the amount of funds in the special reserve fund available for procurement is less than $1,500,000,000, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report detailing the amount of such funds available for procurement and the impact such reduction in funding will have—

''(A) in meeting the security countermeasure needs identified under this section; and

''(B) on the annual Public Health Emergency Medical Countermeasures Enterprise and Strategy Implementation Plan (pursuant to section 2811(d)).

''(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'advanced research and development' has the meaning given such term in section 319L(a).

''(2) The term 'special reserve fund' means the 'Biodefense Countermeasures' appropriations account, any appropriation made available pursuant to section 521(a) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, and any appropriation made available pursuant to subsection (g)(1).''.

SEC. 402. BIOMEDICAL ADVANCED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY.

(a) DUTIES.—Section 319L(c)(4) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–7e(c)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by inserting ''(which may include advanced research and development for purposes of fulfilling requirements under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or section 351 of this Act)'' after ''development''; and

(2) in subparagraph (D)(iii), by striking ''and vaccine manufacturing technologies'' and inserting ''vaccine-manufacturing technologies, dose-sparing technologies, efficacy-increasing technologies, and platform technologies''.

(b) TRANSACTION AUTHORITIES.—Section 319L(c)(5) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–7e(c)(5)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(G) GOVERNMENT PURPOSE.—In awarding contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements under this section, the Secretary shall provide a clear statement of defined Government purpose related to activities included in subsection (a)(6)(B) for a qualified countermeasure or qualified pandemic or epidemic product.''.

(c) FUND.—Paragraph (2) of section 319L(d) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–7e(d)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) FUNDING.—To carry out the purposes of this section, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Fund $415,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017, such amounts to remain available until expended.''.

(d) CONTINUED INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—Section 319L(e)(1)(C) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–7e(e)(1)(C)) is amended by striking ''7 years'' and inserting ''11 years''.

(e) EXTENSION OF LIMITED ANTITRUST EXEMPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 405(b) of the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–6a note) is amended by striking ''6-year'' and inserting ''11-year''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall take effect as if enacted on December 17, 2012.

(f) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION.—Section 319L of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–7e) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an independent evaluation of the activities carried out to facilitate flexible manufacturing capacity pursuant to this section.

''(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report concerning the results of the evaluation conducted under paragraph (1). Such report shall review and assess—

''(A) the extent to which flexible manufacturing capacity under this section is dedicated to chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear threats;

''(B) the activities supported by flexible manufacturing initiatives; and

''(C) the ability of flexible manufacturing activities carried out under this section to—

''(i) secure and leverage leading technical expertise with respect to countermeasure advanced research, development, and manufacturing processes; and

''(ii) meet the surge manufacturing capacity needs presented by novel and emerging threats, including chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear agents.''.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) QUALIFIED COUNTERMEASURE.—Section 319F–1(a)(2)(A) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–6a(a)(2)(A)) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''to—'' and inserting ''—'';

(B) in clause (i)—

(i) by striking ''diagnose'' and inserting ''to diagnose''; and

(ii) by striking ''; or'' and inserting a semicolon;

(C) in clause (ii)—

(i) by striking ''diagnose'' and inserting ''to diagnose''; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) is a product or technology intended to enhance the use or effect of a drug, biological product, or device described in clause (i) or (ii).''.

(2) QUALIFIED PANDEMIC OR EPIDEMIC PRODUCT.—Section 319F–3(i)(7)(A) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–6d(i)(7)(A)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i)(II), by striking ''; or'' and inserting '';'';

(B) in clause (ii), by striking ''; and'' and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) a product or technology intended to enhance the use or effect of a drug, biological product, or device described in clause (i) or (ii); and''.

(3) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 319F–3(i) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–6d(i)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(C), by inserting '', 564A, or 564B'' after ''564''; and

(B) in paragraph (7)(B)(iii), by inserting '', 564A, or 564B'' after ''564''.

SEC. 403. STRATEGIC NATIONAL STOCKPILE.

Section 319F–2 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–6b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting ''consistent with section 2811'' before ''by the Secretary to be appropriate''; and

(ii) by inserting before the period at the end of the second sentence the following: ''and shall submit such review annually to the appropriate congressional committees of jurisdiction to the extent that disclosure of such information does not compromise national security''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(D), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: ''and that the potential depletion of countermeasures currently in the stockpile is identified and appropriately addressed, including through necessary replenishment''; and

(2) in subsection (f)(1), by striking ''$640,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2006. Such authorization is in addition to amounts in the special reserve fund referred to in subsection (c)(10)(A).'' and inserting ''$533,800,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017. Such authorization is in addition to amounts in the special reserve fund referred to in subsection (h).''.

SEC. 404. NATIONAL BIODEFENSE SCIENCE BOARD.

Section 319M(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–f(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) one such member shall be an individual with pediatric subject matter expertise; and

''(iv) one such member shall be a State, tribal, territorial, or local public health official.''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following flush sentence:

''Nothing in this paragraph shall preclude a member of the Board from satisfying two or more of the requirements described in subparagraph (D).''; and

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) provide any recommendation, finding, or report provided to the Secretary under this paragraph to the appropriate committees of Congress.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 307, the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act of 2013, introduced by my colleague, MIKE ROGERS, from Michigan, would reauthorize programs designed to foster the development of chemical, biological, radioactive, and nuclear medical countermeasures and strengthen the Nation's preparedness infrastructure. It reauthorizes programs for 5 years at the fiscal year 2012 appropriated level and does not create a new program nor increase the authorization for appropriations for an existing program.

Congress originally enacted the programs reauthorized in PAHPRA through the Project BioShield Act of 2004 and Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Act of 2006. Project BioShield authorized funds for the purchase of medical countermeasures through the Special Reserve Fund and enabled the Secretary of Health and Human Services to authorize the emergency use of medical products.

PAHPRA created the Biodefense Advanced Research and Development Authority within HHS to help with the development of medical countermeasures and ensure communications between HHS and the developers of medical countermeasures. Reauthorizing these programs would help the Nation respond to a CBRN attack and is essential to addressing gaps in the Nation's flu preparedness.

H.R. 307 is essentially the same as H.R. 6672, the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act of 2012, which passed the House in December by a vote of 383–16.

I would urge all Members to support this critical piece of legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 307, the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act of 2013. Unfortunately, last month, before the end of the Congress, we were unable to get this final bill over the finish line, so I am grateful to Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member WAXMAN for agreeing to move quickly to get this bill passed and sent over to the Senate without further delay.

This bill is virtually identical to the House-passed bill last December. It reflects bipartisan work that took place between the House and Senate over several months late last year to resolve differences between the House- and Senate-passed PAHPRA reauthorization bills.

We all know very well that our Nation continues to face threats that require an ongoing commitment to public health and emergency preparedness. Of course, I think to my own district and State of New Jersey after we experienced a devastating storm that destroyed entire communities. The Federal Government's support, including through programs authorized by PAHPRA, was critical in the wake of this hurricane disaster.

The legislation before us today reauthorizes programs and activities first established as part of the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002, the 2004 Project BioShield Act, and the 2006 Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Act. Over the past decade, these programs have represented comprehensive efforts to prepare for and respond to public health emergencies. As a result of the investments that followed, our Nation is better equipped to respond to public health emergencies.

I just want to take a few moments to highlight ways that H.R. 307 will continue the progress we've made over the past decade:

First, the bill further facilitates the development of medical countermeasures through emphasizing medical countermeasure advancement in the National Health Security Strategy, requiring the development of a 5-year budget analysis of the countermeasure enterprise, and calling for the development of a countermeasure strategy and implementation plan;

Second, it bolsters the Nation's medical and public health preparedness and response infrastructure, including through a new authority that would allow States to deploy personnel funded through Federal programs to the areas within their State where they are most needed in the aftermath of a disaster;

Third, it strengthens and clarifies the position of Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response as the lead for HHS on emergency preparedness and response and calls for streamlining and better coordinating HHS preparedness grants with those of other Departments;

Finally, it places even greater emphasis on the special needs of pediatric and other at-risk populations in preparing for and responding to public health emergencies.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 307 improves FDA's emergency response capabilities. It will enable FDA to authorize the distribution and use of medical countermeasures in preparation for an emergency and to take actions during an emergency that will allow for the most effective use of medical countermeasures.

I just wanted to thank the Congressmen. First, I want to thank my colleague, who is about to speak, Congresswoman ANNA ESHOO, for all her work on this legislation over the years; also, obviously, MIKE ROGERS and Congressman GENE GREEN. These are different people who have authored the legislation over the years.

I would also like to recognize the contributions of Chairman UPTON, Chairman PITTS, Ranking Member WAXMAN, and Congressman MARKEY in strengthening the legislation as it moved through the committee process and in discussions with the Senate. They have all worked in a bipartisan fashion over the past 1½ years to accomplish the goals of our Members, and they should be commended for their work.

I urge Members to join me in supporting passage of H.R. 307. I am hopeful that our Senate colleagues will move forward on this bill's passage so we can get it to the President's desk as quickly as possible.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS), the prime sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ranking Member PALLONE. I want to thank ANNA ESHOO for being such a great partner in what is truly a collaborative effort to get this bill passed and protect our ability to protect so many Americans.

It's been about 10 years, Mr. Speaker, since September 11 and the anthrax attacks that followed. The threat of bioterrorism remains a very real danger, indeed, to the American people. As we have seen in events across northern Africa, our adversaries in al Qaeda and others are still hell-bent on their terrorism acts, and we know that they are interested in chemical and radiological and biological elements to further their political gains.

Fortunately, we have spent the last decade preparing for those chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear threats by developing and stockpiling numerous medical countermeasures to protect Americans in the event of attack. As a result of these efforts, we now have numerous vaccines and treatments in the Strategic National Stockpile that will save thousands of lives if we're attacked. However, the work to protect Americans against bioterrorism is not finished, and we must pass this bill or the future of America's public health preparedness infrastructure will be in jeopardy.

The Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act is a fiscally responsible bill that represents common ground between the bipartisan House-and Senate-passed preparedness bills in the 112th Congress.

I'd like to take this opportunity again to thank the bipartisan cosponsors—first, ANNA ESHOO for her long-term commitment and partnership in this, certainly Mr. PALLONE from New Jersey as well, Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member WAXMAN, and all of our great partners in the Senate—for their support in what has been a very productive process to ensure the health preparedness of our States and hospitals for the next flu outbreak or pandemic.

□ 1240

This bill will reauthorize critically important biodefense programs designed to promote the continued development of medical countermeasures against chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear threats, and would strengthen the Nation's public health preparedness infrastructure. Reauthorizing these programs is essential to how the Nation would respond to these types of attacks.

The bill would also reauthorize programs for 5 years at the fiscal year 2012 appropriated level. The bill would not create a new program nor increase authorization for appropriations for an existing program. This bill would reauthorize and improve certain provisions of Project Bioshield and something we call PAHPA.

Again, I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish this bill Godspeed for the safety of all of our first responders and those who might be exposed to what we know is a real threat when it comes to the safety, health, and national security of the United States.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO). She is a longtime advocate and sponsor of this legislation.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, Mr. PALLONE, for his leadership and legislative courtesies along the way. I'm very proud that as we begin a new year and a new Congress that this bill is on the floor. I think it's fitting that we begin a new Congress with this bill, the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization. It is very important legislation, as you have already heard from those that have spoken.

I first introduced this legislation with Congressman MIKE ROGERS, my friend, my colleague, at the committee, and we've done other bills together very successfully, as well. We began that particular effort in 2006 to better help our country prepare for a chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear attack—all words that none of us really wish to utter. But we need to be prepared.

Developing and stockpiling appropriate countermeasures is essential for public safety. And these programs encourage American companies to invest in areas of critical need because we need the partnership of the private sector in this as well.

The bill before us today includes new provisions that highlight the important needs of our Nation's children. Children are not just little adults. They need special care and medical attention. They're especially vulnerable to biological or chemical agents because of their size, their limited capacity to flush toxins out of their bodies, their underdeveloped motor skills, and their total reliance on their parents or other caregivers. And certainly the role of the Congress in this is to make sure that we have laws that really speak specifically to them.

While the hope is that we will never need to use these countermeasures to combat an attack on our country, I'm proud that we've strengthened these programs for everyone in our country, especially children.

This legislation is supported by the American Public Health Association, the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials, the National Association of County and City Health Officials, and Trust for America's Health, as well as, very importantly, the American Academy of Pediatrics.

I'm very pleased that we're, once again, voting to pass the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act, just as we did a month before the end of the last Congress, and I strongly urge my colleagues in the Senate to do the same. This is a bipartisan effort, and it's critical to our national preparedness and security strategies. We very often come to the floor about strategies relative to our military and strategies relative to our national intelligence community. This is about the public health element of that national security for our country.

We need to move forward with this and bring the legislation to the President's desk for his signature.

I thank Chairman UPTON, the ranking member of the full Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. WAXMAN, and certainly the distinguished chairman of the Health Subcommittee and, again, my wonderful partner, Congressman MIKE ROGERS.

Mr. PITTS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include for the RECORD a joint letter from four public health organizations: the American Public Health Association, the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials, the National Association of County and City Health Officials, and Trust for America's Health.

JANUARY 22, 2013.

Hon. FRED UPTON, *Chairman,*
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. JOSEPH R. PITTS, *Chairman,*
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. HENRY A. WAXMAN, *Ranking Member,*
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. FRANK PALLONE, JR., *Ranking Member,*
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. MIKE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMEN UPTON AND PITTS, RANKING MEMBERS WAXMAN AND PALLONE, AND REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: On behalf of the undersigned organizations, dedicated to protecting the public health of our nation, we write to express our support for the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act of 2013 (PAHPRA, H.R. 307). We urge swift passage in the House as this legislation is critical to the safety of our nation. We thank you for your leadership in moving PAHPRA though the House in the 112th Congress and are eager to work with both the House and Senate to ensure final passage in this session.

PAHPRA is vital to state and local health and other public health practitioners who are a critical part of any community's first response to disease outbreaks, emergencies, and acts of terrorism. The following provisions in particular are essential to keeping communities healthy and safe:

Temporary Redeployment of Federally Funded Personnel During a Public Health Emergency (Section 201): The provision allows states and tribes to request from the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) the authority to temporarily reassign public health personnel from other HHS-funded grant programs to respond to a major emergency. The authority would allow state and local governments to meet the tremendous staffing needs required by a disaster.

Reauthorization of the Public Health and Emergency Preparedness Grants (PHEP) (Section 202): The PHEP cooperative agreement program provides funding to local and state public health departments to strengthen their capacity and capability to effectively respond to public health emergencies including terrorist threats, infectious disease outbreaks, natural disasters, and biological, chemical, nuclear, and radiological emergencies. State and local health departments work with federal government officials, law enforcement, emergency management, health care, business, education, and religious groups to plan, train, and prepare for emergencies so that when disaster strikes, communities are prepared.

Reauthorization of the Hospital Preparedness Program (HPP) (Section 203): HPP provides funding to state and local health departments to enhance hospital preparedness and improve overall surge capacity in the case of public health emergencies. The preparedness activities carried out under this program strengthen the capabilities of hospitals throughout the country to respond to floods, hurricanes, or wildfires, and also include training for a potential influenza pandemic or terrorist attack.

Carryover of Grant Use, Coordination (Section 202 and 203): The bill updates the preparedness grant programs at HHS giving grantees limited ability to carry over funds encouraging flexibility and efficiency. The provisions promote long-term planning currently impossible in an unpredictable fiscal environment.

Children's Preparedness (Sections 103, 307 and throughout): The bill establishes the National Advisory Committee on Children and Disasters to bring together federal and non-federal partners to provide guidance and recommendations on medical and public health preparedness for children before, during and after a disaster or public health emergency. The bill takes significant steps to consider the particular needs of pediatric populations in Medical Countermeasure (MCM) research and development. The bill also calls for consideration of the needs of children, as an at-risk population, in the Public Health Emergency Medical Countermeasures Enterprise Strategy and Implementation Plan, PHEP, HPP, and Medical Reserve Corps.

Enhancing Situational Awareness and Biosurveillance (Section 204): The bill calls for planning and integration of the current biosurveillance systems to strengthen the nation's bioterrorism and disease outbreak response capabilities. The bill also requires coordination with the National Biodefense Science Board. HHS is required to provide a report to Congress on their implementation plans and progress.

Individuals with Disabilities (Section 101): The bill calls for the consideration of the needs individuals with disabilities in the National Health Security Strategy.

Thank you again for your work to reauthorize this important legislation. We look forward to working with you and your staff to move this bill to the President's desk.

Sincerely,

GEORGES C. BENJAMIN, MD, FACP, FACEP (E),
Executive Director, American Public Health Association.
PAUL E. JARRIS, MD, MBA,
Executive Director, Association of State and Territorial Health Officials.
ROBERT M. PESTRONK, MPH,
Executive Director, National Association of County and City Health Officials.
JEFF LEVI, PH.D.,
Executive Director, Trust For America's Health.

Mr. PALLONE. I now would like to yield 3 minutes to another sponsor of the legislation, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act which will reauthorize certain provisions of the Project Bioshield Act of 2004 and the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Act of 2006.

This legislation was initially passed by Congress to help the U.S. develop medical countermeasures against chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear terrorism agents, to provide a mechanism for Federal acquisition of these newly developed countermeasures.

Our Nation remains vulnerable to these threats because many of the vaccines and medicines to protect our citizens do not exist. Developing and stockpiling these medical countermeasures require time, resources, and research, all of which will be provided under the legislation before us today. I'm pleased that the language I supported during the committee process aimed at increasing emphasis on regional trauma care centers was included.

This bill is very important to me because the University of Texas Medical Branch's Galveston National Laboratory is near our district. The Galveston National Lab is the only BSL–4 lab located on a university campus. At the lab, scientists conduct research to develop therapies, vaccines, and diagnostic tests for naturally occurring emerging diseases such as SARS and avian influenza, as well as for microbes that might be employed by terrorists.

This is exactly the type of research we hope to encourage under the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act.

As an original cosponsor of this bill with Mr. ROGERS, I'm very pleased at how quickly we have moved this rare bipartisan piece of legislation. I would like to thank Chairman ROGERS, Chairman UPTON, Chairman PITTS, Ranking Member WAXMAN, Ranking Member PALLONE, Mrs. Myrick and Ms. ESHOO for their work on this important legislation. The House passed this bill twice last year, and I hope the Senate acts quickly, and we will send it to the President.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional colleagues to speak, and I would simply urge Members to join me in supporting passage of H.R. 307 and hope that our Senate colleagues will move forward on the bill's passage so we can get the bill to the President's desk.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. It has strong bipartisan support. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 307, the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act of 2013, and urge my colleagues to support this bill as well.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has been a long time coming. In fact, it's the same one we passed just last month at the end of the 112th Congress. H.R. 307 reflects a lengthy, but extremely productive process with our Senate colleagues and their staff to come together to bridge the differences between earlier House and Senate bills. H.R. 307 is the product of that effort. It is our hope that this time around, the Senate will pass the bill as soon as possible after the House acts on the legislation today.

Toward that end, H.R. 307 reauthorizes and makes minor—but important—improvements to various programs and activities first established in the 2002 Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act; 2004 Project Bioshield Act; and the 2006 Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Act, or as it is commonly referred to, ''PAHPA.'' These programs and activities are key in helping to ensure that our nation is well prepared to successfully manage the effects of natural disasters, infectious disease outbreaks, and acts of bioterrorism.

H.R. 307 includes dozens of changes to these underlying authorities. Let me highlight just three provisions that deserve special attention:

First, the bill will ensure that the Food and Drug Administration focuses on medical countermeasures of the highest importance. Medical countermeasures are products designed to combat chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear agents. H.R. 307 will facilitate communication between the FDA and product sponsors—particularly on high priority countermeasures for which sponsors have developed regulatory management plans—to resolve scientific and regulatory questions and help make these products available more quickly. Just last month, FDA approved the first drug developed and procured under Project BioShield.

The FDA provisions in H.R. 307 will also facilitate the rapid provision of existing medicines to people in need during an emergency. Taken together, these FDA provisions—along with the renewed emphasis in our countermeasure enterprise through other parts of the legislation—will make it possible for a greater number of drugs and devices to move from early development to procurement.

Second, the legislation makes improvements to the nation's blueprint for public health preparedness and response activities that will enhance the ability of our diverse health care system to respond to mass casualty emergencies. Among such improvements are clarifying the role of the Assistant Secretary of Preparedness and Response as the lead office within the Department of Health and Human Services for emergency preparedness and response. H.R. 307 also establishes a new authority to permit the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services to approve a request of a state, territory, or an Indian tribe to redeploy certain federally-supported employees during the time of a national emergency to geographic areas where these employees are needed most.

Finally, H.R. 307 continues support for investments in state and local public health departments. Such investments are necessary to make certain that we have the requisite public health infrastructure in place to respond immediately and appropriately to any public health threat that may arise.

This legislation reflects the effort of a number of members—Democrats and Republicans alike. On our side of the aisle, Congressman GREEN, Congresswoman ESHOO, Congressman MARKEY, and our Health Subcommittee Ranking Member, Congressman PALLONE, have been deeply involved. I want to thank them and their staff for all the long and incredibly hard work they have put into this legislation and to the process of getting us here today.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 307.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 307.

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. PITTS. 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.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 2 p.m.

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 22, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

SPEAKER BOEHNER: I write to inform you that I have notified Missouri Governor Jeremiah Nixon of my resignation from the U.S. House of Representatives, effective 11:59 p.m., January 22, 2013.

Serving the Eighth Congressional District in the U.S. House of Representatives has been the greatest honor of my professional career. I am humbled and grateful for the opportunity to represent Southern Missouri, to bring the ideas of the people to our Capitol, and to be part of our democracy. I have always emphasized the same virtues of the people who sent me here: civility, hard work, integrity and love for our neighbors. I deeply appreciate the way our House of Representatives reflects these important parts of life in our great Nation.

I'm grateful beyond words for the members of my staff, our committees and my fellow colleagues in Congress for their service, guidance and friendship. So many talented individuals work to ensure the House of Representatives reflects the voice and will of the People, and most Americans never see the men and women working long hours to advance policy, to support debate and to conduct meaningful oversight.

Finally, I have to thank the constituents of the Eighth Congressional District. In times of tragedy, they have inspired me with their courage. In times of disaster, they have inspired me with their resilience. In times of uncertainty, they have inspired with me their unwavering optimism. I have been honored to fight by their side. I am very proud of what we have accomplished.

Very sincerely,

JO ANN EMERSON.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 22, 2013.

Hon. JEREMIAH W. NIXON,
Governor of Missouri,
Jefferson City, MO.

GOVERNOR NIXON: I write to inform you that I will resign my seat in the U.S. House of Representatives, effective 11:59 p.m., January 22, 2013.

Serving Missouri's Eighth Congressional District for 17 years has been an incredible honor, a welcome challenge, and a deeply rewarding endeavor. I count myself as incredibly fortunate to have represented Americans who are so passionate about the principles of service and community. Our democracy is in good hands thanks to the talent, dedication and civic pride of the proud Americans working every day to improve our Nation and its prospects.

I commend the citizens of my District to you, and I assure you that my trust in the People remains well-placed with those I have had the honor of representing.

Very sincerely,

JO ANN EMERSON.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

PANDEMIC AND ALL-HAZARDS PREPAREDNESS REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 307) to reauthorize certain programs under the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to public health security and all-hazards preparedness and response, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 29, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 24]

YEAS—395

Alexander	Brownley (CA)	Collins (NY)
Amodei	Bucshon	Conaway
Andrews	Burgess	Connolly
Bachmann	Bustos	Conyers
Bachus	Butterfield	Cook
Barber	Calvert	Cooper
Barletta	Camp	Costa
Barr	Cantor	Courtney
Barrow	Capito	Cramer
Barton	Capps	Crawford
Bass	Capuano	Crenshaw
Beatty	Cárdenas	Crowley
Becerra	Carney	Cuellar
Benishek	Carson (IN)	Culberson
Bentivolio	Cartwright	Cummings
Bera	Cassidy	Daines
Bilirakis	Castor (FL)	Davis (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Castro (TX)	Davis, Danny
Bishop (NY)	Chabot	Davis, Rodney
Bishop (UT)	Chaffetz	DeFazio
Black	Chu	DeGette
Blackburn	Cicilline	Delaney
Blumenauer	Clarke	DeLauro
Bonamici	Clay	DelBene
Bonner	Cleaver	Denham
Boustany	Clyburn	Dent
Brady (PA)	Coble	DeSantis
Brady (TX)	Coffman	DesJarlais
Braley (IA)	Cohen	Deutch
Brooks (IN)	Cole	Diaz-Balart
Brown (FL)	Collins (GA)	Dingell

Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—29

Amash
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Campbell
Cotton
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Foxx
Graves (GA)
Harris
Hudson
Jones
Jordan
Kingston
Labrador
LaMalfa
Marchant
Massie
Miller (FL)
Mullin
Pittenger
Radel
Rokita
Sensenbrenner
Southerland
Stockman
Stutzman
Woodall

NOT VOTING—8

Aderholt
Buchanan
Carter
Gabbard
Honda
Kelly
Lewis
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1427

Messrs. GRAVES of Georgia, BRIDENSTINE, MARCHANT, ROKITA, KINGSTON, SOUTHERLAND and SENSENBRENNER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. KIND, PETERSON, RANGEL and WESTMORELAND changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

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

Mr. DUFFY. 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, this 15-minute vote on the motion to adjourn will be followed by a 5-minute vote on approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 0, nays 416, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 25]

NAYS—416

Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Horsford
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)

Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Cohen

NOT VOTING—15

Aderholt
Becerra
Carter
Clyburn
Crowley
DeLauro
Gabbard
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Kelly
Pelosi
Scott (VA)
Van Hollen
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1445

Mr. CUMMINGS changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 24, H.R. 307—Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 25, Motion to adjourn, had I been present, I would had voted "nay."

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

NO BUDGET, NO PAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the largest threat that confronts every man, woman, child, and us collectively as a Nation: $16 trillion in national debt. This massive debt that is carried by the Nation grows larger each and every day.

Americans should be united that the overspending and reckless financial unpaid loans has created a legacy of debt for all current and future generations of Americans. Americans are united that it is right to help those most needy and vulnerable.

Sadly, the debt prevents this Nation from fully meeting those needs. The annual interest alone is crowding out our ability to fund services for those most in need. National debt annual interest is a part of mandatory spending that consumes 60 percent of our yearly expenses. This crowds out important services and creates economic harm that costs Americans jobs.

It is time to work together to end the debt and provide a secure future for all Americans. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 325 that requires the Senate to pass a budget and allows no pay for Congress without a budget.

CENTRAL NEW YORKERS WANT FAIR SHOT AT AMERICAN DREAM

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

Mr. MAFFEI. Mr. Speaker, just in these last weeks I have already begun to meet with local business owners in my district at the places where they work. I have spoken with constituents at their doorsteps, and I have had conversations at events throughout our community. The one message central New Yorkers have made clear to me is that we need to grow our middle class, fix our economy, and create more good-paying jobs for the working families of this country. Central New Yorkers want a fair shot at the American Dream.

Now, we need to balance the budget, but we need to do it in the right way, not on the backs of our middle class and seniors. Medicare and Social Security must be protected, but we can do this without sacrificing vital investments in future generations.

Our local businesses want to expand and hire new workers, but they need the young people with the abilities and demeanor to succeed. That's what I have heard going around central New York. We need to keep central New York part of the broad shoulders of the middle class on which this country's future rests.

To this House I say: I am committed to do everything I can to ensure that every central New Yorker gets a fair shot at the American Dream.

PASS A BUDGET

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania who spoke just a few minutes ago put his finger right on the problem. We have a $16.4 trillion debt—$50,000 for every man, woman, and child in this country; $50,000 for every baby born today. Before that baby draws his or her first breath, it's greeted with a $50,000 bill, their part of the U.S. debt. Mr. Speaker, that's reckless.

But there's something even more reckless. The only way to solve these problems is with a budget—every house knows it, every business knows it, almost every government knows it, but not the U.S. Senate, which hasn't passed a budget for 4 years.

Tomorrow, the House will take up H.R. 325. This bill will force the U.S. Senate to finally pass a budget in order to increase our debt ceiling.

The time is now. The Senate has to act.

□ 1500

FINAL FLIGHT OF SPACE SHUTTLE ''CHALLENGER'

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, 1986, the Space Shuttle *Challenger* broke apart 73 seconds after launch. The whole world cried watching *Challenger* tumble back to Earth knowing that seven brave Americans had lost their lives. Commander Dick Scobee, pilot Michael Smith, mission specialist Judy Resnick, specialist Ron McNair, mission specialist Ellison Onizuka, payload specialist Greg Jarvis, and America's first and only teacher into space, Christa McAuliffe, all perished pursuing our dreams.

The night of the disaster, President Reagan put all of our thoughts, our pain, and our prayers into words. He said:

> We will never forget them, nor the last time we saw them, this morning, as they prepared for their journey and waved goodbye and ''slipped the surly bonds of Earth'' to ''touch the face of God.''

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S INAUGURAL SPEECH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, thank you for allotting the time. I appreciate it very much.

My name is KEITH ELLISON. I'm here today to reflect on what I believe was a historic speech for the ages yesterday. President Obama met the historic challenge, met the historic moment; and I just want to talk about my feelings about how important that speech really, really was. President Obama, you should understand, was called upon to make his second inaugural address. And inaugural addresses, historically, are speeches that people don't always remember, but there are some that we will never forget because of how important they are.

His first speech 4 years ago was a speech during which, over the course of 18 minutes, he talked about trying to reach out diplomatically. He talked about the importance of trying to come together to solve common problems. And I think the basic attitude of the first speech was conciliation in an effort to try to work out problems both foreign and domestic.

In this speech, however, President Obama set forth what I believe was a clear, concise agenda based on values that he owns. I was so proud to hear President Obama talk about the need

to address climate change. He reminded us that you can believe in climate change or you can disbelieve in climate change, but the fact is our storms are harder, the drier weather we are seeing is causing forest fires, and we are seeing climatic catastrophes associated with climate change. We're seeing the consequences of it. So if we ignore the cause, we cannot ignore the consequence. I was so proud to hear him say that.

He also spoke out boldly for equality, human rights and civil rights for all Americans. I remember that he said, and you may recall, too, Mr. Speaker, he said, we will never forget Stonewall, Seneca Falls, and Selma. These are three iconic moments in civil rights history when he talked about the women's rights movement, the gay rights movement, and the African American movement for civil rights; but they all added up to one thing, which is that an American is an American is an American. It doesn't matter what your color is, what your sex is, or who you love and want to be with. What matters is that you are an American and entitled to the full protection of the law in these United States.

I think it was very important for him to do so. It represented an evolutionary moment in American history that a President being inaugurated into his second term would stand up for the first time and say ''civil and human rights for all people.'' I thought it was a great moment, and I found myself cheering even though I hadn't planned on doing so.

But he didn't stop there. He specifically said we need to stand here and protect Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, three critical programs this Nation depends on, three critical programs that seniors depend upon. But not only do seniors depend on them. Also we know that seniors and people live on survivors benefits. When their loved one who gets Social Security dies, children are entitled to get survivors benefits. And these survivors benefits are literally putting food on the tables for millions of families all across this country.

But not only that. People with disabilities get Medicare and Social Security. And he stood up for these programs, reminding us that this richest country in the history of the world—the richest country in the history of the world—does not need to throw its poor, its vulnerable, and its aged under the bus. We are not too broke to make sure that our senior citizens, our children who are on survivors benefits, and people who are vulnerable economically, we're not too poor to make sure that there's something for them and that they have a livelihood and a way to make it forward.

Imagine the richest country in the history of the world saying, I'm sorry, Grandma, but we got to cut your benefits because we can't make it. The reality is that when he gave that speech and he specifically identified those three programs as central to the American Dream, the American promise, I was proud. And I said, that's right. And I tell you, I was so happy to hear him say that.

But he didn't even stop there. He talked about the need for immigration reform and the fact that for so many people around the world, America is still the land of opportunity and that we cannot sit by as 12 million people live in our country in the shadows with no pathway toward citizenship. The President specifically called on us to do something about it.

Now, the President knows that guns are a volatile issue. He didn't smack the issue of gun violence prevention right on the head, but he did mention the victims of Sandy Hook; and he did tell us that children have a right to be safe at school, thereby signaling that, you know, yeah, we are going to do some things about the proliferation of guns, high-capacity clips, and background checks, things that make sense, not taking away the right to own a gun, but to do commonsense gun violence prevention measures that I think will make everybody safer. In fact, if you're looking at the news right now, you know that there was another shooting today in Texas—today—today.

So the bottom line is that the President laid out a vision, an inclusive vision, for America. The President got up in front of the world stage, all the Members of Congress, Ambassadors, Senators, the Supreme Court, and everybody assembled and said, This is the direction that we're going in. We're going to say Americans, whatever their background, are included within the promise of America. We're going to address income inequality. We're going to protect the social safety net.

Now, some pundits—you can always count on the punditry to throw salt around—they said, well, it didn't reach out to the Republicans. Well, I think that Republicans are on Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid; and they probably, or at least their parents, appreciate protection of that program. Republicans live on this planet in which we see the temperature rising and the consequences of global climate change hurting more and more people. Some Republicans are black, some Republicans are Latino, and some Republicans are gay. And when they heard that they are included in Obama's vision of America, they must have felt good about that.

So I don't agree that this speech didn't reach out to the full range of the political spectrum, left and right. I think that if you're in the category that he mentioned, that no matter what your political ideology may be, that you would feel that, yes, this includes me.

Now, I think the President's speech was also great because it was courageous. No President has ever mentioned before the gay community in the United States; and most people like myself and most people are what we call straight or heterosexual.

□ 1510

But all of us know that there is prejudice against the gay community. There's no denying this. There's no sense in denying it. We all know that these folks are our neighbors, they're our coworkers, they're our friends, and we know that they have suffered because of prejudice against them. For a President to stand up and say this isn't right and that everybody is included in the American Dream, I thought was a great moment. It was a first. It was historic. I think that President Obama seized the historical mantle and said, I'm not going to sit up here and use a bunch of flowery, vague language. I'm going to get up here and talk about what I really believe in. I was so proud of Obama yesterday. I admired how he handled himself and what he said.

I think over the past 4 years, President Obama has, in my opinion, bent over backwards to reach out to the Republican Conference. He has really accommodated them in a whole number of ways, and yet their conference—and the record is clear—has come forward and said that their goal over the course of the last 4 years was to make him a one-term President. Well, they failed. He's a two-term President. So the question is: Are we now going to come together? Is the caucus of ''no'' now going to say there are some things we're willing to work with? I hope so.

Let me tell you. My dad was a Republican for many years. Of course, I love my dad and loved him when he was a Republican. He was what I would call a ''sensible Republican.'' He believed in watching the money. He believed in getting the most out of every dollar. He believed that the government had a limited role and shouldn't get in everyone's business. Today, we have folks who are not in the realm of even negotiation. They're willing to shut the government down, allow our country to go over the fiscal cliff and default on America's debt just to get their way. That's an extremist position. This is an extremist ideology. It's not a reasonable thing to say.

Now, some of them will come up here and talk about how big the debt and the deficit is. Wait a minute. When we say that we want to cut oil subsidies to Big Oil companies, they don't want to do that. When we want to raise some taxes on the wealthy so we can use that money to lower the deficit, they don't want to do that. I doubt anyone who says they're outraged by the debt and the deficit, and we give credible solutions on how to lower it and they say ''no''—I begin to doubt that that's really what they're concerned about.

The speech yesterday that the President gave, I believe, is a good starting point. The President is not negotiating with himself. He's declaring his position. The other side in the political divide can declare their position, and then we can come together and negotiate. I'm a huge supporter of the

President, but I kind of believe that what he used to do, he used to state his values, then he used to anticipate what the other side would want, then he used to try to come together, bring both sides together, and then he would go to the table and negotiate. So we would end up not with a liberal position, but with sort of a centrist position, and we would start out right there, and then anywhere we would go from there would be further to the right. So if we're lucky, we end up with a center-right position.

Now I think we start with, as we are proud to be the progressive liberals that we are, we start out with what we believe in, then they say what they believe in, and then we negotiate, and maybe we'll end up in the middle. But I don't want to end up in the center right anymore. I want to end up with some reasonable compromise that protects Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid; that protects civil rights for all Americans; that addresses this massive income inequality; that addresses climate change; that moves us toward a green economy; that allows people who are immigrants to have a pathway into the respectability of life in American society. The President did not disappoint last night. I believe in those things. Clearly he does, too. And I was so proud to see the President stand and deliver for these important values.

Over the next several weeks, Mr. Speaker, we're going to be in a huge debate. We just finished the whole debate on the so-called fiscal cliff. It really wasn't a fiscal cliff. That was just the name the press loved to call it, but the reality is it was a set of budgetary deadlines and tax deadlines. We were able to come up with a deal, but the worst part of the deal is what wasn't in it. That's why I voted for it. I wasn't thrilled with the deal, but the thing I didn't like about it was the stuff mostly that was not included. Because even though I was happy to extend unemployment for a year, that was good. Even though I was happy to raise taxes on the richest Americans, because I believe it's their patriotic duty to help their country out, that was good too. I believe those were good things.

I thought the fact that we did not deal with the debt ceiling, the sequester, and the continuing resolution really just put us in a position where a few months later our Republican friends would say: You're going to cut vital programs for Americans who need them, or we're going to shut down the government. You're going to cut Head Start, you're going to cut food stamps, you're going to cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, or we're going to default on America's debt. This is the hardcore bargaining position they've been trying to ram down our throat.

I'll never forget Speaker BOEHNER, who said, ''Look, if they don't take these cuts in one loaf, we'll feed it to them a slice at a time.'' That's a quote.

And so I was concerned that this deal we just did, this so-called fiscal cliff deal, the New Year's Eve deal, even though there were things in it that I thought were good, I was concerned, Mr. Speaker, because of what wasn't in it. I believe the American people and our markets, our business people, deserve to have this budgetary issue resolved in a way so they can actually plan.

My Republican friends correctly point out that there is uncertainty when Congress doesn't solve problems, but they're the ones causing the uncertainty. In fact, they are guilty of creating the problem that they criticize the most. They say that we shouldn't kick the can down the road. They say we should have some finality. But they're the ones who are not agreeing to some finality. They say that we need to make sure that we get some real job creation, but they're the ones cutting into the public sector, causing us layoffs from the Federal Government, and therefore State governments. And of course, people who have government jobs spend money too, which leads people who they do business with to have jobs. If you work for the EPA and you go to a local grocery store, you spend money there, which allows the cashiers and the stock people to have jobs.

Everything they say they don't want it seems like that's what they're for. They don't want job cuts, they don't want job losses, but they create them. They don't want uncertainty, but they create it. They want finality, but they avoid it. It doesn't make any sense. They say they want to reduce the deficit, but they enlarge it. So my point is: What's really going on here?

I think President Obama has just kind of had enough and has said rather than trying to figure out how to do a deal with these folks who keep moving the goalpost, I'm just going to say what I'm about, I'm going to declare what my values are, and they can come to the table and represent their own point of view, and we'll find a way, hopefully, to get to a point where we can agree and go forward. Even if we hate the deal, even if we don't like it, at least maybe we can move forward so Americans can at least be able to plan for their future.

Mr. Speaker, I think that Presidential inauguration speeches are important. They do lay out an important path. I was reviewing, Mr. Speaker, the inaugural speeches of President Abraham Lincoln. I'm a huge fan of Abraham Lincoln. I wouldn't call myself an expert or scholar of Lincoln, but I'm sort of an amateur reader of everything about Lincoln.

In Lincoln's first speech, he was conciliatory. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln, when he was elected, as soon as he was elected, Southern States began to secede even before he was inaugurated. South Carolina, Mississippi, the other States, they started seceding each before he was inaugurated. As soon as he was elected, some of them said, We are out of here.

So when he came to his inaugural speech, the first one, he was trying to keep the Southern States in and trying to keep the border States from leaving. So he said some things that were so conciliatory, that even the abolitionists of the time thought that he wasn't what they were hoping for. He wasn't really against slavery. He said he was, but they thought that he didn't prove it. They thought he was halting, they thought he was too cautious, and they criticized him for this.

But after the Civil War broke out and so much blood was spilled and so much harm was done to our Nation—620,000 people died in the Civil War—President Lincoln came back 4 years later. On that speech, his second inaugural speech, it was a bold defense of the union cause and an argument that slavery must go.

□ 1520

He didn't pull any punches on the second one. Now, he was not bodacious, and he was not offensive—he was trying to be as conciliatory as he could be—but he made very clear that America was going to be, one, whole and not divided and, two, that it would be slave free. He didn't water it down, as some pundits think that Obama should water his position down. The second time around, after we went through all the big fights, President Lincoln stood firm and spoke firmly and clearly but also in a conciliatory way about what he believed in. I don't know. Maybe there were some people back in 1865 who might have said, Well, Lincoln ought to be a little more sympathetic to the South, and he ought to try to work with them more.

Look, I'm not trying to compare this budgetary fight to the horror of slavery. There is no comparison, not at all. I'm not trying to say that our Republican colleagues are in any way sympathetic to slavery. They're not. That's not true. I'm simply trying to make the point that when you start out trying to work with somebody and you can't get anywhere, and when you go through all the travails and difficulties of trying to get somewhere and you can't, then at the end of the fight, if you win, you're probably going to say, Look, I tried to work with you and you wouldn't work with me. I ended up coming out on top on this thing, so now I'm going to bargain for my position.

This is not to say the President is not going to negotiate. This is not to say the Democrats aren't going to negotiate. We are going to negotiate. We believe that the democratic process requires an eye toward compromise, but I also believe that we went to our constituents in 435 districts around this country and that we told them what we believed in and we told them what we stood for, so they deserve for us to at least articulate that position. If we have to make a compromise on some

things for the sake of the Union, for the sake of the Nation, we should do that, but we should never act like we don't believe in what we do, in fact, believe in, which is Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid; which is confronting income inequality; which is equality for all Americans regardless of race, color, sexual preference; and all that kind of stuff. We should say what we believe in. We should say that we believe that a woman should earn every penny that a man makes. We should say these things. We should not be afraid to be who we are and articulate our vision of the world. Then when we go to the negotiating table, there might be some things we have to give up, and there might be some things we get, but we should never make any mistake about what we're all about.

So I'm really proud of the President tonight. I feel the President did a fine job for America yesterday, and I wish the President well. I do know that the President, in being a man of reason, will listen to Republican arguments as to what they would like to see happen, but I also believe, based on what he said yesterday, that he is going to fight for what he believes in, too. He warned us against dogmatism, and he also said Look, don't confuse absolutism with principle. So that's sort of a warning to our side a little bit in his saying, look, I am going to have to negotiate some things. But when he sits around that table, we know where he's starting from, and that makes me feel good.

I wish all the best for this Presidency and this Congress because I think that, if the Republicans are successful and if the Democrats are successful and if the President is successful, then America will be successful. So I'm here to say that I hope we do negotiate, but there are some things that, quite frankly, I'm not willing to cave in on—Social Security, Medicaid, Medicare beneficiary cuts. They're asking for cuts from the people who have already been cut.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that 20 percent of widowed women on Social Security have nothing but Social Security to live on, and yet we want to reduce their benefits? Do you know that a full third of widowed women on Social Security depend upon Social Security to the degree of 90 percent of their incomes? We're talking about people who are making somewhere between $17,000 and $24,000 a year to begin with. You cannot go to people who already have so little and say give me back even more.

This is at a time, because of our housing foreclosure crisis, when rents in nearly every city have gone up, and this is at a time when we have limited vitally important programs that help ease the pain of poverty for Americans. So there are some things that we are going to protect in this and that we are going to call upon the masses of Americans to protect.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, that today I don't have the ability to be here for the whole hour—duty calls—but I did want to offer a few reflections on the speech that was given. I also want to say a few other things as it relates to the next period coming up.

In the next few weeks, we're going to face a debt ceiling increase. In fact, we have a debt ceiling vote tomorrow. We're not voting to raise the debt ceiling; we're voting to suspend it. I think this is bad policy because markets, businesspeople, and everybody else need to know that the Congress is going to stand by the credit rating and the debts of the American people. We're not going to default, and we shouldn't threaten that we are. It's bad. It's not a good thing to do. It's important for the American people to know that, when we talk about raising the debt ceiling, Congress is not approving new spending. We're not borrowing. We're saying that we're going to pay the bills on debts we already acquired.

It's kind of like this: If you have a family and if somehow you're already obligated to pay a mortgage, if you don't have the money for your mortgage, you may have to go to your cousin or your brother or your uncle and say, I need you to help me until next week so I can pay the mortgage. So you now have borrowed money to pay an obligation that you already owe, an obligation that, if you don't pay, you will default on. You can also have a situation in which somebody doesn't have enough money but goes into a local electronics store and says, I'm going to buy that big screen television right there on my credit card.

Those are two different scenarios—borrowing to meet obligations you've already acquired and borrowing to buy stuff you really cannot afford. Raising the debt ceiling is the first one, Mr. Speaker. It's borrowing to meet obligations we already have. It's not borrowing for new expenditures. So, when we appropriate money and when we have had appropriated expenditures in the past, we might raise the debt ceiling to meet those obligations, which we should do, because to do otherwise is to say that America is going to default on its debts, which we cannot do, not just for our own sakes, but this would cause international harm to the world economy.

People are confused about this whole debt ceiling debate, and I don't believe that it's right for Republicans to just suspend the debt ceiling and then to put a bunch of stuff in there about the Senate and all that kind of stuff, some provisions that are blatantly unconstitutional, too, by the way. So I'm disappointed in this thing that's coming up, but people need to know that this debt ceiling vote is coming up.

They should also know that the sequester is coming up. With the New Year's Eve deal, we delayed the sequester 2 months. These are massive cuts to the tune of, I think, around $89 billion that are going to be put on the Pentagon and domestic spending. They're dumb cuts. We're not looking at specific programs and evaluating their worth and eliminating some and keeping others. We're just, like, ''chop.'' This is no way to budget for a Nation, and I hope we can delay the sequester, but it's coming up soon. Republicans have vowed that they want even more cuts, maybe even in addition to the sequester, to negotiate. I think we should remind everybody that we've already had $1.7 trillion in cuts and that we just did $600 billion in new revenue. That's about $2.3 trillion. How much more cutting do we need to do, particularly when we're talking about vital programs for Americans?

So, Mr. Speaker, if we're going to make cuts, we should cut things that we really don't need. For example, Medicare part D, which passed in 2003, prohibits Medicare from negotiating drug prices with the pharmaceutical companies. Now, the Veterans Administration does negotiate for drug prices all the time, but Medicare is prohibited from doing so. Basically, if the pharmaceutical company says this drug costs this, the government has to pay, and we can't use our large buying power to lower a price.

□ 1530

We should change that. We should introduce competitive bidding. That would save us a quite a bit of money, Mr. Speaker. That's a way we could save money.

Here's another thing we should do. We should eliminate oil subsidies, coal subsidies, and natural gas subsidies. The fossil fuel industry, a highly profitable industry, making a lot of money, a profitable industry, there's no reason in a free market economy we should be subsidizing a profitable company. It doesn't make sense. Even if you are a free market person, you have a hard case to make that we should be handing Exxon, Chevron, and Mobil money. We shouldn't do it. We should end it, and any real conservative would agree with me on that. Now, if somebody is just trying to get money to friends, that's another story. But if you're really about reducing the deficit, that's one way to do it.

You know, there are a number of things we could cut. There's a lot of Cold War weapons systems that could be eliminated. Our nuclear arsenal could be reduced without threatening our national security, and we could save money in doing it.

There are ways to reduce the budget. There are ways to do it, and we probably should. But let's do it in a way where we keep Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, food stamps, aid for college students, money for investing in medical research, and groundbreaking research to give life to brand-new industries. You know, a lot of people don't know, Mr. Speaker, this thing we call the Internet was started with a government program—something called DARPA. A government grant helped fund the Internet. Yes, it

did. I don't know about Al Gore, but I do know that the government, a government grant, put the money into the form that we now know as the Internet. The government did that.

The government funded the project for mapping the human genome. The government. The government's not always bad.

So we should keep some programs. We should lower others, but we've got to think about this thing in a different way than we are.

All I want to say, Mr. Speaker, as I begin to wrap up is that it is an honor and a privilege to be able to serve in this, the greatest deliberative body in the world. And even though we have big fights with our Republican colleagues, it's an honor to serve with them, too. We're both here, sent here by the 435 districts that we represent to argue our positions and try to come to some kind of solution. I believe that we can have solutions if everyone has an eye toward compromise, but that depends upon everybody starting out carrying out the vision of the district they represent.

My district wants me to stand up for Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, stand up for civil and equal rights for everybody, including gay people. My district wants me to find a pathway to citizenship for immigrants who are here. My district wants me to do something about climate change and move our economy toward a green economy. Now, I'm going to start there, and then we can negotiate with our colleagues on where we end up, but I'm proud that the President stood up for our values. I think his speech was groundbreaking, historic, and gave real energy to people who share his value system.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I have to curtail my hour, and I yield back the balance of my time.

FORTY YEARS OF VICTIMS' LEGACY OF ABORTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago today marks the U.S. Supreme Court's infamous, reckless, and inhumane abandonment of women and babies to abortionists. Forty years of victims, dead babies, wounded women, shattered families. Forty years of government-sanctioned violence against women and children. Since 1973, more than 55 million children have been killed by abortion, a staggering loss of children's precious lives, a death toll that equates to the entire population of England.

The passage of time hasn't changed the fact that abortion is a serious, lethal violation of fundamental human rights; and that women and children deserve better, much better; and that the demands of justice, generosity, and compassion require that the right to life be guaranteed to everyone, regardless of age, sex, race, condition of dependency, disability, or stage of development.

Rather than obscure or dull our consciousness to the unmitigated violence of abortion, the passage of time has only enabled us to see and better understand the innate cruelty of abortion and its horrific legacy—victims—while making us more determined than ever to protect the weakest and most vulnerable and end the mass deception by the abortion industry.

Earlier today, Linda Shrewsbury, an academic and an African American with a degree from Harvard, who had an abortion, told a 40 Years Of Victims press conference:

> The lies that brought me to that day and its sorrowful aftermath are crystal clear in my mind: falsehoods and deceptions that concealed the truth about abortion. Lies planted in my thinking by clever marketing, media campaigns, and endless repetition led to a tragic, irreversible decision—the death of my first child.

She goes on to say:

> It's past time to lance the national wound of abortion with truth. The high culture—thought leaders, media, celebrities—that brought us abortion seem vested beyond extraction.

She said she ''dreamed of the volcano of abortion truth that could erupt one day from the grass-roots—women and men and their relatives witnessing to their suppressed emotion, unspoken trauma, and lived pain. With abortion denial ended, we as a society could then reconnect with reality and life.''

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, there are seemingly ominous present-day signs that hinder ending abortion denial and a reconnection with reality and life. Certainly the re-election of the abortion President Barack Obama, public funding for abortion in the ObamaCare health exchanges that come online in 2014, a massive increase of public funding for abortion, the use of coercion to compel religious believers and entrepreneurs to violate their consciences, slick advertising, and the export of abortion worldwide.

And it is deeply troubling that despite the fact that Planned Parenthood claims direct responsibility for killing over 6 million unborn babies in their clinics, including a record 333,964 abortions in 2011 alone, Planned Parenthood remains President Obama's favorite organization.

Despite these and many obstacles, however, we will never quit. In adversity, our faith and trust in God is tested, but it also deepens and overcomes and forges an indomitable, yet humble, spirit.

The pro-life movement—and I've been in it for 41 years—is comprised of some of the noblest, caring, smart, and selfless people I have ever met. They make up an extraordinarily powerful, nonviolent, faith-filled human rights struggle that is growing in public support, intensity, commitment, and hope.

The compassionate women and men who staff thousands of pregnancy care centers, many of the women being post-abortive themselves who try to save women from that irreversible decision, help women who are experiencing unexpected pregnancies, and they provide tangible assistance and an enormous amount of love and emotional support both before and after the birth of a child.

The pro-life movement is not only on the side of compassion, justice, and inclusion. We are on the right side of responsible science and of history.

Someday future generations will look back on America and wonder how and why such a seemingly enlightened society, so blessed and endowed with education, advanced science, information, wealth, and opportunity, could have failed to protect the innocent and the inconvenient. They will wonder how and why a Nobel Peace Prize-winning President could also simultaneously have been the abortion President.

Dr. Alveda King, niece of the late Dr. Martin King, who had two abortions but is now solidly pro-life, said in one of her speeches:

> My Uncle Martin had a dream. He dreamt that we would live out that which is self-evident, that all men are created equal. He called on America to admit our wrongs and turn from them. Today, I call on all of us, regardless of nationality, race, or religion, to admit our wrongs and turn from them. I believe that the denial of the right to life is the greatest injustice we face in the world today. There is no compassion in killing. There is no justice in writing people out of the human race.

□ 1540

History, Mr. Speaker, will not look favorably on today's abortion culture. We must, indeed and instead, work tirelessly to replace it with a culture of life.

Mr. Speaker, forty years ago today marks the U.S. Supreme Court's infamous, reckless and inhumane abandonment of women and babies to abortionists.

Forty years of victims—dead babies, wounded women, shattered families.

Forty years of government sanctioned violence against women and children.

Since 1973, more than 55 million children have been killed by abortion—a staggering loss of children's precious lives—a death toll that equates to the entire population of England.

The passage of time hasn't changed the fact that abortion is a serious, lethal violation of fundamental human rights. And that women and children deserve better—much better. And that the demands of justice, generosity and

compassion require that the right to life be guaranteed to everyone, regardless of age, sex, race, condition of dependency, disability, or stage of development.

Rather than obscure or dull our consciences to the unmitigated violence of abortion, the passage of time has only enabled us to see and better understand the innate cruelty of abortion—and its horrific legacy victims—while making us more determined than ever to protect the weakest and most vulnerable, and end mass deception by the abortion industry.

Earlier today, Linda Shrewsbury, an academic and African American with a degree from Harvard who had an abortion told a ''40 Years of Victims'' press conference that: ''the lies that brought me to that day and its sorrowful aftermath are crystal clear in my mind—falsehoods and deceptions that concealed the truth about abortion. Lies planted in my thinking by clever marketing, media campaigns and endless repetition led to a tragic irreversible decision—the death of my first child.

I didn't really understand back then. At age 20, I had no inkling of the mental and emotional darkness I was about to enter. I couldn't have grasped the immense psychological toll abortion would take for years into the future—unrelenting tears, guilt, shame, and depression. After spending many years in denial, I did eventually find healing. When I understood and rejected distortions about fetal development, doublespeak about choice, rights, planned and wanted children; I understood the reality and victimhood of my aborted child. I understood the absence of moral bases for choosing to ''dis-entitle'' an innocent human being of life. When I embraced truth, truth set me free and I finally gained inner peace.

It's past time to lance the national wound of abortion with truth. The high culture—thought leaders, media, celebrities—that brought us abortion seem vested beyond extraction. I dreamed of the volcano of abortion truth that could erupt one day from the grassroots—women and men and their relatives witnessing to their suppressed emotion, unspoken trauma, and lived pain. With abortion denial ended, we as a society could then reconnect with reality and life.''

Clearly there are seemingly ominous present-day signs that hinder ending abortion denial and a reconnection with reality and life—the reelection of the abortion President Barack Obama, public funding for abortion in the Obamacare health exchanges that come on-line in 2014, the use of coercion to compel religious believers and entrepreneurs to violate their conscience, and the export of abortion worldwide.

And, it is deeply troubling that despite the fact that Planned Parenthood claims direct responsibility for killing over 6 million unborn babies, including a record 333,964 abortions in 2011 alone, Planned Parenthood remains President Obama's favorite organization.

Despite these and any obstacles, we will never quit. In adversity our faith and trust in God is tested, but it also deepens and overcomes and forges an indomitable yet humble spirit.

The pro-life movement is comprised of some of the noblest, caring, smart and selfless people I have ever met. They make up an extraordinarily powerful, non-violent, faith-filled human rights struggle that is growing in public support, intensity, commitment and hope.

The compassionate women and men who staff thousands of pregnancy care centers throughout America provide women who are experiencing unexpected pregnancies tangible assistance, love and emotional support both before and after the birth of her child.

With malice towards none, even President Obama for whom we must pray, we believe that the nightmare that is abortion on demand will end.

The pro-life movement is not only on the side of compassion, justice, and inclusion; we are on the right side of responsible science and of history.

Someday future generations will look back on America and wonder how and why such a seemingly enlightened society, so blessed and endowed with education, advanced science, information, wealth and opportunity could have failed to protect the innocent and inconvenient. They will wonder how and why a Nobel Peace Prize winning President could also simultaneously have been the Abortion President.

Dr. Alveda King, niece of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, had two abortions but is now pro-life. She said in one speech: ''My Uncle Martin had a dream. He dreamt that we would live out that which is self-evident—that all men are created equal. He called on America to admit our wrongs and turn from them. Today, I call on all of us, regardless of nationality, race or religion, to admit our wrongs and turn from them. I believe that the denial of the right to life is the greatest injustice we face in the world today. There is no compassion in killing. There is no justice in writing people out of the human race.''

History will not look favorably on today's abortion culture. We must instead work tirelessly to replace it with a culture of life.

Pro-lifers celebrate the sanctity of life. Unborn babies are not disposable commodities. We recognize that unborn children, like their older brothers and sisters, have inherent worth, value, and dignity. They are children too. If left alone to grow and mature, they too will become older brothers and sisters—and perhaps parents themselves someday.

Modern medicine and scientific breakthrough—especially the widespread use of ultrasound—have shattered the pernicious myth that unborn children are mere blobs of tissue. It's time to recognize birth merely as a celebratory event in the life of a person—not the beginning of life. And we've got to step up our efforts to educate and persuade. Far too many politicians, judges, journalists and others choose denial and deceptive speech over truth.

Today doctors diagnose illness and disability before birth. New and exciting breakthrough health care interventions for the unborn—including microsurgeries—are leading to an ever expanding array of successful treatments and cures of sick or disabled unborn babies in need of help. Unborn children are society's littlest patients who like any one of us might need health care.

In stark contrast, abortion methods rip, tear and dismember or chemically poison the fragile bodies of babies and abortion pills cause premature expulsion from the womb and death. There is nothing benign, compassionate, or just about an act that utterly destroys the life of a child and often physically, psychologically, and emotionally harms women. And despite the near total absence of any meaningful reporting by the media, women get hurt and some even die from legal abortions.

According to the most recent Centers for Disease Control (CDC) report, from 1973 to 2008 at least 403 women tragically died in the United States from legal abortion. And that sad fact is almost certainly a significant undercount because the methodology employed by CDC is passive and voluntary and likely to miss instances of both mortality and morbidity.

In the years since CDC's ''most recent report,'' many more women have surely died. Like Tonya Reaves, a 24-year-old woman who died last July from a botched second trimester dismemberment abortion—a D&E—at a Chicago area Planned Parenthood abortion mill.

The abortion industry excels at surface appeal argument and propaganda. Indeed the misleading term ''safe abortion'' purposely misses the point that no abortion—legal or illegal—is ever safe for the baby and that all are fraught with negative health consequences for the mother.

Today, at least 104 credible studies show significant psychological harm, major depression and/or elevated suicide risk in women who abort.

The Times of London reported that, ''[S]enior . . . psychiatrists say that new evidence has uncovered a clear link between abortion and mental illness in women with no previous history of psychological problems.'' They found ''that women who have had abortions have twice the level of psychological problems and three times the level of depression as women who have given birth or who have never been pregnant.''

In 2006, a comprehensive New Zealand study found that 78.6% of the 15–18-year-olds who had abortions displayed symptoms of major depression as compared to 31% of their peers. The study also found that 27% of the 21–25-year-old women who had abortions had suicidal ideations compared to 8% of those who did not have an abortion.

At this morning's ''40 Years of Victims'' press conference courageous post-abortive women, as well as the mother of a minor girl who was transported across state lines to New Jersey to evade Pennsylvania's parental involvement laws spoke eloquently of the anguish of abortion.

Irene Beltran said: ''My entire being was overcome by terror, and I felt deep anguish in the core of my soul when I ended the life of my own child for the sake of convenience. At the clinic I was treated like livestock being herded from one step to the next . . . When the abortionist administered the poison in my stomach I was mortified and shocked because I felt my child kick and turn very hastily. Years later I found out she was being burned and could feel the pain. Since I was 6 months pregnant this would be a two-day process. The second day consisted of the abortionist tearing my daughter out of me—limb from limb, piece by piece. But I did not go back. After feeling my daughter fight for her life I went straight to my mother's home crying for help. She drove me to the Labor and Delivery Department at a local hospital. I arrived at the hospital grasping on the slim chance they could save my daughter, but there was nothing the doctors could do. The effects of the toxin were irreversible.''

Marcia Carroll said even though ''my daughter chose to have the baby, raise it . . .. The father's family arranged a taxi, a train, and subway rides to sneak her across state lines

to New Jersey where his family met them in front of the abortion clinic. . .. They planned, financed, harassed, and ultimately threatened my daughter into having the abortion . . .. As a result of the legal abortion that was completed unbeknownst to me, my daughter suffered years of depression, intense grief, post-traumatic stress disorder, nightmares, and thoughts and even attempts of suicide.''

Kellie Stauffer spoke of her abortion at the age of 14: ''We all thought abortion would erase the situation I had gotten myself in and we would go on living life the way it was. That was not the case. . . . life sadly was never the same. I hated myself. I tried to numb my pain in any way I could find, drugs, alcohol, food, meaningless relationships, but nothing took away the deep darkness that overwhelmed my soul. . . . She persuaded me to go to a Rachel's vineyard retreat and that weekend saved my life. I allowed myself to feel the forgiveness God had been showing me all along. . . . I will never forget what I did to my first child. I am still brought to my knees in tears at times when I remember the pain I caused her. In response to God's grace and for my daughter's spirit I will be silent no more.''

Olivia Gans Turner said: ''I was not told vital information about the child I was carrying. Including the medical fact that by the time I had an abortion at 12 weeks, my baby already had a beating heart and brain waves! . . . I have not forgotten one moment of that day, and never will. That single day changed my life forever.''

Abortion not only has deleterious effects on women but on children born subsequently to women who have had a previous abortion.

At least 115 studies show a significant association between abortion and subsequent premature births. Researchers Shah and Zao showed a 36% increased risk for preterm birth after one abortion and a staggering 93% increased risk after two.

Similarly, the risk of subsequent children being born with low birth weight increases by 35% after one and 72% after two or more abortions. Another study shows the risk increases 9 times after a woman has had three abortions.

What does this mean for her children? Preterm birth is the leading cause of infant mortality in the industrialized world after congenital anomalies. Preterm infants have a greater risk of suffering from chronic lung disease, sensory deficits, cerebral palsy, cognitive impairments and behavior problems. Low birth weight is similarly associated with neonatal mortality and morbidity.

The extremism of the pro-abortion industry is shocking.

Last spring, the House of Representatives took up a bill to ban sex-selection abortion. The bill garnered a solid majority—246 to 168—in the House. President Obama, however, made it absolutely clear that he would veto the sex-selection abortion prohibition should it be sent to the White House.

While sex-selection abortion almost exclusively targets girls for extermination—simply because they are little girls—the egregious practice remains legal in most states. In fact, only four states—Illinois, Pennsylvania, Oklahoma and Arizona—and several countries including the United Kingdom proscribe it.

And if that's not shocking enough, many remain unaware of the fact that sex-selection abortion is part of a deliberate plan of population control—a war on women. In other words, abort the girls so they can't grow up someday and have children of their own.

In her book ''Unnatural Selection: Choosing Boys Over Girls, and the Consequences of a World Full of Men,'' Mara Hvistendahl traces the sordid history of sex-selection abortion as a means of population control.

''By August 1969, when the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and the Population Council convened another workshop on population control, sex selection had become a pet scheme,'' Hvistendahl writes. ''If a reliable sex-determination technology could be made available to a mass market,'' there was ''rough consensus'' that sex-selection abortion ''would be an effective, uncontroversial and ethical way of reducing the global population.''

Many of you might recall the undercover sting operation by Live Action that exposed several Planned Parenthood affiliates who were eager, ready and willing to facilitate secret abortions for underage sex-trafficking victims—some as young or younger than 14. As the prime sponsor of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act—the landmark law to combat human trafficking—I found the willingness of Planned Parenthood personnel to exploit young girls and partner with sex traffickers to be absolutely appalling.

Now, Live Action has released sting-operation videos—part of a series, ''Gendercide in America''—that show Planned Parenthood personnel advising undercover female investigators how to procure a sex-selection abortion. Caught on tape, one staffer tells an investigator to wait until her baby is 5 months along to get an ultrasound that reveals the sex of the child. Then, if it's a girl, kill it.

For most of us, ''it's a girl'' is cause for enormous joy, happiness and celebration. But far too often, this phrase can be a death sentence.

These cruel, anti-woman policies have had horrible consequences everywhere, especially in China (and India as well).

China's one child per couple policy in effect since 1979 constitutes massive crimes against humanity. The Nuremberg Nazi war crimes tribunal properly construed forced abortion as a crime against humanity—nothing in human history compares to the magnitude of China's 34-year assault on women and children.

In China, brothers and sisters are illegal in most instances.

The price for failing to conform to the one child per couple policy is unbearably high. A Chinese woman who becomes pregnant without a permit will be put under mind-bending pressure to abort. She knows that ''out-of-plan'' illegal children are denied education, health care, and marriage, and that fines for bearing a child without a birth permit can be 10 times the average annual income of two parents, and those families that can't or won't pay are jailed and their homes smashed in.

If the brave woman still refuses to submit, she may be held in a punishment cell, or, if she flees, her relatives may be held and, very often, beaten. Group punishments will be used to socially ostracize her. And her colleagues and neighbors will be denied birth permits. If the woman is by some miracle still able to resist this pressure, she may be physically dragged to the operating table and forced to undergo an abortion.

Over the years, I have chaired 43 congressional human rights hearings focused in whole or in part on China's one child policy. At one, the principal witness, Wuijan, a Chinese student attending a U.S. university, testified about how her child was forcibly murdered by the government. She said, ''[T]he room was full of moms who had just gone through a forced abortion. Some moms were crying. Some moms were mourning. Some moms were screaming. And one mom was rolling on the floor with unbearable pain.'' Then Wuijan said it was her turn, and through her tears she described what she called her journey in hell.''

Not only has the Obama Administration turned a blind eye to the atrocities being committed under the one child policy, but continues to provide financial support—contrary to U.S. law—to the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), an organization that supports, plans, implements, defends and whitewashes the Chinese government's brutal program.

Twenty nine years ago—on May 9, 1984—I authored the first amendment ever to a foreign aid bill to deny funding to organizations such as the UNFPA that are complicit with China's forced abortion and involuntary sterilization policy. It passed. After all these years, it is astonishing that policy makers—including and especially the Obama Administration—remain indifferent or worse, supportive, of these massive crimes against women and children. The Obama Administration has long enabled this cruel policy by its silence and financial support to the tune of $50 million a year to the UNFPA.

The result of this policy is a nightmarish ''brave new world'' with no precedent in human history, where women are psychologically wounded, girls fall victim to sex-selective abortion (in some provinces 140 boys are born for every 100 girls), and most children grow up without brothers or sisters, aunts or uncles or cousins.

Women bear the major brunt of the one child policy not only as victimized mothers. Due to the male preference in China's society and the limitation of the family size to one child, the policy has directly contributed to what is accurately described as gendercide—the deliberate extermination of a girl—born or unborn—simply because she happens to be a girl.

As a result of the Chinese government's barbaric attack on mothers and their children, there are some 100 million missing daughters in China today.

Because of the missing girls—China today has become the human sex trafficking magnate of the world. Women and young girls from outside the country are being sold as commodities throughout China—a direct consequence of the one child policy. Several prominent people including Ted Turner have suggested that the United States—indeed the world—needs to follow China's example and promulgate a one child per couple policy.

Mr Speaker, despite the best and slickest market branding money can buy, the stubborn fact remains that Planned Parenthood clinics are among the most dangerous places on Earth for a child. Planned Parenthood's own personnel are now taking a second look and, thanks to ultrasound, are clearly seeing what is being done to millions of children in the womb.

One of those abortion providers who took a second look and walked away is Abby Johnson, a former Planned Parenthood abortion

clinic director. In her book ''Unplanned,'' Abby Johnson exposes the duplicity and cruelty of what really goes on behind closed doors at a Planned Parenthood clinic. In it she writes how she witnessed and assisted in an abortion of a 13-week-old baby by holding the ultrasound probe, and as she pointed out in the book, it was the first ultrasound-guided abortion at that facility.

She writes in the book: ''The details startled me. At 13 weeks you could clearly see the profile of the head, both arms, legs, and even tiny fingers and toes. With my eyes glued to the image of this perfectly formed baby, I watched as a new image emerged on the video screen. The cannula, a straw-shaped instrument attached to the end of the suction tube, had been inserted into the uterus and was nearing the baby's side. It looked like an invader on the screen: out of place, wrong. It just looked wrong.''

She goes on to write: ''My heart sped up; time slowed. I didn't want to look, but I didn't want to stop looking either. At first, the baby didn't seem aware of the cannula. It gently probed the baby's side, and for a quick second I felt relief But I couldn't shake an inner disquiet that was quickly mounting to horror as I watched the screen.'' Remember, this is an abortion clinic director saying this.

''The next movement was a sudden jerk of a tiny foot of the baby as he started kicking, as if trying to move away from the probing invader.''

''As the cannula pressed in, the baby began struggling to turn and twist away. It seemed clear to me that the fetus could feel the cannula, and it did not like the feeling. And then the doctor's voice broke through, startling me: 'Beam me up, Scotty,' the abortionist said lightheartedly to the nurse. He was telling her to turn on the suction, in an abortion the suction isn't turned on until the doctor feels he has the cannula in exactly the right place.

Abbey Johnson, abortion clinic director, went on to write: ''I had a sudden urge to yell, Stop; to shake the woman and say, Look at what's happening to your baby. Wake up; hurry. Stop them. But even as I was thinking those words, I thought of my own hand and saw my own hand holding the probe. I was one of them performing this act'' of abortion.

''My eyes shot back to the screen. The cannula was already being rotated by the doctor and now I could see the tiny body violently twisting with it. For the briefest moment it looked as if the baby was being wrung like a dishcloth, twirled and squeezed. And then the little body crumpled and began disappearing into the cannula before my eyes. The last thing I saw was the tiny perfectly formed backbone sucked into the tube. And then everything was gone. The image of that tiny dead baby mangled and sucked away kept replaying in my mind. What was in this woman's womb just a moment ago was alive. It wasn't tissue. It wasn't cells. This was a human baby, fighting for life. A battle was lost in the blink of an eye.

''What I have told people for years''—8 years as a clinic director at a Planned Parenthood clinic— ''what I have told people for years,'' Abby Johnson continues, ''what I believed and taught and defended is a lie.'' Abby Johnson is now an amazing pro-life leader.

Mr. Speaker, as we stand here on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives this afternoon marking 40 years since seven members of the U.S. Supreme Court imposed abortion on demand for all nine months on the United States of America, the legacy of Roe v Wade—dead babies and injured women, shattered families—begs reappraisal. And courageous women like Abby Johnson are showing the way.

Mr. Speaker, we have a duty to protect. The struggle to re-establish durable protections for the most discriminated minority in America today—unborn babies— is worth any personal sacrifice, inconvenience or pain.

We cannot allow the violence against women and their children to continue.

I would like now to yield to my good friend and colleague, MARSHA BLACKBURN.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for the excellent work that he continues to do, year in and year out, on this issue. I appreciate his leadership.

We do stand today and mark the 40th anniversary of the tragic Roe v. Wade decision, and it really said that not all life is created equal. Since the Supreme Court gave our government's seal of approval, if you will, for on-demand abortion, there have been over 55 million lives lost.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not certain that we think about the gravity or the enormity of the issue until we look at it in that collective sense, 55 million lives that have been lost.

As a woman, I personally believe that America is better than choosing abortion, and I agree, and I believe that women deserve better.

The gentleman from New Jersey referenced the press conference that victims held today, and I was so touched by a statement from one of those that participated in this press conference. Her name is Irene Beltran. Ms. Beltran tells the story of what she endured when she was living in southern California and when she chose the path of abortion, and it is a very tender and heart-wrenching story. I want to quote from one paragraph in her story and this statement that she gave. And I'm quoting Ms. Beltran now:

> I've grief-stricken countless people with the choice that I've made. I've robbed my seven children of a sister that they could have played with, fed, and helped nurture. I've robbed three sets of grandparents of a granddaughter. I've robbed future generations from ever existing. I've suffered from depression, anxiety, and eating disorder, just to name a few. I felt damaged, humiliated and hopeless.
>
> Women deserve better than abortion. I stand before you today because my daughter forgives me, my family forgives me, the Lord forgives me, and I forgive myself. I dedicated the rest of my existence to fight this life-and-death war. This is why I am silent no more.

That is the statement from Ms. Beltran as told at the press conference today. And we all know in our hearts what she says is just so true, that life is a natural right. It's a gift from God, whose love extends beyond our comprehension, and He calls on us to protect the smallest and the weakest among us.

We're moving forward with pro-life legislation in the States, and the gentleman from New Jersey referenced the movement that he has worked in for 40 years. We have 24 State legislatures that passed a record 92 measures that restricted abortion in 2011. Nine States have recently banned most abortions after 20 weeks of pregnancy.

On the national level, we're working to end taxpayer funding for abortion. I have legislation that addresses that Title X funding. And we are continuing to work to make certain that we focus on helping the families that have felt the impact of abortion in their life. We're focusing on celebrating life and committing to making certain that we stand and work toward a pro-life America.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I want to thank my good friend and colleague, MARSHA BLACKBURN, for her exemplary leadership and for her very eloquent statement today.

I'd like to yield to Congresswoman ANN WAGNER, the gentlelady from Missouri.

Mrs. WAGNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is with heavy heart that I stand here today on the 40th anniversary of Roe v. Wade, a decision that has done so much harm to the moral landscape of our Nation.

Since that dreadful day 40 years ago, there have been more than 55 million abortions in this country. That is roughly one-fifth of the United States population whom we will never know. We will never derive the contributions to society that these nameless angels could have brought to the world. And even worse is the emotional pain that millions of women have endured in the days, months, and years after their abortion.

It's my honor to put in the RECORD today the story of Joyce Zounis, who joins us today. It's compelling testimony, and it's an honor to put her testimony forward.

Since I was sworn into Congress nearly 3 weeks ago, I have had the opportunity to sign on to pieces of pro-life legislation. I believe that it is important that we prevent any taxpayer dollars from going to abortions or organizations that perform abortions.

I believe in the sanctity of life, that life is truly a gift, from conception to natural death, and I am dedicated to protecting the rights of the unborn. I support the efforts to reduce the number of abortions in this country, and will work not only to make abortion illegal, but to make abortion unthinkable.

You see, as a mother of three beautiful children, the sanctity of life is very cherished and very personal to me. In fact, it was exactly 23 years ago that I came to Washington, D.C., on a bus from St. Louis, Missouri, to participate in the March for Life. I know it was exactly 23 years ago because I was 6 weeks pregnant at the time with my second son, Stephen. Taking a 14-

hour bus ride while experiencing morning sickness is generally not advisable, but I knew actively participating in the pro-life movement at a time when I was carrying my unborn child was so very important.

As a mother, I want to raise my children in a world that values life at all stages. I do not want to raise them in a world that exhibits a flagrant disregard for human life. And at that moment 23 years ago, I knew that it was not enough to simply say that I was pro-life; I had to, indeed, walk the walk.

On the anniversary of the Supreme Court decision that legalized abortion in this country, I am heartbroken for the pain this decision has caused over the last 40 years, but I am hopeful, hopeful and inspired by the many young people I have seen today who will be marching side by side with me for life this Friday. I encourage my colleagues to join me and show support for human life at all stages.

JOYCE ZOUNIS—TV AND RADIO PRODUCER AND HOST, LIVING BEYOND THE BANDAIDE OF ABORTION

''We will not speak of this again'' were the words spoken to me as my mom and I, a 15-teen-year old high school sophomore, walked into the abortion facility. I too wanted to forget this problem. I was determined to be the one who decided when I became a mom; NOT a positive reading on a stick. Already disconnected, my mind was not on what was about to happen, but of missing cheerleading practice.

The room was filled with many girls and to my mom's dismay we saw someone we knew. Our secret was blown. I sat in a room waiting for my name to be called just like any other doctor's appointment but this was like no other. They said it won't hurt; it did! They said it would be over real quick; it has lasted 35 years!

Eleven years after my first abortion, I was having my seventh. I was in the same waiting room, walking the same hall, wearing the same gown, taking the same pill, and laying on the same table. To this abortionist's disgust, my pregnancy was further along and required more of his time.

Several hours later the vacuum-like noise broke a decade-old trance—''what have I done?'' I began to weep uncontrollably, and this enraged the abortionist. His gestures were rough, and he was morbidly pleased to have me see his bloody garments when he was finished. The nurse quickly moved me to the recovery room and gave me crackers. Within 10 minutes I was rushed out the back door and nauseous on my way home.

Eleven years, three clinics, two states, seven abortions, and not once was I told of the physical risks I would suffer later: the necessity of bi-lateral mammograms and fear of breast cancer; ovarian cysts; being bed ridden for five months in my last pregnancy and having to explain the possibly of ''mommy dying'' to my four young children due to placenta previa, which resulted in my losing all but two pints of blood; and, a partial hysterectomy at delivery.

Not once was I told of the emotional trauma I would suffer: uncontrollable anger flamed by betrayal, deafening seclusion, and the inability to trust. That child loss through choice would devour my dignity as I justified the twisted truth. Or that deception would slowly creep into all areas of my life including the need to discretely reveal several of my abortions as miscarriages.

I was never told I would feel like I was the only one going crazy. Everyone talks about their ''right to choose;'' but no one talks about the choice. In my case this led to sabotaging many life joys. I will never forget hearing my firstborn's heartbeat. Instead of joy, I was in shock, terrified that the nurses could see right through me and what I had done to my other children.

I was never told you would need to grieve and cry for your unborn; that your life would be forever altered by the horrors of your 'chosen' loss, tormented by the innate longing to hold and know your dead children and their dreams. Or that my five living children would suffer with an impossible mom; trapped by the hidden sadness of her gullible past.

Through divine intervention in 1990, I had participated in an abortion recovery program. The tears so long forgotten had begun to form and fall together with the bandaides covering my shameful sorrows. With grateful relief I was able to acknowledge, name, and mourn my seven babies and rightfully publically position them among their siblings.

For over two decades, my now deceased mom joined me in telling others that abortion hurts everyone: family, friends, and future generations. We were wrong. Abortion was not the right answer for my untimely pregnancies.

I now know that you are forever a mom regardless of the age of your child; 6 seconds, 6 days or 60 years. I was blind to this but now I see. This momma of 12 children chooses to be a voice of truth. In pregnancy you carry the baby for only nine months but in abortion you carry it for a lifetime just with empty arms.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much for that very powerful statement.

I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE).

Mr. NUNNELEE. I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his leadership in speaking out on this very important issue.

Our Declaration of Independence, our Nation's birth certificate, states that all are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, and among those are the right to life; but now, for 40 years, over 55 million Americans have been denied that basic right to life guaranteed by our Declaration of Independence.

The Supreme Court got it wrong with Roe, just as they got it wrong with Dred Scott. Now, I accept the fact that under our system of law Roe is the law of the land today, but I, along with many millions of people around America, pray that one day that decision will be overturned.

While in this body we've had much spirited debate over the right to life, there's one area where we have found bipartisan agreement, and that is that taxpayers should not be forced to subsidize a practice that so many of us find abhorrent. We must protect taxpayers from funding abortion. That's why, earlier today, I introduced legislation that would do just that.

Under ObamaCare, the Federal Government is required to sponsor at least two multistate insurance plans.

□ 1550

The bill that was introduced earlier today would simply prevent those plans from paying for abortions, thus making sure that taxpayers around the Nation are not required to subsidize the taking of life. Now this isn't new policy, in fact, it's simply an extension of longstanding Federal policy, and that's why I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Recently, President Obama said:

> When it comes to protecting the most vulnerable among us, we must act now. Let's do the right thing.

This bill is an effort to do the right thing, to protect taxpayers from funding the destruction of the most vulnerable among us: the unborn child.

In closing, let's remember the words of the prophet of old:

> This day I call Heaven and Earth as witnesses against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessings and curses. Now choose life, so that you and your children may live.

On this 40th anniversary of Roe, let us rededicate ourselves to choose life.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you so much, Mr. NUNNELEE.

I yield to Mr. POMPEO of the Fourth District of Kansas.

Mr. POMPEO. Today, I stand here on the 40th anniversary of one of the worst decisions of our United States Supreme Court. It was deeply flawed. Too many Justices spoke of emanations of penumbras but missed the core principle contained in the Constitution: this notion that every human being is endowed with this special dignity that we call life.

The cost of that decision has been enormous: 55 million souls were not brought into this world. We can feel it in families torn asunder and in lives that didn't get to become the next great leaders in our Nation. These lives were lost to each of us. They're lost to the families. They're lost to our community. They're lost to their Maker.

But I want to talk today about hope. Ever since this decision in 1973, there's been a march. And I was in the Army. When you march, you march to victory. We've had this special march. We'll have this march again this week. We'll have it in Kansas. Kansas has a very special relationship to this march.

In 1991, in Wichita, Kansas, the city which I represent, we held the Summer of Mercy, where people came together in peace to talk about these lives that should have been protected but had not been. And this week, the airlines permitting, I'll be back to watch young people from all across south central Kansas board buses bound for Washington, D.C. I'll see them off from churches and cathedrals and synagogues, folks coming to Washington, D.C., to once again march on this town to demand that we do everything we can in our power here in Washington, D.C., to protect every human life.

I'm very proud of the rich history and the contribution that the citizens of the Fourth District of Kansas have made to this movement. It is certainly important to me as a matter of faith. But as a matter of science, we have

this one right as well. We must protect every unborn life. I'm dedicated to doing so. I look forward to being with that next generation, these young people coming to Washington, D.C., so this fight can continue.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to VICKY HARTZLER.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you. I applaud my colleague from New Jersey, and I thank him for his leadership on this very important issue.

Today marks the 40th anniversary of the Supreme Court ruling in Roe v. Wade and Doe v. Bolton, two rulings which impose legalized abortion in this country. I was in junior high at the time this ruling came down, and I really didn't understand the implications. It was only later when I took a child development class and they showed pictures of the different stages of the baby's development that I came to realize this wasn't just talk about a blot of tissue. This procedure ended a beating heart and denied life into this world. I became pro-life then and continue to be pro-life now.

This Friday, hundreds of thousands of Americans will come to Washington to recognize this anniversary. And it's not an anniversary observed with celebration, but one marked by somber reflection. We mourn the loss of 55 million aborted boys and girls, innocent children who were never given the right to live, attend school, go to birthday parties, participate on little league teams, or become siblings and peers. We mourn for families who do not know their lost children but wish they did. We mourn the devastating impact abortion has on our culture and our consciences.

This anniversary also represents an occasion to renew our commitment to defending the most fundamental human right: the right to life. We know that more Americans now describe themselves as pro-life—50 percent—than those that consider themselves pro-choice—41 percent—and we know that younger Americans have begun to understand that the protection of their rights cannot be built upon the destruction of an innocent human being's right to life.

Still, we have work to do. The Federal Government continues to subsidize family planning clinics that provide abortions. In 2011, the Nation's largest provider, Planned Parenthood, performed a record number of abortions, over 330,000 abortions. Most of us in Congress represent approximately 750,000 people. If you think about it, that's almost half of a congressional district that was wiped out in 2011 at the hands of Planned Parenthood clinics alone. Planned Parenthood ended the beating hearts of these innocent victims while deluding vulnerable women that their choice wouldn't have any harmful consequences, and they did so with taxpayer funding, over $500 million in 2011.

This must stop.

Abortion does have consequences. It destroys babies. It harms women physically and emotionally, and it harms men, too.

This past weekend, I had the opportunity to hear a man speak, who shared the heartbreak and the shame that he has suffered for over 20 years at the loss of four children that he was responsible for their abortions. It impacted his marriage, his mental and physical health, his parenting, and how he was able to do his job.

Abortion has consequences. It deadens our consciences and it perpetrates the lie that killing the unborn is morally acceptable.

This week, I stand with hundreds of thousands here in Washington who know better, who understand the truth, that abortion harms us and is killing off future generations. We observe the 40th anniversary of Roe v. Wade with the renewed hope that more Americans will see this truth and honor life.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentlelady for her very eloquent statement.

I yield to my good friend and colleague, Mr. HUELSKAMP.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Thank you. I appreciate the time from such a pro-life leader.

First of all, my wife, Ang, and I are proud adoptive parents of four children. Our heartfelt gratitude goes out to their birth mothers and birth families for choosing life for our four children, and I believe you will be eternally rewarded for your generous choice.

It is reassuring, as was mentioned here, that every year millions of Americans descend on Washington and our State capitals, including Kansas, to stand as surrogate voices for the millions of lives taken by abortion. It's a shame that this event has to happen. But this year, descending on Washington is more than just about abortion; it's about religious liberty.

Those in favor of abortion like to cast this debate about rights and choices rather than rights or wrongs. So if we're to use their terms, where is the outrage at the fact that Americans increasingly have no choice, particularly under the President's health care plan, when it comes to paying for abortion, paying for abortion drugs, and numerous other things they find morally reprehensible? And where's the outrage that religious liberty, the first part of the First Amendment, can come at the expense of this radical agenda?

We in this Congress stand as the people's direct representatives in Washington and must stand as a check to the most pro-abortion President in our history. A President's second term is usually about legacy building, but for the sake of the unborn and for the sake of our religious liberty, I fear for the legacy that he will attempt to craft in the next 4 years.

□ 1600

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It is a high honor and privilege to yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

I come to the floor today to join my colleagues in support of the March for Life.

It seems that too often in Washington these days the focus is on what people are against rather than what they are for. But this Friday, thousands of Americans will gather because of their support of what our Founders described as one of the unalienable rights endowed by our Creator: life. Some of those gathered will be Republicans, others Democrats. Others will belong to no political party at all. They will belong to every faith and race and will belong to every socioeconomic demographic.

Those gathered this Friday and those of us here on the floor of the House this afternoon are joined because we believe that life must be protected—and must be protected especially for those who have no ability to protect it themselves.

Since Roe v. Wade in 1973 medical science has made tremendous gains. Today, expecting parents can watch 3–D images of their young child playing in the womb. Today, doctors can perform life-saving surgeries on children while they are still in utero. Today, thanks to medical science, we know that within 6 weeks after conception these little lives have a heartbeat and brain waves.

Here in the people's House we are taking steps to defend life, as are numerous State legislatures throughout the country. But the real heroes are those men and women who volunteer at pregnancy centers helping women, and those gathered for the March for Life who are committed to this mission. They gather this year not only in the name of protecting life but also to celebrate the life of the founder of the March, Nellie Gray. We'll all miss her red coat up there on that stage, leading the March up the hill, but I know Nellie would be as pleased as I am to see the progress being made for this most important cause—and she would encourage us never to rest until the job is done.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I want to thank the distinguished majority leader for his exemplary leadership for many years, but especially as majority leader, and for reminding all of us that the unborn child, especially over the last 2 decades, has become the littlest patient, where microsurgeries and interventions can save children and enhance their life. I appreciate his extraordinary leadership.

I now yield to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, and I thank you for your leadership as a medical doctor.

It is a real special thing in this Chamber that we have pro-life patriots who represent medicine, the profession of law, mothers, fathers, people who understand life from the most intimate fashion.

I happen to be a pastor. It was 40 years ago that I had just accepted the call to my first church out of divinity school. I was busy in that ministry and getting started and didn't take too much notice of Roe V. Wade. But it was in 1978 when that issue hit me full square in the face, when two wonderful young people in my church came to my office and said, Pastor, we have a problem, and went on to talk about an unplanned pregnancy that they had. As we discussed, they committed to the fact that they intended to keep the child as a gift of God. But ultimately the story didn't go that way because their parents—who were fine, upstanding church members yet determined that these children wouldn't have that as a detriment to their life—encouraged them to, as they called it, terminate the pregnancy.

It broke my heart, and I watch the pain in these two young people go on even to this very day 40 years later. I committed to my God that I would stand for life strongly and have the privilege of doing that in the pastorate, in counseling sessions, on boards of adoption agencies, and crisis pregnancy centers as well.

It was just a few years ago—6 years to be exact—when I held in my hands little John Timothy Walberg, my first grandson, along with his twin brother, Mica Todd Walberg, two little boys born at 24 weeks, 1.12 lbs, 12 inches long, fighting for life. They had been born just down the corridor from where abortions were being done on those same age children. I saw these two boys fight for life. Someday I will see John Timothy again in heaven, but I thank God that little Mica Todd is a live 6-year-old, growing strong, healthy, a gift of God.

The Framers of our Declaration of Independence went to their knees many times. They understood the value of politics, but they also understood the value of truth, truth that came not from man, but truth that came from God. Truths such as these were set in Psalm 127:3:

> Behold, children are a gift of the Lord. The fruit of the womb is a reward.

Jeremiah 1:5:

> Before I formed you in the womb, I knew you. Before you were born I set you apart.

Psalm 139, where it says:

> For You formed my inward parts;
> You wove me in my mother's womb.
> I will give thanks to You, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made.
> Wonderful are Your works,
> And my soul knows it very well.
> My frame was not hidden from You,
> When I was made in secret,
> And skillfully wrought in the depths of the earth.
> Your eyes have seen my unformed substance.
> And in Your book were all written the days that were ordained for me,
> When as yet there was not one of them.

I end by going back to what ultimately came from understanding of truth by our Framers and Founders, when they said:

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I now yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for leading this discussion one more time.

Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Those were the values described by our Founding Fathers. And against that backdrop, we must understand that a Nation is judged the same way that people are judged. We're judged by how we speak for those least able to speak for themselves.

The most fragile in any circumstance are those with no voice at all, the unborn. And on this day, 40 years after a Supreme Court decision, 50 million voices with no representation, no opportunity to speak, how will this Nation be judged? I think the answer is clear. Our Supreme Court at that time expressed conflict on when life began, but today's science leaves no conflict. DNA is established on day one. The heartbeat is visible soon thereafter.

What Nation would put mothers at odds with their unborn children and declare it to be a matter of choice? This is no matter of choice; it's a constitutional question of protection of life. It's a value that—our Founding Fathers would blanch at our definition today. They would have no concept that we would have these discussions.

But the hope lies ahead of us because the younger generations are seeing the technological replays of the unborn and know that it's more than a mass of tissue. Their standing in greater numbers on behalf of life, as is every one of us who are speaking here today.

May God bless this Nation as we seek to protect the unborn.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much, Mr. PEARCE, for that very moving statement.

I now yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS).

Mr. HARRIS. I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for taking a pause every year to let us review what happened 40 years ago and what's happened since. Because some 40 years ago, obviously the Supreme Court decided that it was no longer the State's prerogative to decide what laws could regulate abortion. We know some of the consequences of that: We know we have third trimester abortions; we have abortions for sex selection; we have abortions without the consent or even the notification of parents when minors are involved. That's the path we've gone down. But as the majority says, much has changed in 40 years and deserves reevaluation.

□ 1610

I'm an obstetric anesthesiologist. I've spent 25 years in the labor and delivery suite always wondering about the hypocrisy of being in a labor and delivery suite doing everything we could to save a 24-week baby, while across the corridor, 24-week babies were dismembered under what Roe v. Wade allowed under the law of the land.

The majority leader is right: science has changed tremendously. Why, 40 years ago, we didn't have the Human Genome Project. We didn't realize the richness and diversity of the human genome, which only strengthened the notion that each and every human being is absolutely unique from the moment of conception. And that's in every embryology textbook you can look into. Every human being is unique from the moment of conception. And now, as the majority leader said, we have 3–D and 4–D ultrasound. We can see these human beings that are not blobs of tissue; they are human beings. So maybe we need to revisit what Roe v. Wade said.

Let me tell you a story that really makes you think about revisiting this because, as you know, we spend hundreds of millions of dollars to fund organizations whose real sole purpose is to end life through abortion and very little to help the pregnancy centers that the majority leader spoke of. But in a pregnancy center north about 7 years ago—it's a pregnancy center in Baltimore—a woman speaking Spanish called one afternoon. She was on political asylum in the United States from El Salvador. She was single, had two children already, and was pregnant with a third. She called the pregnancy center, actually, to get a referral for an abortion. That day, by coincidence, maybe the grace of God, a counselor was there who spoke Spanish and spoke to that woman. That woman really wanted to keep her child; but as many women facing abortion, she was in a period of crisis. She needed help, not the help that a Planned Parenthood would offer, but the help that this pregnancy center offered, by helping her through her pregnancy, giving her the support she needed, the money she needed, and the things she needed to have that child.

Now, I know that story because that Spanish-speaking counselor was my wife. Seven-year-old Jennifer comes over to our house now. I look into her eyes, and I wonder if anyone is ever going to tell her the real story of what almost happened and how is someone going to look in her eyes and tell Jennifer that she was better off because of Roe v. Wade.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I now yield to the distinguished obstetrician, Dr. ROE, PHIL ROE, from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank CHRIS SMITH for not just this year, but for over 30 years of advocating for life and making that one of his missions in life. CHRIS, thank you for what you have done not only for this Congress, but for our country, to make awareness. I really appreciate it. I can't

thank you enough for what you have personally done and sacrificed.

Exactly 40 years ago next month, I was a young doctor in training in Memphis, Tennessee, and I was drafted in the U.S. military and left the country to go to Southeast Asia for a tour of duty there. And something happened when I was gone. Roe v. Wade passed. It really passed, and I wasn't even aware of it because I was out of the country. I came back to my training, which had been interrupted by my military service, and realized something very fundamentally different had happened to America.

As an obstetrician, I personally have delivered around 5,000 babies. In the 31 years I was in medical practice in Johnson City, Tennessee, a small town in northeast Tennessee, our group had delivered over 25,000 babies—25,000 children. I see these children now as doctors, lawyers, teachers, Sunday school teachers, soccer coaches, housewives, and farmers, you name it, bettering our community. I cannot imagine my community without these young people there. They are the future of this great Nation.

As Dr. HARRIS mentioned, I saw when ultrasound went from when it was just a blob that you saw to being able to visualize the heartbeat 28 days or less post-conception. It's unbelievable to be able to see that. And to see this child develop is something that I can't explain to you how fulfilling that is to be able to see that happen. And to have a ''choice'' snuff that out is a law that we have to get right in this country. Thank goodness minds are changing.

I look around this great room here, this great Chamber, and wonder what it would be like if different choices were made, the great people that I've met here in Congress that might not be here had a different choice been made. In this Chamber, we have a clear responsibility and duty for those that do not have a voice. The fourth President of our country, and the architect of the Constitution, James Madison, warned that the rights of the minority must be protected. The unborn children of America represent the greatest silent minority that there is. They are the most innocent among us and deserve the protection we afford all people in this great country.

Life is a precious miracle from God that begins at conception. As a physician, I can personally attest after visualizing literally thousands of ultrasounds. We have to make our laws consistent with science of today.

It's been mentioned before that one of our government's most important duties is to protect the most vulnerable among us, and I pledge to continue to remember and strive toward this as long as I breathe. I'm heartened that so many others today have chosen to do the same thing. And may God very much bless the 4 million women last year in this country who chose life, not a choice to terminate life.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Dr. ROE, thank you very much. Thank you for your great leadership here.

I would like to now yield to my good friend and colleague, Dr. FLEMING, a medical doctor as well, from the great State of Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman, my good friend from New Jersey, for all the great work that you've done in this area and many others, protecting children; and we're all grateful to you for doing that.

Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago, when the Supreme Court's Roe v. Wade decision was handed down, I was just a college student taking premed courses with a desire to pursue my goal of being a doctor one day. That was when Roe v. Wade was passed, and hardly anybody even noticed what a landmark decision that was that has led now to the death of over 55 million unborn innocents in this country.

Today, after 36 years as a family physician and having delivered hundreds of babies, I know now more than ever that life begins at conception. Over the decades, medical technology has only served to confirm what we know. Ultrasound has given us a powerful window into the womb that shows us a small, intricately developing human being. We know now through DNA that every little baby, every little embryo, is a unique blueprint in history. Protecting these pre-born children must be our first priority. That's what I strive to do as a family physician in Louisiana, looking after expectant mothers and their soon-to-be-born babies.

As a Congressman, my aim has been unchanged. Abortion is an attack on the very creed that I follow as a physician: first, do no harm. As a Member of Congress, I've stood firm against abortion, against laws that have infringed on the conscience protections of medical providers who want nothing to do with abortion, and I have consistently opposed the use of taxpayer dollars for abortion services.

Many think that at the termination of a pregnancy that the problem goes away, but nothing could be further from the truth. We know through studies that young women who have abortions are more likely to have depression, more likely to commit suicide, and more likely to have future miscarriages and problems with their pregnancy.

Mr. Speaker, the problems do not end with the termination of an innocent life. The abortion epidemic has cost 55 million children their lives. This is a national tragedy, and it must stop; and on this heartbreaking anniversary today, 40 years after Roe v. Wade, I'm more committed than ever to defending the lives of the unborn.

□ 1620

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I would like to yield to my good friend, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. To my good friend, Mr. SMITH, thank you. Thank you for managing this.

The last handful of Congressmen that have come up to the mic have been medical doctors. I get to stand here behind the microphone and share a slightly different story. This is that one very special time of year I get to stand here and say ''thank you'' to a woman named Mary Lynn Sheridan, at the time who was named Mary Lynn Gephart.

She was a 17-year-old who found out she was pregnant, and she was in the car on the way, at that time in southern California, on her way to, apparently, Tijuana. And she broke down crying and kept crying more and kept hyperventilating. The two girlfriends she was with were so terrified she was getting sick in the car, they turned around and took her back home. Heaven forbid, she told her mother she was pregnant.

I was born a few months later at Holy Family Unwed Mother's Home in downtown L.A. The amazing thing is—picture this: You're in your thirties. You come into work one day. You turn on your computer, and there's an email saying, Hi, DAVID, you have no idea who I am, but your sister gave me information. Here's your birth mother.

What do you do? How about if she's never told her family, told her two daughters that I'm out there?

And I send a really carefully worded note after having a family meeting, and I had one of the most amazing experiences you could imagine. Imagine a couple of weeks later, you get a phone call, and it's this little voice saying, I've prayed for you every single day of your life. Every March 3, I go to mass and I light candles for you. Are you okay? Are you happy? Have you had a good life?

All I could tell her through all the tears was, Look, I'm incredibly lucky. I was adopted by an amazing family. I've gotten to live a great life. I'm here in Congress, which, actually, in many ways, may have disappointed her.

But the reason I stand here and tell the story is I've had this amazing relationship, having now met my birth father, having spent holidays with my family that has raised me and my birth family. I have a picture in my office with all these kids and all these people where all of our families—even my little sister, who has met her birth family, because my siblings are all adopted, and we get everyone together and go to Disneyland.

I've noticed there is an amazing change out there where the little kids come up to you and say, Okay, my mom is your sister, but your sister is not my mom's sister. The little kids get it. I think with this I get to come here behind the microphone and say, Thank you. Thank you for giving me the chance to be alive. Thank you for giving me the chance to engage in this battle that we have here in Congress of trying to do good things for our country. Thank you, Mary Lynn Sheridan.

My mother would send my birth mother pictures of me as a baby. So

when I would go to Walnut, California, and go see my birth mother, down the hallway would be all these pictures of me as a little kid. My birth mother has developed a very aggressive type of Alzheimer's, and something amazing has happened in her mind. She can describe all those photos. In her mind now, I grew up with my two younger sisters there in Walnut, California. In her mind, I've been with her this whole time. And that heartbreak she used to describe to me for all those years wondering what had happened to me is gone.

Thank you, God, and thank you to Mary Lynn for giving me a chance to be here today. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank you so very much for sharing not only with the Congress, but with the country, that very moving story.

I would like to now yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding and for leading this Special Order on this 40th anniversary of Roe v. Wade.

Forty has a lot of biblical implications. Moses led them wandering in the desert for 40 years, and Jesus spent for 40 days and 40 nights. Marilyn and I have been married for 40 years.

There are a number of things I would like to tell in this narrative, Mr. Speaker. The first thing I would like to relate is the story of Joyce Zounis, who has delivered to me her narrative, and I will pick out some of the highlights of it and introduce it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield just briefly to my good friend, Ms. FOXX, because she does have to leave, and then we'll go right back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. KING. I'm sorry I could not get down here early, but the Rules Committee kept me.

I want to say all of us here are speaking on an extraordinarily important topic to our Nation. Life is the most fundamental of all rights. It is sacred and God-given. But millions of babies have been robbed of that right in this, the freest country in the world. That is a tragedy beyond words, and it's a betrayal of what we, as a Nation, stand for.

Before liberty, equality, free speech, freedom of conscience, the pursuit of happiness, and justice for all, there has to be life. And yet, for millions of aborted infants, many pain-capable and many discriminated because of gender or disability, life is exactly what they've been denied, often at taxpayer expense. And an affront to life for some is an affront to life for every one of us.

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

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

May we, in love, defend the unborn; may we, in humility, confront this national sin; and may we mourn what abortion reveals about the conscience of our Nation.

And I thank my colleague from Iowa very much for yielding.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, and I start again from the beginning, Mr. Speaker.

This is the 40th anniversary of Roe v. Wade. I never imagined that we would be here 40 years afterwards, 55 million abortions afterwards, still seeking respect for innocent, unborn human life and the right of personhood that many over on the other side of the aisle also claim one should have once they're born. But they give no right, no dignity to babies who are preborn.

I would like to provide some of the narrative here of a story written by Joyce Zounis. Joyce's narrative is about her life. Each one of these are just heart-wrenching, and this is among those heart-wrenching stories shared now by millions around the country.

Joyce's story starts out with this in bold, ''We will not speak of this again.''

It's her mother telling her as a 15-year-old girl on the way to the abortion clinic that there would be no discussion outside of what happened that day. That's at age 15.

It says that ''the room was filled with many girls,'' of which she knew weren't able to keep it as a secret.

> They said it won't hurt; it did. They said it would be over real quick; it has lasted 35 years.

And 11 years later—here's the narrative, Mr. Speaker: Eleven years, three clinics, two States, seven abortions, not once was I told of the traumatic suffering that would follow, which it did.

And on the seventh abortion, Joyce Zounis writes:

> Several hours later, the vacuum-like noise broke a decade-old trance—''What have I done?''

And as her story continues, she writes about emotional trauma, ''That child lost through choice would devour my dignity''—they didn't tell her that. She said, ''I justified my twisted truth.''

That goes on every day here in America, 4,000 times a day in America. Everyone talks about their right to choose, but no one talks about the result of the choice.

□ 1630

She writes, ''I will never forget hearing my firstborn's heartbeat,'' a thing of joy for most people.

> Instead of joy, I was in shock, terrified that the nurses could see right through me and what I had done to my other children. I was never told you would need to grieve and cry for your unborn, that your life would be forever altered by the horrors of your ''chosen'' loss.

Put this in this perspective: 40 years of Roe v. Wade. How did we get here, Mr. Speaker? It's important for us to understand how the creeping decisions of a Supreme Court creep in on the innocent unborn lives of 55 million babies who were victims of abortion, of millions of mothers and of fathers who have suffered the trauma and the heartbreak of finding out afterwards that they carried the responsibility and the burden on their consciences that altered them for a lifetime.

It changed their relationships with their other children and with their family members, and it changed their relationships with brothers and sisters and mothers and fathers that they interrelate with in their daily lives.

In 1965, we had a Supreme Court decision called Griswold v. Connecticut, and that was the camel's nose under the tent. At that time, Connecticut had passed State legislation that had prohibited the sale of contraceptives. It was supported by the Catholic Church, of which I am a member, and it was litigated to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court found a right to privacy, which was manufactured out of thin air. That right to privacy prohibited banning the sale of contraceptives to married couples. That ''right to privacy'' phrase became the foundation, from 1965 until 1973, for Roe v. Wade and Doe v. Bolton. Those two cases came together and essentially said that you have a right to an abortion at any time, for any reason—abortion on demand. That was the conclusion of the two cases, Doe v. Bolton, in '73.

We went on. We got some opportunities to try to make some changes here in Congress; and the beginning of it was the ban on partial birth abortion, which was litigated to the Supreme Court and was turned down. I arrived here on the Judiciary Committee, and we rewrote that language, under the leadership of STEVE CHABOT of Ohio, so that it would comply with the decision of the Court. It was litigated across the countryside, and I went into the courtroom of Judge Kopf in Lincoln, Nebraska, as he had concluded that the findings of Congress were inferior to the preparation work of the attorneys in that court.

Someone had to speak up. I did so in Lincoln that day, and let him know that our congressional findings were deeply deliberated and well founded. I did so through the press, and I found out that he reads the papers. What happened finally was we were able to have a case sustained to the Supreme Court that at least banned the gruesome process of partial birth abortion.

In the process of these debates that we've had, Mr. Speaker, it has been useful. We've marched here. This will be the 40th year that hundreds of thousands and, by now, millions of people—

especially young people—have come to Washington, D.C., and have gone out to the basilica for the pro-life vigil mass—or I've seen as many as 15,000 people out at the basilica—all praying together, all singing together, all joining together in an effort to protect and defend innocent unborn human life, and then have come the next day here to the Mall in Washington and marched together from the Mall all the way around to the Supreme Court and then dispersed across the Capitol Grounds to the various receptions and offices so that they could bring their influence.

This has changed the conscience of America. This has informed millions of now mothers who might have given up their babies to abortion instead. I'm encouraged by the path that we've taken. I have to believe that, over the years, the millions of voices raising together in hymns and prayer and in the marching have had its effect and is having its effect. There will be a day when we see the end of Roe v. Wade. There will be a day when we respect and revere every human life from that instant, or moment, of conception until natural death. That's what I work for. That's what I pray for. That's what many Members of the Pro-Life Caucus here in Congress have and many people across the countryside have.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to live in a country that has so many millions of people who have great respect for innocent unborn human life, and I will be forever grateful if I live to see the day that Roe v. Wade is finally set aside and that life is protected in law.

JOYCE ZOUNIS—TV AND RADIO PRODUCER & HOST LIVING BEYOND THE BANDAIDE OF ABORTION

''We will not speak of this again'' were the words spoken to me as my mom and I, a 15-teen-year old high school sophomore, walked into the abortion facility. I too wanted to forget this problem. I was determined to be the one who decided when I became a mom; NOT a positive reading on a stick. Already disconnected, my mind was not on what was about to happen, but of missing cheerleading practice.

The room was filled with many girls and to my mom's dismay we saw someone we knew. Our secret was blown. I sat in a room waiting for my name to be called just like any other doctor's appointment but this was like no other. They said it won't hurt; it did! They said it would be over real quick; it has lasted 35 years!

Eleven years after my first abortion, I was having my seventh. I was in the same waiting room, walking the same hall, wearing the same gown, taking the same pill, and laying on the same table. To this abortionist's disgust, my pregnancy was further along and required more of his time.

Several hours later the vacuum-like noise broke a decade-old trance—''what have I done?'' I began to weep uncontrollably, and this enraged the abortionist. His gestures were rough, and he was morbidly pleased to have me see his bloody garments when he was finished. The nurse quickly moved me to the recovery room and gave me crackers. Within 10 minutes I was rushed out the back door and nauseous on my way home.

Eleven years, three clinics, two states, seven abortions, and not once was I told of the physical risks I would suffer later: the necessity of bi-lateral mammograms and fear of breast cancer; ovarian cysts; being bed ridden for five months in my last pregnancy and having to explain the possibly of ''mommy dying'' to my four young children due to placenta previa, which resulted in my losing all but two pints of blood; and, a partial hysterectomy at delivery.

Not once was I told of the emotional trauma I would suffer: uncontrollable anger flamed by betrayal, deafening seclusion, and the inability to trust. That child loss through choice would devour my dignity as I justified the twisted truth. Or that deception would slowly creep into all areas of my life including the need to discretely reveal several of my abortions as miscarriages.

I was never told I would feel like I was the only one going crazy. Everyone talks about their ''right to choose;'' but no one talks about the choice. In my case this led to sabotaging many life joys. I will never forget hearing my firstborn's heartbeat. Instead of joy, I was in shock, terrified that the nurses could see right through me and what I had done to my other children.

I was never told you would need to grieve and cry for your unborn; that your life would be forever altered by the horrors of your 'chosen' loss, tormented by the innate longing to hold and know your dead children and their dreams. Or that my five living children would suffer with an impossible mom; trapped by the hidden sadness of her gullible past.

Through divine intervention in 1990, I had participated in an abortion recovery program. The tears so long forgotten had begun to form and fall together with the bandaides covering my shameful sorrows. With grateful relief I was able to acknowledge, name, and mourn my seven babies and rightfully publically position them among their siblings.

For over two decades, my now deceased mom joined me in telling others that abortion hurts everyone: family, friends, and future generations. We were wrong. Abortion was not the right answer for my untimely pregnancies.

I now know that you are forever a mom regardless of the age of your child; 6 seconds, 6 days or 60 years. I was blind to this but now I see. This momma of 12 children chooses to be a voice of truth. In pregnancy you carry the baby for only nine months but in abortion you carry it for a lifetime just with empty arms.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FORTENBERRY. 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 gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, this Friday, hundreds of thousands of people will gather in Washington for a peaceful march, exercising the most American of values—the right to assemble and the right to freedom of speech. Among the people who will come are multitudes of young persons from all over America—young people who are the inheritors of the great civil rights traditions of this land. These young people are pro-life. Mr. Speaker, they're really saying something pretty simple.

They are saying that the time for honesty has come, that the time for a new national conversation has come, that the time for the violence to end has come, and that the time since the Supreme Court decision that legalized abortion on demand some 40 years ago has inflicted a deep wound on ourselves and the very soul of this country.

Over the past few decades, we have witnessed an evolving desensitization to abortion. It has become too easy to think of abortion as a procedure, as something clinical, somehow normal, removed. Disguised in the mantle and vocabulary of health, minds and hearts can easily become numb to what abortion really is, to what it really does and to who really dies.

But the youth among us, they know better. They know that women deserve better.

Abortion is so often the result of abandonment. A woman, in not knowing where to turn, falls into the grasps of the abortion industry, which says, We can quietly make this go away. There are no consequences here; just pay over there. But the consequences are so very real. Abortion is an act of violence. The woman so often carries the wound from this act of violence imposed upon her. Her unborn child dies. The abortion industry profits from this pain, and the other responsible party—the man—escapes his responsibilities. This is why the early feminist movement saw abortion as another form of male domination over women.

Mr. Speaker, young people, they know this. They sense this. They know instinctively that the Supreme Court's decision was a dinosaur decision, not based on science. They know that the consequences of abortion are very real, and they're simply saying there's a better way. There has to be a better way. We should be loving enough and caring enough. We certainly are big enough. We certainly have resources enough to rally as a community and help a person no matter how difficult her circumstances. They are saying no woman should be left alone or in isolation. We are a community committed to the beautiful gift of life. Mr. Speaker, that's the message from these young people who will gather by the tens of thousands this Friday in Washington, and I'm proud to stand with them.

With that, I yield to my good friend, Congressman SMITH.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend for yielding, and I applaud his tremendous leadership over the years in defense of the culture of life, for being consistent on all human rights issues—from child soldiers and combating that abuse of children to the abuse of unborn children by way of abortion. So I thank him for that. I would just make a few points, because we are coming to a close, Mr. Speaker.

Today, doctors diagnose illness and disability before birth. New and exciting breakthrough health care interventions for the unborn, including microsurgeries, are leading to an ever-expanding array of successful treatments and cures of sick or disabled unborn babies. A few other Members have made this point very clearly, as do I, which is that unborn children are society's littlest patients, and they might need health care just like any one of us.

□ 1640

In stark contrast, abortion methods rip, tear, dismember or chemically poison the fragile bodies of unborn babies to death, and abortion pills cause premature expulsion from the womb and death. There is nothing benign, compassionate, or just about an act that utterly destroys the life of a child and often physically, psychologically, and emotionally harms women. And despite the near total absence of any meaningful reporting by the news media, women get hurt and even die from legal abortions.

According to the most recent Centers for Disease Control report, from 1973 to 2008, at least 403 women tragically died in the United States from legal abortion. And that sad fact is almost certainly a significant undercount because the methodology employed by CDC is passive and voluntary and likely to miss instances of both mortality and morbidity.

In the years since CDC's ''most recent report,'' many more women have surely died, like Tonya Reaves, a 24-year-old woman who died last July from a botched second trimester dismemberment abortion, a D&E, at a Chicago area Planned Parenthood abortion mill.

The abortion industry, Mr. Speaker, excels at surface appeal argument and at propaganda. Indeed, the misleading term ''safe abortion'' purposefully misses the point that no abortion, legal or illegal, is ever safe for the baby, and all are fraught with negative health consequences for the mother.

Today, at least 104 credible studies show significant psychological harm, major depression, and/or elevated suicide risk to women who abort. The Times of London reported that:

> Senior psychiatrists say that new evidence has uncovered a clear link between abortion and mental illness in women who have had no previous history of psychological problems. They've found that women who've had abortions have twice the level of psychological problems, three times the level of depression as women who have given birth or who have never been pregnant.

One comprehensive study out of New Zealand in 2006 found that 78.6 percent of the 15- to 18-year-olds who had had abortions displayed symptoms of major depression as compared to 31 percent of their peers.

Mr. Speaker, there are at least 115 studies that show significant association between abortion and subsequent premature births. You never read about this in the news media.

Researchers Shah and Zao show a 36 percent increase for pre-term birth after one abortion and a staggering 93 percent increased risk after two.

What does this mean for children? Pre-term birth is the leading cause of infant mortality in the industrialized world after congenital anomalies. Preterm infants have a greater risk of suffering chronic lung disease, sensory deficits, cerebral palsy, cognitive impairments, and behavioral problems. Low birth weight is similarly associated with neonatal mortality and morbidity.

These are consequences that are visited upon a woman later on. She's never told this at the abortion clinic that subsequent children that she will have later in her life could suffer prematurity and low birth weight.

And, finally, the extremism of the pro-abortion industry is shocking.

Last spring, the House of Representatives took up TRENT FRANK's bill to ban sex-selection abortion. The bill garnered a solid majority, 246–168 in the House. President Obama, however, made it absolutely clear that he would veto the sex-selection abortion prohibition should it be sent to the White House.

While sex selection targets almost exclusively girls for extermination, simply because they're girls, the egregious practice remains legal in most of our States. In fact, only four States—Illinois, Pennsylvania, Oklahoma, and Arizona—and several countries, including the United Kingdom, prohibit sex-selection abortion. And yet we have not been able to get that legislation enacted into law, and it's opposed by President Obama.

Mr. Speaker, we need to stand up for life. Again, I want to thank my good friend and colleague from Nebraska for having this second Special Order on defending life. And like JEFF, I do look forward to the March for Life on January 25 where we will all rally in defense of the defenseless.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. If the gentleman would perhaps be interested in entering into a bit of a dialogue, and I'm sorry I missed your earlier statement, but let me say to you, thank you for your stalwart leadership, your deep commitment to the beautiful gift of life, for saying to America consistently, constantly, fervently, with heart and emotion for 30-plus years, I think you've been here.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thirty-three.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. There is a better way. We can do better than this. Women deserve better. But in your last comment, you touched upon the issue of sex-selected abortion, and I wonder if in your earlier comments you talked about policies, such as the one-child policy in China, which are taking hold, sadly, in other parts of South Asia, how they are affecting population imbalance and how it ends up being the little girls, the unborn little girls who are primarily the targets of these state-imposed coercions on families. So you have this very significant imbalance in the population because of the targeting of unborn little girls in the womb for sex-selected abortion. Perhaps you touched on that earlier.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No, I did not.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. It's a very important part of this overall discussion, to talk about the consequences of where all of this leads. And in a country like China, which has imposed this brutality upon its own people, the women who have come here undercover, we've had them in our hearings. They've had to be behind screens because they fear reprisal from the Chinese Government toward their families, who've talked about being victimized by coercive abortion, that issue plus the issue of how this is created, and it is targeted primarily at unborn girls, the grave injustice of that.

I know you're so learned and have such details on that subject, perhaps you can re-raise that if you didn't earlier talk about it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for raising that important issue.

The People's Republic of China doesn't have a pro-life movement per se. The government is a dictatorship. Regrettably, going back to 1979, they enacted with great push and encouragement from the United States and from the West, Europe especially, a one-child-per-couple policy where brothers and sisters are illegal, where women are systematically, forcibly aborted, and forced sterilization is commonplace to achieve quotas. Not only does a woman have to get a birth authorization from the Government of China to have a baby; if she has an out-of-plan birth, she is aborted forcibly.

Over the years, as chairman of the China Commission and as chairman of the Human Rights Committee of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I've chaired 43 congressional hearings on human rights in China; and many of those were focused on, as you pointed out, women who had to be behind screens to tell their story about the gross indignity, the exploitation, the crimes against humanity that had been committed against them.

In China today, there are approximately 100 million, maybe more, missing daughters, the direct consequence of sex-selection abortion and what is often referred to as gendercide, the deliberate killing of a little girl simply because she is a girl.

In her book ''Unnatural Selection: Choosing Boys Over Girls and the Consequences of a World Full of Men,'' Mara Hvistendahl traces the sordid history of sex-selection abortion as a means of population control. And almost no one knows about this. You'll never read about this in the local papers. You don't hear about it on the major news broadcasts. She writes:

> By August 1969, when the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and the Population Council convened

another workshop on population control, sex selection had become a pet scheme.

Hvistendahl writes:

> If a reliable sex-determination technology could be made available to a mass market, there was a rough consensus that sex-selection abortion would be an effective, uncontroversial, and ethical way of reducing the global population.

What that means is that you kill the girl child in the womb, you end one life, and that girl who will never grow up to be a woman because she has been exterminated because she happened to be a girl, will never be a mother. So it is a means of population control. It is absolutely an egregious violation of human rights, and yet our own President refuses to support a ban on sex-selection abortion. He talked about we the people and inclusion yesterday. Where's the inclusion of all unborn babies, but those who are particularly targeted for elimination, the girl child?

□ 1650

And I would also add, finally, Live Action, an undercover sting operation that they had done—and it's on the Web, you can watch it, you can watch the raw footage, liveaction.org—in their series, ''Gendercide in America,'' they showed Planned Parenthood personnel in this country advising undercover female investigators how to procure sex-selection abortions. I watched that and was sickened by the admonishment, the so-called counseling that was all caught on tape.

One staffer tells the investigator to wait until her baby is 5 months along, get the ultrasound. That's when you can determine the gender of the child, boy or girl, and if it's a girl, that's when you can kill it.

And it was all made very clear. The investigators were laying out a scenario where, if it's a girl, I want the girl child to be destroyed. And there was Planned Parenthood accommodating that to the nth degree.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. If the gentleman would yield for a moment, I think it's important, an important tangent. It's not tangential. It's an element of this discussion because it shows once we give up on this basic fundamental human right, once we let go of our civil rights tradition and we don't include every person, including those who are most vulnerable in the womb, we can see the consequences. Maybe not here just yet, to a large degree, but we can certainly see the consequences of what I talked about earlier in terms of the desensitization of what abortion really is.

So in other places it's lent itself to coercive population control, and even to the shocking horror of taking the life of little girls simply because they're a girl. Now, that still bothers our conscience here in this country, but you can see how it's related to the deeper problem of once we start down this pathway, we desensitize ourselves to the hard, to the important reality that the life within is deserving of protection; that women who perhaps are in very difficult circumstances deserve better than this, deserve a fullness of commitment from you and me and the United States Congress and communities of concern everywhere that there is a better way.

We do not have to do this to one another. We do not have to impose this wound upon women. We do not have to think in this paradigm when there are hard circumstances. We can do it differently.

And I think it's important to have a discussion about the broader consequences of what is happening all around us because we desensitize ourselves in what I call a dinosaur decision, because it wasn't based on science. We didn't have the fullness of technology back then, which fortunately helped so many of us understand just how that small, tiny little life is viable, is real, and is growing and can reach its fullness of potentiality if we just nurture it.

And sometimes people who are in circumstances that are tough and difficult and need a little help with that nurturing, they deserve that support and help. That's our message. That's our message.

So if we can turn this back and build upon a new ideal that life is beautiful, life is a gift, it is worthy of support, not only just from individuals but from the culture at large, I think we'll go a long way towards stopping this aggressive, horrific assault that is happening, primarily in other places but is a threat to potentially happen here, where you're even going so far as to select out the little girl for termination because she's a girl.

This is particularly hard for me, to be honest with you, because I have five daughters. Just kind of happened that way. And I remember, in our last ultrasound for the baby, she's 7, I still call her a little baby, but when we saw that child in the womb, my youngest one at that time looked at me and said, Dad, I hope it's a boy so you have someone to play with.

But technology has helped us understand that life, the nature of that life. And so that's why the Supreme Court decision was not scientific, terribly misguided, has inflicted a deep wound upon us, has given us a false notion of choice and freedom, which tickles the ear, sounds good at one level, but the consequences are oh so deep and real for the individual, for those who are responsible and have been able to escape their responsibility, for geopolitical movements now that have ended up in coercive population control measures, which is grievously unjust, particular to women in far away places.

Going back to what I said as well, if you'd like, describe some of the testimony that we heard from the women who came from China in secret, who had to be, again, behind screens because we were fearful, and they were as well, for reprisals against their families back in China simply because they dared stand up and say, the government should not impose coercive abortion upon me.

There was one woman, as I recall, who was in tears. She had four abortions imposed upon her by the government.

You recall that hearing last year because you were responsible for it, and I think it's a great credit to your leadership.

But again, as hard as this is to look at, as painful as it is, I don't think there's been a more powerful hearing in which I've participated in the United States Congress, hearing from the victim of a government-imposed, coerced abortion and what the consequences were on her.

I'm sorry. Perhaps you had raised that earlier. I didn't have the privilege of hearing your earlier talk, but I think that perspective is important as well.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my friend for yielding and for raising again another very important point. You know, at several of these hearings, which were covered very scarcely by the news media, unfortunately, we had some powerful witnesses from women who are actually the victims of coercive abortion.

Over the many years we've had such hearings, and when they tell their story, and they talk about the helplessness and almost hopelessness of the situation, trying to evade family planning cadres in China as they hunt them down.

You know, most people are unaware of the fact that it begins with economic coercion. If you have a baby out of plan, you are fined if you do not voluntarily walk into the abortion mill for the child to be destroyed. And many women want those children.

One of the women we had testify, her name was Wuijan. She was a Chinese student attending a U.S. university, and part of her testimony—these are her words—she said, when she was rounded up, literally grabbed by the family planning cadres and thrown into a van, totally against her will, she said:

> The room was full of moms who had just gone through a forced abortion. Some moms were crying. Some moms were mourning. Some moms were screaming. And one mom was rolling on the floor with unbearable pain.

Then Wuijan said that it was her turn, and through her tears she described her journey into hell. Here is a woman, just like so many others that we heard from, who were literally trussed, picked up, arrested.

I had a woman back in the 1990s, who was pretty much smuggled out of China, who ran one of the family planning centers in Fujian Province, and she self-described herself: ''By day I was a monster, by night a wife and

mother of one.'' And she talked about it, and she got asylum here eventually.

But she talked about how she would use every part of the police state to ensure that women, even if they evaded family planning cadres up to the ninth month—to drag her in and to kill the baby, and if it's very late in the pregnancy, with a poison shot of formaldehyde or some other substance right to the soft part of the brain to kill the baby.

These are crimes against humanity. They are ever-present throughout China. And again, they're missing 100 million girls, maybe more, because of gendercide and the loss of life. There's no precedent. There's no example that even comes close of a government using abortion as a tool of population control and the like. And it came right out of the population control movement and what happened in the early or late sixties and especially into the seventies, right here in the United States.

In 1984, I say to my friend, Mr. FORTENBERRY, 29 years ago I offered the first amendment on this floor, from this podium, to a foreign aid bill to deny funding to any organization, such as the U.N. Population Fund, that is complicit in China's forced abortion policy and involuntary sterilization. It passed, and it morphed into what became known as the Kemp-Kasten Amendment, offered on the appropriations bill by Congressman Jack Kemp.

After all of these years, it is astonishing to me that we still have so many Members of Congress, we have an administration, in the Obama administration, that is, at best, indifferent, and I would say, at worst supportive of these crimes by giving money to the groups that are on the ground enabling these crimes against women. The Obama administration has enabled this cruel policy by its silence and its financial support to the tune of some $50 million a year to the U.N. Population Fund.

We passed, in this House, a prohibition. They, unfortunately, ignore it, do findings that do not comport with the reality on the ground, and then end up sending this money.

□ 1700

And I met with a woman whose name is Peng Peiyun, who ran the family planning program in China, I say to my friend, Mr. FORTENBERRY, for several hours in a conversation in Beijing. She kept coming back to the fact that the U.N. Population Fund was there on the ground and found nothing but voluntary abortions. Of course, there are a loss of lives, too, but no coercion. So the whitewashing that the U.N. Population Fund has been able to provide to this egregious violation of women's rights in China, and now we today, under the Obama administration, are funding it, Mr. FORTENBERRY. So it's something that has to end. We should be on the side of life and respect, not enabling such terrible things.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. As we're winding down here—we only have a few moments left—I think perhaps we can talk about some good news as well as some common ground. Because everybody listening to this and this important dialogue, this highly sensitive dialogue, may not agree with us. But the vast majority of Americans do agree that the government should not be entangled in this. In other words, taxpayer money should not be going for the provision of abortion. That's one bit of good news.

The second bit of good news, I think, is, again, those of us who have been here a little while, who have been in these trenches trying to beg and plead for an increase of awareness as to what the consequences of abortion are, young people are recognizing that, again, there's got to be a better way. They've lived with this through their generation. They've seen the scars, seen the wounds, seen the effects on society. And they're coming forward and saying, Women deserve better. Can't we be loving enough, can't we be big enough to do something different here?

And I think that's a great sign of encouragement for two reasons. One is, projecting forward, maybe we can reshape society. But also, heal the wounds that have already occurred. Because they are substantive and deep. And I think it's important. And young people, I believe, recognize this. They're there saying, Don't make this choice. It's a false choice, particularly if you feel coerced or abandoned. There are people here ready to help, love, get you through. But if there is that deep wound, we're also here to heal and help. And I think it's just such a beautiful message.

It inspires me that so many young people would come to the Capitol and say, Legislators, older generation of America, let's change this paradigm. Let's change this idea. Because it's not serving our country. It's not serving our people. It's leaving us deeply, deeply hurt. And we can do better.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. One of the things that is so noble about the pro-life movement is that it loves and cares for women during the time of their crisis. And if they do procure an abortion, they are there, again, with Project Rachel and all of these outreaches to help women find reconciliation and peace.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. And men.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. And men, too, have lost track of the number of women we have met that found that peace. We had four women today at the 40 Years of Victims who told their story of the terrible crisis of the abortion but also the reconciliation and peace that they found later.

You make a very good point, Mr. FORTENBERRY, about the young generation. I have never seen more pro-lifers at the March for Life than we are seeing now. And I went to the first one back in 1974 with my wife, Marie, and then made every one thereafter. When I speak in schools, I used to get a great deal of pushback in answer to a question on the right to life. There are still people who push back, but many students say, It's life. Ultrasound has helped enormously. It's a window to the womb. We all remember Dr. Bernard Nathanson, the founder of NARAL, who became a pro-lifer. He said, ''If wombs had windows, abortion would end.'' The ultrasound is a window to the womb. And you can see that magnificent unborn child moving, shaking around, sucking his or her thumb, doing somersaults inside the womb. Blobs of tissue and protoplasm don't do this.

I think this young generation also has another perspective as well. One of my favorite musicals is ''Les Miserables.'' My wife and I have seen it twice—once in New York, once here in Washington. And now the movie. There's a very haunting song in ''Les Miserables,'' a song by Marius, one of the chief people in that musical, Victor Hugo's ''Les Miserables,'' and it's called, ''Empty Chairs and Empty Tables.'' And he says, ''There's a grief that can't be spoken, there's a pain,'' and it goes on and on, ''Empty chairs and empty tables where my friends will live no more.''

We have empty chairs and empty tables. A third of this generation has been killed by abortion. You look to your left, you look to your right in a classroom or at a diner, there are missing children and now young adults even up to the age of 40, since 40 years ago Roe v. Wade was handed down. Empty chairs, empty tables. And I would add to that, empty cribs.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Again, I thank the gentleman for your poignant words, your passion, your deep belief in this. So I think now is the time to let the healing begin. Let's put the past behind us. Let's look forward, marching arm-in-arm with the new civil rights movement that these young people are the great inheritors of, to say that we as a Nation can all stand for the beautiful gift of life.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the great Henry Hyde once said, "Our moment in history is marked by a mortal conflict between a culture of life and a culture of death. God put us in the world to do noble things, to love and to cherish our fellow human beings, not to destroy them. Today we must choose sides."

It is so very important that those of us here remember that we as Americans, and even more so as members of this body, have a special stewardship that perhaps no other people on Earth have.

While every human being is called of God to make the best difference they can in this life for their fellow human beings, in America that calling weighs heavier upon us as citizens than it does any other people on Earth. Because this Nation was founded on the timeless premise that all men are created equal; with the image of God stamped on each soul; with the rights to LifE, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—in that order.

Yet today marks 40 years of legalized abortion-on-demand in America. Of over 50 million

innocent unborn babies slaughtered before they see the light of day.

I both hope and believe that the conscience of America has begun to stir. I mourn the genocide marked by today's tragic anniversary, Mr. Speaker. But more than that, I look prayerfully forward to the day when the same America that rushed into Europe to arrest the Nazi holocaust will muster that same courage here at home, and future generations of children will walk in the sunlight of freedom. May it be so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, today we as a Nation reflect on the 40th anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision in Roe v. Wade. It is estimated that in the 40 years since that fateful decision, 55 million abortions have been performed in the United States of America—millions of unique and precious human lives ended by the unspeakable tragedy of abortion.

As a matter of morality, history, science, reason, and most of all faith, I can come to no other conclusion but that every human life begins at conception and every life is worthy of protection. We have a sacred responsibility to protect the innocent and defend the rights of those who are unable to defend themselves. The struggle to protect life is truly a struggle to change hearts and minds. It requires faith, reason, debate, action, and compassion.

Often we hear that we ought to do something for the least of these; truly, unborn life is the least of these. Let us recognize it. Let us hold it precious. Let us live up to our responsibilities from the Creator and grant those yet to be born that precious right to life.

Later this week, thousands of citizens will fight for the rights of the unborn by participating in the March for Life in Washington, D.C. Thousands more will march to support the inalienable right to life in local events in Texas and around the country. I applaud those who attend, both in body and spirit, for their determination to uphold the sanctity and dignity of human life and wholeheartedly support their efforts.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 40th anniversary of the monumental court decision Roe v. Wade.

Since the Supreme Court legalized abortion in 1973, 40 years ago today, 54 million abortions have been performed throughout the United States. Over 4,000 babies will be aborted today alone and over the course of 2013, 1.4 million children in the United States will not be granted the gift of life.

Mr. Speaker, I am unapologetically pro-life. I believe that the miracle of human life begins at conception. I believe that every human being has the unalienable right to life and that this right must be protected by law.

As a proud member of the Pro-Life Caucus, I respect the sanctity of human life in all of its stages. Science proves that human beings develop at an astonishingly rapid pace and that the life of a child begins long before he or she is born into this world. At about 22 days after conception, a child's heart begins to circulate his own blood, unique to that of his mother's and his heartbeat can be detected on ultrasound.

Americans have a proud tradition of standing up and fighting for those who can't fight for themselves. As a woman, a wife, a mother of two children, and as the Representative of Alabama's Second Congressional District, I'm committed to fighting for the unborn.

Recently, my home state of Alabama became the fifth state in the Nation to pass a measure banning abortions after 20 weeks, which is the point where unborn children can feel pain. I applaud the Alabama Legislature for taking such a strong stance on abortion and for protecting those who do not have a voice.

As the 113th Congress begins, I will continue to do everything in my power to fight for the unborn, prevent taxpayer money from funding abortions, and protect our democratic system from the encroachment of an all-powerful judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, today is a time to celebrate the miracle of life and mourn those whose lives were unjustly ended. Let us use the 40th anniversary of Roe v. Wade as an occasion to reaffirm our beliefs and vow to fight for the life of every child.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today we remember the children who have died as a direct result of the Supreme Court's decision in Roe v. Wade, and Doe v. Bolton, which were decided 40 years ago today.

In the 40 years since that terrible day, my wife, Sandy, and I have been blessed with six children. It has been our privilege to raise them and watch them grow and mature, and three of our children are now married and have begun to have children of their own. Sandy and I now have eight beautiful grandchildren, and each of them have unique talents and personalities. I look forward to welcoming more grandchildren and great grandchildren into our family in the future.

In the 40 years since that terrible day, an estimated 55 million innocent children have died as a result of abortions performed in the United States. In 2011 alone, Planned Parenthood reported performing 333,000 abortions. The death of 333,000 children in that one year represents more lives lost than if the entire population of Orlando, Florida, was suddenly extinguished. Over the past 40 years, abortion has claimed nearly three times the total population of the State of Florida, or the same number of people who lived in the Northeast United States as of July 1, 2012.

Life is a gift, and each and every day, I am grateful for the gift of my children, and my grandchildren. Today, I mourn the loss of the 55 million children who never had the opportunity to live and grow and to one day have children of their own. I mourn for their families, who never had the joy of knowing them. I mourn for our nation, which will never benefit from the lives and the love of these children, who would have been our sisters and brothers, sons and daughters, our friends, and our neighbors.

We must never cease to fight for life, nor cease to be grateful for our own.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the 40th Anniversary of the Supreme Court decision of Roe v. Wade. I was a senior in high school when the case was decided and I still remember that decision vividly today. I could not understand how the Court could legalize the stopping of a beating heart on demand. I thought it was outrageous then and the intervening years since then have done nothing to change my opinion. My opinion has been reinforced by the tragic record of abortion. Fifty five million innocent children have been lost and countless women have suffered both mental and physical pain as a result of abortion.

We are a nation of 315 million people. That means that over one sixth of our friends, neighbors, and family members are not with us today because of abortion. Millions of children have been denied the right to live their own lives, to skin their knees on the playground, to go on their first date, to graduate from high school, and to go on to have families of their own. All those unique, amazing lives were ended before we were even able to know them.

The tragedy of abortion doesn't stop with the loss of so many innocent children. Like any medical procedure, abortion can have devastating side effects and complications that cause pain and suffering. Mental anguish, regret, and other emotional pain can also result from abortion.

It is time for us as a nation to reject such a dismal and heartbreaking procedure. It is time for us to reject the cold callous indifference of abortion that abandons women and their precious children. We're a nation that takes care of our own, that protects the most innocent and vulnerable among us, and stands up for justice for women and children. As Roe v. Wade shows, justice does not flow from the pen of a judge. Justice comes from the loving heart of a human being and from the natural law enshrined in the Declaration of Independence. "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." Today, let us continue the fight for Life and justice for all Americans and especially for unborn children and their mothers.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I solemnly rise today in memory of more than 50 million innocent lives who were lost as a result of the Roe v. Wade decision that was handed down 40 years ago today.

As Americans, we have a moral obligation to protect the rights of the unborn, and to protect the sanctity of life.

That is why I was proud to cosponsor two pieces of legislation that would prohibit the hard-earned dollars of taxpayers that make up family planning grants from being awarded to any entity that performs abortions.

Introduced by Rep. DIANE BLACK and Rep. MARSHA BLACKBURN, these bills will prohibit hundreds of millions of federal taxpayer dollars from subsidizing large abortion providers such as Planned Parenthood.

As a Christian, a father, and a Member of the Pro-Life Congressional Caucus, I am deeply committed to preserving our nation's traditional family values and will always be a strong advocate for policies that value the sanctity of life.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 325, NO BUDGET, NO PAY ACT OF 2013

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–2) on the resolution (H. Res. 39) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 325) to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until May 19, 2013, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. GABBARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. ADERHOLT (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of a death in the family.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, January 22, 2013.

REVISIONS TO THE AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2012 AND 2013 BUDGET RESOLUTIONS

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 503 of H. Con. Res. 112, the House-passed budget resolution for fiscal year 2013, deemed to be in force by H. Res. 5, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the budget allocations and aggregates. The revision reflects the budgetary impact of H.R. 8, the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012, which makes permanent certain tax policies enacted in 2001, 2003, and 2010 and would provide relief from the Alternative Minimum Tax. A corresponding table is attached.

This revision represents an adjustment pursuant to sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended (Budget Act). For the purposes of the Budget Act, these revised aggregates and allocations are to be considered as aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to section 101 of H. Con. Res 112.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, House Budget Committee.

BUDGET AGGREGATES

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal Year	
	2013	2013–2022
Current aggregates: [1]		
Budget authority	2,793,848	[2]
Outlays	2,891,589	[2]
Revenues	2,293,339	32,472,564
The American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (H.R. 8):		
Budget authority	0	[2]
Outlays	0	[2]
Revenues	−203,799	−3,515,231
Revised aggregates:		
Budget authority	2,793,848	[2]
Outlays	2,891,589	[2]
Revenues	2,089,540	28,957,333

[1] Section 506 of H. Con. Res. 112 stipulates that adjustments to allocations and aggregates shall apply while the measure is under consideration and take effect upon enactment of that measure. The current aggregates reflect the original budget resolution levels adjusted only for those measures, which were provided an adjustment during consideration and that have been enacted into law. Presently, the revenue aggregates in H. Con. Res. 112 have been adjusted by −203,799 for FY2013 and by −$3,515,231 for FY2013–FY2022 for measures enacted into law.

[2] Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2015 through 2022 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR RESOLUTION CHANGES

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

	2013		2013–2022 Total	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
House Committee on Ways & Means				
Current allocation:	985,036	982,582	11,683,572	11,672,931
Changes for the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (H.R. 8)	0	0	+198,295	+198,295
Revised allocation:	985,036	982,582	11,881,867	11,871,226

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 23, 2013, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

74. A letter from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Determination of Foreign Exchange Swaps and Foreign Exchange Forwards Under the Commodity Exchange Act received January 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

75. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluroxypyr; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0962; FRL-9371-1] received January 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

76. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of four officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of major general and brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

77. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Treasury, transmitting annual report on recruitment and retention, training and workforce development, and workforce flexibilities; to the Committee on Financial Services.

78. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report under Section 319 of the Fair and Accurate Credit Transactions Act of 2003; to the Committee on Financial Services.

79. 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; Colorado; Revisions to New Source Review Rules [EPA-R08-OAR-2011-1025; FRL-9762-5] received January 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

80. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; New Hampshire; Redesignation of the Southern New Hampshire 1997 8-hour Ozone Nonattainment Area [EPA-R01-OAR-2010-0290; FRL-9768-7] received January 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

81. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Smoke Management Requirements for Mandatory Class I Areas under 40 CFR 51.309 [EPA-R08-OAR-2011-0636; FRL-9636-6] received January 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

82. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Major Sources: Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional Boilers and Process Heaters [EPA-HQ-OAR-2002-0058; FRL-9676-8] (RIN: 2060-AR13) received January 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

83. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Particulate Matter [EPA-HQ-OAR-2007-0492; FRL-9761-8] (RIN: 2060-AO47) received January 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

84. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Regional Reliability Standard PRC-006-SERC-01 — Automatic Underfrequency Load Shedding Requirements [Docket No.: RM12-9-000; Order No. 772] received January 14, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

85. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Afghanistan and Change to Policy on Prohibited Exports (RIN: 1400-AD26) received January 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

86. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Interagency Working Group on U.S. Government-Sponsored International Exchanges and Training FY 2012 Annual Report; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

87. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

88. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

89. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting a copy of the charter of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights State Advisory Committees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

90. A letter from the Federal Liaison Officer, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Setting and Adjusting Patent Fees [Docket No.: PTO-C-2011-0008] (RIN: 0651-AC54) received January 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

91. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a letter regarding two additional pending cases under Section 3 of the Defense of Marriage Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

92. A letter from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting a report on the continuing need for bankruptcy judgeships; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

93. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Major Capital Investment Projects [Docket No.: FTA-2010-0009] (RIN: 2132-AB02) received January 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

94. A letter from the Chair, NASA Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel, transmitting the Panel's Annual Report for 2012; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

95. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a semi-annual report to Congress on the continued compliance of Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Moldova, the Russian Federation, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan with the Trade Act's freedom of emigration provisions, as required under the Jackson-Vanik Amendment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

96. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of intent to obligate funds for purposes of Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund (NDF) activities; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

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. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 39. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 325) to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until May 19, 2013, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–2). 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 Ms. MOORE (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ENYART, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MAFFEI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 11. A bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Education and the Workforce, Financial Services, and Natural Resources, 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. LAMBORN:

H.R. 326. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to establish a point of order to prohibit the extension of the public debt limit unless a concurrent resolution on the budget has been agreed to and is in effect; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself and Mr. TIERNEY):

H.R. 327. A bill to establish requirements relating to the provision of certain products to the Government of Afghanistan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 328. A bill to establish a pilot program for the expedited disposal of Federal real property; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 329. A bill to amend the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 to encourage States to provide records to the National Instant Background Check System; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 330. A bill to designate a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 331. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to permit the centralized reporting of veteran enrollment by certain groups, districts, and consortiums of educational institutions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MORAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 332. A bill to provide victims of gun violence access to the same civil remedies as are available to those injured through other means; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 333. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability rated less than 50 percent to receive concurrent payment of both retired pay and veterans' disability compensation, to eliminate the phase-in period for concurrent receipt, to extend eligibility for concurrent receipt to chapter 61 disability retirees with less than 20 years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. HALL, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 334. A bill to approve the Keystone XL pipeline project permit; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Natural Resources, 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. BOUSTANY (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. JONES, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HARPER, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CONYERS,

Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. WALBERG, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 335. A bill to ensure that amounts credited to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund are used for harbor maintenance; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 336. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for counterfeiting or selling Presidential inauguration tickets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER:

H.R. 337. A bill to require States to carry out Congressional redistricting in accordance with a process under which members of the public are informed of redistricting proposals and have the opportunity to participate in the development of such proposals prior to their adoption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 338. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to include certain territories and possessions of the United States in the definition of State for the purposes of chapter 114, relating to trafficking in contraband cigarettes and smokeless tobacco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (for himself, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 339. A bill to require the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives to make video recordings of the examination and testing of firearms and ammunition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 340. A bill to amend the Higher Education Opportunity Act to restrict institutions of higher education from using revenues derived from Federal educational assistance funds for advertising, marketing, or recruiting purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 341. A bill to facilitate nationwide availability of volunteer income tax assistance for low-income and underserved populations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. TURNER, Mr. JONES, Mr. YODER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. COFFMAN):

H.R. 342. A bill to prioritize certain Government obligations for continued payment in the event that the statutory debt limit is reached, to appropriate funds for the pay and allowances of all members of the Armed Forces, and for those civilian employees of the Department of Defense and the Coast Guard serving in a combat zone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, 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. JONES:

H.R. 343. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that every military chaplain has the prerogative to close a prayer outside of a religious service according to the dictates of the chaplain's own conscience; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 344. A bill to restore the application of the Federal antitrust laws to the business of health insurance to protect competition and consumers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 345. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to eliminate all Federally-imposed mandates over the local budget process and financial management of the District of Columbia and the borrowing of money by the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. NUNNELEE:

H.R. 346. A bill to amend title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to ensure that the coverage offered under multi-State qualified health plans offered in Exchanges is consistent with the Federal abortion funding ban; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HANNA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GRIMM, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H.R. 347. A bill to provide, develop, and support 21st century readiness initiatives that assist students in acquiring the skills necessary to think critically and solve problems, be an effective communicator, collaborate with others, and learn to create and innovate; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 348. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Social Security Act to provide for employment tax treatment of professional service businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROBY (for herself, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BACHUS, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H.R. 349. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 with respect to maximum enrollment and eligible land in the conservation reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. MULVANEY):

H.R. 350. A bill to repeal the Legal Services Corporation Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.J. Res. 20. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures with respect to elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. JONES, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. FARR, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. LEE of California):

H.J. Res. 21. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to clarify the authority of Congress and the States to regulate corporations, limited liability companies or other corporate entities established by the laws of any State, the United States, or any foreign state; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.J. Res. 22. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of consecutive terms that a Member of Congress may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIGELL:

H. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution prohibiting the House or Senate from adjourning for a period of more than 5 days during a fiscal year unless the House involved has adopted a concurrent resolution on the budget for such fiscal year and has approved legislation to provide funding for the operations of the government for the entire fiscal year; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia:

H. Res. 40. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that active duty military personnel who are stationed or residing in the District of Columbia should be permitted to exercise fully their rights under the Second Amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HOLT:

H. Res. 41. A resolution expressing support for designation of February 12, 2013, as Darwin Day and recognizing the importance of science in the betterment of humanity; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

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 Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 11.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 326.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 2

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 327.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States;

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 328.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power

To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Clause 2 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: To borrow Money on the credit of the United States;

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: 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. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 329.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 330.

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 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 331.

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 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 332.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Equal Access to Justice for Victims of Gun Violence Act is constitutionally authorized under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Additionally, the Preamble to the Constitution provides support of the authority to enact legislation to promote the General Welfare.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 333.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sect. 8, Clause 1: to provide for the common defense and general welfare

Art. I, Sect. 8, Clause 12: to raise and support Armies

Art. I, Sect. 8, Clause 16: to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress

Art. I, Sect. 8, Clause 14: The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution,

Art. I, Sect. 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 the Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 334.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 3

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 335.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 336.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 3, Clause 1: ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States;''

Article I, Section 3, Clause 6: ''To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;''

By Mr. COOPER:

H.R. 337.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) The authority granted to Congress under Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution of the United States gives Congress the power to enact laws governing the time, place, and manner of elections for Members of the House of Representatives; and

(2) The authority granted to Congress under Section 5 of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution gives Congress the power to enact laws to enforce Section 2 of such Amendment, which requires Representatives to be apportioned among the several States according to their number.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 338.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

''The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.''

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia:

H.R. 339. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution that states that Congress shall have Power ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States . . .''

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 340.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §1 and 8.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 341.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 342.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution sets the power of appropriations and states that ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .''. In addition, Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 states that ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .''. Also, Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), grant Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 343.

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 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, and 16), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 344.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8 Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 345.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. NUNNELEE:

H.R. 346.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 347.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 348.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article XVI of the Constitution—Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes. . . .

By Mrs. ROBY:

H.R. 349.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority on which this bill rests in the power of Congress in in the U.S. Constitution under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, Commerce Clause.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 350.

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. McGOVERN:

H.J. Res. 20.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H.J. Res. 21.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.J. Res. 22.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V.—The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Mr. LONG and Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 24: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. WOLF, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 32: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 44: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 45: Mr. SCALISE, Mr. LONG, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. POSEY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 61: Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 71: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 106: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 107: Mr. BARTON.

H.R. 109: Mr. BENTIVOLIO and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 110: Ms. CHU, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 111: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. FARR, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 125: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 129: Mr. MORAN, Mr. CAPUANO, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 137: Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MENG, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. MORAN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 138: Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MENG, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 141: Ms. MENG, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. HOLT, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 142: Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 146: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 149: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 181: Mr. HANNA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. REED, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. MENG, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. TONKO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 182: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 196: Mr. OLSON and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 207: Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 217: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. ROSS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. STEWARD, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. HURT, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BARR, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. PETRI, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. MESSER, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 220: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 227: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. HOLT, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 233: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 235: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. YODER, Mr. Schack, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 246: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 247: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 258: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 262: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 283: Mr. FINCHER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 297: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.

H.R. 301: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 303: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. LATHAM, Ms. HAHN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MICA, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 310: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. BARR, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 311: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 317: Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WALDEN, and Mrs. BLACKburn.

H.R. 322: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 324: Mr. BENISHEK and Mr. JONES.

H. Res. 10: Ms. CHU.

H. Res. 24: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. ROSKAM.

H. Res. 31: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Ms. WATERS.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. CAMP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 325, to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until May 19, 2013, and for other purposes, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MRS. MILLER OF MICHIGAN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on House Administration in H.R. 325, to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until May 19, 2013, and for other purposes, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.