

that is shared and mourned by our entire country, definitely in this Congress of the United States, and across the world. Whatever is in our power to be helpful to them, we will do—and we will do it quickly. Most importantly, they will always and ever be in our prayers.

GIVE US THEIR NAMES

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most disturbing aspects of the unfolding scandal involving the misuse of the IRS is what can only be described as an insatiable appetite for names, names, and more names.

Conservative groups—and only conservative groups—seeking to organize under section 501 were subjected to pages of intrusive and irrelevant questions but with a common theme: give us their names. Give us the names of your volunteers. Give us the names of your donors and your family members and your business associates. Give us the names of speakers and audience participants in your meetings.

One man applying to form a group to educate teenagers in constitutional principles was told to turn over the names of his students. As he told a reporter, Can you imagine my responsibility to parents if I disclosed the names of their children to the IRS?

This tactic was not limited to new applications. The venerable Leadership Institute, which has been schooling young people in constitutional principles for 40 years, was put through a year-long audit. The IRS wasn't only interested in financial information, they wanted the names of the students and their college interns and the names of anyone who had subsequently hired these young people. And when the IRS wasn't demanding the names of ordinary Americans or asking what they were reading or thinking or saying, in some cases applicants were given names and told to reveal what they knew about these people.

Mr. Speaker, these are facts that are undisputed by the administration and its apologists. For a period of more than 2 years, these questions were put to Americans whose political opinions had been singled out by one of the most powerful and feared agencies of the Federal Government.

What I would like to know is why? Why did the IRS demand lists of names of thousands of Americans whose only common characteristic is that they disagreed with this administration? Where are these lists now? With whom were they shared? Who wanted to know these names? What possible use would the IRS have to track the names of high school students who simply wanted to learn about their Constitution? But most importantly, what were these names used for and what are they being used for?

I don't have an answer to these questions, but I find their implications deeply disturbing; and they must be answered during the course of the investigations now underway, and they must be answered in full and with certainty.

□ 1030

I cannot conceive of the reasons why the Federal Government would be so interested in compiling such lists; but we know for a fact that they were, and that fact is undisputed. What we don't know is why; and knowing the answer to that question and the other questions raised by this undisputed fact is absolutely essential to a society that values its freedom of speech, its freedom of assembly, its freedom of press, and its freedom of conscience.

We know the ancillary effect of these illegal demands. They dried up donations to these conservative groups. They heavily suppressed volunteer activities. We know some lists were leaked to liberal publications like The Huffington Post and ProPublica. What we don't know is what was the direct purpose of gathering these names.

The administration's spokesman this weekend said the law is irrelevant and called it a distraction. Well, on the contrary, this strikes at the very foundation of a free society, the rule of law, and the right of the people to question the policies of their government without fear of retribution or intimidation.

Seventy-five years ago, Winston Churchill warned of a "state of society where men may not speak their minds, where children denounced their parents to the police, where a businessman or small shopkeeper ruins his competitor by telling tales about his private opinions."

If it is possible that we have taken even a single step down the road that leads to such places, then that situation should occupy our full and undistracted attention until it is fully and completely rectified, new safeguards are erected against its recurrence, and those responsible are held fully accountable.

MAXIMIZING OPTIMAL MATERNITY SERVICES FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

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

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to challenge my colleagues to make optimal maternity outcomes a priority in our country.

Tragically, childbirth in this wealthiest of nations has significantly greater risks for mothers and babies when compared to almost all other developed nations.

In the U.S., more than two women die every day from pregnancy-related causes, and more than one-third of all women who give birth experience some type of complication with an adverse

effect on their health. These tragedies are most often found in communities of color.

Regrettably, mothers aren't the only victims of our maternity care system. Sadly, out of every 1,000 babies born in the United States, nearly seven babies die. Particularly disturbing is that since 1991, premature birth—the leading cause of low birth rate and infant mortality—has actually increased in our country by more than 30 percent. Adding to this concern is that the U.S. spends more than double of any country in the world on maternity care and still ranks far behind most developed countries in maternal and infant outcomes. Clearly, something must be done to protect mothers and babies.

While it is important to continue studying the causes, we already know many factors that contribute to poor birth outcomes and to high costs. One well-established factor is that current U.S. medical practice does not follow the vast body of research that exists on the best evidence-based maternity care. This includes the research of credible studies showing that multiple noninvasive maternity practices can produce considerable improvement in birth outcomes without detrimental side effects to mother or baby.

Two examples of these noninvasive and relatively simple practices significantly underused during pregnancy are group models of prenatal care and smoking cessation programs. Unfortunately, the U.S. also has a widespread overuse of Cesarean sections and scheduled inductions. The overuse of these practices, which are beneficial only in limited situations, has been associated with complications that jeopardize the health of mother and baby and with longer hospital stays and multiple costly procedures.

These tragically poor childbirth outcomes and high costs must no longer be tolerated in our country. Therefore, this week I am introducing the Maximizing Optimal Maternity Services for the 21st Century Act, better known as the MOMS Act. This bill will create a coordinating committee to ensure that Federal agencies are on the same page in promoting the best evidence-based maternity practices in their programs. And it will facilitate across maternity professions collaboration in the education of a diverse maternity care workforce. In addition, the MOMS Act authorizes grant programs for professional organizations to recruit and retain minority maternity care providers.

The MOMS Act also establishes an online database to make available the best evidence-based maternity care information to women and families, and it authorizes a consumer education campaign focused on how to achieve the healthiest maternity outcomes.

The MOMS for the 21st Century Act further expands research on the best maternity practices and on the identification of the geographic areas that lack adequate maternity health care providers.