United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 18, 2013 No. 87

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 18, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TED POE 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 WOMEN'S PREVENTATIVE HEALTH AWARENESS CAMPAIGN ACT

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

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about core American values—values of liberty, values of freedom, values of individual rights.

Today, a bill is going to come before this body that is a blatant attempt to take away those individual rights, those individual freedoms—freedoms that are core to who we are. This bill aims to take away individual decisions from America's mothers, America's sisters, and America's daughters. This bill is a travesty and a slap in the face of those core values of individual liberty and individual freedom, and this bill criminalizes doctors for doing our jobs.

Now, I'm a doctor. Core to the oath that I took was to sit with my patients, answer their questions and empower them to make the decisions that best fit their faith circumstances, their individual circumstances, their family circumstances. That's core to the oath every doctor in the United States of America has taken. That's core to my job. The bill that's coming to the floor today takes those values and slaps them in the face. They put the government right in the middle of my exam room, but the government has no place between the doctor and the patient.

What we should be debating is how we empower our patients, how we promote women's health, how we try to keep women healthy and help them plan their pregnancies, how we empower families. As a husband and as the father of a daughter, keeping women healthy is extremely important to me, and helping empower parents and families to plan those pregnancies is not only smart; it's good medicine.

The legislation I am introducing later this week, the Women's Preventative Health Awareness Campaign Act, will direct the Department of Health and Human Services to educate women about the importance of the preventative wellness exam. This is a piece of legislation that will help address the issue of planning families, of planning when you want to be pregnant. It will help address the issues of undiagnosed heart disease. It will help us diagnose cancer, and it will save thousands of lives.

I would urge my colleagues in this body on both sides of the aisle to join us in this bill. It's not only smart medicine; it will get to the core of empowering patients, of empowering women and of empowering families to make the decisions that best fit within the context of their lives.

That's the oath that I took as a doctor; that's the promise that I make to all of my patients; and that's the oath that we take in this body—to protect those individual freedoms and the individual rights of all Americans and of all America's women.

PROTECTING LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WALORSKI. I rise today to address the importance of protecting life.

While I am home in Indiana, spending time in our communities, the importance of strong values and Hoosier common sense continues to rule the foundations of our families.

I believe it is critical for Congress to act today to protect human life and to treat women and the unborn children with the protection they deserve from the dangers of late-term abortions. We are talking about the next generation of moms and grandmothers, of aunts and sisters and of our loved ones. There is not a price that can be put on the value of an innocent human life. I have been a strong supporter of life and of defending the unborn, and I feel that it's our responsibility to protect the most vulnerable who cannot protect themselves.

I urge my colleagues to join me in the support of H.R. 1797 for the sake of protecting the unborn from late-term abortions.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, later today, the Judiciary Committee will mark up the first immigration reform

Printed on recycled paper.

bill offered by the Republicans in the 113th Congress. Since election day, no Member of Congress has done more to highlight and praise the Republicans for their new spirit of bipartisanship on immigration than I. I praise our committee and subcommittee chairmen for their new tone in the Republican-led immigration hearings.

When the Republican Party chairman said Republicans have to stop pushing Latino voters away, I said, ''Right on, Reince.''

When young Republicans warned the GOP to change its tune in order to remain viable, I said, ''I think you're right.''

When your former candidate for Vice President and Budget Committee chairman came to Chicago to talk about immigration reform, I brought him to the barrio so that the Latino community could see him and applaud his commitment to immigration reform.

Judge CARTER, the gentleman from Texas, and I shared the stage in San Antonio to discuss immigration reform deep in the heart of Texas, where we agreed on more things than we disagreed. He and I have met almost every day since January with a small bipartisan group of colleagues to fashion a bill that both parties can embrace.

And it's hard work for both parties.

On the other side of the aisle, it is hard to talk about immigrants in a new way when your party, its platform, its candidates, its talk radio, and its TV personalities have spoken disparagingly about immigrants for years. When you reference gangbangers and drunk drivers and rapists every time you talk about immigrants, it is hard to switch gears quickly; but most Republicans in this body, up until last week, were singing from a new and more harmonious hymnal.

Bipartisan work on immigration reform has been difficult on my side of the aisle, too. I have always fought for universal health care coverage, but discussing health care coverage for undocumented immigrants and their families—even in the context of a legalization program where they pay their full taxes, submit fingerprints, and pay huge fines—is a nonstarter not only for Republicans but for Democrats, unfortunately, alike. I have advocated for LGBT rights from my days as a Chicago alderman, but to work in a bipartisan manner, it's off the table.

To keep discussions going with Republicans, I am told that the Diversity Visa Program, which brings in immigrants from Africa and Ireland and around the world who diversify our immigrant pool, is eliminated—no discussion in the name of bipartisanship. Siblings—brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens—will no longer be able to be sponsored by their family members to come to America, and the fees and fines we charge—billions upon billions—on immigrants so that they can be here legally, that will fund more drones, fences, border guards, and more enforcement on the border, a border that is as secure as I've seen in American history—but we'll do it.

□ 1010

I ask my Republican colleagues when is it enough?

But I want to keep things moving forward, so I hold my tongue, work within the bipartisan process and stay with the group. I speak well of Republicans who have partnered with Democrats on a serious bipartisan bill this year.

A tough, but fair bipartisan bill is moving towards passage, and our tough but fair bipartisan House bill is nearly complete. We're putting aside partisan bickering to solve a difficult policy issue for the American people.

In this moment, just in time for the Fourth of July, we get red meat politics for the barbecue and partisan fireworks on immigration.

The Arizona S.B. 1070 law was substantially struck down by the Supreme Court. No matter. Now your side of the aisle wants to nationalize it.

Sheriff Joe Arpaio is slapped by the Federal courts for systematically denying the civil rights of U.S. citizens and legal immigrants. No matter. Let's canonize him.

Police and local governments want immigrants in their communities to be able to call the police if they're a victim of crime or witnesses to crime. Too bad. Republicans in Washington know better than your cops, prosecutors and mayors at home. They will cut your Federal funding unless you commit to a full-frontal deportation and local immigration enforcement.

When 500,000 Latino citizens turn 18 every year and become potential voters, Republicans seem hell-bent on lining up and jumping off the demographic cliff.

While our country demands solutions and leadership, Republicans are feeding the partisan monster red meat as if their calendars already read 2014.

As a Democrat, I could probably stand back and watch. If you want to hang yourself on the immigration issue, who am I to stop you? But as an American, I have to tell you what I really feel. Your country needs you to step away from the partisan red meat and fearmongering that has defined your party on immigration. Come back to your senses. Do not push forward a bill that criminalizes every immigrant family and makes everyone think twice before they call 911.

You are better than this. America needs you to be.

OUR NATION'S WAKE-UP CALL

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, in the early 1760s, the Royal Governor of Massachusetts began issuing writs of assistance as general warrants to search for contraband. They empowered officials to search indiscriminately for evidence of smuggling.

These warrants were challenged in February 1761 by James Otis, who argued forcefully that they violated the natural rights of Englishmen and were, in fact, ''instruments of slavery.''

A 25-year-old attorney who attended the trial later wrote:

> Every man of a crowded audience appeared to me to go away as I did, ready to take arms against writs of assistance. Then and there the child independence was born.

That young lawyer was John Adams. To him, that's the moment the American Revolution began. The general warrants were the first warning that his king had become a tyrant.

The Founders specifically wrote the Fourth Amendment to assure that indiscriminate government searches never happened again in America. In America, in order for the government to invade your privacy or to go through your personal records or effects, it must first present some evidence that justifies its suspicion against you and then specify what records or things it's searching for.

Last week, we learned the Federal Government is today returning to those general warrants on a scale unimaginable in colonial times by seizing the phone and Internet records of virtually every American.

We're told that this is perfectly permissible under past Supreme Court rulings because the government is not monitoring content, but only the records held by a third party. But if phone records are outside the protection of the Fourth Amendment because they're held by a third party, then so too are all of our records or effects held by third parties. That means the property you keep in storage or with a family member, the private medical records held by your physician, the backup files on your computer maintained on another server, all are subject to indiscriminate search. In fact, many of the general warrants served long ago in Boston were on warehouses owned by third parties.

Even if we were to accept this rationale, then that third party, for example, the phone company, ought itself to be safe from general warrants like those that have apparently scooped up the phone and Internet records of every American. It's argued with Orwellian logic that it's permissible to seize these records indiscriminately since they aren't actually searched until a legal warrant is issued by a secret FISA court. But if general warrants can produce the evidence for specific warrants, isn't the Fourth Amendment prohibition against general warrants then rendered meaningless? And all we know of the secret FISA court and its deliberations is that out of 34,000 warrants requested by the government, it has rejected only 11—hardly a testament to judicial prudence or independence.

We're told that the information will be used only to search for terrorists.

Does anyone actually believe that? Just a few months ago, the Director of National Intelligence brazenly lied to Congress when he denied the program existed at all. Just a few weeks ago, we learned that this administration has taken confidential tax information belonging to its political opponents and leaked it to its political supporters. Is there anyone so naive as to believe the same thing won't be done with phone and Internet records if it suits the designs of powerful officials?

A free society does not depend on a police state that tracks the behavior of every citizen for its security. A free society depends instead on principles of law that protect liberty while meting out stern punishment to those who abuse it. It doesn't mean we catch every criminal or terrorist. It means that those we do catch are brought to justice as a warning to others. This is true whether we are enforcing the laws of our Nation or the Law of Nations.

Indeed, if we had responded to the attack on September 11 with the same seriousness as we responded to Pearl Harbor, terrorism would not be the threat that it is today.

Ours is not the first civilization to be seduced by the siren song of a benevolent all-powerful government. But without a single exception, every civilization that has succumbed to this lie has awakened one morning to find that the benevolence is gone and the all-powerful government is still there.

Mr. Speaker, this is our generation's wake-up call, and we ignore it at extreme peril to our liberty.

ARLETA HIGH SCHOOL, SUN VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL, AND SAN FERNANDO HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, it's with great pride today that I rise to recognize the great achievements of three high schools in my district, District 29 in California.

I want to begin by congratulating Arleta High School for achieving a 92 percent graduation rate and setting the gold standard for the Los Angeles Unified School District.

Opening in 2006, this school achieved this enormous feat in just 7 years. The Arleta Mustangs have the highest graduation rate of any traditional high school in all of LA Unified School District. This is a testament to all the hard work and support this community has invested in its children and their future.

I would also like to recognize departing Principal Dr. Linda Calvo for her unrelenting vision. She will be dearly missed, and I hope that her successor will continue the tremendous strides made on this campus and the surrounding neighborhoods.

I would also like to recognize LA Unified School District board member Nury Martinez, who actually went to one of the high schools that I'm going to recognize in just a minute. She's been a strong and tireless advocate for this community as a school board member for the last 4 years.

I commend the teachers for their commitment and dedication to their students; the parents for their love, support and involvement in their children's lives; and the students who have risen to the challenge and proved it is possible to reach your dreams.

Bragging rights are not limited to just Arleta High School. Located less than 4 miles away, the Sun Valley High School Wildcats can also be proud. I'd like to congratulate and commend the Sun Valley High School Robotics Team for being named the national champions of the 2013 Mini-Urban Challenge Competition. Sponsored by the United States Air Force Research Laboratory, this challenge requires high school students to design and operate a robotic car to autonomously navigate a model city. One June 1, the Sun Valley Robotics Team competed against nine regional champions in Washington, D.C., and became the national champions.

I want to recognize also Principal Paul Del Rosario for his leadership and continuous support of the team; Mr. Hicks and Ms. Yamagata for guiding and assisting the team through the project and to the victory; the volunteers who invested their own time and money to help the teams, as well; and the students for their perseverance and creativity.

The success of California's 29th District high schools doesn't end there, and it doesn't end just in the classroom.

□ 1020

I would also like to congratulate San Fernando High School's baseball team on winning their second city championship in 3 years. On June 1, San Fernando defeated Cleveland High School 2–1 in Dodger Stadium to claim their championship for a second year in a row.

Under the leadership of Coach Armando Gomez, the Tigers have done a phenomenal job of playing as a team and putting in the extra work to build a successful program at San Fernando High School.

All of these students are a great source of pride to our community, and prove that hard work, sacrifice, and commitment pay off. They are the future of our country and also of the San Fernando Valley.

I think it is important for us to understand that today I stand not only to congratulate the young people, but to congratulate all of the adults that surround them who've given of themselves and gone the extra mile to make sure we bring out the best in our children.

I also would like to take a point of personal privilege to welcome our little ambassador who's here to talk to me and other Members about children's hospitals. You might know him as Lil Vader, as he was in a commercial during the Super Bowl game. He's with me today as a young ambassador, showing leadership at his young age. I think it's important for us to recognize at moments like this that our young people, our young Americans, our teenagers, or maybe they're little kids, but you too can be a leader at any age. You don't have to wait until you're a little older, like us.

FLAWS IDENTIFIED IN CMS COMPETITIVE BIDDING PROGRAM

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, at a time when bipartisanship is rare in Washington, this past week a bipartisan majority of Members of the United States House of Representatives together called upon the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) to delay further implementation of the competitive bidding program for Durable Medical Equipment, Prosthetics, Orthotics and Supplies.

A growing number of flaws have been identified in the bidding program, which is being used to procure these goods and services for those facing life-changing disease and disability. We do not oppose competitive bidding. In fact, we want to ensure that true competition takes place and Medicare plays by the rules they set for the program.

Today, I stand beside 226 of my colleagues here in the people's House and urge the administrator of CMS to do the right thing and use her authority under current law to delay implementation in order to fix these abuses before moving forward in 100 areas nationwide on July 1.

Mr. Speaker, Administrator Tavenner has to know the clock is ticking, and if unchecked, the failure of this program will be on her watch.

TRIBUTE TO HONORABLE RUDOLPH ''RUDY'' CLAY

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a man and a friend of mine who spent most of his adult life being actively engaged in the processes of social advocacy and public policy decisionmaking, and who ultimately became the mayor of Gary, Indiana, and a national progressive political leader.

Rudy Clay was born in Alabama, and after the death of his mother was brought to Gary, Indiana, where he was raised by his two aunts, Ms. Lucy Hunter and Ms. Daisy Washington, who started him attending church, which he did for the rest of his life. He graduated from the Gary Roosevelt High School

and attended the University of Indiana at Bloomington, married his wife, Ms. Christine Swan, was drafted into the Army, served his time, was honorably discharged, went into the insurance business, worked for Prudential and State Farm insurance companies, and ultimately opened his own company, the Rudolph Clay Insurance Agency, of which he was greatly proud.

Rudy, like many people of his era, became actively involved in the civil rights movement of the sixties and seventies, which led him to electoral politics. He was elected to practically everything that one could be elected to in Lake County, Indiana, from precinct committeeman to mayor of Gary. In 1971, Rudy was elected to become the first African American State senator in the State of Indiana. In the Senate, he was the deciding vote that made it possible for an African American to be elected a Lake County commissioner. He was the first African American to be elected county recorder in the State of Indiana. He was county chairman of the Lake County Democratic Party. He served as a Lake County commissioner. He was the chairman of the Gary precinct committeemen's organization, and mayor of his beloved city. And he played a key role in the Obama victory in Indiana in 2008.

Rudy was a great family man, loved by his neighbors and friends, loved by the members of his church and all of those with whom he came into contact. He was loved by his associates in his lodge. The average person in Gary, Indiana, and any place around it knew Rudy Clay, and loved him for his great work.

I convey condolences to his wife, Mrs. Christine Clay; his son, Rudy, Jr.; his brothers and sisters and other members of his family. When one sums up his presence on Earth, they can simply say of Rudy: a job well done, a life well lived.

We salute you, Mayor Rudolph ''Rudy'' Clay. I thank you for being my friend. May your soul rest in peace.

VOCA: CRIMINALS PAY THE RENT IN THE COURTHOUSE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, every day throughout the United States, criminals commit crimes against good people. Some of those cases make the news. The news usually spends a lot of time talking about the defendant. There is a trial, justice occurs, and the world moves on.

But many times, unfortunately, in our culture, there is a victim in that crime. And the victim after the trial is just ignored in some cases. Some of those victims are sexual assault victims. Back in the day when I spent 30 years at the courthouse in Houston as a prosecutor and a judge, I saw a lot of them. In fact, I keep up with some of them today. The crime affects them a lot of ways. Some of them lose their jobs. Some of them are hurt physically and emotionally, and they don't have any money.

And this is not a new concept. Years ago under the Reagan administration, Congress recognized this problem, this issue about the fact that many victims, after the crime and after the trial, they just disappear into lives of quiet desperation, and culture and community doesn't keep up with those people. So during the Reagan administration, Congress decided here's what we're going to do: We're going to make criminals who are convicted in Federal court pay into a fund, and that fund is used to help crime victims. What a great concept—make criminals pay the rent on the courthouse. Make them literally pay for their crime by putting money into a fund that goes to crime victims. And that's the Victims of Crime Act that passed—VOCA as it is called.

And the Federal judges, God bless them, they are nailing those criminals. They are taking a lot of their money away from them and putting in about $2 billion a year into that fund. Today, we have a situation where the fund is over $11 billion, money criminals paid to help crime victims.

But here's the problem: that money isn't going to crime victims. Crime victims only get about $700 million a year out of that fund of $11 billion, with $2 billion coming in every year. And then the government gets an 8 percent cut, that makes it even less. And there's a cap, and government sets the cap on that money. Remember, this is not taxpayer money. It doesn't belong to anybody except to the victims of crime. That money is used and offset for other purposes. It goes to other programs in commerce, science and justice—probably good programs.

And now with sequestration, we hear that that fund may be completely cut off this year for crime victims because of some squirrelly math somebody's using saying sequestration should apply to the crime victims' fund. That's nonsense.

Meanwhile, throughout the country, victims organizations, shelters, groups like CASA, who represent kids in the courtroom when their parents are not doing the right thing by their kids, and many programs are barely keeping the lights on because they don't get enough money from VOCA even though money is available and it's just sitting there, or being offset for other programs.

□ 1030

So what needs to happen is this: one, raise the cap every year. Two billion dollars is coming in every year. We ought to at least allow the victims to have a billion of that, maybe $2 billion of it because it keeps coming in.

And more importantly, what we ought to do is take that money and put it in a lockbox concept. It's a very simple concept; that the criminals pay into the fund, and the funds should go only to crime victims and crime victims' programs. It shouldn't go to other programs in the Federal Government, even if they're good programs, because it was designed by Congress, approved by the administration, to go to those silent, quiet victims who are still, today, hurting because of crimes that are being committed against them. And it just seems nonsense to me.

We have the money available. It's not taxpayer money. We can help victims of crime get their lives back together, and it's not happening because somebody else wants crime victims' money. So let's put this in a lockbox.

Mr. COSTA from California and I have sponsored legislation to say, look, it's not the government's money. It's victims' money, and it ought to all be spent to help victims and victims' programs throughout the country, groups that are doing a great job to help rescue crime victims because of crimes that have occurred against them in the past.

That is justice. And, Mr. Speaker, justice is what we do in this country.

And that's just the way it is.

IMPROVING THE FARRM BILL

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the House is in the process this week of dealing with the most important bill that almost no one has paid any attention to. I'm talking about the FARRM Bill. It goes far beyond dealing with needs of rural and small town America.

It's going to involve, with all likelihood, given the way the past farm bills have exceeded their budget estimates, it's very likely to be over $1 trillion.

The FARRM Bill is actually getting better, slowly but surely, but it has a long way to go to get the most value out of this bill for America's farmers and ranchers, for the people who eat and for protection of the environment.

Mr. Speaker, this week I will be offering some amendments that I hope will be made in order that will try and coax more value out of this process. The first and foremost, based on legislation I've introduced, the Balancing Food, Farm, and Environment Act, would strengthen the environmental quality incentives program to have stricter payments, so we're not putting too much money into any one project, and would disallow spending for large factory farms, but provide additional support for farmers who want to transition to production techniques that use fewer pesticides or antibiotics and stretch those conservation dollars further.

I also have an amendment that would reform the Conservation Reserve Program to direct more money to conservation enhancement and continuous conservation reserve subprograms to

target the most environmentally sensitive areas and reenroll higher priority lands, providing more stability for farmers, better results for the taxpayers, and more flexibility at the State level.

Third, and perhaps most important, an amendment I'm cosponsoring, along with Mr. CHAFFETZ, would apply reasonable limits for means testing crop insurance. The crop insurance program needs greater scrutiny by Congress. It is an area where the Federal Government provides huge subsidies to insurance companies to sell and service the policies. It pays most of the indemnities when there are losses and generous subsidies to make the premiums cheaper for farmers.

Today, in The New York Times, there was an article that talks about the fraud and waste in the program that, really, we haven't zeroed in. There are clear areas of abuse that need more attention.

My friend Mr. MCGOVERN had an amendment that said before you slash nutrition, at least have the rate of fraud and abuse down to the same level as food stamps. I think that's a good proposal.

The amendment that I have introduced with Mr. CHAFFETZ, it would put a limit of $750,000, beyond which we would no longer subsidize the crop insurance for the large agribusinesses. It's not that they couldn't have crop insurance; it's just the taxpayer will not be on the hook.

It's important for us to start paying attention to the crop insurance program. As we, theoretically, get rid of direct payments, although we still are going to have direct payments for cotton, and I have an amendment on that as well, it's important to look at the overall structure of this program. We don't want to be in a situation where, actually, we're going to end up paying more for crop insurance than the cost of traditional commodity programs proposed by the House and the Senate, and that there are not incentives to be able to use it efficiently and to root out fraud and abuse.

I would strongly urge my colleagues to look at amendments like I have proposed, and others. Look at how the FARRM Bill, the most important environmental nutrition and economic development for small towns and rural America, can be done better.

It's past time to have a farm bill that is environmentally sound, that is cost effective and targets areas that need the help the most. This ought to be an area where we can follow through on the desire to get more value out of tax dollars while we help more people.

I look forward to the debate this week. I hope it is robust, and I do hope that we'll be able to debate the wide range of these issues that would make this FARRM Bill much better.

CUTS TO THE SNAP PROGRAM

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, this week, the House debates a FARRM Bill that eliminates SNAP benefits for 38,000 Minnesotans and nearly 2 million Americans.

Last week, I hosted a listening session with Congressman ELLISON on how this would impact our State. We heard from faith leaders, service providers, State and county officials, SNAP recipients, young and old.

Evelyn, a senior, told us she was terrified she'd lose her SNAP eligibility under the House bill, and I quote from her: ''Without the help from SNAP, I wouldn't be able to buy the healthy foods, fresh fruits and vegetables I need to keep my diabetes in check. Without SNAP,'' she said, ''I don't know what I would do.''

For millions of seniors like Evelyn, SNAP is a lifeline. It ensures that they don't have to choose between medicine or buying food. And for America's children, they should be able to attend school and be able to solidly concentrate on their studies because they had something to eat.

I urge my colleagues to reject this immoral cut and to remember the words of Patricia Lull, director of St. Paul Council of Churches: ''No more hungry neighbors.''

THE IMPENDING STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATE HIKE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) for 5 minutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about an issue I deeply care about, and that issue is the affordability and ability of students across America to get a college degree.

Mr. Speaker, as we face this impending student interest loan cliff on July 1, I want to share with you and with the American public a personal story.

I'm the youngest of 12. I have eight older sisters, three older brothers, and my mother and father made a commitment to each other that each and every one of us would get some sort of college degree or advanced degree.

My father passed when I was 2, and there were six of us left in our household that my mother had to raise on her own. I went to college, went to law school, and I watched in her eyes the fulfillment of that promise that she and my dad made to each and every one of us.

□ 1040

Now, not all of my siblings went to law school. One got a vocational degree cutting hair, who now works in Arizona. I have the law degree, and there's a whole mix in between.

As we deal with the issue of student loan interest, we need to make sure that we stand for the students and that we stand for the next generation, because a college degree and a higher educational pursuit will arm those young men and women for generations and empower them to control their own destiny in their own hands.

So I come today on my side of the aisle and say to my colleagues, thank you for joining us in passing a bill in the House that would avert the interest rate spike that will be coming up on July 1. I ask my colleagues to join me and to demand that the Senate take action.

As you see, Mr. Speaker, the Senate has failed to pass a piece of legislation in the Senate to avert this fiscal cliff to our students across America. To me, Mr. Speaker, that's just not right. That's just not fair. We need to do better. And what we need to do is to pass a reform out of this body and out of this Congress that takes the student out of this political theater that has become the student loan interest spike every year that we have to deal with.

The proposal in the House, to me, makes sense. It's a commonsense, market-based approach that will lower interest rates on 70 percent of the loans that students receive in going to college and advanced degrees.

I ask the Senate and I ask my colleagues to continue to join us to put pressure on the Senate to say enough is enough. We care about students. Let's address this issue so that they don't see that interest rate spike that is coming over the horizon and say to the White House, Sign this legislation once and for all that removes the students from the political debate that this issue has become.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as the House begins consideration of H.R. 1797, I rise in solidarity with the women of the world. I rise in outrage at yet another attempt to control our bodies and make choices for us instead of allowing women to make their own choice with their doctors and their families.

First of all, it's the woman's body, not yours. She alone bears the burden, the pain and joy that it brings. Please stop trying to regulate our reproductive organs. They belong to us.

To the men who feel so inclined to tell women what to do, I ask: Have you ever had a menstrual period? Have you ever felt unbearable pain in every bone of your body during childbirth? Will you be there for a mother when she needs prenatal care, formula, and diapers? Will you support Head Start programs? Will you focus on creating good public schools? Will you reform foster care and stop greasing the prison pipeline with unwanted children?

There are grandmothers living in trailer parks and public housing single-handedly raising millions of grandchildren. Where are you when Grandma is trying to feed Jerome, Shaquita,

Pedro, Heather, and John? The only time I see you is on the floor of the House trying to take away Grandma's Social Security and attacking her Medicare and food stamps. Grandma doesn't have a car, so she has no ID so she can vote you out of office.

For some reason, you care about a baby right until the minute it is born into the world, and then you disappear and desert the children you claim to protect and love. Shame on you. Stop the cradle-to-grave neglect and abuse. Stop the shenanigans and bring to the floor bills that will create jobs, jobs, jobs for the American people. And mind your own business and regulate your own body.

ALL-OF-THE-ABOVE ENERGY POLICY

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, it is great to come down on the floor to just take a few minutes to talk about energy policy in this country. Republicans on this side and many of my friends across the aisle, we do believe and speak about an all-of-the-above energy strategy. That means ''all of the above.''

First, and the Speaker would not be surprised that I would come down and talk about nuclear power and how that, in the whole line of the processing of the fuel to the electricity production, they are good-paying jobs. There are challenges we have to overcome, which is the high level of nuclear waste, the spent nuclear fuel, and the location for that, because that is a cost burden on the industry until we get that solved as we promised.

Another major important energy production for us is coal. I come from southern Illinois. There are a lot of coal mines there, and electricity is generated by coal. It is low-cost fuel, and it provides great jobs for our coal miners, and it also creates high-paying jobs in rural America for the power plants in remote locations.

The Governor of the State of Illinois just signed what they're claiming to be the most intense and precise fracking bill in the Nation, which will allow us to look for, locate, and recover, through the fracking process, we believe, crude oil to the extent of which we haven't seen since World War II, which also will ease our reliance on imported crude oil.

Also part of this debate is the renewal portfolio debate, and some of that would be wind and solar. But don't forget the agriculture input through the RFS, which would be biodiesel, whether that is by soybeans or by reformulated cooking oil or beef tallow, or the ethanol debate, whether that is a cellulosic, the future generation of ethanol production, or the corn-based ethanol production as it is.

It's a great time in the energy debate in this country because we're now at a point where we are demanding less and producing more, which would allow us then to at least stabilize and hopefully lower our prices while we then continue to become, now, an energy exporter.

We're in a hearing today in the Energy and Power Subcommittee to talk about exporting coal and exporting liquified natural gas. That will be revenue and jobs to this great country. For many of us, we haven't seen times like this in a long time, and it's up to us in the public policy arena to make sure that we don't mess it up by increasing regulatory demands and other hurdles which will inhibit the entrepreneurs and the risk-takers from taking advantage of this great opportunity.

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 47 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

Reverend Brad Hales, Reformation Lutheran Church, Culpeper, Virginia, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, maker of Heaven and Earth, I thank You and praise You for the blessing of this day. I thank You for our country. I thank You for the laws and government which You instituted for order and honor, and I thank you for our active military and veterans who have sacrificed over and over to make us free.

Father, as a Nation, as individuals, and as a government, we must repent and always come back to You for truth, wisdom, forgiveness, and hope. Let us follow Your words from the Prophet Joel: ''Return to the Lord Your God, for He is gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and abounding in steadfast love.''

I pray all these things in the powerful and the authority-filled name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Ms. BONAMICI led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND BRADLEY HALES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the distinguished majority leader, is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome Pastor Bradley Hales of the Reformation Lutheran Church of Culpeper, Virginia, to the House floor.

For the past 19 years, Pastor Hales has been focusing on the renewal and revitalization of churches for greater growth and involvement in their communities. As the leader of his church in Culpeper, he has overseen the expansion of a congregation that was once only several dozen members strong to over 240 today.

With a great passion and caring for our senior citizens, Pastor Hales was very influential in starting The Place, a gathering center within the church for seniors who wish to meet others and stay involved with their community.

Pastor Hales' civic engagement and enthusiasm for improving the lives of others is not limited to the house of worship. Pastor Hales also serves as a member of the Culpeper Human Services Board and teaches Civil War history at the Culpeper Christian School.

His energy and compassion have a positive effect on so many, the Culpeper Times named him Citizen of the Year in 2012.

Pastor Hales, I'd like to thank you for being with us here today and offering this morning's prayer. Your leadership and willingness to help others is an inspiration to us all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

REGULATIONS ON THE FREE MARKET FOR SUGAR

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

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about sugar. As conservatives, we have a duty to speak out against programs that use regulations to stifle the free market, protect special interests, and have outlived their purpose. There are few programs that better fit this than the current system of price supports, import restrictions, and production quotas that make up our sugar program.

Under this system, the government sets price supports, ensuring that producers have a guaranteed income, no matter what world prices are. Sugar imports are also kept to a minimum, preventing real competition.

But this is not the end of the meddling. Sugar producers have strict sales quotas. Any excess sugar gets bought by the government and then is sold to ethanol producers, usually at a loss to the taxpayer.

This means many things. It means consumers pay billions in higher sugar costs, thousands of jobs are lost in the food industry, and government continues to pick winners and losers in the marketplace.

This week, we will have a chance to vote on an amendment to the FARRM Bill that makes substantial reforms to the program and is estimated by the CBO to save taxpayers $73 million. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and free our sugar from government's heavy hand.

VOTE ''NO'' ON THE PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1797 because we have been here before. Not less than a year ago, this body took up a very similar measure, and it failed. I hope my colleagues will join me in rejecting this attempt.

We cannot ban abortions after 20 weeks, first, because it's unconstitutional, and, second, because we cannot know the individual situation of every woman.

What if a woman gets cancer during her pregnancy?

What if she gets pre-eclampsia, which could cause seizures and kidney damage?

What if a woman's fetus is diagnosed with a severe fetal abnormality, making it unable to survive pregnancy or delivery?

Women and their families are often faced with impossibly difficult decisions, but they are their decisions to make, not ours.

Please vote ''no'' on this thoughtless bill.

THOMASVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA—A 2013 ALL-AMERICA CITY

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

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the city of Thomasville, North Carolina, for being named a 2013 ''All-America City.''

Thomasville, built on a foundation of furniture manufacturing and textiles, was hit hard over the last 25 years by job losses and plant closings. Instead of folding during trying economic times, the city took the challenge head-on and rallied together, as a community, to rebuild and bounce back.

The leadership of the entire community, including Mayor Joe Bennett and Chamber of Commerce President Doug Croft, were instrumental in advancing new projects that made Thomasville stand out as an All-America City.

Initiatives such as Envision 2020, a 20-year development plan for the city; Children At Play, a program to redevelop the city's parks to reduce crime; and Project Divine Interruption, which helps homeless students in the city, are just a few examples of the city's resolve to succeed.

Through the fortitude of its citizens, Thomasville stands as a shining example of what can happen when an entire community collaborates for the betterment of its citizens.

I'm proud to represent Thomasville, North Carolina, and I congratulate them on truly practicing the values that make America great.

THE SEQUESTER AND NATURAL DISASTERS

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, because of climate change, we're facing stronger and more destructive storms and natural disasters than at any other time in American history. And at the same time, the sequester is slashing funding for the agencies that are critical to helping our communities protect, adapt, and rebuild.

NOAA will lose $271 million in funding this year, and that includes $50 million for the geostationary weather satellite program. That's the program that provides continuous monitoring for severe weather.

So less than a year after Hurricane Sandy, a month after the devastating tornadoes in Oklahoma, we're cutting the agency responsible for forecasting and monitoring severe weather.

But it's not just severe weather disasters on our shores that threaten American communities. My congressional district has seen debris from the 2011 Japanese tsunami wash up on our shores, and our regional economy is inextricably linked to the health of our oceans, which are jeopardized by climate change.

Our planet is warming. We're beginning to feel major impacts, and it will only get worse unless we act to protect our climate.

□ 1210

CELEBRATING THE WORK OF TENNESSEE'S FOURTH DISTRICT

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate and promote the work that is being done in Tennessee's Fourth District by Bridgestone North America, Motlow State Community College, members of the local manufacturing community, and local and State governments.

Our economy is hindered by a skills gap that hurts both the businesses that need well-trained workers and those workers looking to better themselves and their families.

Seeing this problem 5 years ago, Motlow Community College's president, Mary Lou Apple, set out to erase this skills gap. A mechatronics program was brought to Rutherford County which combined mechanical, electrical, and computerized curricula to allow local high school students the opportunity to gain high-demand skills in manufacturing, health care, and the financial industries.

I recently toured the Bridgestone North America facility to see how these students are graduating from high school not only with college credit and technical credentials, but, most importantly, real world experience.

I look forward to the great work this program and its students will continue to accomplish in the future, and certainly we need more like them.

STUDENT LOAN RATES

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, unless Congress takes action, student loan rates will double on July 1. This is unacceptable. Access to affordable education is one of the most important issues to young people today, yet many graduates find themselves tens of thousands of dollars in debt as they leave school and try to enter the workforce. In New York State, 60 percent of college students graduate with some debt, averaging $27,000.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to sign the discharge petition by Representative JOE COURTNEY, H.R. 1595, the Student Loan Relief Act, along with over 180 of my colleagues. This legislation would freeze the interest rate at its current 3.4 percent for the next 2 years.

It's time for Republican leadership to acknowledge the urgency of this legislation and bring it to the floor. All Americans deserve a fair shot at a good and affordable education.

STUDENT LOAN RATE HIKES

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from New York bringing up the issue of student loan rates. As he very well knows, the House has passed a bill to do this, and our problem is with the Senate and the President.

''Don't double my rate.'' Every day, students are tweeting those exact words to their Representatives. Like

these students, House Republicans see that July 1 is coming, and with it the automatic doubling of some Federal student loan interest rates.

House Republicans don't believe that that rate should double or that politicians should be in charge of setting them. Weeks ago, Republicans and a few Democrats in the House passed the Smarter Solutions for Students Act, which will not only keep student loan interest rates from doubling on July 1 but will also remove politics from the equation, as well.

But the House can't do it alone. The Senate must act, and the President must lead. Right now, both are failing. In fact, it appears President Obama has completely backed down from defending his original proposal which, like our House bill, offered a permanent solution to the problem. The President is letting the opportunity to build on common ground slip by. Concerned students should ask him why.

20-WEEK ABORTION BAN

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Today, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1797, legislation that would throw doctors in jail for providing constitutionally protected health care. Many of my colleagues talk about less government. Well, here's a place where I agree. This bill takes away the ability of women to make their own health care decisions and attempts to replace the informed judgment of doctors with the opinions of politicians.

Often, there are unexpected complications. Danielle Deaver's amniotic fluid ruptured at 22 weeks, leaving the pregnancy without adequate fluid to continue to develop. Jennifer Peterson was pregnant when she was diagnosed with invasive breast cancer. Danielle, Jennifer, and women like them should be able to face these difficult situations by consulting with their doctors. They should not have to worry about whether they're violating an unconstitutional law.

When abortion is made illegal, it does not go away; it becomes unsafe. Let's not play politics with women's health care. Let's focus on prevention and making sure that women have access to safe and legal abortions. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this unconstitutional bill.

HONORING AND CONGRATULATING U.S. MARINE CORPORAL ZACKERY WALLICK OF DUNDEE, OHIO

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

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Zackery Wallick of Dundee, Ohio, who is the recipient of the Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal with the V, the fifth-highest award for his service.

Zackery received this medal for putting himself in great danger in order to protect a fellow wounded marine in Afghanistan in August of 2010. He was serving as a first team leader of a regimental combat team when a grenade was thrown at him and a fellow marine by Taliban forces. Without hesitation, Zackery threw himself on the marine closest to the explosion, shielding him from the blast.

Thankfully, neither of the marines were injured. Zackery's display of heroism deserves the utmost respect, and I'm proud to honor him today. Zackery has been honorably discharged from the Marine Corps and is now considering attending college. He hopes to pursue a career in law enforcement as a parole officer.

PEPFAR 10-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I had the honor of joining Secretary Kerry and hundreds of advocates to mark the 10th anniversary of our global aids program known as PEPFAR. Ten years ago, when the AIDS pandemic was ravaging many African countries, Democrats, Republicans, and Independents put aside our differences and came together to create the largest, most effective foreign aid program to date.

I'm very humbled to have played a small role in the creation of PEPFAR and proud about the leadership of the Congressional Black Caucus and our chair at that time, Congresswoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON—even before the world knew about this initiative. And I'm so proud of the role my staff played over the years, including the late, beloved Michael Riggs, whose memory and leadership Secretary Kerry recognized this morning.

To quote from a 2002 letter to President Bush, the Congressional Black Caucus called for ''an expanded United States initiative'' to ''respond to the greatest plague in recorded history.'' The next month, in his State of the Union speech, President Bush boldly embraced our call to action.

Now, a decade later, PEPFAR's success isn't just measured in terms of dollars spent but in lives saved and communities transformed.

THE PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today we are going to move one step closer to banning late-term abortions by supporting H.R. 1797, called the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

Late-term abortion isn't rare. I was dismayed and disheartened to hear of the horrors from the Kermit Gosnell trial. Worse, this past month, in my home State of Texas, former employees of the abortionist Douglas Karpen alleged he killed babies born alive.

These acts are inexcusable, immoral and unjustifiable. It's time we got rid of this gruesome and barbaric procedure to prevent future cases like Gosnell's and Karpen's once and for all. The procedure is not only unethical but unessential. There's extensive evidence that unborn babies aborted in this manner are alive until the end of the procedure and fully experience the pain associated with the procedure.

We've got to do the right thing. We must ban late-term abortion. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1797 and protect the value of life, women and unborn babies.

SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the many mom-and-pop shops and small businesses across the country as we celebrate National Small Business Week. I know firsthand the difference that small businesses make in our communities. Almost 70 years ago, my grandmother purchased a little neighborhood store and proclaimed to my grandfather, ''We're in the grocery business now.''

Like most small business families, we took pride in what we did. We shared in the trials and triumphs of small business ownership. It was challenging, but it was rewarding. Our grocery store was our family taking a shot at the American Dream and sharing that success with others.

According to the U.S. Small Business Administration, more than half of Americans either own or work for a small business, and they create about two out of every three new jobs in the United States each year. Small businesses are the backbone of our communities—opening new storefronts, training American workers, and manufacturing and selling goods in our neighborhoods. This may be National Small Business Week, but our Nation wouldn't be what it is today without every day being a small business day.

□ 1220

HONORING THE HARDING FAMILY FOR THEIR MISSIONARY WORK

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great honor to pay respect to Bill Harding and his family, who have served for the last 60 years as missionaries in Ethiopia. In our increasingly self-serving society, their sacrifice on behalf of others is truly remarkable.

Bill Harding left Charlotte in 1954 with his pregnant wife and three boys under the age of 3 and moved to Ethiopia, where he trained pastors and worked with local churches. He loved the people of Ethiopia sacrificially, even enduring house arrest during the Communist revolution.

Since that time, one son, Bill IV, has managed 500 projects, bringing clean water to over 300 villages. Son David runs a separate nonprofit, also providing clean water to thirsty villagers. Son Joe works with American churches to provide desperately needed resources to a major youth development program in Ethiopia. Bill's grandson and granddaughter live in Africa, working for nonprofits and continuing the legacy.

Mr. Speaker, their ministry has impacted millions of people as they have honored the Lord with their lives. Thanks, Bill and your wonderful family, for all that you've done. God bless you.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of comprehensive immigration reform.

In the Bible, it couldn't be more clear:

> When the Son of Man returns in all his glory, escorted by the angels, then He will take His seat on the thrown of glory. All the nations will be assembled before Him, and He will separate the people one from another, like sheep from goats. On the right hand, He will place the sheep; on the left, the goats. And to those on His right, he will say: Come accept the inheritance that is yours, that has been prepared for you since the foundation of the world, for when I was hungry, you gave me food; when I was thirsty, you gave me drink; when I was a stranger, you made me welcome.

My fellow Members of this House, comprehensive immigration reform is not just the right thing to do; it is the righteous thing to do.

LEGACY OF SALLY RIDE

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago today, on June 18, 1983, Dr. Sally Ride became the first American woman in space aboard the space shuttle Challenger, the first of her two flights as a mission specialist.

This former astronaut, physicist, educator, and space advocate left behind a legacy of accomplishments when she died last year at the age of 61. Her legacy continues to inspire and motivate young women with an interest in science, technology, math, and engineering, while the company she founded advances those interests.

We acknowledge Dr. Ride's advocacy for young women in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and math, a precursor for the STEM programs we know are so important today.

As a strong proponent of STEM education and allied programs, I will continue to applaud Dr. Ride's effort to encourage interest in space, science, and the technical fields by blazing a path for other women to follow.

REJECT PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, America faces so many challenges today: How do we create more jobs? How do we boost economic growth? How do we support middle class families and small businesses, build things in America again, improve our schools, and invest in our infrastructure?

So is Congress considering any of these important matters today? No. In fact, here in the middle of June, the Republican-controlled Congress has not scheduled any legislation on any of those important matters. Instead, their priority today is H.R. 1797, where the all-male House Judiciary Committee and the House Republican leadership intends to interject themselves into the private medical decisions of women and their doctors. They discount the health of the woman. They run counter to what medical professionals, including the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, say is appropriate.

So I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 1797. Do not obliterate our constitutional right to privacy. Do not take such personal decisions out of the hands of women and their doctors. Reject this extreme bill.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

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

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, this week marks National Small Business Week.

America's small businesses are the engines of job creation. According to the Small Business Administration, small businesses employ almost half of all private sector employees. And depending on the year, small businesses can account for 80 percent of all new jobs created.

As a small business owner myself, I understand firsthand the challenges and hurdles business owners face on a day-to-day basis. As a Member of Congress, one of my top goals is to continue to push hard for commonsense policies that create the right kind of economic environment for small businesses to grow and hire more people—the exact policies the GOP-led House continues to advocate and advance.

This week, I am asking all small business owners in my district to complete an online survey about the economy and other issues impacting the small business sector by visiting my Web site, chriscollins.house.gov.

I want to salute small business owners as we take time this week to acknowledge your hard work and contributions.

ATTACK ON WOMEN'S REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS

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

Ms. TITUS. I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1797. This bill is not only a direct challenge to the Supreme Court ruling in Roe v. Wade, but it's a dangerous new attack on women's reproductive rights.

The proposed ban in this bill does not include an exception for the physical or emotional health of a woman; it fails to provide sufficient protections for victims of rape and incest; and it has a very narrow exception in cases when a woman's life is in danger.

H.R. 1797 would significantly reduce the safe, legal options that women have and would prevent doctors from providing the most medically appropriate care for their patients.

Republicans have repeatedly demonstrated a lack—a lack—of understanding about basic women's health care, and this bill is just one more example of their continuing attack on women's rights. It is a step backward for women's health and a distraction from the critical work we should be doing to pass legislation regarding immigration reform, strengthening our economy, and creating jobs.

I urge you to vote ''no'' on this unconstitutional legislation.

OPPOSITION TO THE PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

(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, my, my, my; talk about pain. There's lots of pain in our country—mothers and fathers are out of work, losing homes, bills piling up—but here we go again: another day in Congress being squandered as we fight once more about women having access to the medical care we need, free from the long, invasive arm of government. And again, there's a cruel unconstitutional twist. Under the newly minted H.R. 1797, a woman in desperate need of a physician must instead call the police.

Mr. Speaker, the American people know that there's a better way to protect life. Allow women to have access to the health care that we require to live full lives, and let's work together in a bipartisan manner to get people back to work in this country.

HONORING LARRY HELM

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise very proudly today to honor one of our Nation's heroes, a man named Larry Helm, who served honorably as a combat veteran in Vietnam, who now serves as commander of the Molokai Veterans Caring for Veterans Center, and who is very fondly known, to those of us who know him, as ''Uncle Larry.''

He is the epitome of a servant leader, who has been active all across the State of Hawaii fighting for his family, his friends, his neighbors, his community, for veterans and all those who've served in the armed services, taking him all the way to the U.S. Senate, testifying and fighting for benefits.

No matter the challenge, whether in combat in Vietnam, as a community leader, or now as he battles cancer, Uncle Larry has always stood for what is right. He has dedicated three decades of his life to opening a vet center to those veterans on Molokai to make sure that valuable resources are available to these veterans and their families who very often have access to none.

Uncle Larry, we love you, we honor you, and we stand with you in your righteous battles; and we will work to make your vision a reality.

□ 1230

PEPFAR's 10TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe that only 10 years ago, an HIV diagnosis was a death sentence for those living all over the world, but especially in Africa. It was downright disgraceful that even though lifesaving therapy existed, millions of people were dying of AIDS because treatment was unaffordable. There are few votes I have taken in the course of my career that have made as significant a positive impact on this world than the votes I have cast in favor of PEPFAR.

As of September 2012, the United States is supporting lifesaving antiretroviral treatment for more than 5.1 million people. More than 11 million pregnant women received HIV testing and counseling last year; and as a result of adequate treatment, this month the one-millionth baby will be born HIV-free, thanks to PEPFAR.

The fact an AIDS-free generation is on the horizon is a true testament to the willingness of President Bush, President Obama, and Congress to take on this immense challenge and do the hard work necessary to turn the tide against HIV/AIDS. We must continue to do that, Mr. Speaker.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILDREN PROTECTION ACT

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1797, which the House will consider later today. It is another in a long, long line of assaults on women's health; and it is blatantly unconstitutional.

Reproductive health, including abortion care, is a private medical decision between a woman and her health care provider—period. A woman's right to choose is a fundamental freedom, and there is no place for dark-suited politicians to impose their personal beliefs on a woman's private medical decisions.

H.R. 1797 doesn't even include an adequate life exception that takes a woman's health into account. It is patently unconstitutional and is completely inconsistent with the Supreme Court's decision in Roe v. Wade.

Mr. Speaker, once again it is clear that my Republican colleagues are unable or unwilling to put forth ideas to create jobs, strengthen the economy, or invest in America's future. Instead, here we go with another ideological battle. American women have one unified message for Republicans: stay out of our doctors' offices, stay out of our health care, and leave us alone.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

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

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 1797. This act is both dangerous and unconstitutional and violates the rights of women who are in need of an abortion. It is blatantly unconstitutional and in clear violation of more than 40 years of Supreme Court precedent that protect women's access to abortion prior to viability, that is, prior to 24 not 20 weeks. This precedent was first established in Roe v. Wade and affirmed in Planned Parenthood v. Casey.

Make no mistake, pregnancy due to violent and unfortunate circumstances such as rape and incest happens to thousands of women every year, not to mention medical complications that imperil the life of the mother. Women impacted by rape and incest must not be further victimized by this misguided legislation.

We must not allow our Nation's right to choose to be infringed upon by a minority of people in this Nation. We cannot let them bully the rest of the country into accepting their world view. That is why I will continue to support a woman's right to choose and stand in opposition to H.R. 1797, and I stand up for women's right to self-determination.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 18, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 18, 2013 at 9:48 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 330.

Appointment:

Health Information Technology Policy Committee.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

INTERNATIONAL CHILD SUPPORT RECOVERY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1896) to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to ensure that the United States can comply fully with the obligations of the Hague Convention of 23 November 2007 on the International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1896

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''International Child Support Recovery Improvement Act of 2013''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Except as otherwise expressly provided in this Act, wherever in this Act an amendment is expressed in terms of an amendment to a section or other provision, the amendment shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Social Security Act.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO ENSURE ACCESS TO CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES FOR INTERNATIONAL CHILD SUPPORT CASES.

(a) AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF HHS TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH MULTILATERAL CHILD SUPPORT CONVENTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 452 (42 U.S.C. 652) is amended—

(A) by redesignating the second subsection (l) (as added by section 7306 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005) as subsection (m); and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(n) The Secretary shall use the authorities otherwise provided by law to ensure the compliance of the United States with any multilateral child support convention to which the United States is a party.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 453(k)(3) (42 U.S.C. 653(k)(3)) is amended by striking ''452(l)'' and inserting ''452(m)''.

(b) ACCESS TO THE FEDERAL PARENT LOCATOR SERVICE.—Section 453(c) (42 U.S.C. 653(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (3);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) an entity designated as a Central Authority for child support enforcement in a foreign reciprocating country or a foreign treaty country for purposes specified in section 459A(c)(2).''.

(c) STATE OPTION TO REQUIRE INDIVIDUALS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES TO APPLY THROUGH THEIR COUNTRY'S APPROPRIATE CENTRAL AUTHORITY.—Section 454 (42 U.S.C. 654) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)(A)(ii), by inserting before the semicolon ''(except that, if the individual applying for the services resides in a foreign reciprocating country or foreign treaty country, the State may opt to require the individual to request the services through the Central Authority for child support enforcement in the foreign reciprocating country or the foreign treaty country, and if the individual resides in a foreign country that is not a foreign reciprocating country or a foreign treaty country, a State may accept or reject the application)''; and

(2) in paragraph (32)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting '', a foreign treaty country,'' after ''a foreign reciprocating country''; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''or foreign obligee'' and inserting '', foreign treaty country, or foreign individual''.

(d) AMENDMENTS TO INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS.—Section 459A (42 U.S.C. 659a) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following:

''(e) REFERENCES.—In this part:

''(1) FOREIGN RECIPROCATING COUNTRY.—The term 'foreign reciprocating country' means a foreign country (or political subdivision thereof) with respect to which the Secretary has made a declaration pursuant to subsection (a).

''(2) FOREIGN TREATY COUNTRY.—The term 'foreign treaty country' means a foreign country for which the 2007 Family Maintenance Convention is in force.

''(3) 2007 FAMILY MAINTENANCE CONVENTION.—The term '2007 Family Maintenance Convention' means the Hague Convention of 23 November 2007 on the International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance.'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''foreign countries that are the subject of a declaration under this section'' and inserting ''foreign reciprocating countries or foreign treaty countries''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''and foreign treaty countries'' after ''foreign reciprocating countries''; and

(3) in subsection (d), by striking ''the subject of a declaration pursuant to subsection (a)'' and inserting ''foreign reciprocating countries or foreign treaty countries''.

(e) COLLECTION OF PAST-DUE SUPPORT FROM FEDERAL TAX REFUNDS.—Section 464(a)(2)(A) (42 U.S.C. 664(a)(2)(A)) is amended by striking ''under section 454(4)(A)(ii)'' and inserting ''under paragraph (4)(A)(ii) or (32) of section 454''.

(f) STATE LAW REQUIREMENT CONCERNING THE UNIFORM INTERSTATE FAMILY SUPPORT ACT (UIFSA).—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 466(f) (42 U.S.C. 666(f)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''on and after January 1, 1998,'';

(B) by striking ''and as in effect on August 22, 1996,''; and

(C) by striking ''adopted as of such date'' and inserting ''adopted as of September 30, 2008''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 1738B of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (d), by striking ''individual contestant'' and inserting ''individual contestant or the parties have consented in a record or open court that the tribunal of the State may continue to exercise jurisdiction to modify its order,'';

(B) in subsection (e)(2)(A), by striking ''individual contestant'' and inserting ''individual contestant and the parties have not consented in a record or open court that the tribunal of the other State may continue to exercise jurisdiction to modify its order''; and

(C) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking '' 'child' means'' and inserting ''(1) The term 'child' means'';

(ii) by striking '' 'child's State' means'' and inserting ''(2) The term 'child's State' means'';

(iii) by striking '' 'child's home State' means'' and inserting ''(3) The term 'child's home State' means'';

(iv) by striking '' 'child support' means'' and inserting ''(4) The term 'child support' means'';

(v) by striking '' 'child support order' '' and inserting ''(5) The term 'child support order' '';

(vi) by striking '' 'contestant' means'' and inserting ''(6) The term 'contestant' means'';

(vii) by striking '' 'court' means'' and inserting ''(7) The term 'court' means'';

(viii) by striking '' 'modification' means'' and inserting ''(8) The term 'modification' means''; and

(ix) by striking '' 'State' means'' and inserting ''(9) The term 'State' means''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE; GRACE PERIOD FOR STATE LAW CHANGES.—

(A) PARAGRAPH (1).—(i) The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect with respect to a State no later than the effective date of laws enacted by the legislature of the State implementing such paragraph, but in no event later than the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(ii) For purposes of clause (i), in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session shall be deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

(B) PARAGRAPH (2).—(i) The amendments made by subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2) shall take effect on the date on which the Hague Convention of 23 November 2007 on the International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance enters into force for the United States.

(ii) The amendments made by subparagraph (C) of paragraph (2) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDIZATION FOR IMPROVED INTEROPERABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 452 (42 U.S.C. 652), as amended by section 2(a)(1) of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(o) DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDS FOR IMPROVED INTEROPERABILITY.—

''(1) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with an interagency work group established by the Office of Management and Budget and considering State government perspectives, by rule, designate data exchange standards to govern, under this part—

''(A) necessary categories of information that State agencies operating programs under State plans approved under this part are required under applicable law to electronically exchange with another State agency; and

''(B) Federal reporting and data exchange required under applicable law.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The data exchange standards required by paragraph (1) shall, to the extent practicable—

''(A) incorporate a widely accepted, nonproprietary, searchable, computer-readable format, such as the eXtensible Markup Language;

''(B) contain interoperable standards developed and maintained by intergovernmental partnerships, such as the National Information Exchange Model;

''(C) incorporate interoperable standards developed and maintained by Federal entities with authority over contracting and financial assistance;

''(D) be consistent with and implement applicable accounting principles;

''(E) be implemented in a manner that is cost-effective and improves program efficiency and effectiveness; and

''(F) be capable of being continually upgraded as necessary.

''(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require a change to existing data exchange standards found to be effective and efficient.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall issue a proposed rule within 24 months after the date of the enactment of this section. The rule shall identify federally-required data exchanges, include specification and timing of exchanges to be standardized, and address the factors used in determining whether and when to standardize data exchanges. It should also specify State implementation options and describe future milestones.

SEC. 4. EFFICIENT USE OF THE NATIONAL DIRECTORY OF NEW HIRES DATABASE FOR FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH ASSESSING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF FEDERAL POLICIES AND PROGRAMS IN ACHIEVING POSITIVE LABOR MARKET OUTCOMES.

Section 453 (42 U.S.C. 653) is amended—

(1) in subsection (i)(2)(A), by striking ''24'' and inserting ''48''; and

(2) in subsection (j), by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

''(5) RESEARCH.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, the Secretary may provide access to data in each component of the Federal Parent Locator Service maintained under this section and to information reported by employers pursuant to section 453A(b), for—

''(i) research undertaken by a State or Federal agency (including through grant or contract) for purposes found by the Secretary to be likely to contribute to achieving the purposes of part A or this part; or

''(ii) an evaluation or statistical analysis undertaken to assess the effectiveness of a Federal program in achieving positive labor market outcomes (including through grant or contract), by—

''(I) the Department of Health and Human Services;

''(II) the Social Security Administration;

''(III) the Department of Labor;

''(IV) the Department of Education;

''(V) the Department of Housing and Urban Development;

''(VI) the Department of Justice;

''(VII) the Department of Veterans Affairs;

''(VIII) the Bureau of the Census;

''(IX) the Department of Agriculture; or

''(X) the National Science Foundation.

''(B) PERSONAL IDENTIFIERS.—Data or information provided under this paragraph may include a personal identifier only if, in addition to meeting the requirements of subsections (l) and (m)—

''(i) the State or Federal agency conducting the research described in subparagraph (A)(i), or the Federal department or agency undertaking the evaluation or statistical analysis described in subparagraph (A)(ii), as applicable, enters into an agreement with the Secretary regarding the security and use of the data or information;

''(ii) the agreement includes such restrictions or conditions with respect to the use, safeguarding, disclosure, or redisclosure of the data or information (including by contractors or grantees) as the Secretary deems appropriate;

''(iii) the data or information is used exclusively for the purposes defined in the agreement; and

''(iv) the Secretary determines that the provision of data or information under this paragraph is the minimum amount needed to conduct the research, evaluation, or statistical analysis, as applicable, and will not interfere with the effective operation of the program under this part.

''(C) PENALTIES FOR UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE OF DATA.—Any individual who willfully discloses a personal identifier (such as a name or social security number) provided under this paragraph, in any manner to an entity not entitled to receive the data or information, shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.''.

SEC. 5. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleague from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) to urge support of H.R. 1896, the International Child Support Recovery Improvement Act of 2013.

This bill provides the implementing legislation for The Hague Convention on International Recovery of Child Support and other forms of family maintenance, ensuring that law enforcement authorities will be able to enforce child support orders even when a child or parent lives overseas.

Mr. Speaker, as a former sheriff in King County, which is in Seattle, Washington—for those in the Chamber who may not know, I worked there for 33 years—I had the opportunity of putting together a unit that was devoted to finding parents who weren't taking on their financial responsibility for their children and providing those financial needs.

What we learned was not only is it important for the parents to be a part of their child's life when they leave financially—to give them the health care benefits they need, the education that they might need, any other financial needs that the child might need—but it also provides a social benefit, a real benefit of involvement by that parent. Once that parent gets financially involved, that parent is intimately involved with that child's life.

Usually it is the father—sad to say just a couple of days after Father's Day. Ninety-five to 98 percent of the parents who leave and don't continue to support their child financially, it is usually the father.

When that father and that parent gets involved financially, they all of a sudden realize they've missed out on that child's life. They've missed soccer games, baseball games. They've missed their theatrical performances, their participation in every school support, and the rest of their lives.

This also reduces crime in my experience—again, going back as the sheriff—if these kids have both parents involved. It keeps them involved with the family and not in other activities that we would really prefer them not to be involved in.

Currently, States have the option to recognize child support orders from other countries—and many of them do. However, States have found that other countries are less cooperative in recognizing our orders.

The Hague Convention seeks to address this issue by establishing a standardized process so more countries cooperate in collecting child support. Negotiation of this treaty began in 2003, and it was signed eventually in 2007. The Senate acted on this in 2010. They gave their consent. The treaty provides many protections for our children, but States cannot take advantage of the benefits until Congress moves forward.

Enforcement of child support orders should not end at the water's edge. Children, regardless of where they or their parents live, should receive financial support from their parents.

□ 1240

The United States cannot ratify The Hague Convention until all States make the necessary changes, so the time to act is now.

This bill also includes a continuation of our subcommittee's bipartisan efforts to standardize and improve the exchange of data within human services programs. While the child support system already relies heavily on data exchanges, it is important for those exchange efforts to be consistent with the provisions we've recently enacted in the child welfare, TANF, and unemployment programs. The goal is simple: improve government efficiency, provide benefits to those who are eligible, and drive out waste, fraud, and abuse.

Finally, this bill expands researcher access to a database maintained by the Office of Child Support Enforcement. The National Directory of New Hires collects employment outcome information for individuals working in most jobs in the United States. Expanding access to earnings data in the Directory will improve our ability to determine whether Federal education, training, and social service programs help people find and keep their jobs.

According to the administration, most Federal agencies do not currently have reliable access to data that can show the impact of their programs on participants' employment or their earnings. In an era of tighter resources, it is crucial that we have reliable data to conduct rigorous evaluations to make sure that Federal programs are getting results.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD letters of support for this legislation from MDRC and the National Child Support Enforcement Association.

In addition, key parts of this legislation are supported by respected organizations like the Conference of State Court Administrators, the Conference of Chief Justices, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Labor, the Office of Management and Budget, and from the research community, Abt Associates, Mathematica Policy Research, RAND, Social Policy Research, and the Urban Institute.

I want to thank the subcommittee's ranking member, Mr. DOGGETT, who joins me on the floor today, and other members of the subcommittee for their support as original cosponsors.

I invite all Members to join us in supporting this important bipartisan legislation. It will move us a step closer to ratifying The Hague Convention on the International Recovery of Child Support and will ensure that more children living in the U.S. receive the financial support they deserve.

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

NATIONAL CHILD SUPPORT ENDANGERMENT ASSOCIATION,
May 3, 2013.

Hon. DAVID REICHERT, *Chairman*,
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT, *Ranking Member*,
Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN REICHERT AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT: The National Child Support Enforcement Association (NCSEA) supports the bipartisan International Child Support Recovery Improvement Act of 2013 (H.R.

1896) and urges the Committee to consider it as soon as possible.

NCSEA members helped craft the language in the 2007 Hague Convention Treaty on the International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance. The provisions in Section 2 of the bill provide the language necessary to implement it. The Treaty contains procedures for processing international child support cases that are uniform, simple, efficient, accessible, and cost-free to U.S. citizens seeking support in other countries. It is founded on the agreement of countries ratifying the Convention to recognize and enforce each other's support orders.

This bill will assist state and county child support staff who encounter challenging and time-consuming international cases. Presently, there are no agreed upon standards of proof, forms or methods of communication. As more parents cross international borders leaving children behind, international child support enforcement is more important than ever. Ratification of the Convention by the United States will mean that more children will receive financial support from their parents residing in countries that are also signatories to the Convention.

NCSEA has long sought congressional action on this issue, and welcomed last year's bipartisan action by the full House which adopted a nearly identical bill. This measure will help to ensure our nation's children receive the financial support to which they are entitled.

Thank you again for your leadership on this bill.

Sincerely,

COLLEEN DELANEY EUBANKS,
Executive Director.

MDRC,
New York, NY, June 11, 2013.

Hon. DAVID REICHERT,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN REICHERT AND DOGGETT, I am writing to congratulate you on advancing H.R. 1896, The International Child Support Recovery Improvement Act of 2013, to the House floor.

Last year, I was invited to testify before the Subcommittee on Human Resources regarding this bill. During my testimony, I pointed out that the bill includes an important technical provision that enables researchers to more easily access the National Directory of New Hires (NDNH) database, which contains earnings and employment data collected by states from employers. Removing this barrier in the law will result in more accurate, cost-effective assessments of the employment effects of federal programs.

Independent research firms like MDRC are contracted by the government to evaluate the extent to which federal programs work; in many cases, a key measure of effectiveness is the programs' long-term impact on participants' employment and earnings. The NDNH database, maintained by the federal Office of Child Support Enforcement, houses employment and earnings data reported by the states for child support enforcement purposes. However, research contractors are generally unable to access this essential database. Instead they are forced to get the very same data directly from the states, at great cost to the federal government and at considerable burden in duplicative reporting for the states.

In this time of severe budget constraints, Congress must have credible, nonpartisan information to understand whether federally supported programs actually help people find work and increase their earnings. The technical provision in this bill would ensure the availability of data necessary for researchers to examine the effectiveness of these programs.

This provision expands researchers' access to NDNH data and also maintains strong privacy protections. Since personally identifiable information is contained in the NDNH database, the provision requires research firms to continue to uphold strict rules governing the data's confidentiality and provides severe penalties for unauthorized disclosure of this data.

Thank you for recognizing the importance of giving researchers greater access to NDNH data. Attached is my testimony from last year for further reference.

Sincerely,

GORDON L. BERLIN.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,T
Washington, DC, May 24, 2013.

Discharge Statement.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, Office of the Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am writing to request that the Committee on the Budget be discharged from the consideration of H.R. 1896, the International Child Support Recovery Improvement Act of 2013. The bill was referred respectively to the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget.

The bill contains provisions that fall within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget. In order to expedite the passage of this Act, the Committee requests that it be discharged from consideration of the bill, but continue to receive referrals in the future pertaining to legislation that falls within its purview. The Committee on the Budget does not intend to mark up this bill.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2013.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1896, the ''International Child Support Recovery Improvement Act of 2013,'' which the Committee on Ways and Means anticipates may soon receive consideration by the full House.

As introduced, H.R. 1896 contained two provisions (sections 2 and 4) that formed the basis of an additional referral of the bill to your committee. I am most appreciative of your decision to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of H.R. 1896 so that it may proceed to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you are waiving formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on the Judiciary is by no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in those provisions of the bill, including sections 2 and 4 of the bill, which fall within your Rule X jurisdiction. In addition, if a conference is necessary on this legislation, I will support any request that your committee be represented therein.

Finally, I will be pleased to include this letter and your letter dated June 10, 2013 in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 1896.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, June 10, 2013.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP, I write regarding H.R. 1896, the ''International Child Support Recovery Improvement Act of 2013,'' on which the Committee on the Judiciary received a referral. I understand that the bill may soon proceed to consideration by the full House. As a result of your having consulted with the Judiciary Committee concerning provisions of the bill that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of the bill so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1896 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. Our committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1896, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

CBO ON THE INTERNATIONAL CHILD SUPPORT RECOVERY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2013 (H.R. 1896)

The Congressional Budget Office has reviewed H.R. 1896, the International Child Support Recovery Improvement Act of 2013. According to a preliminary estimate of the introduced legislation with amendment, the bill has insignificant direct savings each year and slightly significant savings (approximately $500,000) over 10 years.

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

I am pleased to join the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) in support of the International Child Support Recovery Improvement Act.

We tried to do this just about a year ago. In the last Congress, I coauthored very similar legislation that was bipartisan here on the floor. Though we acted here, the Senate was slow to act, and we are hopeful that now, with the leadership of Chairman REICHERT and, again, with broad bipartisan support, we can get this measure passed not only here in the House but see prompt action in the Senate.

International borders should never be barriers to children receiving the financial support that their parents are obligated to provide nor should a parent be able to shirk his responsibility to his child by just leaving America, but the complexity and difficulty in enforcing child support obligations when a child and the noncustodial parent live in one country and when the other parent lives in another sometimes lets a parent off the hook.

The bill before us today would reduce many of the challenges in collecting child support across international borders by fully implementing The Hague Convention on the International Recovery of Child Support. The Senate adopted that Hague Convention as a treaty in 2010, and this legislation will bring us into full compliance and will encourage the State child support agencies to have uniform methods for processing international child support orders.

Here in the United States, many of our State child support agencies already recognize and enforce foreign child support obligations. Whether or not the United States has a reciprocal agreement, this just ensures that all 50 States do. Many foreign nations are not enforcing a U.S. child support order in the absence of a treaty or other agreement. While our Nation does have reciprocal child support agreements with some countries, it does not have arrangements with many of those around the globe, hence the need for this single treaty that establishes a uniform, efficient, and accessible procedure for processing international child support cases.

Some desperate families are today asking for help through the Federal Office of Child Support Enforcement, and that office is not able to provide the help. We have an estimated 160,000 international child support cases that currently involve children or parents here in the United States, and with the very nature of our global economy—with more goods and services and people moving across national boundaries—this number is likely to only grow.

As with other effective child support measures, it's taxpayers who benefit by not being saddled with the costs of supporting children when a parent should be doing that. The Congressional Budget Office concludes that this bill would result in some modest debt savings to the child support program.

In addition to improving the international collection of child support, the legislation includes a provision that is new, under Mr. REICHERT's leadership, concerning data standardization within the child support enforcement system. We've worked diligently to incorporate the same requirement into other human resources programs to improve the ability to share data—a step that will make them more efficient, less susceptible to fraud, and better able to reach those who really need assistance.

Finally, this measure would also allow certain researchers access to wage information in a child support database, known as the National Directory of New Hires, in order to determine the effectiveness of employment-related programs.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is truly bipartisan, and it doesn't cost taxpayers money. In fact, it will save taxpayers money. Most importantly, it will help more children get the financial help that they deserve. The House passed nearly identical legislation last year at about this time. After we pass the bill today, I urge my Senate colleagues to act promptly to ensure that leaving the country doesn't mean leaving your child support obligation behind.

I thank the gentleman from Washington for his leadership, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I think it's very clear that this is a very bipartisan piece of legislation which is really focused on strengthening the family, protecting children, and, for parents who have left their homes, reengaging them with their families, getting them involved in their children's activities and providing for them financially.

One statistic that I recall when I first became sheriff in 1997 is that we began this program at the State level. Since 72 percent of juvenile males were without fathers, 72 percent of those committed homicide. It's just a stark figure, a stark statistic, that really highlights the need for parents to be involved in their children's lives.

So, Mr. Speaker, once again, I wholeheartedly, of course, endorse this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1896.

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. REICHERT. 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.

□ 1250

ADDITION OF VACCINES AGAINST SEASONAL INFLUENZA TO LIST OF TAXABLE VACCINES

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 475) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include vaccines against seasonal influenza within the definition of taxable vaccines.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 475

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

SECTION 1. ADDITION OF VACCINES AGAINST SEASONAL INFLUENZA TO LIST OF TAXABLE VACCINES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (N) of section 4132(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting ''or any other vaccine against seasonal influenza'' before the period.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) SALES, ETC.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to sales and uses on or after the later of—

(A) the first day of the first month which begins more than 4 weeks after the date of the enactment of this Act, or

(B) the date on which the Secretary of Health and Human Services lists any vaccine against seasonal influenza (other than any vaccine against seasonal influenza listed by the Secretary prior to the date of the enactment of this Act) for purposes of compensation for any vaccine-related injury or death through the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund.

(2) DELIVERIES.—For purposes of paragraph (1) and section 4131 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of sales on or before the effective date described in such paragraph for which delivery is made after such date, the delivery date shall be considered the sale date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GERLACH) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GERLACH. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise to urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation that my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) and I believe will help make the upcoming flu season less miserable for millions of Americans and avoid expensive hospital stays for those suffering with the flu.

Last December, in the midst of a flu season in which the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reported more than 12,000 people hospitalized with flu complications and 149 deaths among children under the age of 18, the Food and Drug Administration approved a new vaccine developed to fight the four-strain flu virus. But despite this development, it is imperative that we pass this legislation if we want to guarantee the most up-to-date four-strain flu vaccine is available to patients who need it.

That's because under the current law, the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program—a no-fault system for compensating injuries or death caused by vaccines—covers flu vaccines that only protect against three viral strains.

This bill would add vaccines that protect against four viral strains to the program and ensure that the most up-to-date and effective flu vaccines are available in time for the start of the flu season this fall. Without the liability protections of the compensation program, civil litigation from the use of this vaccine could explode and disincentivize vaccine producers from making this new medicine available.

The Vaccine Injury Compensation Program was created in 1986 because at

the time fears of frivolous lawsuits that could wipe out businesses and bankrupt health care providers were causing vaccine manufacturers to leave the market, thereby leaving the general public without access to the best medicines available. So getting this new vaccine on the program list is essential.

One other note: it's important to understand that this bill is not, as some media have inaccurately reported, a ''flu tax.'' This legislation does not create any new taxes. The bill before us does not raise tax rates. And there's absolutely no evidence that flu shots will cost one penny more if this bipartisan bill becomes law.

In fact, the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation analyzed the legislation and concluded there would be no new taxes or windfall to the Federal Government. That's because under the current law, 75 cents goes into the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program every time someone gets a flu shot or any number of other vaccines used to protect the public against all kinds of diseases.

The truth is that every one of the estimated 135 million Americans who received a flu shot during this past flu season paid 75 cents into the fund, and that 75 cents charged today would also apply to this new vaccine. If you think 75 cents is an exorbitant amount to pay, consider that in my home State of Pennsylvania the average cost of a hospital stay ranges from $649 per day to $1,921 per day, according to the Kaiser Family Foundation. Without this legislation, taxpayers would be picking up the tab for flu-related hospitalizations for seniors and others enrolled in Medicaid and Medicare.

The only way the Federal Government will collect more money next flu season is if a greater number of people voluntarily get flu shots. And most medical professionals will tell you getting a flu shot improves public health and lowers the risk of racking up expensive medical bills, especially for children and seniors.

Vanderbilt University Medical Center, in collaboration with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, found that flu vaccine reduced the risk of flu-related hospitalization by 71.4 percent among adults of all ages and by 76.8 percent in study participants 50 years of age or older during the 2011–2012 flu season.

In closing, I would ask my colleagues to support this legislation so that our doctors and hospitals can offer the public the very best and latest protection against constantly evolving strains of the flu virus this fall.

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

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

I rise in support of H.R. 475, a bill to update the excise tax on vaccines against seasonal influenza.

Year after year, the flu poses a threat to millions of Americans, causing between 24,000 and 49,000 deaths and 226,000 hospitalizations each year. In fact, my home State of Massachusetts had over 28,000 confirmed cases of flu this past season. The flu is particularly life-threatening for our Nation's most vulnerable, the elderly and children. During the most recent flu season, there were 150 pediatric deaths across the Nation, and it is estimated that 90 percent of those children were not vaccinated.

America must prepare for the next flu season. Public health and medical professionals, hospitals and vaccine manufacturers are moving quickly to prepare for the upcoming season by manufacturing new vaccines and educating the public about the importance of preventing the flu. One critical step in this preparation is to make certain that the newest and most effective flu vaccine will be available to the public.

To do that, I introduced this legislation that we're acting upon today with my friend, Congressman GERLACH, to update our law to ensure access to new flu vaccines.

The National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program was established in 1986 to ensure an adequate supply of vaccines, stabilize vaccine costs, and establish and maintain an accessible and efficient forum for individuals found to be injured by certain vaccines to be compensated. These awards are funded by a 75 cent per dose excise tax on vaccines that are widely used and recommended by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for routine administration to children.

The program requires congressional action from time to time because unless the excise tax is assessed on a particular vaccine, it is not covered by the program, and therefore, those injured can't be compensated under the program.

Currently, the excise tax on seasonal influenza vaccine applies only to three-strain vaccines and excludes any non-three-strain vaccines. But for the flu season, three new advanced influenza vaccines will be available. These vaccines will provide broader protection against the flu because they can combat more strains of the virus. Therefore, we must amend the excise tax law to include the advanced flu vaccine.

To ensure access to the new vaccine, our bill would apply the excise tax to all vaccines against seasonal influenza just as it has in the past.

It is very important to note this will not increase the tax or change the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program. Let me repeat. It is very important to note that this will not increase the tax or change the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program.

It's also important to note that this legislation does not affect in any way the FDA approval process. Vaccines for children, adolescents, and adults are approved and recommended through a rigorous, multiyear process. Vaccines must be approved by the FDA and then must also be evaluated and formally recommended by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention before they are administered by health care providers or covered by health insurance programs.

Before concluding, I'd like to note that this legislation has broad support, including AARP, Every Child by Two, Families Fighting Flu, Immunization Action Coalition, Infectious Diseases Society of America, and MassBio.

Our legislation brings the excise tax into alignment with the most recent developments in medicine. The quick enactment of H.R. 475 is critical to making the newest seasonal flu vaccines available for the 2013–2014 season.

I urge the House to pass this legislation as quickly as possible, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 475 is a great bipartisan, bicameral bill that will help protect our Nation's children and seniors from flu.

I want to thank my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) for his cooperation and work on this legislation. I also would like to thank Dave Olander and the Ways and Means staff, Anne Dutton, my chief of staff, and especially Lori Prater, my Ways and Means counsel for their great work on this legislation. I also thank Senator HATCH and Senator BAUCUS on the Senate side for their work in moving this legislation in that Chamber.

□ 1300

With the 2013 flu season on the horizon, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 475 to ensure that the public has access to the newest four-strain flu vaccine.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GERLACH, and thanks to our very capable staffers for having assembled parts of the argument here, and point out that in the Senate, this was done by unanimous consent. That's an important consideration.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GERLACH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 475.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONCERNING THE PARTICIPATION OF TAIWAN IN THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1151) to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan at the triennial International Civil Aviation Organization Assembly, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1151

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

SECTION 1. CONCERNING THE PARTICIPATION OF TAIWAN IN THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Safe, secure, and economical international air navigation and transport is important to every citizen of the world, and safe skies are ensured through uniform aviation standards, harmonization of security protocols, and expeditious dissemination of information regarding new regulations and other relevant matters.

(2) Direct and unobstructed participation in international civil aviation forums and programs is beneficial for all nations and their civil aviation authorities. Civil aviation is vital to all due to the international transit and commerce it makes possible, but must also be closely regulated due to the possible use of aircraft as weapons of mass destruction or to transport biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons or other dangerous materials.

(3) The Convention on International Civil Aviation, signed in Chicago, Illinois, on December 7, 1944, and entered into force April 4, 1947, established the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), stating ''The aims and objectives of the Organization are to develop the principles and techniques of international air navigation and to foster the planning and development of international air transport so as to . . . meet the needs of the peoples of the world for safe, regular, efficient and economical air transport.''.

(4) The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, demonstrated that the global civil aviation network is subject to vulnerabilities that can be exploited in one country to harm another. The ability of civil aviation authorities to coordinate, preempt and act swiftly and in unison is an essential element of crisis prevention and response.

(5) Following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the ICAO convened a high-level Ministerial Conference on Aviation Security that endorsed a global strategy for strengthening aviation security worldwide and issued a public declaration that ''a uniform approach in a global system is essential to ensure aviation security throughout the world and that deficiencies in any part of the system constitute a threat to the entire global system,'' and that there should be a commitment to ''foster international cooperation in the field of aviation security and harmonize the implementation of security measures''.

(6) The Taipei Flight Information Region, under the jurisdiction of Taiwan, covers 180,000 square nautical miles of airspace and provides air traffic control services to over 1.2 million flights annually, with the Taiwan Taoyuan International Airport recognized as the 10th and 19th largest airport by international cargo volume and number of international passengers, respectively in 2011.

(7) Despite the established international consensus regarding a uniform approach to aviation security that fosters international cooperation, exclusion from the ICAO since 1971 has impeded the efforts of the Government of Taiwan to maintain civil aviation practices that comport with evolving international standards, due to its inability to contact the ICAO for up-to-date information on aviation standards and norms, secure amendments to the organization's regulations in a timely manner, obtain sufficient and timely information needed to prepare for the implementation of new systems and procedures set forth by the ICAO, receive technical assistance in implementing new regulations, and participate in technical and academic seminars hosted by the ICAO.

(8) On October 8, 2010, the Department of State praised the 37th ICAO Assembly on its adoption of a Declaration on Aviation Security, but noted that ''because every airport offers a potential entry point into this global system, every nation faces the threat from gaps in aviation security throughout the world—and all nations must share the responsibility for securing that system''.

(9) On October 2, 2012, Taiwan became the 37th participant to join the United States Visa Waiver program, which is expected to stimulate tourism and commerce that will rely increasingly on international commercial aviation.

(10) The Government of Taiwan's exclusion from the ICAO constitutes a serious gap in global standards that should be addressed at the earliest opportunity in advance of the 38th ICAO Assembly in September 2013.

(11) The Federal Aviation Administration and its counterpart agencies in Taiwan have enjoyed close collaboration on a wide range of issues related to innovation and technology, civil engineering, safety and security, and navigation.

(12) The ICAO has allowed a wide range of observers to participate in the activities of the organization.

(13) The United States, in the 1994 Taiwan Policy Review, declared its intention to support Taiwan's participation in appropriate international organizations and has consistently reiterated that support.

(14) Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, agreed to on September 11, 2012, affirmed the sense of Congress that—

(A) meaningful participation by the Government of Taiwan as an observer in the meetings and activities of the ICAO will contribute both to the fulfillment of the ICAO's overarching mission and to the success of a global strategy to address aviation security threats based on effective international cooperation; and

(B) the United States Government should take a leading role in garnering international support for the granting of observer status to Taiwan in the ICAO.

(15) Following the enactment of Public Law 108–235, a law authorizing the Secretary of State to initiate and implement a plan to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan at the annual summit of the World Health Assembly and subsequent advocacy by the United States, Taiwan was granted observer status to the World Health Assembly for four consecutive years since 2009. Both prior to and in its capacity as an observer, Taiwan has contributed significantly to the international community's collective efforts in pandemic control, monitoring, early warning, and other related matters.

(16) ICAO rules and existing practices allow for the meaningful participation of non-contracting countries as well as other bodies in its meetings and activities through granting of observer status.

(b) TAIWAN'S PARTICIPATION AT ICAO.—The Secretary of State shall—

(1) develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan at the triennial ICAO Assembly—next held in September 2013 in Montreal, Canada—and other related meetings, activities, and mechanisms thereafter; and

(2) instruct the United States Mission to the ICAO to officially request observer status for Taiwan at the triennial ICAO Assembly and other related meetings, activities, and mechanisms thereafter and to actively urge ICAO member states to support such observer status and participation for Taiwan.

(c) REPORT CONCERNING OBSERVER STATUS FOR TAIWAN AT THE ICAO ASSEMBLY.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to Congress a report, in unclassified form, describing the United States strategy to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan at the triennial ICAO Assembly and at subsequent ICAO Assemblies and at other related meetings, activities, and mechanisms thereafter. The report shall include the following:

(1) A description of the efforts the Secretary of State has made to encourage ICAO member states to promote Taiwan's bid to obtain observer status.

(2) The steps the Secretary of State will take to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan in ICAO and at other related meetings, activities, and mechanisms thereafter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of bipartisan legislation that I authored to help secure observer status for Taiwan at the International Civil Aviation Organization. This legislation requires the Secretary of State to develop and execute a strategy to ensure that Taiwan has a seat at the table for ICAO's upcoming September plenary meeting.

It has been over 40 years since Taiwan was last a member of ICAO. Indeed, a lot has changed in those 40 years. As it stands now, all communications between Taiwan and the U.S. on aviation safety must be channeled through the American Institute in Taiwan, which is our Nation's de facto embassy in Taiwan. The fact that Taiwan can't speak directly to the Federal Aviation Administration without this added layer of bureaucracy makes no sense. After all, we are talking about air safety information that is otherwise readily available to all of ICAO's members.

Taiwan's entry into the U.S. Visa Waiver Program last year has dramatically increased both the frequency of flights between our airports and the real number of travelers coming here to the United States. For my home State of California, the increase in visitors from Taiwan has resulted in a significant boost for the local economy, especially for the travel industry, the leisure industry, for restaurants,

for example, and shops. I'm proud to have worked on Taiwan's entry into the Visa Waiver Program because I know that, as a result of this agreement, Taiwanese Americans in Southern California have a much easier time staying connected to their families.

Mr. Speaker, as the number of visitors from Taiwan has grown exponentially, there is an urgent need to ensure that Taiwan has real-time access to air safety information. Strengthening air safety benefits American citizens as much as it does the Taiwanese. Every year, tens of thousands of Americans fly through Taiwan's air space, which must be as safe as it can be, and this bill will certainly help.

Just as Taiwan was allowed to join the World Health Organization as a result of the SARS outbreak, so, too, should Taiwan be afforded the opportunity to observe the proceedings of the ICAO. We all share the responsibility to ensure that international air travel is safe. Taiwan's unique political status has thus far hindered its inclusion in ICAO. With this piece of legislation, we're sending a clear message that air safety is a priority and not a geopolitical issue.

Earlier this year, my good friend Eliot Engel of New York and I traveled to Taiwan to see firsthand the immense progress that the people of Taiwan have made over such a short period of time. Taiwan is indeed a beacon of freedom in the Asia-Pacific region. We share many values with Taiwan, including an unwavering commitment to democracy, to human rights, to free markets, and to the rule of law. Helping Taiwan gain entry as an observer into the ICAO is the right thing to do, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation.

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

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

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1151. I would certainly like to thank personally the chief sponsor of this proposed bill, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), for his leadership on this issue, and also our senior ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), for his support as well. And I am happy to say that I'm a proud cosponsor of this bill as well.

This legislation directs the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to gain observer status for Taiwan at the triennial assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO). Taiwan has made significant progress in its economic and political development. Today, Taiwan is a leading trade partner of the United States and stands as a beacon of democracy throughout Asia. However, Taiwan has been shut out of participating in international organizations like ICAO.

Founded in 1947, ICAO's main goal is to ensure safe and efficient air transportation around the globe. Taiwan deserves to be brought into the ICAO as an observer. It has jurisdiction over an airspace of approximately 180,000 square nautical miles and provides air traffic control services to more than 1.2 million flights a year. In my recent visit to Taiwan as well, it was interesting to learn that there are approximately 600 weekly flights in existence between China and Taiwan alone. Taiwan's international airport is the world's 19th largest in terms of passenger volume, and the number of travelers between Taiwan and the United States is likely to increase with Taiwan's entry into the Visa Waiver Program last year, as mentioned earlier by my distinguished chairman, Mr. ROYCE.

Taiwan's exclusion from ICAO has impeded Taiwan's efforts to maintain civil aviation practices that keep up with rapidly evolving international standards. It is unable to even contact ICAO for up-to-date information on aviation standards and norms. Nor can it receive ICAO's technical assistance in implementing new regulations or participate in ICAO technical and academic seminars.

Taiwan has made every effort to comply with ICAO's standards, but their continued exclusion not only hurts Taiwan, but it puts the rest of us in the entire world at risk, especially when you're talking about safety and hazardous conditions when it deals with air travel. With such a heavy volume of flights, Taiwan's exclusion has prevented ICAO from developing a truly global strategy to address security threats based on effective international cooperation.

ICAO's own rules and practices allow for the meaningful participation of noncontracting countries as well as other organizations in its meetings and activities through the granting of observer status.

The United States, in a review of Taiwan policy conducted in 1994, declared its intention to support Taiwan's participation in appropriate international organizations and has consistently reiterated that support.

Mr. Speaker, with this bill today, Congress is calling on the United States Government to take a leading role at ICAO to assist Taiwan in gaining observer status, and we look forward to working with our administration officials to track the development of these efforts.

Again, I thank the gentleman from California for his leadership on this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1310

Mr. ROYCE. I thank the gentleman from American Samoa, and I'd like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), chairman emeritus of the Foreign Affairs Committee and chairman of the Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa. She is also a cosponsor of this measure.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of our committee for introducing this excellent piece of legislation and for his leadership in our committee.

I am very pleased to speak in favor of this legislation which assists Taiwan, one of our most valued allies, in obtaining observer status at the ICAO, or the International Civil Aviation Organization.

Taiwan is a major hub for international air travel; and, particularly, it serves as the link between Northeast and Southeast Asia and to Europe and the United States. And now that Taiwan has joined the Visa Waiver Program, travel between our two nations will undoubtedly increase.

Almost 1.3 million flights pass over the region each year; but due to the ill advised appeasement of China at the United Nations, Taiwan must receive its international aviation safety and security information secondhand.

Taiwan's exclusion from international organizations like ICAO is a short-sighted and dangerous practice. It ends up hurting the international community as much as it does the Taiwanese people themselves.

Preventing a significant player in aviation like Taiwan from participating in ICAO threatens the entire international community which depends on the application of universal aviation standards.

Unfortunately, attempts to placate China at the feeble United Nations are nothing new and are a reminder that that organization lacks seriousness. China's threat that foreign interference will hurt negotiations with Taiwan to allow its participation in ICAO should be ignored by the U.N.

The U.N. must do what is right for the entire international community, and I urge the organization to put aside its petty politics and work on behalf of the safety of all of the world's citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the Taiwan Relations Act continues to be the cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy with our democratic ally, Taiwan; and we must always keep it as the guiding beacon. The next meeting of ICAO is this September, and I expect to see our State Department have a strategy that they will implement to make sure that Taiwan will be at the table this fall.

The friendship between the people of the United States and Taiwan has cemented into one of our most cherished partnerships, and I look forward to the United States Government demonstrating its continued commitment to the people of Taiwan with the passage of this most excellent bill.

I thank the chairman for the time, and I thank him for his leadership on Taiwan through the years.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself and certainly commend the gentlelady from

Florida for her most eloquent statement and historical outline of what has happened in terms of our special relationship with the people and the leaders of Taiwan. And she could not have said it better.

You know the old saying, If you're not at the table, you're going to be on the menu. I think Taiwan has been on the menu for too long. They need to be at the table and especially playing such a strong and important economic role as a democracy in Asia and as a beacon of light to all the people of Asia as to what it means to live under democratic conditions.

With that, Mr. Speaker, again I thank my good friend, the chairman, for his leadership in bringing this bill. I have no further speakers, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, it has been over 40 years since Taiwan last had a seat at the International Civil Aviation Organization. The volume of air traffic in and out of Taiwan's airports back then cannot be compared with that incredible volume of traffic, millions of planes a year, that come in and out of modern-day Taiwan.

Under the Visa Waiver Program, airlines have added even more flights in order to take advantage of greater demand for tourists and business travel from Taiwan into the United States. This number is only going to grow as more and more Taiwanese take advantage of the Visa Waiver Program.

It is time that we readmit Taiwan into ICAO so that everyone who boards a plane can have the utmost confidence about the safety of their trip. Aviation technology has progressed by leaps and bounds, and the idea that Taiwan cannot directly communicate with the United States or any other nation engaging in issues regarding air safety is not in anyone's interest. That's not in the interest of any nation.

I urge my colleagues to join in supporting H.R. 1151. Taiwan is one of America's closest friends in the world. We share so much in common, including a steadfast dedication to democracy and the rule of law and human rights; and it is time that we fixed this problem.

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1151, a resolution in support of one of our nation's closest friends in the Asia-Pacific Region, Taiwan.

This resolution directs the State Department to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan at the upcoming International Civil Aviation Organization Assembly.

The United States, in the 1994 Taiwan Policy Review, declared its intention to support Taiwan's participation in appropriate international organizations and has consistently reiterated that support.

In 2004, this Chamber voted, with my support, legislation in support of Taiwan's efforts to gain observer status to the World Health Organization. Those efforts finally succeeded in 2009 when Taiwan was included in the International Health Regulations (IHR).

For decades, Taiwan has been a key security, economic, and political partner for the American people.

Taiwan has been one of America's biggest trading partners for many years—the 11th largest in 2012—purchasing nearly $25 billion worth of American goods that year.

Taiwan is also a global leader in information technology, telecommunications, and other knowledge-based industries.

Most significantly, Taiwan is becoming a beacon of democracy for the Chinese people after their successful, open elections in 2008 and 2012.

It is important for this Chamber to continue its support of the Taiwanese people and enhance Taiwan's standing in international bodies.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me and vote in support of America's partner in peace and prosperity, Taiwan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1151.

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. ROYCE. 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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1947, FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1797, PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 266 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 266

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1947) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture. After general debate, the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1797) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-15 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1320

POINT OF ORDER

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order against H. Res. 266 because the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. The resolution contains a waiver of all points of order against consideration of the bill, H.R. 1797, which includes a waiver of section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act, which causes a violation of section 426(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Maryland makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentlewoman has met the threshold burden under the rule and the gentlewoman from Maryland and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, when the majority began this Congress, it began with the idea, in their language, that they would adhere to fiscal responsibility and to constitutionality—in fact, we read the Constitution on the floor of this body—and that they had learned the lessons from the election slaughtering in 2012, and that is to stop the assault on women's health care. But, oh, no. Here we are today with a bill, H.R. 1797, that violates the Congressional Budget Act, that violates the Constitution, and that violates the doctor-patient relationship that a woman has with her doctor, and we haven't focused on jobs.

So, when you look at H.R. 1797, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, it would impose a ban across the country on abortion after 20 weeks. Aside from ignoring medical realities and placing the lives of mothers with serious medical conditions at risk through governmental interference with the doctor-patient relationship, the underlying bill also includes reporting requirements that, according to the Congressional Budget Act, which it would violate, would add costs to local law enforcement.

With a total of 25 States introducing 64 similar abortion-ban measures in the

last 3 years, this bill is yet another assault on women's reproductive rights and is blatantly unconstitutional.

Abortion care in this country is a private, medical decision that's made between a woman and her health care provider. Those are the only people who should be in the room. And yet here in this legislation they've created just a narrow exception that doesn't even take into account the risk to a woman's health and would subject physicians to criminal penalties for caring for their patients.

H.R. 1797 contains unreasonable, unjustified penalties for doctors, including 5 years in jail, and would have a negative impact on abortion care and reproductive health care all across the country. By jeopardizing and criminalizing abortion care, we limit the options women have to receive comprehensive reproductive health care. And these limitations could lead women to access abortion care that is both unsafe and dangerous to their health.

I'd like to yield 15 seconds to the other side if they would care to address the question of whether this closed rule means that there will not be a single amendment or alternative offered to this bill, which has a profound effect on women's health and reproductive rights. I yield 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from North Carolina if she cares to answer that question.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, this is a dilatory tactic and has nothing to do with our bill.

Ms. EDWARDS. Well, reclaiming my time, under the rule, it's the case that the bill I believe that we'll vote on today for final passage has not followed regular order, and it has been rewritten after its adoption in the Judiciary Committee. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the Nation's leading medical experts on women's health, strongly opposes a 20-week ban citing the threats these laws pose to women's health.

With that, I would like to yield 1 minute to my colleague from California (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, today we're discussing a bill that's divisive, will never become law, and is an affront to women's health.

As a longtime advocate for a woman's right to choose and the idea that women and their doctors should be making personal health decisions, not politicians, I stand in strong opposition.

This 20-week abortion ban is a harmful measure that jeopardizes a woman's health and her ability to have a family in the future by denying her access to an abortion even if she experiences severe, dangerous health complications as a result of a pregnancy.

In a potentially life-threatening situation, a woman and her doctor deserve to have every medical option available to them. This bill is clearly unconstitutional and an attempt to substitute politicians' judgment for that of doctors and their patients as they make their difficult, personal medical decisions.

Instead of bringing bills to the floor that address the major issues facing our country right now, the Speaker and majority leader have brought another bill to a vote that is much more about political posturing than helping America's economy or students.

I ask the leadership of the House, how many jobs does this bill create? Does this bill help balance our budget? How many student loans will be kept at a low rate by passing this bill?

Ms. EDWARDS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim time in opposition to the point of order and in favor of consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 10 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the question before the House is: Should the House now consider H. Res. 266? While the resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, the Committee on Rules is not aware of any violation of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act. This is a dilatory tactic.

In order to allow the House to continue its scheduled business for the day, I urge Members to vote ''yes'' on the question of consideration of the resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, it's very clear to me that the underlying bill, in fact, does violate the Congressional Budget Act. It imposes an unfunded mandate on local police departments for the work that they do.

Now, it's this crowd on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, who is opposed to unfunded mandates. Nevertheless, it's also true that, in fact, the decision to receive an abortion in this country, particularly late in a pregnancy, is an intensely personal decision, and yet it's the suits on the other side of the aisle who've decided that it's their decision to interfere with a woman's right to make those choices between herself and her doctor. It's a decision that none of us wants to face and one that legislators, particularly Members of Congress, should not interfere with.

The bill also cites the Constitution as its authority in order to qualify under the rules of the House. And yet it is blatantly—blatantly—unconstitutional, completely inconsistent with the Supreme Court's decision in Roe v. Wade.

And so I'd like to yield 15 seconds, again, to the gentlewoman from the other side to ask her whether, under the definitions in this bill, what does it mean to not have protection of the life of the mother include psychological or emotional condition?

Well, the gentlewoman can't answer that, and so I suppose I could ask her, as well, if the Speaker would allow, I yield, again, 15 seconds to the gentlewoman, if this bill cites the Constitution as its authority in order to qualify under the rules of the House, and yet it's blatantly unconstitutional, do House rules allow it to be considered, allow H.R. 1797 even to be considered on the floor of this House if it's unconstitutional?

I yield 15 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I will repeat what I said before. This is a dilatory tactic, and we should be moving on to the resolution.

□ 1330

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I know that the gentlewoman from North Carolina and the other side would prefer to yield and move on with a bill that violates the Budget Control Act, violates the Constitution, and violates the relationship between a doctor and a patient; and yet the decision to receive an abortion is a woman's, and a woman's alone.

In addition, H.R. 1797 infringes on the right of the District of Columbia to make decisions about the way in which it cares for its residents. I mean, the majority is all over the place—interfering with the District of Columbia, interfering with women's rights to make the decision by themselves, and actually stepping on the toes of local law enforcement to impose costs on them to enforce an unconstitutional bill. Thank goodness it won't become law.

The sponsor of this bill is certainly entitled to his beliefs—and it was a ''his,'' because on the Judiciary Committee that considered this, there's not a single Republican woman who had the chance to consider this on the Judiciary Committee. And yet the role of the government should not be to limit access to health care or to limit the freedom and liberties of the public. We should recognize that this decision is one best left to a woman, in consultation with her doctor, her family, and her faith.

Women across this country don't rely on Congress and politicians to advise them on mammograms, cervical cancer screenings, or maternal health needs; and abortion is no different. As with these other procedures, we should make comprehensive health care available to all women and allow them, with the consult of their health provider and loved ones, to decide when, how, and why they take care of their health.

Americans, including women, sent a clear message last November at the polls. They're tired of Congress meddling in their business and taking extreme and divisive legislation targeted at assaulting women's health.

And so with that, I'd actually yield another 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from North Carolina if she would care to respond: Whether today, given that 40 percent of women are primary breadwinners in their household, but women continue to face workplace challenges,

pay inequity, and other barriers to fully contribute to our economy, would you agree that this bill does not address those economic challenges for women, or create jobs, and is an exercise in political theater at best?

With that, I yield 10 seconds to the gentlewoman to respond.

Ms. FOXX. I thank the gentlewoman for asking the question.

What I think most Americans would wonder, Mr. Speaker, is where is the due process for the millions of babies who are murdered every year in this country by these unconscionable tactics of abortion.

Ms. EDWARDS. Reclaiming my time, I'd like to yield 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Yes, I would just like to ask a question:

Are there any Republican women on the House Judiciary Committee, which reported this legislation? And do you think it's fair or proper for a body of men to solely determine one of the most important and private decisions a woman can make in regard to her own health and body?

Ms. EDWARDS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Maryland has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I guess I just have a few questions that I will put out there on the table.

The American people want us to work to address the Nation's most urgent priorities, like creating jobs and strengthening the economy. I wonder if the Speaker at all can inform us what jobs this particular bill creates.

Under the new reporting requirements in this bill for rape and incest victims, would they have to report even if their life is in danger from the perpetrator? Curious question. Does this bill disqualify more than half of all rape victims, since 54 percent of these rape victims do not report rape due to intimidation and embarrassment? Under the definitions in this bill, what does it mean not to have protection of the life of the mother included in psychological and emotional conditions? Does the bill disqualify, again, rape victims? Is it the case that the bill redefines what qualifies as incest by only applying it to a minor? So an adult, who has been victimized by a relative since childhood and who gets pregnant, is not allowed to have an abortion or a pregnancy with that relative? We have a lot of questions.

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you, women across America are tired of having their rights assaulted. They're tired of having their health care decisions taken from them. We need to vote down H.R. 1797.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, in order to allow the House to continue its scheduled business for the day, I urge Members to vote ''yes'' on the question of consideration of the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 266 provides for a closed rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1797, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, and general debate for H.R. 1947, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act.

Mr. Speaker, the rule before us today provides for general debate of H.R. 1947, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, also known as the FARRM Bill. This legislation provides for a 5-year authorization of Federal agriculture and nutrition policy.

H.R. 1947 makes necessary reforms and updates to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, previously known as food stamps, as well as Federal agriculture policy. It is important to make commonsense changes to these programs to ensure their viability and that they remain targeted to those most in need of assistance. This year's version of the farm bill has gone through regular order, including numerous hearings at the Agriculture Committee, a full committee markup and amendment process.

Additionally, the Rules Committee has received hundreds of amendments from Members seeking to further improve the bill during floor consideration. House Republicans remain committed to an open, transparent process; and I am pleased to say we're continuing that commitment with the consideration and process for the FARRM Bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, for 40 years I've been marching for this women's choice bill, but we seem never to finish with it. It's something that people like to drag up and bring out.

In that regard, I want to ask the women of America to think of two things. First, I want you to remember the panel that Chairman ISSA put together last year to discuss contraception and whether or not women should have access to it. If you recall, that panel was made up entirely of men. There was a young woman, a graduate of law school, who wanted to speak that day; but she was found to be unworthy, unable to speak. Indeed, her virtue, her character, everything else about her was assailed because she had tried to do what many of us know we can do here, and that is speak.

Think about another thing now. Think about the Judiciary Committee; 22—now 23—all white guys turning down every amendment to try to preserve women's health, to try to preserve women's psyche, and do anything in the world to do this—and to try to discuss that this bill, as my colleague vainly tried to do, that this is unconstitutional. Everybody knows it. Everybody knows the Senate's not going to take this up. This is purely window dressing.

And as I do here often, I want to remind everybody that it costs $24 million a week to run the House of Representatives. We've spent over $54 billion almost already now just trying to repeal the health care bill.

□ 1340

When in the world are we going to get to work? 2½ weeks from now, the interest rate on college loans will double. Are we doing anything about that? Not a thing on Earth. Do we care about the people who are out of work? Do we care about the people who are facing loss of their food stamps? No. We care more about war on women. Women of America, keep those two panels before your mind forever. Those are the deciders—the men on ISSA's panel, the men on the Judiciary Committee.

Now, in State Houses all over this country, and in Governors' mansions and Halls of Congress, the majority's antichoice agenda is driven by men in blue suits and red ties who seem to believe that once they get elected to something, they have a right to play doctor. I would like to think about what they have done over the last years to remind my fellow American women.

Already, because of the majority's efforts, women in eight States are required to undergo an ultrasound before they can exercise their constitutionally protected right to a safe and legal abortion—an ultrasound that is not medically necessary, an ultrasound that is medically contradicted, and an ultrasound for which they are required themselves to pay. As we speak, the legislators in the State of Wisconsin have passed a similar measure through the State House and are awaiting the enactment into law.

Most telling is right now more States have a waiting period for abortions

than a waiting period to buy a gun. Let me say that again. More States have a waiting period for abortions—a constitutionally protected procedure—than have a waiting period to buy a gun.

Now, here in Congress, the majority conducted a hearing at the Oversight and Government Reform Committee last year that I have already spoken of. There were five men and zero women. As you know, they talked about Sandra Fluke and all the vituperation and hatred that was poured down on her because she wanted to speak.

But just last week—I think this past week—the majority took it a whole lot further. For the first time, during the committee, after it was all passed and gone, before it goes to the Rules Committee, the sponsor of this bill made one of those comments like Todd Akin had made. And I think if you scratch an awful lot of guys on that committee, they all feel the same way because it keeps coming up over and over. You can't get pregnant, they say, if you're raped. They believe that in the bottom of their heart, and some of them were doctors. But during the committee amendments to include the exceptions for the health of the mother and victims of rape and incest, they were rejected along party lines.

Mr. FRANKS has been taken off the bill, and for the first time, in my recollection, unanimous consent has to be given here to ask a woman—they have found a Republican woman who would take this bill—off a completely other committee and allow her to manage the bill. If that is not a first, I don't know what is. And if that is not PR, I don't know what is. And if that is not simply trying to fool you, I don't know what else that is.

As Mr. FRANKS' remark and the extreme nature of his bill became clear, they realized they were about to anger the American women even more than they had last fall, and you know how that turned out at the election. Instead of abandoning the legislation and respecting a woman's right to choose, they decided to try to make changes to the underlying bill, after it had already passed through committee, and assign a woman outside the committee to manage a bill on the floor.

Such a cowardly move is an insult to the intelligence of women in America. You are supposed to believe this was all done well and properly. No amount of window dressing is going to change the fact that you are severely trying to restrict a woman's right to choose with today's bill. I don't think anybody makes any bones about that.

The majority has argued the legislation is in response to new science, even though if there has ever been a House of Representatives that cared not a whit for science, I can't imagine they would come even close to this one. When a fetus feels pain is the new idea. As my colleague, Mr. NADLER, has previously made clear, their so-called ''new findings'' are nothing more than the marginal views that fly in the face of established science. In fact, one of the experts upon which the majority relies has testified that science for and against fetal pain is most uncertain.

The fact of the matter is that today's legislation is unconstitutional and contains a narrow and adequate exception for the life of a woman and a victim of rape and incest. No man on any of those committees, no man on any of those panels, is ever going to have to face that problem himself of rape and incest. How strange it is that they know the precise answer for people who are victimized by it.

Many serious health conditions actually materialize or worsen after the 20-week mark in a pregnancy and can seriously compromise the health of the mother. A physician has to be able to provide the best care for their patients; and in cases where a woman's health is exacerbated by pregnancy, politicians have no right in intruding in the doctor-patient relationship and criminalizing those trying to protect their patients' lives and safety.

Furthermore, the majority's requirement that a victim of rape or incest report the crime to authorities before receiving an abortion effectively prevents many victims from exercising the right to choose. More than half of all rape victims, as we know, don't report, and that is a sad thing.

The requirement in today's bill ensures that a woman who has been a victim of rape or incest faces massive barriers to exercising her right to safe and legal reproductive health care. Mr. Speaker, from requiring women to undergo mandatory ultrasounds to applying police reporting requirements for victims of rape, the majority has made it very clear that they don't trust women. In fact, it came up at the Judiciary Committee that one of the reasons they needed to report it to police is because women would lie. I think they make an exception in that case for their sisters, their daughters, their mothers, perhaps. It is just the rest of us who can't be trusted.

Try as he might, no man will ever understand the choice that faces a young woman who is told that she suffers from severe valvular heart disease and that, if she carries a child to term, her life and the life of that child are at risk, or the choice of a woman who is violently raped and would be reminded of the crime against her every moment of every day if she is forced to carry the pregnancy to term.

I urge my colleagues to respect the established science on this issue and the constitutional right of every American woman. Reject today's rule and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that my colleague from New York knows this, but I will make sure it gets into the RECORD.

In the 2007 case of Gonzales v Carhart, the Supreme Court made clear that there is a ''legitimate interest of the government in protecting the life of the fetus that may become a child.'' The Supreme Court has also made clear that ''the government may use its voice and its regulatory authority to show its profound respect for the life within the woman,'' and that Congress may show such respect for the unborn through ''specific regulation because it implicates additional ethical and moral concerns that justify a special prohibition.''

Mr. Speaker, I am really troubled by the fact that so many of my colleagues simply refuse to acknowledge that we're dealing with human life in this situation, in the situation of abortion. My heart goes out to any woman who is facing a situation where they're considering abortion. I think every member of our conference feels that way—men and women. Nobody takes the issue of abortion lightly. Unfortunately, not enough attention is being paid to the unborn child.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield, now, 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, Dr.—Congressman—FLEMING.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for all of the great work she has done on this.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to support the rule and the underlying bill, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, that is so vital.

My background: I'm a physician who has delivered hundreds of babies during my career. In addition to that, I'm a husband of 35 years, a father of four—two boys, two girls—a grandfather of two boys, and soon, in 6 weeks, grandfather of a little girl, a little granddaughter, and I'm so proud.

□ 1350

Let me tell you for a moment about what I witnessed.

At about the time of the 20 weeks, midterm, the 4–D ultrasound now gives such an amazing view into the window of that womb. What did I see? I could see that that little girl looks just like her big brother. Number two, in another frame, she is sucking her thumb. Then in another frame, she is holding up two fingers as though to say, Be patient. I'll be out soon.

We have such wonderful technology, such technology that, today, we can actually do surgery on a fetus at 20 weeks in order to fix a heart ailment or some other condition that may kill the baby in the womb or soon thereafter. What have we learned from this technology? We have learned that they feel pain. We have to provide anesthesia.

Mr. Speaker, our friends on the other side of the aisle, when it comes to animals, are all about the Humane Society and about the humane treatment of animals, and I have a high regard for that. When it comes to the issue of torture or even of discomfort for prisoners of war, they are all about supporting that.

But what happens in a midterm or later pregnancy when there is an abortion? What happens is just absolute

torture. You realize that, in Washington, D.C., today, a woman can go for an abortion while she is in labor at term. And how would you do the abortion? How is it done? How did Dr. Gosnell do it? You stick a trocar into the skull, suck the brain out, literally dismember the baby limb from limb. What torture and what pain.

Is that really the kind of people we are, Mr. Speaker? I think not.

We understand that at least at 20 weeks, maybe sooner, the baby feels pain. So I would just submit to you today, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is not just about abortion—this is about pain; it's about torture to that young life. We can't say that this is like an amputation of a limb. That baby inside the womb has a distinct DNA that you will never see again either in history or in the future. It is a different human being. It's living there inside of its mother. So I am in support of this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in strong opposition to this rule and to the blatantly unconstitutional underlying legislation, which threatens the health and basic rights of women all over America.

Right now, we should be working to create jobs and grow the economy. Instead, here we are again with the majority's trying to insert their extreme and divisive ideological preferences into law. Yet again, they are trying to impose their traditional view of a woman's role on everyone else—force women back into these traditional roles with limited opportunities.

This legislation, which attempts to ban virtually all abortions after 20 weeks, is a clear violation of the law of the land, and it has already been struck down in its sponsor's home State of Arizona, but they don't give much regard for the law of the land. Witness the number of times that they have voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act—37 times. This bill is anti-choice, anti-Constitution, anti-science, and it is, yes, anti-woman.

There is no exception in this bill for women whose health is threatened by carrying the fetus to term. Yes, why should we worry about women's health or whether they live or whether they die? Instead, this bill puts the Federal Government squarely between a woman and her doctor. It threatens doctors with 5 years in jail if they perform a legal, constitutional and sometimes medically necessary procedure.

I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle:

Does the bill disqualify more than half of all rape victims since 54 percent of these victims do not report a rape due to intimidation or embarrassment?

Or under the new reporting requirements in this bill for rape and incest victims, would they have to report even if their lives are in danger from the perpetrators?

And yes, is it the case that this bill redefines what qualifies as ''incest'' by only applying it to a minor? Therefore, an adult who has been victimized by a relative since childhood and who gets pregnant is not allowed to have an abortion from pregnancy with that relative?

Simply put, this proposed ban is antithetical to our laws and is an affront to women's health, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE).

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

In a report commissioned by the Department of Justice, Dr. Anand, a fetal pain expert, wrote:

> It is my opinion that the human fetus possesses the ability to experience pain from 20 weeks of gestation, and the pain perceived by a fetus is possibly more intense than that perceived by term newborns or older children.

The reality of Dr. Anand's statement is seen in the fact that surgeons routinely administer anesthesia to unborn children before performing neonatal surgery. The truth is that at 20 weeks these unborn children feel every bit of pain inflicted on them in the name of ''choice'' and in the name of ''convenience.''

Mr. Speaker, what we do with this knowledge says a lot about us. If we turn a blind eye to the agony and suffering of our most vulnerable, can we say that we are still a Nation that pursues life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness? If we willingly embrace cruelty in the name of ''choice,'' then can we say with integrity that we continue to secure the blessings of liberty not only for ourselves but for our posterity?

The good news is that, for those who have been affected by the pain of abortion, there is one who chose, who made a real choice, to endure pain on behalf of all of us, and by His stripes we are healed.

Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress, let us remember that even though we may not be able to hear their cries we are not absolved from the guilt of ignoring their pain.

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

Ms. LEE of California. First, let me thank the gentlelady for yielding, but more importantly, I just want to thank Congresswoman SLAUGHTER, our ranking member on the Rules Committee, for fighting for women's health and for the rights of women, really, all of her life.

Thank you so much.

I rise in strong opposition to this rule and the underlying bill. Once again, the Republicans have decided to make women's health a battleground as part of their, yes, ongoing war on women.

The bill on the floor this week is nothing more than a direct challenge to Roe v. Wade and a vehicle for yet another ideological attack against women's reproductive rights. In fact, this is the 10th time that the Republicans have forced a vote on this topic since taking control of the House in 2011. The bill is a direct threat to the privacy rights and health of every woman living in this country and especially to women of color, who already face an increased stigma and other barriers to reproductive health due to the terrible Hyde amendment. Now, I remember the days of back alley abortions. Many women died and were permanently injured before Roe v. Wade. With this bill, Republicans have decided to try to take us back there—to threaten physicians, for instance, with criminal prosecution.

Can you imagine a criminal prosecution for attempting to provide the medically accurate information and care that is best for their patients? Why in the world should Members of Congress or any legislator interfere with women's personal health choices?

These private decisions should always be between a woman, her family, her doctor, or whomever else she chooses to help in making these very difficult decisions. We should not be making it—not you nor I. We should let women make their own decisions. Congress has no business in the personal lives of women—no business.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlelady an additional 10 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. We need to vote ''no'' on this rule and this bill. We need to get back to the real business—like creating jobs—that we should be doing, like creating economic opportunities we should be doing. We should be trying to figure out how to reduce poverty. We should be trying to figure out how to ensure our young people have the best quality public education. There are many issues this Congress needs to take on. Why don't you stay out of the personal lives of women. It has no place on this floor.

□ 1400

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, contrary to what our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are accusing us of, we're talking about the beginning of the 6th month of pregnancy. Nothing in this bill has any impact on abortion during the first 20 weeks.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, as a person of conscience, I believe we are called to protect the most vulnerable in our society.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is an important measure to do exactly that: protect unborn children who can feel pain. And as parents of four children, two boys and two girls, Cindy and I instinctively do all

we can as parents to protect our children from pain.

During the Gosnell trial, we all learned of the gruesome methods of ending the life of just-born children, some of whom were a little over 20 weeks old. If Gosnell aborted these children moments before they were removed from the womb in the method similar to the dismemberment which occurs in several clinics throughout our country and science tells us causes pain to the baby, would the loss of life have been any less tragic, any less appalling? We cannot stand idly by and allow such painful terminations of human life to continue.

I urge passage of this bill, and I look forward to casting my vote in support of the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA).

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule.

I stand here on behalf of the women in Hawaii and across the Nation to continue to protect the fundamental right of women to have access to safe and legal abortion care. I strongly oppose the underlying bill, H.R. 1797, and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

The bill is like a leap backwards for women in our Nation. The very premise of this bill is contrary to credible scientific evidence and does not have the widespread support of our leading experts.

H.R. 1797 goes against a decades-old Supreme Court ruling, Roe v. Wade, that gave women a fundamental right to choose, a protection provided in the United States Constitution. And remember, States were given the ability to regulate those laws. These proposed Federal restrictions are unconstitutional, inappropriate, and unnecessary.

Abortion is one of the safest medical procedures available in this country, due in large part to the expertise and skill of our Nation's trained medical professionals who offer high quality care to women.

This bill would threaten our doctors with 5-year prison terms for doing their jobs, even those that are caring for women who are facing serious health concerns with their pregnancies. It is critically important that our laws protect and support the woman's health, not deny access to care.

Abortion care is a private medical decision between a woman and her health care provider. It is not the responsibility of Congress to infringe upon that right. That is why the American Congress of OB–GYNs, American Nurses Association, and 46 other organizations, in addition to 15 religious groups, stand in strong opposition to this bill.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to stand strongly in opposition to this harmful and misleading bill and soundly vote ''no'' on the rule.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, there's a lot of talk about rights here today and very little talk about the right to life for the babies that are being aborted.

Madam Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

Mr. BENISHEK. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for allowing me to be here as well.

I rise today in support of the rule for H.R. 1797, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, and to urge my colleagues to support this important and long overdue piece of legislation.

This bill will help to protect those in our society who are least able to defend themselves—the unborn. The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act will prohibit late-term abortions after the 20th week of a pregnancy for the simple reason that by 20 weeks of development, unborn children are able to feel and react to pain. This time period is based on extensive scientific research, and the majority of the American people are in favor of banning late-term abortions when they know that the unborn child is able to feel pain.

As a doctor, I was horrified to hear the stories of gross misconduct and negligence that came to light in the trial of the Philadelphia abortionist Kermit Gosnell. The callous disregard for innocent human life that was displayed in the Gosnell clinic extended beyond unborn children to adult patients, and I believe that there is bipartisan agreement that this was terrible. The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act will help to prevent some of the worst abuses that were perpetrated by Kermit Gosnell and protect patients nationwide.

As the overwhelming majority of my constituents in northern Michigan believe, life inside the womb is just as precious as life outside the womb, and it must be protected.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Ms. MOORE. I thank the ranking member.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to H.R. 1797, which would callously and cavalierly limit access to abortion for women across the country.

Boy, I tell you, the House GOP has truly pushed the limits this time by offering this unconstitutional bill.

Madam Speaker, this week, the much-maligned Miss USA contestant, Miss Utah, alluding to the power dynamics between men and women in the workplace, was lampooned for a flubbed answer when she said, and I quote:

> I think especially the men are seen as the leaders of this, and so we need to try to figure out how to create education better so that we can solve this problem.

However inarticulate, I think Miss Utah was on to something.

When you consider the subject at hand, women's right to a medically safe abortion, we once again see men taking leadership roles and invading the privacy and medical decisions of women so that now we have before us a bill that is borne of ignorance and disregard for medical science in every way, shape, and form. There is no concern for the biology, physiology, sociology of the woman.

Perhaps, if we could create education better of the importance of women's lives, we would not be here with this bill before us. This bill is an abomination, plain and simple, at its foundation, its heart, its utter disrespect for the dignity and health of women. It also has other harmful effects.

Now, I am sympathetic for those women, as well, who face an abortion at 20 weeks. Often these women are facing complications that endanger their health or they have found out about a severe fetal anomaly. Others are victims of rape or incest. These are the most difficult decisions in their lives.

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

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

Ms. MOORE. Medical providers have told us of harrowing tales of women who have developed life-threatening pre-eclampsia with impaired kidney functions, seizures, dangerously high blood pressure that threatens their health. They also tell us of the women who receive an aggressive cancer diagnosis right in the middle of their pregnancy and have to make the difficult choice between their pregnancy and their own life.

In situations like these, women need to be able to consult their families and their doctors and no one else. Perhaps their own priest or rabbi or imam, but most certainly not their politician denying the care they need. It is hazardous, cruel, and simply the wrong thing to do.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding time.

□ 1410

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, this bill is not borne of ignorance but of extremely deep-felt concern for unborn children who suffer pain as they are being murdered.

Madam Speaker, I fear for the conscience of our Nation because the termination of unborn children for any reason is tolerated in some parts of our country throughout pregnancy, even though scientific conclusions show infants feel pain by at least 20 weeks' gestation. That means literally that a baby at the halfway point of a pregnancy will experience pain during the violence of a dismemberment abortion, the most common second-trimester abortion wherein a steel tool severs limbs from the infant and its skull is crushed.

Madam Speaker, it's even difficult for me to describe this procedure without getting emotional. These procedures are horrific, and in terms of pain, like torture to their infant subjects. As

a country, we should leave this practice behind. That's why I'm a cosponsor of the underlying legislation to prohibit elective abortions in the United States past 20 weeks. Since 1973, approximately 52 million—52 million, Madam Speaker—children's lives have been tragically aborted in the United States. It is unconscionable that in America, where we fight for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, we tolerate the systemic extermination of an entire generation of the most vulnerable among us.

H.R. 1797 rejects that hypocrisy and provides commonsense protections for unborn children who feel pain, just as you and I do. My colleague and friend from Arizona, Representative TRENT FRANKS, is a champion for the unborn, and I commend him for authoring this legislation, which prohibits an abortion of an unborn child that has surpassed 20 weeks after fertilization.

In light of the recent conviction of Philadelphia-based, late-term abortionist Kermit Gosnell, who was found guilty of first-degree murder in the case of three babies born alive in his clinic and then killed through a procedure he called ''snipping,'' which involved Gosnell inserting a pair of scissors into the baby's neck and cutting its spinal cord, a procedure that was reportedly routine in his clinic, we cannot stand idly by.

Madam Speaker, some would have us think that Gosnell is an anomaly or an outlier. However, after his conviction, more individuals have stepped forward to expose similar practices in other States. Americans should be asking how different are these snipping procedures from abortions performed throughout clinics in the country. Unfortunately, there is little difference between these procedures. The practice of murdering viable, unborn children who can feel pain must end. I urge my colleagues to join me in speaking for those who cannot speak for themselves and vote in favor of this rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 1797. When debating the issue before us, it is important to understand that this is not strictly a matter of conscience but an issue with very real and potentially life-altering implications for women and families across the Nation.

It is my fundamental belief that the right to choose is and must remain a personal health decision that a woman makes in consultation with her doctor, without government intervention. Additionally, we should also be promoting policies that strive to reduce the number of unwanted pregnancies through improved access to family planning and contraception, as well as effective sex education.

Sadly, rather than coming together to address our fiscal challenges and help stimulate job creation, the majority continues to doggedly pursue a radical ideological agenda. This legislation, like other attempts to restrict women's access to comprehensive health care, is unacceptable and could seriously endanger the health and safety of women across the country. As such, I firmly oppose the underlying bill and urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague for yielding.

Madam Speaker, pain, we all dread it. We avoid it. We even fear it. And we all go to extraordinary lengths to mitigate its severity and its duration.

Madam Speaker, today, there are Kermit Gosnells all over America inflicting not only violence, cruelty, and death on very young children, but excruciating pain as well.

Many Americans, including some who self-identified as pro-choice—were shocked and dismayed by the Gosnell expose' and trial. Perhaps the decades-long culture of denial and deceptive marketing has made it difficult to see and understand a disturbing reality. Even after 40 years of abortion on demand and over 55 million dead babies and millions of wounded moms, many—until Gosnell—somehow construed abortion as victimless and painless. That has changed.

The brutality of severing the spines of defenseless babies—euphemistically called ''snipping'' by Gosnell—has finally peeled away the benign facade of a billion-dollar abortion industry.

I note parenthetically, and it may come as a shock to many, but according to the Americans United for Life Legal Defense Fund, the U.S. is among only four nations in the world that allows for abortions for any reason after viability, and one of only nine nations that allows abortions after 14 weeks. We're in some pretty bad company, Madam Speaker, because that includes China and North Korea. We are far outside the global mainstream.

I would note, Madam Speaker, that like Gosnell, abortionists all over America decapitate, they dismember, and they chemically poison babies to death each and every day. That's what they do. Americans are connecting the dots and asking whether what Gosnell did is really different than what other abortionists do. I would note to my colleagues that a D&E abortion, a common method after 14 weeks, is a gruesome, pain-filled act that literally rips and tears to pieces the body parts of a child.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is a modest but necessary attempt to at least protect babies who are 20 weeks old—and pain capable—from having to suffer and die from abortion.

I would note to my colleagues that a majority of Americans are with us trying to protect lives. According to a recent Gallup poll, 64 percent of Americans believe that abortion should not be permitted in the second 3 months of pregnancy; 80 percent say abortion should not be permitted in the last 3 months of pregnancy. The polling company found that 63 percent of women believe that abortion should not be permitted after the point where substantial medical evidence says that the unborn child can feel pain. The women get it, and they have so polled when asked if they are against this kind of pain for babies.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act recognizes the medical evidence that unborn children feel pain. We are not living in the Dark Ages. One leading expert in the field of fetal pain, Dr. Anand, at the University of Tennessee stated in his expert report, commissioned by the U.S. Department of Justice:

> It is my opinion that the human fetus possesses the ability to experience pain from 20 weeks of gestation, if not earlier, and the pain perceived by a fetus is possibly more intense than that perceived by term newborns or older children.

Surgeons today entering the womb to perform corrective procedures, Madam Speaker, on unborn children, have seen those babies flinch, jerk, and recoil from sharp objects and incisions.

□ 1420

Surgeons routinely administer anesthesia to unborn children in the womb. We now know that the child ought to be treated as a patient, and there are many anomalies, many sicknesses that can be treated while the child is still in utero. When those interventions are done, anesthesia is given.

Dr. Colleen Malloy, assistant professor, Division of Neonatology at the Northwestern University, in her testimony before the House Judiciary Committee in May of 2012 said:

> When we speak of infants at 20 weeks post-fertilization we no longer have to rely on inferences or ultrasound imagery, because such premature patients are kicking, moving and reacting and developing right before our eyes in the neonatal intensive care unit.

In other words, there are children the same age who, in utero, can be killed by abortion who have been born and are now being given lifesaving assistance.

She went on to say:

> In today's medical arena, we resuscitate patients at this age and are able to witness their ex-utero growth.

She says:

> I could never imagine subjecting my tiny patients to horrific procedures such as those that involve limb detachment or cardiac injection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, I join my many colleagues today who have spoken out against this outrageous bill.

I also want to object to the way that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have brought up H.R. 1797 for consideration.

When a bill that affects the lives and the health of women all across our country is coming up for this consideration, we deserve to have an open process. But, instead, the majority is taking a rather undemocratic approach, blocking all amendments to this harmful bill.

Beyond the fact that the bill is unconstitutional, it endangers the lives of women across our country. It places a ban on abortions with the narrowest of rape and incest exceptions, and it forces a woman who has been raped to report the attack to law enforcement before seeking an abortion.

So I have to ask these questions: Do the sponsors of this legislation understand the trauma that a rape survivor endures?

And do they understand what a cruel message that is to send to a woman in her time of greatest need?

Madam Speaker, those of us who are here in the Congress, I believe we all came here to solve the problems of the day. As we address our national priorities, is this issue high on their list?

Is this the issue that gives people confidence that Congress understands the challenges that people throughout America face today?

I know what those challenges are, I think. I've listened to my constituents. They worry about putting food on the table, a roof over their heads, and sending their kids to college.

So here we are, with a very narrow agenda, with an issue that is being used to strike at the heart of women's health issues.

I urge my colleagues, please reject this rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, even Kermit Gosnell's own defense attorney, having gone through all the evidence at trial, said:

> I've come out of this case realizing that 24 weeks is a bad determiner. It should be more like 16, 17 weeks. That would be a far better thing, and I think the law should be changed to that. I think pro-choice would have still the right to choose, but they've got to choose quicker.

We are talking here, Madam Speaker, about the beginning of the 6th month of pregnancy. Nothing in this bill has any impact on abortion during the first 20 weeks.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire if my colleague has other requests for time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, we will use the balance of our time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Well, that sort of leaves me uninformed. But I want to introduce the previous question before I do my closing. And I'm hoping you are prepared to close. Is that correct?

Ms. FOXX. No, Madam Speaker. I'm not just yet ready to close, but if my colleague is ready to close—

Ms. SLAUGHTER. No, I'll reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Is the gentlewoman from New York ready to close? I thought that was the question she was asking.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. That was the question I had asked you. I am prepared to. Mr. CONNOLLY is my last speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would the gentlelady from New York like to recognize the gentleman?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Not until I find out if we're prepared to close.

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

Madam Speaker, as advances in medical science result in improved treatments and personalized medicine, the development of unborn children is further understood. Doctors can perform lifesaving surgeries on babies still in the womb at earlier points in the pregnancy than ever before.

When a baby is born prematurely, medical innovation is increasing the likelihood of that baby's survival. Babies born as early as 20 weeks post-fertilization are being cared for in neonatal units across the country.

By 8 weeks after fertilization, the unborn child reacts to touch. By 20 weeks post-fertilization, the unborn child reacts to stimuli that would be recognized as painful if applied to an adult human. The baby responds the same way you and I respond to pain, by recoiling from it.

As Dr. Anand, at the University of Tennessee, who is considered the leading expert in the field of fetal pain, stated in a report accepted by a Federal judge as expert testimony:

> It is my opinion that the human fetus possesses the ability to experience pain from 20 weeks of gestation, if not earlier, and the pain perceived by a fetus is possibly more intense than that perceived by term newborns or older children.

Surgeons entering the womb to perform corrective procedures on unborn children have seen those babies flinch, jerk, and recoil from sharp objects and injections. Recognizing this discomfort, surgeons routinely administer anesthesia to unborn children in the womb before performing surgeries.

According to Planned Parenthood, the largest abortion provider in America, babies aborted at 14 weeks or later are often subjected to a painful dismemberment abortion, which involves inserting a long steel tool into the woman and grabbing, usually an arm or a leg, tearing it from the baby's body and pulling it out of the mother. The procedure is repeated as the baby is torn, limb from limb, until his or her entire body has been removed and the head is finally crushed and removed. The dismemberment abortion is the most common method of abortion in the second trimester.

Another abortion procedure involves injecting digoxin and/or potassium chloride into the baby's heart, which induces cardiac arrest, and the baby's killed.

Madam Speaker, it's important that the American people understand exactly what happens when they hear the word ''abortion.'' It is a heart-wrenching, painful procedure that tears a baby limb from limb before crushing his or her head, or it is a poisonous chemical injection.

A March 2013 poll conducted by a polling company found that 64 percent of the public supports a law like the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, prohibiting an abortion after 20 weeks when an unborn baby can feel pain, unless the life of the mother is in danger.

Supporters included 47 percent of those who identified themselves as pro-choice in the poll. The poll also found that 63 percent of women believe that abortion should not be permitted after the point where substantial medical evidence says that the unborn child can feel pain.

□ 1430

Madam Speaker, Congress cannot sit idly by while this grotesque and brutal procedure which rips the tiny baby apart limb by limb in the womb is performed in our country. That is why it is necessary for Congress to pass H.R. 1797 and protect the lives of these unborn children from this excruciating pain.

Madam Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a summary of the evidence of the unborn pain research.

Madam Speaker, I now reserve the balance of my time.

FETAL PAIN: THE EVIDENCE

[From www.doctorsonfetalpain.org, Mar. 14, 2011]

The eleven points below summarize the substantial medical and scientific evidence that unborn children can feel pain by 20 weeks after fertilization.

1: Pain receptors (nociceptors) are present throughout the unborn child's entire body by no later than 20 weeks after fertilization and nerves link these receptors to the brain's thalamus and subcortical plate by no later than 20 weeks after fertilization.

DOCUMENTATION

a. Pain receptors (nociceptors) are present throughout the unborn child's entire body by no later than 20 weeks.

1. Myers, 2004, p.241, para.2, ''The first essential requirement for pain is the presence of sensory receptors, which first develop in the perioral area at approximately 7 weeks gestation and are diffusely located throughout the body by 14 weeks.[95]''

Myers LB, Bulich LA, Hess, P, Miller NM. Fetal endoscopic surgery: indications and anaesthetic management. Best Practice & Research Clinical Anaesthesiology. 18:2 (2004) 231–258.

[95]Smith S. Commission of Inquiry into Fetal Sentience. London: CARE, 1996.

2. Derbyshire, 2010, p.7, para.2, ''For the foetus, an existence of 'pain' rests upon the existence of a stimulus that poses a threat to tissue, being detected by a nervous system capable of preferentially responding to stimuli that pose a threat to tissue. The entire experience is completely bounded by the limits of the sensory system and the relationship between that system and the stimulus. If pain is conceived of in this manner then it becomes possible to talk of foetal pain anytime between 10 and 17 weeks GA [gestational age] when nociceptors develop and

mature, and there is evidence of behavioural responses to touch.''

Note: Derbyshire's other published works indicate that he believes pain requires subjective human experience, not possible until after birth; nonetheless, he acknowledges this finding.

Derbyshire SW, Foetal pain? *Best Practice & Research Clinical Obstetrics and Gynaecology* 24:5 (2010) 647–655.

3. Anand, 1987, p.2, para.2, ''Cutaneous sensory receptors appear in the perioral area of the human fetus in the 7th week of gestation; they spread to the rest of the face, the palms of the hands, and the soles of the feet by the 11th week, to the trunk and proximal parts of the arms and legs by the 15th week, and to all cutaneous and mucous surfaces by the 20th week.[25,26]''

Anand KJS, Hickey PR. Pain and its effects in the human neonate and fetus. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 317:21 (1987) 1321–1329.

[25]Humphrey T. Some correlations between the appearance of human fetal reflexes and the development of the nervous system. *Progress in Brain Research*. 4 (1964) 93–135.

[26]Valnaan HB, Pearson JP. What the fetus feels. British Medical Journal. 280 (1980) 233–234.

4. Vanhatalo, 2000, p.146, col.2, para.2, ''First nociceptors appear around the mouth as early as the seventh gestational week; by the 20th week these are present all over the body.''

Vanhatalo S, van Nieuwenhuizen O. Fetal Pain? *Brain & Development*. 22 (2000) 145–150.

5. Brusseau, 2008, p.14, para.3, ''The first essential requirement for nociception is the presence of sensory receptors, which develop first in the perioral area at around 7 weeks gestation. From here, they develop in the rest of the face and in the palmar surfaces of the hands and soles of the feet from 11 weeks. By 20 weeks, they are present throughout all of the skin and mucosal surfaces.[19]

Brusseau R. Developmental Perpectives: is the Fetus Conscious? International Anesthesiology Clinics. 46:3 (2008) 11–23.

[19]Simons SH, Tibboel D. Pain perception development and maturation. Seminars on Fetal and Neonatal Medicine. 11 (2006) 227–231.

6. Rollins, 2012, p.465, ''Immature skin nociceptors are probably present by 10 weeks and definitely present by 17 weeks. Nociceptors develop slightly later in internal organs. Peripheral nerve fibers that control movement first grow into the spinal cord at about 8 weeks of gestation.''

Mark D. Rollins, Mark A. Rosen, ''Anesthesia for Fetal Intervention and Surgery'', in *Gregory's Pediatric Anesthesia*, ed. George A. Gregory & Dean B. Adropoulos (West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 444–474, 465.

b. nerves link these receptors to the brain's thalamus and subcortical plate by no later than 20 weeks after fertilization.

1. Van Scheltema 2008, p.313, para.1—''The connection between the spinal cord and the thalamus (an obligatory station through which nearly all sensory information must pass before reaching the cortex) starts to develop from 14 weeks onwards and is finished at 20 weeks.''

Van Scheltema PNA, Bakker S, Vandenbussche FPHA, Oepkes, D. Fetal Pain. *Fetal and Maternal Medicine Review*. 19:4 (2008) 311–324.

2. Glover, 1999, p.882, col.1, para.1, ''Most incoming pathways, including nociceptive ones, are routed through the thalamus and, as stated above, penetrates the subplate zone from about 17 weeks... These monoamine fibres start to invade the subplate zone at 13 weeks and reach the cortex at about 16 weeks. This puts an early limit on when it is likely that the fetus might be aware of anything that is going on in its body or elsewhere.''

Glover V. Fetal pain: implications for research and practice. *British Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology*. 106 (1999) 881–886.

3. Lee, 2005, p.950, col.1, ''In contrast to direct thalamocortical fibers, which are not visible until almost the third trimester, thalamic afferents begin to reach the somatosensory subplate at 18 weeks' developmental age (20 weeks' gestational age)[16] and the visual subplate at 20 to 22 weeks' gestational age. These afferents appear morphologically mature enough to synapse with subplate neurons.[17]''

Note: Lee et al. believe that pain requires conscious cortical processing, which they deem unlikely until 29 or 30 weeks; nonetheless, they acknowledge this finding.

Lee SJ, Ralston HJP, Drey EA, Partridge, JC, Rosen, MA. A Systematic Multidisciplinary Review of the Evidence. *Journal of the American Medical Association*. 294:8 (2005) 947–954.

[16]Kostovic I, Rakic P. Developmental history of the transient subplate zone in the visual and somatosensory cortex of the macaque monkey and human brain. *Journal of Comparative Neurology*. 297 (1990) 441–470.

[17]Hevner RF. Development of connections in the human visual system during fetal mid-gestation: a Diltracing study. *Journal of Experimental Neuropathology & Experimental Neurology*. 59 (2000) 385–392.

4. Gupta, 2008, p.74, col.2, para.1, '' Peripheral nerve receptors develop between 7 and 20 weeks gestation . . . Spinothalamic fibres (responsible for transmission of pain) develop between 16 and 20 weeks gestation, and thalamocortical fibres between 17 and 24 weeks gestation.''

Gupta R, Kilby M, Cooper G. Fetal surgery and anaesthetic implications. *Continuing Education in Anaesthesia, Critical Care & Pain*. 8:2 (2008) 71–75.

5. Van de Velde, 2012, p 206, para.3, ''To experience pain an intact system of pain transmission from the peripheral receptor to the cerebral cortex must be available. Peripheral receptors develop from the seventh gestational week. From 20 weeks' gestation [= 20 weeks post-fertilization] peripheral receptors are present on the whole body. From 13 weeks' gestation the afferent system located in the substantia gelatinosa of the dorsal horn of the spinal cord starts developing. Development of afferent fibers connecting peripheral receptors with the dorsal horn starts at 8 weeks' gestation. Spinothalamic connections start to develop from 14 weeks' and are complete at 20 weeks' gestation, whilst thalamocortical connections are present from 17 weeks' and completely developed at 26–30 weeks' gestation. From 16 weeks' gestation pain transmission from a peripheral receptor to the cortex is possible and completely developed from 26 weeks' gestation.''

Marc Van de Velde & Frederik De Buck, Fetal and Maternal Analgesia/Anesthesia for Fetal Procedures. Fetal Diagn Ther 31(4) (2012) 201–9.

2: By 8 weeks after fertilization, the unborn child reacts to touch. After 20 weeks, the unborn child reacts to stimuli that would be recognized as painful if applied to an adult human, for example by recoiling.

DOCUMENTATION

a. By 8 weeks after fertilization, the unborn child reacts to touch.

1. Gupta, 2008, p.74, col.2, para.2, ''Movement of the fetus in response to external stimuli occurs as early as 8 weeks gestation. . .''

Gupta R, Kilby M, Cooper G. Fetal surgery and anaesthetic implications. Continuing Education in Anaesthesia, Critical Care & Pain. 8:2 (2008) 71–75.

2. Glover, 2004, p.36, para.4, ''The fetus starts to make movements in response to being touched from eight weeks, and more complex movements build up, as detected by real time ultrasound, over the next few weeks.''

Glover V. The fetus may feel pain from 20 weeks; The Fetal Pain Controversy. Conscience. 25:3 (2004) 35–37.

3. Myers 2004, p.241, para.6, ''A motor response can first be seen as a whole body movement away from a stimulus and observed on ultrasound from as early as 7.5 weeks' gestational age. The perioral area is the first part of the body to respond to touch at approximately 8 weeks, but by 14 weeks most of the body is responsive to touch.''

Myers LB, Bulich LA, Hess, P, Miller, NM. Fetal endoscopic surgery: indications and anaesthetic management. Best Practice & Research Clinical Anaesthesiology. 18:2 (2004) 231–258.

4. Derbyshire, 2008, p.119, col.2, para.4, ''Responses to touch begin at 7–8 weeks gestation when touching the peri-oral region results in a contralateral bending of the head. The palms of the hands become sensitive to stroking at 10–11 weeks gestation and the rest of the body becomes sensitive around 13–14 weeks gestation.[35]''

Note: Derbyshire's other published works indicate that he believes pain requires subjective human experience, not possible until after birth; nonetheless, he acknowledges this finding.

Derbyshire SW. Fetal Pain: Do We Know Enough to Do the Right Thing? Reproductive Health Matters. 16: 31Supp. (2008) 117–126.

[35] Fitzgerald M. Neurobiology of fetal and neonatalpain. In:Wall P, Melzack R, editors. Textbook of Pain. Oxford Churchill Livingstone, 1994. p.153–63.

5. Kadić, 2012, page 3, ''The earliest reactions to painful stimuli motor reflexes can be detected at 7.5 weeks of gestation (Table 2).''

Salihagić Kadić, A., Predojević, M., Fetal neurophysiology according to gestational age, Seminars in Fetal & Neonatal Medicine. 17:5 (2012) 1–5, 3.

b. After 20 weeks following fertilization, the unborn child reacts to stimuli that would be recognized as painful if applied to an adult human, for example by recoiling.

1. Gupta, 2008, p. p.74, col.2, para.2, ''Behavioural responses. . . Response to painful stimuli occurs from 22 weeks gestation [= 20 weeks post-fertilization].''

Gupta R, Kilby M, Cooper G. Fetal surgery and anaesthetic implications. Continuing Education in Anaesthesia, Critical Care & Pain. 8:2 (2008) 71–75.

2. Giannakoulopoulos, 1994, p.77, col.2, para.3, ''We have observed that the fetus reacts to intrahepatic vein needling with vigorous body and breathing movements, which are not present during placental cord insertion needling.''

Giannakoulopoulos X, Sepulveda W, Kourtis P, Glover V, Fisk NM. Fetal plasma cortisol and β-endorphin response to intrauterine needling. Lancet. 344 (1994) 77–81.

3. Lowery, 2007, p.276, col.2, para1, ''Fetuses undergoing intrauterine invasive procedures, definitely illustrative of pain signaling, were reported to show coordinated responses signaling the avoidance of tissue injury.[15]''

Lowery CL, Hardman MP, Manning N, Clancy B, Hall RW, Anand KJS. Neurodevelopmental Changes of Fetal Pain. Seminars in Pernatology. 31 (2007) 275–282.

[15] Williams C. Framing the fetus in medical work: rituals and practices. Social Science & Medicine. 60 (2005) 2085–2095.

4. Mellor, 2005, p.457, col.1, para.2, ''For instance, the human fetus responds to intrahepatic needling (versus umbilical cord sampling) by moving away and with an increase in the levels of circulating stress hormones. . .[71,72,74,75]''

Note: Mellor et al. believe that the unborn child is kept 'asleep' in utero, and therefore does not perceive pain; nonetheless, they recognize this finding.

Mellor DJ, Diesch TJ, Gunn AJ, Bennet L. The importance of 'awareness' for understanding fetal pain. Brain Research Reviews. 49 (2005) 455–471.

[71] Giannakoulopoulos X, Sepulveda W, Kourtis P, Glover V, Fisk NM. Fetal plasma cortisol and β -endorphin response to intrauterine needling. Lancet. 344 (1994) 77–81.

[72] Giannakoulopoulos X, Teixeira J, Fisk N. Human fetal and maternal noradrenaline responses to invasive procedures. Pediatric Research. 45 (1999) 494–499.

[74] Gitau R, Fisk NM, Teixeira JM, Cameron A, Glover V. Fetal hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal stress responses to invasive procedures are independent of maternal responses. Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism. 86 (2001) 104–109.

[75] Gitau R, Fisk NM, Glover V. Human fetal and maternal corticotrophin releaseing hormone responses to acute stress. Archives of Disease in Childhood—Fetal Neonatal Edition. 89 (2004) F29–F32.

5. Bocci, 2007, page 31–32, ''By week 14, the repertoire of movements is complete. Fetal movements may be spontaneous, reflecting individual needs of the fetus, or may be evoked, reflecting fetal sensitivity to its environment.''

C. Bocchi et al, Ultrasound and Fetal Stress: Study of the Fetal Blink-Startle Reflex Evoked by Acoustic Stimuli. Neonatal Pain, ed. Giuseppe Buonocore & Carlo V. Bellieni (Milan: Springer, 2007), 31–32.

3: In the unborn child, application of such painful stimuli is associated with significant increases in stress hormones known as the stress response.

DOCUMENTATION

1. Tran, 2010, p.44, col.1, para.7, ''Invasive fetal procedures clearly elicit a stress response . . .''

Tran, KM. Anesthesia for fetal surgery. Seminars in Fetal & Neonatal Medicine. 15 (2010) 40–45.

2. Myers, 2004, p.242, para.2, ''Human fetal endocrine responses to stress have been demonstrated from as early as 18 weeks' gestation. Giannakoulopoulos et al[99] first demonstrated increases in fetal plasma concentrations of cortisol and β-endorphin in response to prolonged needling of the intrahepatic vein (IHV) for intrauterine transfusion. The magnitude of these stress responses directly correlated with the duration of the procedure. Fetuses having the same procedure of transfusion, but via the non-innervated placental cord insertion, failed to show these hormonal responses. Gitau et al[100] observed a rise in β-endorphin during intrahepatic transfusion from 18 weeks' gestation, which was seen throughout pregnancy independent both of gestation and the maternal response. The fetal cortisol response, again independent of the mother's, was observed from 20 weeks' gestation.[100] Fetal intravenous administration of the opioid receptor agonist, fentanyl, ablated the β-endorphin response and partially ablated the cortisol response to the stress of IHV needling, suggesting an analgesic effect.[101] A similar, but faster, response is seen in fetal production of noradrenalin to IHV needling. This too is observed in fetuses as early as 18 weeks, is independent to the maternal response and increases to some extent with gestational age.[102] Thus, from these studies one can conclude that the human fetal hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis is functionally mature enough to produce a β-endorphin response by 18 weeks and to produce cortisol and noradrenalin responses from 20 weeks' gestation.''

Myers LB, Bulich LA, Hess, P, Miller, NM. Fetal endoscopic surgery: indications and anaesthetic management. Best Practice & Research Clinical Anaesthesiology. 18:2 (2004) 231–258.

[99] Giannakoulopoulos X, Sepulveda W, Kourtis P, Glover V, Fisk NM. Fetal plasma cortisol and β-endorphin response to intrauterine needling. Lancet. 344 (1994) 77–81.

[100] Gitau R, Fisk NM, Teixeira JM, Cameron A, Glover V. Fetal hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal stress responses to invasive procedures are independent of maternal responses. Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism. 86 (2001) 104–109.

[101] Fisk NM, Gitau R, Teixeira MD, Giannakoulopoulos, X, Cameron, AD, Glover VA. Effect of Direct Fetal Opioid Analgesia on Fetal Hormonal and Hemodynamic Stress Response to Intrauterine Needling. Anesthesiology. 95 (2001) 828–835.

[102] Giannakoulopoulos X, Teixeira J, Fisk N, Glover V. Human fetal and maternal noradrenaline responses to invasive procedures. Pediatric Research. 45(1999) 494–499.

3. Derbyshire, June 2008, p.4, col.1, para.5, ''Another stage of advancing neural development takes place at 18 weeks, when it has been demonstrated that the fetus will launch a hormonal stress response to direct noxious stimulation.''

Note: Derbyshire believes that pain requires subjective human experience, not possible until after birth; nonetheless, he acknowledges this finding.

Derbyshire SW. Fetal Pain: Do We Know Enough to Do the Right Thing? Reproductive Health Matters. 16: 31Supp. (2008) 117–126.

4. Gupta, 2008, p.74, col.2, para.3, ''Fetal stress in response to painful stimuli is shown by increased cortisol and β-endorphin concentrations, and vigorous movements and breathing efforts.[7,9] There is no correlation between maternal and fetal norepinephrine levels, suggesting a lack of placental transfer of norepinephrine. This independent stress response in the fetus occurs from 18 weeks gestation.[10]''

Gupta R, Kilby M, Cooper G. Fetal surgery and anaesthetic implications. Continuing Education in Anaesthesia, Critical Care & Pain. 8:2 (2008) 71–75.

[7] Boris P, Cox PBW, Gogarten W, Strumper D, Marcus MAE. Fetal surgery, anaesthesiological considerations. Current Opinion in Anaesthesiology.17 (2004) 235–240.

[9] Giannakoulopoulos X, Teixeira J, Fisk N. Human fetal and maternal noradrenaline responses to invasive procedures. Pediatric Research. 45 (1999) 494–499.

[10] Marcus M, Gogarten W, Louwen F. Remifentanil for fetal intrauterine microendoscopic procedures. Anesthesia & Analgesia. 88 (1999) S257.

5. Fisk, 2001, p.828, col.2, para.3, ''Our group has shown that the human fetus from 18–20 weeks elaborates pituitary-adrenal, sympatho-adrenal, and circulatory stress responses to physical insults.'' p.834, col.2, para.2, ''This study confirms that invasive procedures produce stress responses. . .''

Fisk NM, Gitau R, Teixeira MD, Giannakoulopoulos, X, Cameron, AD, Glover VA. Effect of Direct Fetal Opioid Analgesia on Fetal Hormonal and Hemodynamic Stress Response to Intrauterine Needling. Anesthesiology. 95 (2001) 828–835.

6. Kadić, 2012, page 3, ''As early as 16–18 weeks, fetal cerebral blood flow increases during invasive procedures.[26,27] An elevation of noradrenaline, cortisol, and beta-endorphin plasma levels, in response to needle pricking of the innervated hepatic vein for intrauterine transfusion, was registered in a 23-week-old fetus [= 21 weeks post-fertilization].'' (Table 2).''

Salihagić Kadić, A., Predojević, M., Fetal neurophysiology according to gestational age, SEMINARS IN FETAL & NEONATAL MEDICINE (2012) 1–5, 3, doi:10.1016/j.siny.2012.05.007.

[26] Teixeira JM, Glover V, Fisk NM. Acute cerebral redistribution in response to invasive procedures in the human fetus. Am J Obstet Gynecol 1999;181:1018e25.

[27] Smith RP, Gitau R, Glover V, et al. Pain and stress in the human fetus. Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol 2000;92:161e5.

4: Subjection to such painful stimuli is associated with long-term harmful neurodevelopmental effects, such as altered pain sensitivity and, possibly, emotional, behavioral, and learning disabilities later in life.

DOCUMENTATION

1. Van de Velde, 2006, p.234, col.1, para.3, ''It is becoming increasingly clear that experiences of pain will be 'remembered' by the developing nervous system, perhaps for the entire life of the individual.[22,33]. These findings should focus the attention of clinicians on the long-term impact of early painful experiences, and highlight the urgent need for developing therapeutic strategies for the management of neonatal and fetal pain.''

Van de Velde M, Jani J, De Buck F, Deprest J. Fetal pain perception and pain management. Seminars in Fetal & Neonatal Medicine. 11 (2006) 232–236.

[22] Vanhalto S, van Nieuwenhuizen O. Fetal Pain? Brain & Development. 22 (2000) 145–150. [33] Anand KJS. Pain, plasticity, and premature birth: a prescription for permanent suffering? Nature Medicine. 6 (2000) 971–973.

2. Vanhatalo, 2000, p.148, col.2, para.4, ''All these data suggest that a repetitive, or sometimes even strong acute pain experience is associated with long-term changes in a large number of pain-related physiological functions, and pain or its concomitant stress increase the incidence of later complications in neurological and/or psychological development.''

Note: Vanhalto & Niewenhuizen believe that pain requires cortical processing; nevertheless, they acknowledge that, ''noxious stimuli may have adverse effects on the developing individual regardless of the quality or the level of processing in the brain . . . after the development of the spinal cord afferents around the gestational week 10, there may be no age limit at which one can be sure noxae are harmless.'' (p.149, col.1, para.2).

Vanhalto S, van Nieuwenhuizen O. Fetal Pain? Brain & Development. 22 (2000) 145–150.

3. Gupta, 2008, p.74, col.2, para.3, '' There may be long-term implications of not providing adequate fetal analgesia such as hyperalgesia, and possibly increased morbidity and mortality.''

Gupta R, Kilby M, Cooper G. Fetal surgery and anaesthetic implications. Continuing Education in Anaesthesia, Critical Care & Pain. 8:2 (2008) 71–75.

4. Lee, 2005, p.951, col.1, para.3, ''When long-term fetal well-being is a central consideration, evidence of fetal pain is unnecessary to justify fetal anaesthesia and analgesia because they serve other purposes unrelated to pain reduction, including . . . (3) preventing hormonal stress responses associated with poor surgical outcomes in neonates[71,72]; and (4) preventing possible adverse effects on long-term neurodevelopment and behavioral responses to pain.[73–75].''

Note: Lee et al. believe that pain requires conscious cortical processing, which they deem unlikely until 29 or 30 weeks; nonetheless, they acknowledges this finding.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself 30 seconds.

Congress should not be standing around while this is going on. Congress should also not be standing around

while college loan rates are doubling and we have so many people out of work.

I'm delighted to yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentlewoman from New York, CAROLYN MALONEY.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank my fellow New Yorker and good friend for yielding and for her outstanding leadership in this body on so many, many issues, particularly in the area of health.

My colleagues, once again, we need to ask ourselves where were the women when the Judiciary Committee produced this outrageous assault on women's health and women's reproductive rights? The answer is very clear. On this panel, there is not one female face participating in this crucial issue in their health care, absolutely nowhere. This is a photo of the members of the Judiciary Subcommittee that held a hearing on this legislation before us, and not one Republican on that panel is a woman.

The bill that was produced is evidence that women did not participate in this decision-making. For example, it was not until the chair of that subcommittee made a comment not worthy of this House that the majority added an insulting and narrow exception for pregnancies resulting from rape.

Last November, women came out in droves to say, Keep your laws off our bodies, out of our personal lives, and out from between women and their doctor.

This bill that a man sponsored and that an all-male panel has approved jeopardizes the health and well-being of women, and only women; it is indifferent to the rights of women, and only women; and it is callous to the concerns of women, and only women.

I can promise you that women will long remember this. They will remember it today, they will remember it tomorrow, and they will remember it at the polls when they select their Representatives.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, if we can defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that would allow the House to hold a vote on the Student Loan Relief Act. If Congress doesn't act next month, the undergraduate students across this country will see a doubling of their student loan interest rates.

To discuss our proposal, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so that the House can take up the Student Loan Relief Act, H.R. 1595, which is a bill that the American people are truly concerned about and watching Congress to see whether or not we do the right thing. In 12 days, as this chart shows, the subsidized Stafford student loan rate will double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. This will add to the debt burden of the average college student with a Stafford student loan portfolio of about approximately $5,000.

Today, the average student is leaving college with an average debt level of about $25,000 to $26,000. We know the big numbers: $1.1 trillion in student loan debt now in the U.S. economy, more than credit cards and more than used cars. Yet we are standing here 12 days before the doubling of this rate and we are debating a bill which is right in the middle of the polarized gridlock politics that the American voters rejected soundly in the last election rather than dealing with the bread-and-butter issues that really matter to young Americans and to middle class families all across this country.

The fact of the matter is we know young people in this country need to get a post-high school degree, whether it's a 2-year degree or a 4-year degree. The Stafford student loan program is the workhorse of providing affordable loans for millions of students, and 7.5 million students use the Stafford subsidized loan program. Yet, if we don't act in 12 days, those 7.5 million are going to see their interest rates double to 6.8 percent.

Now, we may hear from the other side, well, we took up a bill on May 23, H.R. 1911, a bill with a variable rate that we now know from the Congressional Budget Office who issued a report this past Monday will be, in fact, worse than if we did nothing and allowed the rate to go to 6.8 percent. That's been not only verified by the Congressional Budget Office but also by the Education Trust and The Institute for College Access and Success, a nonpartisan group funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the Walton Family Trust, and it states very clearly:

> If passed, it will lead to higher rates on all types of Federal student and parent loans than if Congress did nothing at all.

We need to act on H.R. 1595. 187 Members have signed a discharge petition, and it is time to act to protect America's college students.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, as our colleagues on the other side of the aisle know full well and as our colleague from Connecticut has acknowledged, the House has passed a bill to take care of the issue of student loan rates doubling on July 1; however, the Senate has refused to act on the bill. What we passed was what the President asked for in his budget, and he has suddenly flip-flopped on the issue and doesn't support it anymore.

The House has done its job. We're now waiting for the Senate and the President to acknowledge that they have a responsibility in this area. We've not been frivolous about this. We are not ignoring the issue.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, on July 1, young women in college face a doubling of Federal student loan interest rates; but instead of legislating the rights of our daughters and granddaughters to access safe and legal reproductive care, we should be ensuring that the cost of college doesn't skyrocket at the end of the month.

When it comes to the most personal and important decisions a woman will ever make, we deserve the privacy and freedom to make the decision that's right for us. No matter how many women the majority trots out to advance their agenda, their attempt to take away our reproductive rights will not stand.

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' to defeat the previous question and urge a ''no'' vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I would like to point out that none of the Members on the other side of the aisle have even acknowledged the pain that unborn children feel or the fact that half of those babies that are being murdered are little girls.

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

Before liberty, equality, free speech, freedom of conscience, 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 against because of gender or disability—life is exactly what they've been denied. 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 valued on a sliding scale. We hope the era of elective abortions, ushered in by an unelected court, will be closed and collectively deemed one of the darkest chapters in America's history. But until that day, it remains a solemn duty to stand up for life.

□ 1440

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.

Madam Speaker, we go to extraordinary lengths to save not only human beings, but even animals because we value life so much. However, there are

many who do not hold the unborn in the same esteem, and that is tragic for more than 1 million unborn babies every year.

There is nothing more important than protecting voiceless, unborn children and their families from the travesty of abortion. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote for life by voting in favor of this rule and the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 266 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1595) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rate for Federal Direct Stafford Loans. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1595 as specified in section 3 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 266, if ordered, and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 1151.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 196, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 248]

YEAS—229

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—196

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman

Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Bonner
Campbell
Hunter
Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Pascrell
Rogers (KY)
Yarmuth

□ 1507

Messrs. SHERMAN and PAYNE changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 193, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 249]

YEAS—232

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—193

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Bonner
Campbell
Hunter
Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Pascrell
Rogers (KY)
Yarmuth

□ 1516

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONCERNING THE PARTICIPATION OF TAIWAN IN THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1151) to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan at the triennial International Civil Aviation Organization Assembly, 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 California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 0, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 250]

YEAS—424

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
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
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers

Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
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
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
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
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
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
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
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
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 (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
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
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
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Bonner
Campbell
Hunter
Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, George
Pascrell
Rogers (KY)
Yarmuth

□ 1524

Mrs. NAPOLITANO changed her 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.

FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AMODEI). Pursuant to House Resolution 266 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1947.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1528

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1947) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, with Mrs. MILLER of Michigan in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1947, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013.

□ 1530

This bipartisan bill is 4 years in the making, and I could not have had a better partner than my friend from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

He began this process 4 years ago when he led us into the countryside to have eight field hearings across this great Nation. We followed up those field hearings with a series of 11 audit hearings on every single policy under the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Agriculture.

In all, we held 40 hearings on every aspect of this FARRM Bill. The result is legislation that calls for reduced spending, smaller government, and commonsense reform.

The committee has held two markups of this essential bill, the first, last Congress, and one last month. Both of those markups lasted for more than 12 hours each. We considered over 200 amendments in total. In the end, we achieved a large bipartisan margin of support. The vote tally this year was 36–10, with 23 out of 25 Republicans and 13 out of 21 Democrats supporting it.

Some of my colleagues were amazed by the duration of the markup; but I came to Congress to legislate, and an important part of the legislative process is an open and fair debate. The Speaker shares that sentiment, and I hope during the debate of the amendments to the FARRM Act, we'll let the body work its will, then we'll vote for final passage.

The FARRM Act is different for many reasons. There is a reason that we put reform in the title. This is the most reform-minded bill in decades. It repeals outdated policies, while reforming, streamlining, and consolidating over 100 government programs.

It reforms the SNAP Act, also known as the food stamp program, for the first time since the welfare reforms of 1996; and it makes tremendous reforms to the farm programs.

The Agriculture Committee and the agriculture community have voluntarily worked together to make these reforms and to contribute to deficit reduction. Every part of this bill is a part of the solution to Washington's spending problems. We save the American taxpayer nearly $40 billion, which is almost seven times the amount of cuts to these programs under sequestration.

Regarding reforms to traditional farm programs, first of all, we eliminate direct payments. They cost taxpayers $5 billion a year. They were payments that people received every year, regardless of the market conditions and whether or not they farmed.

Instead, we take a more market-oriented approach to policy, where there is no support when market prices are high. We encourage responsible risk management where farmers are able to plan for catastrophic events.

In addition to eliminating direct payments, we repeal the ACRE Act, the disaster program for crops, and the countercyclical program. My philosophy from the beginning of the FARRM Bill process has been that these programs had to be based on market economies. They had to work for

all crops in all regions of the country. Our bill achieves this, while also saving $23 billion, which is a record 36 percent spending reduction.

In conservation, a subject near and dear to my heart, we streamline the delivery of these incredibly important programs. During our hearings, we learned that conservation programs had grown in number and complication, often acting as a deterrent for the adoption of these voluntary, incentive-based programs. Therefore, the FARRM Act eliminates and consolidates 23 duplicative and overlapping programs into 13, which saves nearly $7 billion.

We authorize and strengthen and fully pay for livestock disaster assistance that is incredibly important to our livestock producers during devastating droughts, such as the ones we're experiencing recently.

The bill invests in core specialty crop initiatives like Specialty Block Grants, Plant Pest and Disease Management programs; and the FARRM Act also maintains our investment in agricultural research.

You know, my friends, I've had a lot of my colleagues ask me, FRANK, why do you get so excited about these issues? Why do you get so stirred up? You're usually a pretty calm, laid-back fellow.

Well, let me tell you, I come from a part of the country that was the abyss of the Great Depression and the drought of the 1930s. Some of you may have seen Mr. Burns' documentary about the Dust Bowl. Those are my constituents. Those were my relatives in Roger Mills County, as well as the panhandle.

I was raised by a generation, my grandparents, who were young men and women during the Great Depression, who lived through that drought. They were scarred forever.

My maternal grandfather cosigned my first farm lease, cosigned my note at the bank so that I could start farming. But he was convinced, till the day he died, just as my other grandfather was, the Great Depression was coming back; it was coming back.

My parents were young men and women in the fifties, and they went through the drought of the fifties, far worse than the drought of the thirties. To the day he died, my father was convinced that it would never rain again.

And I came home from college in 1982 just in time to observe the collapse in agricultural land prices. I was raised by the generation that suffered through the thirties and the fifties.

I came home to watch the Vietnam generation be destroyed, farmers be destroyed by things beyond their control in the early 1980s. That's why I get so worked up on this policy.

The misery of the thirties, the misery of the eighties, economically, was not an accident. It was policy mistakes in the twenties and thirties that led to that agony. It was policy mistakes in the seventies and eighties that led to that agony.

Now, you say, FRANK, you're excited, you're getting worked up. Look at the 1930 census for Roger Mills County. There were 14,000 people living in my home county. By the 1940 census there were 7,000 people living in my home county. And we've just now made it back to the mid-3,000s.

You don't have that kind of economic devastation, depopulation, suffering by accident. And that's why I'm here; that's why I'm working with my colleague, the ranking member, Mr. PETERSON. That's why I've worked with Republicans, Democrats alike for years now to get to this point. That's why I want to work with all of you.

I cannot make it rain. There may be people in this town who say they can make it rain, but I cannot make it rain. But in my tenure as chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, I can make sure we pass a comprehensive FARRM Bill that does not repeat the mistakes of the 1920s and -30s, does not repeat the mistakes of the 1970s and -80s.

I will not be a part of inflicting on future generations what was inflicted on what I call that generation of Vietnam veterans who came home to farm and, instead, went to the bankruptcy auctions, or my grandparents' generation, whose young men and women were wiped out in the 1930s. I will not be a part of that.

So I will work with all of you to try and improve this draft that attempts to produce a safety net that is workable, that is efficient, both for rural America and producers, but also for consumers.

I ask you to work with me in that regard. I ask you to do the right thing. I ask you to avoid the mistakes of the past. I ask you to look at the language, to study the language, and be good, responsible legislators.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to associate myself with the comments of the chairman, who, by the way, has done an outstanding job putting this bill together. And with the exception of maybe some differences on the SNAP title of the bill, I have to say that if I was still chairman, I wouldn't have a bill that's much different than what the chairman and I have put together. And maybe one of the reasons for that is that my family has a similar background to Mr. LUCAS' family. My grandfather went through the Depression.

□ 1540

My father almost got bankrupted by Ezra Taft Benson and some of the nonsense that went on during that period of time. So the chairman is right. Policy makes a big difference in agriculture, and I stand with him in never going back to a time where we don't give our farmers and ranchers the safety net they need to operate in a very risky and now capital intensive business.

So today we're debating a new 5-year farm bill. As the chairman said, the process has gone on long enough. We started the debate on this when I was still chairman, and it's time for us to pass a bill.

This farm bill gives farmers and ranchers the necessary tools to provide American consumers with the safest, most abundant and most affordable food supply in the world. The bill includes farm, conservation, trade, nutrition, credit, rural development, research, forestry, energy and specialty crop programs.

With roughly 16 million American jobs tied to agriculture, the farm bill is a jobs bill. The rural economy remained strong during our Nation's financial crisis, and in my part of the world it was agriculture that kind of kept us going through that process. This is why the farm bill is so important. Failing to pass a new 5-year farm bill could potentially devastate our rural economy. Why would we jeopardize the one part of our economy that has been, and continues to be, working?

I often tell people that the Agriculture Committee is probably the least partisan of all the committees in Congress. And that doesn't happen by accident. We listen to each other, we try to understand each other, work together, and at the end of the day, have the best interests of our constituents in mind.

The bill before us today is a compromise that reflects that tradition. It's a compromise between commodities and regions, urban and rural Members. I didn't get everything I wanted; Chairman LUCAS didn't get everything he wanted, but that's how the legislative process is supposed to work.

The bill makes major reforms to farm programs. Repealing direct payments saves taxpayers nearly $40 billion a year, and it ensures that farmers won't get a government subsidy for doing nothing. Instead, producers are given the choice between two countercyclical farm safety programs, addressing either price declines or revenue losses, which only support farmers during difficult times. The bill also sets new income requirements so individual millionaires won't receive farm payments and continues the no-cost sugar program.

H.R. 1947 also makes significant reforms to dairy programs, the result of more than 4 years of work that we've done on the committee and compromise within the dairy industry. The new dairy safety net will address the volatility of the dairy market, help consumers by making all milk prices more stable and hopefully eliminate the price spikes that have been normal in today's marketplace.

The 2008 farm bill was the first farm bill to address the growing demand for fresh fruits and vegetables, local foods and organics. The 2013 FARRM Bill

continues this investment by increasing funding for specialty crop block grants, providing support for the Farmers Market and Local Food Promotion programs and authorizing the very first organic check-off for research and promotion.

We also recognize the challenges facing many beginning farmers by including support for outreach and education to beginning, socially disadvantaged and military veteran farmers and ranchers. The bill also streamlines and reforms current conservation programs, better targeting resources to allow farmers and ranchers to continue to preserve our valuable natural resources.

Now, a lot of attention has been given to the bill's cuts to nutrition programs, more than $20 billion over 10 years in this bill. Personally, I would have preferred that we updated the income and asset limits in the current SNAP program so that we would have treated everybody in the country the same. We've looked at that, we weren't able to come to consensus, so we didn't move in that direction.

So we have cuts to nutrition spending in this bill, and they've received most of the attention in this regard, but we also like to point out that there's additional support for TEFAP, increased funding for Community Food Projects with a focus on low-income communities, and it provides more resources to help USDA's anti-trafficking efforts.

So, while I think it's ridiculous to cut hundreds of billions of dollars out of nutrition programs, as some Members have called for, I also don't think it's realistic to say that we can't cut one penny from these programs because clearly there isn't a government program that couldn't stand some reductions. So I think what we've done here at the end of the day is responsible reform that's a middle ground that will allow us to continue and to complete the work on this bill.

So I know we're going to have a lot of amendments I guess starting tomorrow, but it's my opinion, and it's the chairman's opinion, that in order for us to get a bill conferenced, we need to go through this process and stick together on the committee so we can have a bill that can be conferenced and get this bill signed before September 30 when the current law expires.

We need to keep this a bipartisan bill and not stray too far from what was approved in committee. I know that compromise is rare around here, but it's what is needed to finally get a new 5-year farm bill completed, and that is our objective.

So, Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time and yield back.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chair, I'd like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the farm bill. The American people want Congress to cut wasteful spending and red tape. And I honestly believe the American people also want to have their food grown right here in America. It's my opinion this farm bill accomplishes both those goals. This farm bill also cuts spending for agriculture programs by over $40 billion—that's billion with a B.

The bill eliminates or consolidates more than 100 programs administered by USDA. It also ends the often criticized direct payments for farmers. The farm bill also cuts $20 billion in mandatory spending on food stamps over the next 10 years.

Many opponents of the bill have characterized this legislation as a bill to support the expansion of the food stamps. That couldn't be further from the truth. Like many of my colleagues here, I believe the food stamp program is wasteful and open to fraud. Food stamp spending has doubled since 2008, and it's tripled since 2002. Without reform, food stamp spending will continue to increase through loopholes the Obama administration has used to expand the program.

That's why we should pass this farm bill. I agree it's not perfect. But passage allows the House to join with the Senate in conference to pursue further reforms that are one step closer to signing this into law.

With that, Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the farm bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the second-ranking member of the House Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE.)

Mr. MCINTYRE. Madam Chairman, for decades, Congress has worked in a bipartisan fashion to craft farm bills that protect and support our farmers, strengthen rural economic development, encourage conservation and provide nutritional support for the most vulnerable in society. These bills have generally received wide bipartisan support.

This year I was pleased to, once again, work with my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee to advance a strong, reform-minded, fiscally responsible and bipartisan farm bill. This bill preserves the farm safety net and provides regional equity while consolidating over 100 programs and making targeted cuts to rein in Federal spending and move toward a balanced budget.

These reforms will save almost $40 billion. In fact, do you realize that less than 1 percent of our entire Federal budget is agriculture? Yet, by God's grace, it feeds us all.

The farm bill is critical not only to our Nation. I know in North Carolina agribusiness and farming are the number one industry. Each year, agribusiness brings millions of dollars in revenue to our State, supporting countless families. When we talk about economic opportunity for families in rural America, we are talking about the farm bill.

Last Congress, we brought a broad, bipartisan bill, but the committee was never able to get a vote on the floor. Now is our chance. Now is the critical time for rural America. People in our rural communities do count, and they ought to have the opportunity to have a farm bill voted upon. Now is the time that our farmers need to be able to plan for the future, and now we must have that opportunity to give them the chance to plan to help feed all of us.

This is the place, now is the time, now we have that opportunity to do something about it. Delay is serious, not only for our farmers, but for all of us. Short-term extensions only provide a band-aid. Uncertainty diminishes agriculture's ability to face the challenges associated with a growing population in our country and indeed a growing world population.

Yes, rural Americans are willing to do their part to cut the deficit and rein in spending, but we should not disproportionately put the burden upon the backs of families who live in small towns and communities across America. We hope that you will stand together and let's get the farm bill done for all Americans.

□ 1550

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to Subcommittee Chairman CONAWAY from the great State of Texas.

(Mr. CONAWAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Chairman, I want to thank Chairman LUCAS as well as Ranking Member PETERSON for the great work they've done in getting us to this point. It's been bipartisan, and it's been an honor to work with both these gentlemen.

This bill wasn't written overnight. This bill that we'll consider today or tomorrow or the next couple of days is the result of 4 years of debate, a 2-year audit of every single policy in the USDA, as well as 40 hearings and the second markup last month and now the floor debate. This landmark bill saves taxpayers billions over the next 10 years while making the greatest reforms in food policy since 1996.

There are many reasons why this balanced, equitable, and market-oriented farm bill is deserving of support. As we consider this legislation, I hope every Member of Congress will really think about how important it is to walk the walk rather than just talk the talk. This is a piece of legislation, not an opportunity for theatrics.

The difference between those who don't support this legislation and those who do is simple: the first group talks about cutting spending, talks about cutting the deficit, talks about making reforms, and talks about reducing the size of government, and the farm bill and its supporters actually do all of those things.

Failure to pass this farm bill means more of the same from Washington—

$40 billion in additional government spending; 100 programs that we on the committee believe have outlived their usefulness will continue on; and we will continue the runaway, abusive spending programs within the SNAP programs without the reforms that we've put in place for this bill.

Opposing this bill is a vote for the status quo in Washington. A vote against this bill is a vote for the status quo in Washington.

I could go back to my district and tell my constituents that I voted against this bill because I'm a fiscal conservative, knowing full well that what I really did was leave Washington with the spending spigot fully turned on, and I'm not going to do that. I hope my fellow Members won't do it either.

This bill helps to provide food safety for our national security. A nation that produces its own food is more secure.

In addition to the work on the Ag Committee, I also serve on the Armed Services Committee and the House Intelligence Committee, and I see the dangers that our country faces every day. It is not in our Nation's best interest to depend on other countries for our food supply like we do for energy and other areas.

This bill is supported by hundreds of farm associations, agribusinesses, and farmers and ranchers across the country, including more than 80 in my home State of Texas.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. Let's pass this and move on.

While farmers and ranchers would rather not ask us for this farm bill, it's simple—they don't have a choice.

If they could buy insurance for their crops like you and I can on our home, they would do it in a heartbeat. But they cannot. Without federal crop insurance, farmers and ranchers would have no insurance on a crop that they will spend more money each year to produce than most Americans will spend in a lifetime.

If farmers and ranchers could freely market their crops around the world without foreign governments putting up barriers, high tariffs, and spending billions of dollars to subsidize their farmers and ranchers, they would gladly do it.

But while we are debating cutting farm policy to record low levels, foreign subsidies and tariffs are hitting record highs and just keep rising. There is nothing free market about selling out America's farmers and ranchers to the uncompetitive trade practices of foreign countries.

This farm bill represents a modest response to Mother Nature and foreign subsidies and tariffs. It represents just one-quarter of 1 percent of the total budget. If every committee in Congress and every facet of government contributed to deficit reduction as the Agriculture Committee has, we would have the deficit licked by now.

Great thinkers throughout history have drawn the connection between the people who produce our food and clothing and the good of a nation. We in Congress owe it to the American taxpayer to pass legislation that promotes the safest, most abundant and cheapest food and fiber supply in the world.

I urge my colleagues to pass this farm bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to one of our subcommittee ranking members, the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Madam Chairman, I rise today to highlight the important and positive reforms in this year's FARRM Bill, that includes the Dairy subtitle, as we try to improve and save money for the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, otherwise known as the 2013 FARRM Bill.

I first want to thank Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member PETERSON for the terrific work that they've done in cobbling together this bipartisan effort. It's never easy.

I can tell you as a grandson of two generations of dairy farmers in California that what American farmers do every day is work as hard as they possibly can to provide the highest value food quality at the most cost-effective level to American consumers, and they've been doing it for generations.

The Dairy Security Act of this bill is the result of 4 years of hard work and compromise by dairy producers and other members of the dairy industry across the country. This program is intended to provide a strong, market-based safety net that will keep dairy producers afloat while providing stable consumer prices.

The dairy industry—and producers especially—has been a victim in recent years because of dramatic price volatility, and so have the consumers. At the same time, producers have been forced to deal with feed costs that have skyrocketed from $2 a bushel to $7 a bushel, and that has had a dramatic impact.

Dairy producers across the country have seen their overhead increase as their profits have remained stagnant. Current Federal dairy policy continues to foster outdated support programs which no longer provide a meaningful safety net or ensure any stability for our dairy farmers or our consumers.

In California, my home State, the leading dairy State in the Nation, we have lost 100 dairies as a result of bankruptcy in the last 18 months. Something needs to be done. We need to fix this broken system.

This title provides stability to the producers and benefits the consumers as well. It is time to bring meaningful reform, and this measure does this.

I ask my colleagues to support this effort as we move along this bipartisan compromise.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their outstanding work in crafting the 2013 FARRM Bill. I would especially like to thank the farmers and ranchers across rural America for their patience as we work through this long, difficult process.

Madam Chair, the bill before us today is the product of our extensive outreach to farmers, ranchers, and stakeholders across the entire country.

I believe that the most essential aspect of writing any farm bill is the critical input we receive from our rural constituents. The Agriculture Committee made this possible through holding a series of farm bill field hearings in nearly every region of the country, allowing producers to contribute to the farm bill process by having their voices heard.

Last year, I had the opportunity to host one of those field hearings in my hometown of Jonesboro, where all types of producers from Arkansas and around the Midsouth region had a chance to testify. They shared with the committee the challenges they face in the modern agricultural economy and provided suggestions about how the farm bill can be tailored to reflect their unique risk in the marketplace. This feedback was critical in helping us craft policy that meets the needs of producers not only in Arkansas, but around the country.

After hearing from stakeholders across the Nation, it was remarkable to me to hear time and time again that ag producers are willing to do their part to reduce the deficit. This willingness has allowed the Ag Committee to craft a farm bill that saves nearly $40 billion. This was no easy task, mind you, and the committee had to make some very tough choices. But I believe we were able to fairly balance the needs of our producers with the need to pay down the debt.

The final product is a bipartisan farm bill that saves taxpayers money, reduces deficit spending, and repeals outdated government programs while reforming, streamlining, and consolidating others. Whether it's through the elimination of direct payments, the consolidation of conservation programs, or eliminating abuse in the food stamp program, every part of this bill contributes fairly to deficit reduction.

I proudly support the 2013 FARRM Bill, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to another subcommittee ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ).

Mr. WALZ. Madam Chairman, I, too, want to thank the chairman and the ranking member, who not only have worked unwaveringly to craft a great piece of legislation, but collaborating, shepherding this thing through, saving taxpayer money, supporting jobs, streamlining for efficiency, and eliminating burdensome programs. I'd also especially like to say they've done it with dignity, they've done it with grace, and they've done it with the respect and thoughtfulness for this institution. And I'll tell you, the American people need a lot of that.

Last week, we had a poll that showed us at a 10 percent approval rating. The North Koreans are at 17 percent. That ought to tell you something here. It would be funny if it wasn't so dang disappointing. The sacrifices that went

into us doing the basic needs, the American public did not believe we could fulfill the basic needs. Well, you know what, they're wrong on this count because we're going to do it in here with the leadership of these two gentlemen who have spoken before. We need to make sure that this piece of legislation goes through the process, it's amended by the Members of this House in an appropriate manner, and we move it forward.

I can tell you, for those who say we would be better off just doing an extension, that's not what my dairy folks are telling me when they've watched drought, flood, and winter kill. They're struggling day to day to try and feed their herds and facing liquidation. To them, no farm bill means no funding for livestock disaster programs. Tell that to my youth in my district, where the average age of a farmer is 58 years, where we lose all these good programs to put people on the land.

So I urge all my colleagues: take a look at this. Do what you're hearing people say. This is reform. This is savings. This is smart policy. And it also gives the American people food security.

It's a national security issue. We feed 316 million Americans—our farmers do—and billions worldwide. I ask my colleagues, look over our shoulder, in this quote by Daniel Webster. Let us try and develop something worth being remembered for.

I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the subcommittee chairman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of this FARRM Bill. I, along with many others in this room, have worked on drafting a farm bill that meets the needs of our agricultural producers and consumers.

We've taken part in audit hearings and met with producers, grocers, and consumers. We've debated agricultural policy through two midnight-hour markups on a bill that should pass every 5 years. Through all of this, I have gained knowledge of many unnecessary programs and the fraud and abuse that plagues these programs. I also have a newfound appreciation for the FARRM Bill and its value to American citizens.

My granddad always said the farm bill is for when times are bad, not when they are good.

□ 1600

Several of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have reasons to vote against the bill. Some say it cuts too much. For others, it doesn't cut enough. Let me be clear. This bill is a good step in the right direction. It will reduce Federal spending. It reduces the fraud, abuse, and waste in many of the government programs that are in the government today.

I would like to share a few facts with you. If we don't pass this bill:

$40 billion is the amount of money that will be spent on outdated commodity programs that we have cut out of this bill;

11 million is the number of additional acres in conservation programs that would receive a government program that we have cut out of this bill.

We have also reduced SNAP payments for about 2 million people who should not qualify for them anyway.

Some of the reforms to the nutrition title include:

Restrictions in the use of the LIHEAP program;

Eliminating lottery winners from qualifying for SNAP benefits;

And eliminating State performance bonuses and advertising for the program.

As my friend from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) has asked: ''Is this a legislative moment or a theater moment?''

Madam Chair, I submit that this is a true legislative moment. During this time, we need to act on the facts. Farmers and families need the certainty of long-term agricultural policies so they can continue to be the cornerstone of our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to an outstanding member of our committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Chair, I want to begin by thanking the chairman of the Ag Committee, Mr. LUCAS, and the ranking member, Mr. PETERSON, for their hard work. There have been countless hours on this bill, and so have their staffs. I appreciate their dedication.

I very much want to support a farm bill, so it is with deep regret that I come to the floor to say that I cannot support this farm bill. The main reason is because of the $20.5 billion cut in the SNAP program. That is too much, that is too harsh. Two million people will lose their benefits. Over 200,000 kids will be knocked out of the free breakfast and lunch program. Those aren't my statistics or a liberal think tank's statistics; that's what CBO says, the Congressional Budget Office. What happens to these 2 million people? Where do they go? Where do they get food? The fact of the matter is food is not a luxury, it is a necessity.

There are some who have said that all we are doing is reforming SNAP and we are dealing with the rising costs. If we were truly reforming SNAP, I would feel better about it if we held at least one hearing on it in the subcommittee.

In terms of dealing with rising costs, the best way to deal with that is to invest in our economy and put people back to work. When more people go to work, the number of people on SNAP goes down. It's countercyclical. That's how you decrease spending on SNAP.

Madam Chair, we have 50 million people in this country who are hungry—17 million are kids. We all should be ashamed. We ought to be having a discussion on how to end hunger in America. SNAP is one tool in the antihunger toolbox to end hunger. We need to have a broader discussion. But I can say with certainty that cutting SNAP by $20.5 billion will not alleviate hunger in America. It will cause more pain, more suffering, and more misery.

I want a farm bill that not only helps our farmers but moves us toward a day where we no longer have hunger in America. Unfortunately, this bill as written will make hunger worse.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), a subcommittee chairman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the House Agriculture Committee's 2013 FARRM Bill.

This legislation is a product of 3 years of extensive hearings, research, and fact finding. The bill eliminates outdated farm programs, direct payments, countercyclical payments, the average crop revenue election program, and the supplemental revenue assistance payments, for example. These programs are part of an old system and need to be eliminated.

Regarding SNAP and food stamps, we have made significant reforms. Specifically, we have closed a number of loopholes and have eliminated categorical eligibility. While we have eliminated these loopholes, such as automatic enrollment, the bill still allows for eligibility, based on income, to ensure that those who truly need the assistance continue to have access.

For the second consecutive Congress, I have had the privilege to chair the Subcommittee on Conservation, Energy, and Forestry. At the subcommittee level, we were successful in consolidating and cleaning up a number of programs. The bill consolidates 23 conservation programs down to 13. I believe it achieves this without negatively impacting the effectiveness or the goals of these programs.

We have also included several provisions to promote the health of our Nation's forests. Agriculture is the number one industry in Pennsylvania, and I am pleased to see that we are bringing much-needed reform to the Commonwealth's top sector—dairy. First and foremost, this bill repeals all of the dairy price support system, and replaces that system with a free-market margin program.

Like many of my colleagues, I have significant concern with the supply management portion of the dairy title. However, we can address this matter in the amendment process.

This bill is not perfect. However, it does make significant changes to both farm and nutrition programs, and will save the taxpayer over $40 billion. Without passage of this bill, none of these reforms will be made, none of the savings will be realized, and we will continue these broken policies or, even worse, revert to the permanent law for the 1930s and the 1940s.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation, and I thank both the chairman and ranking member for their leadership.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR), a former member of the committee.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the importance of passing the new 5-year farm bill into law.

I first want to thank Chairman LUCAS for all the good work that he has done, and my ranking member, Mr. PETERSON—I still call him my ranking member, Mr. PETERSON—for all the work that he and the other members of the Agriculture Committee, in a bipartisan way, have done, including the staff that worked so hard to make sure that we get this farm bill done.

As you know, we did pass an extension, which was not the right thing to do, but we did an extension. We need to provide some sort of continuity with a 5-year program. As you know, this is something that needs to be done in a bipartisan way, and this is what the committee has done after having numerous bill hearings, after making some changes that provide some reform, reform that will save the taxpayers over $40 billion in funding over the next 10 years through important reforms to our commodity, conservation, and nutrition agencies.

I don't like the cuts to the nutrition, but I do understand this is a process. We have to get into a conference committee and work with the Senate. Therefore, I'm asking the Members to support the process and get this bill to where we can support it as bipartisan.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the farm bill—a product of several years of hard work and patience from Chairman LUCAS, Ranking Member PETERSON, and their staffs at the Agriculture Committee.

Madam Chairman, I would like to call attention to the patience of our farming community across this Nation, the economic engine of rural America, and especially to the farming families in the Eighth District of North Carolina, which I call home. When I go home every weekend and travel across my district, I hear one resounding thing, and that is get a 5-year farm bill done to provide us the certainty we need.

Madam Chairman, this bill is not perfect. In my opinion, it does not contain enough cuts or reforms, but our alternative is the status quo. I would like to see more cuts and will offer and support amendments to do just that. Ultimately, I will support this bill because not supporting it, again, means the status quo. Not supporting this bill means not getting over $40 billion in mandatory cuts when we had the chance. Not supporting this bill means not having a 5-year bill to provide certainty that our farmers need.

From the important provisions found in the commodities title to ensuring the critical safety net of crop insurance remains intact to making responsible cuts and reforms to bloated programs, saving the taxpayers' money, this bill is a bill we need to support.

This a bill that provides the tools our farmers need to keep them producing food and fiber for our country and the world.

Like I said, this bill is not perfect and I look forward to the debate we will have in the coming days, and considering the amendments my colleagues and I will offer to make this the best bill we can for the Agriculture Community and the American taxpayer.

On behalf of the farmers and agribusiness community of North Carolina, I am eager to get this bill finished and providing long awaited certainty and reforms.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to a new member of our committee from Illinois (Mr. ENYART).

Mr. ENYART. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of this important and long overdue legislation.

When I ran for Congress, I pledged to work for southern Illinois' agricultural industry. That's why I voted in committee to advance this bipartisan 5-year bill.

The inability of the House to pass a farm bill was among the biggest failings of the last Congress. This is by no means a perfect bill. It cuts far too deeply to the SNAP program. There are real people in my district and in yours who depend on this program, and while we must reduce the deficit we shouldn't be doing that on the backs of those who can't afford to put food on the table. However, I believe that funding will be bolstered here on the floor of the House and in conference.

□ 1610

Let's look at what the bill does right:

It funds infrastructure upgrades for Midwestern waterways so farmers can get their crops to market;

It increases energy access to rural America, improving efficiency and reducing input costs for farmers and small businesses;

It ensures farmers have the flexibility to grow a wide array of crops without penalty and without fear of losing their insurance;

It saves taxpayer dollars and conserves critical wildlife and hunting habitats while still allowing farmers to manage their lands as they see fit;

It makes the USDA more efficient by streamlining programs and by cutting down on unnecessary paperwork and burdensome regulation for farmers;

It eases access to lines of credit so that farmers who want to expand their businesses have the tools necessary to do so;

It strengthens crop insurance to protect taxpayers while also making sure that farmers don't lose the farm if disaster strikes.

It's time that we do what we were sent here to do. It's time to act on a bill that, although imperfect, should have been adopted a year ago. It's time to pass a comprehensive farm bill. I stand in support of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to join with me.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

Mr. BENISHEK. I rise today in support of H.R. 1947, better known to everyone simply as the farm bill.

Over the past 3 years, I've been talking to farmers all over northern Michigan. My district is home to a diverse group of farmers. These family-owned operations are a vital and growing part of northern Michigan's economy, and it has been a privilege getting to know them.

Earlier this month, I visited with farmers in Leelanau County. I spoke to farmers at the Bardenhagen Farm in Suttons Bay, Michigan. Jim Bardenhagen and his family have been working their farm for over a century, so they know a thing or two about agriculture. Their story is like that of a lot of farmers across the First District and this whole country. These farmers have been telling me about the need for a strong farm bill, and I believe that's just what we have here.

Look, I understand this farm bill is not an easy issue for everyone. I can fully understand. I'm a doctor, not a farmer, so I tend to talk and trust those who understand these complicated issues best—the farmers in my district. For those of you who don't have a lot of farmers, don't worry. You sure eat. I'd be happy to give you the numbers of lots of farmers in northern Michigan, and they'd be happy to talk to you.

I look forward to a robust debate.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to another new member of the committee, the gentlelady from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS).

Mrs. BUSTOS. I rise today to talk about an issue of critical importance to my district in Illinois, and that is passing a 5-year farm bill.

As anyone can tell as one drives across my district, from Rockford to the Quad Cities to Peoria and everywhere in between, agriculture is our number one industry. My district is home to thousands of farmers and to millions of acres of some of the best farmland in the world. It is also home to Caterpillar and John Deere—among the best farm implement manufacturers in the world. The entire western border of my congressional district is met by the Mississippi River, on which barge transportation of agricultural products is absolutely vital to commerce in the region, in the State, and even in the world.

Whenever I talk with farmers or those employed in the agricultural business, what I hear more than anything else is that they want—and they need—certainty. Unfortunately, last year, Congress failed to pass a 5-year farm bill and, instead, resorted to a short-term extension, which expires at the end of September.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentlelady an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Thank you, Mr. PETERSON.

As a member of the Agriculture Committee, it was an honor to be part of the farm bill markup last month. Unlike so much else in Washington, the markup was an exercise in bipartisanship. The entire committee was civil and accommodating toward one another. While the bill we passed is not perfect, it contains many worthwhile provisions.

Illinois farmers have endured some of the most extreme weather conditions in recent years, including record floods this year and the worst drought in a generation just a year ago. That is why we need to keep in place a strong and stable crop insurance program so that farmers, always at the mercy of Mother Nature, can continue to provide the food our Nation and our world depend on. The bill also contains an amendment that I sponsored that would help aid improvements to river transportation infrastructure, flood prevention and drought relief, including the aging locks and dam system along the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers.

The family farmers I talk with back home in Illinois want the security and the stability of a 5-year farm bill. That is how they can plan for future growth and investments and can continue to provide the world with a stable food supply. Let's give them the certainty by passing a 5-year farm bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes for the purpose of a colloquy to the gentleman from Washington State, DOC HASTINGS.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As you know, the central Washington growers whom I represent provide a variety of top-quality produce to people across the country and around the world, including the majority of apples, pears, and cherries grown in the United States. There is no question that both consumers and growers want to ensure that we have the safest food supply in the world. However, Mr. Chairman, I have serious concerns with the one-size-fits-all regulations that the Food and Drug Administration has proposed to govern the way that all fruits and vegetables are grown and harvested.

I think that we can all agree that lettuce and apples are grown in completely different ways. For one thing, lettuce is grown in the ground and apples in the trees. That's obvious. It only makes sense that these products should be evaluated based on how susceptible they may be to food safety risks and subjected to regulations that would reflect both the risk level and the way they are grown.

I am concerned that the current regulations, which subject all growers of fresh produce to the same requirements and restrictions, are nearly impossible to meet for tree fruit growers in my district. There has never been a known food safety problem with fresh apples; and yet if implemented, these regulations risk putting our growers out of business and pushing apple production overseas.

Would the chairman agree that the FDA should evaluate the risks of individual agricultural products based on the best available science and consider the growing methods and conditions of these products when developing regulations under the Food Safety Modernization Act for the safe production, harvesting, handling, and packing of fresh fruits and vegetables?

I yield to the chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS. I recognize the gentleman from Washington's concerns about the one-size-fits-all approach of the FDA. In fact, this was among the several concerns we raised during debate in the House when the Food Safety Modernization Act was under consideration.

I share his belief that, if the FDA is going to be given the task of telling farmers how to farm, it should do so after a thorough examination of the risks of the different types of fruits and vegetables and then, based on the best available science, consider the growing methods and the conditions of individual commodities when developing regulations.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

I would encourage the FDA to reevaluate the proposed regulations, including docket No. FDA–2011–N–0921–0001, and make the necessary revisions to ensure that they meet this purpose.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I would like to thank the chairman for his words and his attention to this issue that is so important to the growers of my central Washington district. I look forward to continuing to work with him to ensure that the new food safety regulations recognize the diverse way that farms across the Nation grow our food and keep them safe for the public.

Mr. PETERSON. I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to another new member of the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS).

Mr. VARGAS. I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member of the Agriculture Committee for their leadership and their hard work in bringing a farm bill to the floor this year.

I rise in support of many of the provisions in the FARRM Act, but with grave concerns about the cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP.

I strongly support the provisions in the FARRM Act that expand funding for the Specialty Crop Block Grants, that restore funding for the Specialty Crop Research Initiative and that maintain funding for pest and disease control, market access programs and organic agriculture.

While the FARRM Act provides many positive provisions that support a strong agriculture safety net, the $20.5 billion in cuts to the SNAP program is unconscionable. If the FARRM Act is enacted, the CBO estimates that nearly 2 million low-income people will lose SNAP benefits and that another 1.8 million people live in households that would experience a benefit cut of $90 per month.

We cannot continue to balance the budget on the backs of our poor, our children, our seniors, and our veterans. I want to support a farm bill, but I cannot support these cuts to SNAP. I do, though, thank them very much for their hard work.

□ 1620

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California, a home of amazingly diverse agriculture, Mr. LAMALFA.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1947.

Is this farm bill perfect? No. Would I like for it to have done more? Yes. Is this still a bill that modernizes and moves farm bill reform forward? Yes.

We've made many landmark improvements and modernized many programs within this bill. The farm bill provides logical reforms that would streamline our Federal Government and cut spending and protect our farmers, ranchers, and rural communities.

We indeed are reducing spending in the farm bill by $40 billion, including $6 million in sequestration. We're streamlining the conservation programs to the tune of $13.2 billion by repealing direct payments, also. We are also saving money in the food stamp area by $20.5 billion.

The farm bill offers the first reforms and savings to the SNAP law since the Clinton-era welfare reforms in 1996, modernizing SNAP programs while eliminating waste, fraud, and abuse.

In the House Agriculture Committee, I'm proud to say we added further reforms to SNAP by preventing the USDA and States from engaging in SNAP recruitment activities and prohibiting the USDA from advertising SNAP on TV, radio, and billboards.

This is a farm bill we need to pass to move in the right direction. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I'm now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the minority whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his work, and I thank Mr. LUCAS for his work.

We struggle in this Congress to try to bring bipartisan legislation to the floor. It's a shame.

I've normally voted for the farm bill for a reason I will express here. First of all, the farm bill is an important piece of legislation. It sets Federal policy in a range of areas that deeply affect the lives of farmers, their communities, and consumers. But it also makes a huge difference in the lives of those who rely on food assistance to avoid hunger, especially children.

It's a shame that we could not consider the farm bill on its merits without undermining its credibility with what we clearly believe are not reforms and not the elimination of waste, fraud, and abuse.

It's so simple to say that. I've heard that for all the time I've been here in Congress. Let's just cut out fraud, waste, and abuse. Everybody wants to cut out fraud, waste, and abuse; but cutting out assistance for hungry people is neither fraud, nor waste nor abuse. Well, it may be abuse.

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP as it is called, protects over 46 million Americans who are at risk of going without sufficient food. Nearly half of those are children. Are there some reforms that are needed? Perhaps. And the Senate has made those reforms in a moderate, considered way.

The average monthly benefit per participant last year according to the USDA was $133.41. I challenge any Member of this House to live on $133.41 for food. That's $4.45 a day.

At a time when millions remain out of work struggling to support themselves and their family as they seek jobs, it would be irresponsible to make the kinds of cuts that are proposed in this bill. No one in the richest country on the face of the Earth should go hungry in this country.

Yet that's exactly what this bill would do, slashing $20.5 billion from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and putting 2 million of our fellow Americans at risk.

Feed the hungry; clothe the naked; give shelter to the homeless—that's not a political policy. That's a moral policy. Our faiths teach us that.

While we've cut millions in funding in this bill, this Congress has done nothing to advance legislation that will help create jobs or opportunities to help expand our middle class. While it's important that Congress provide certainty to the agricultural community, which I support, this unbalanced bill takes the wrong approach on these cuts to SNAP.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Chair, I'm disappointed. This ought to be a bipartisan bill. Mr. PETERSON wants it to be a bipartisan bill and many of our people and, as a matter of fact, a majority of our people supported it in committee.

I think the chairman wants it to be a bipartisan bill. I understand he has to deal within the framework of his caucus like every chairman has to do on either side of the aisle. I understand that. But it is a shame.

A bill that ought to be bringing us together for people who provide this country with food and fiber and, indeed, provide a lot of the world with food and fiber, that we have put this almost poison pill—I don't know whether it's going to be a poison pill—but almost poison pill in it, I regret that. It's not worthy of our country. It's not worthy of the morals of this Nation.

But I thank the chairman and I thank the ranking member for their efforts to try to bring us together. Whether they've done so or not, we'll have to see.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM).

Mrs. NOEM. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership on this issue.

Madam Chairman, today I rise, I stand, and at this point I'd even leap for joy, for a farm bill that's good for agriculture in this country.

This bill that we have today isn't a perfect bill, but it is a good bill. It is bipartisan, it saves nearly $40 billion, it reforms the food stamp program and farm programs, it eliminates direct payments, it consolidates conservation programs, it saves money, it gives us a safety net, and it is still accountable to taxpayers.

As we debate this bill, though, I don't want to lose sight of a big policy discussion. We decided decades ago that it was important for us to have a farm bill because it was important for us to grow our own food in this country. We didn't want to rely on another country to feed us because we recognized that the instant we did that, we would allow that country to control us.

That's why good farm policy is important to our national security. That's why when we go to the grocery store, we can count on buying safe food. We can know that there will be affordable food there at affordable prices. A farm bill is the reason that we all enjoy these benefits. We can't take our food supply for granted.

I urge my colleagues to pass this bill this week.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER).

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I thank the chairman, and I rise in support of H.R. 1947, the FARRM Bill.

This is a win-win. This is a win for the American people because they're going to continue to get the safest and cheapest food in the world.

It's a win for farmers and ranchers all across the country because now they will have a 5-year farm bill that will give them policy to make the important decisions they need to make to run their businesses and their farms and ranches.

And more importantly it's a win-win for the American people because this brings $40 billion worth of savings at a time when we're running trillion-dollar deficits.

There's been a lot of discussion about what this bill does and doesn't do. This bill does bring reform, reforming over 100 different programs. What this bill doesn't do is take one benefit away from a SNAP recipient who's qualified for that.

What we find is there's been some gamesmanship in this program. What we owe the American people is to make sure that the people who are on these benefits that are very timely for some folks, but make sure that they qualify for it. So those people that want to say this takes money away or food away from families, that's just not true.

I urge you to support this reform bill. It's good for the American people.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

□ 1630

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I come to the floor, first, to congratulate this bipartisan effort. I have been through other farm bills I guess a couple of times. I've seen it when we had a Republican chair, a Democrat chair, and a Republican chair. I've seen it as Ranking Member PETERSON worked hard with Republicans 6 years ago. And I've seen it as our chairman, FRANK LUCAS, has worked hard with Ranking Member PETERSON over the last year and a half. This is a very, very difficult balance to pull together.

But here's what we get with this: first of all, the end of direct payments by the agreement of our producers. Whoever, as a recipient of a government check, stepped forward and said: I'll give that up because economically we can do that. And at the same time, we get some reform in the SNAP side of this thing that says we're going to start holding some people accountable without taking a single calorie out of the mouths of those that are needy and those who we want to get those benefits.

And in the middle of all of that, if we don't pass a bill, we revert to the 1949 bill, which would be a calamity. And if we don't address the SNAP version of this, then what we end up with, Madam Chair, is a growing food stamp program. So I urge its adoption.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

Mr. DAINES. Madam Chairman, one of the top requests that I hear from Montanans when I go back every weekend is Congress needs to pass a long-term farm bill.

One in five of Montana jobs rely on agriculture, and it's past time for passage of a 5-year farm bill that protects

and promotes Montana's number one industry. We need a farm bill that supports our rural communities and gives the ag community the certainty needed to plant the crops that feed our country and ensure a stable food supply. We need a farm bill that gives Montana farmers relief from burdensome regulations and encourages young people to remain active in their family farms.

This bill also contains important provisions for our timber community, and for the health of our forests. As we begin fire season, we've already seen the terrible consequences of the lack of active forest management. It's important we give the Forest Service the necessary regulatory relief in order to protect our communities.

In light of our Nation's escalating debt crisis, Congress must look to save taxpayer money wherever possible. I am pleased that the Ag Committee has made substantive, cost-saving changes to a wide variety of programs in the proposed farm bill, including reforms designed to reduce fraud and abuse in the distribution of food stamps. It's important to get the farm bill passed through the House, into conference, and on the President's desk before expiration. It's time to pass the farm bill.

Mr. PETERSON. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Chair, I rise to support this bill, and I certainly appreciate the persistent hard work and leadership of Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member PETERSON, and I want to thank both for bringing this very important legislation to the floor for a House vote.

In 2012, Louisiana farmers and ranchers produced nearly $11.4 billion in commodities. It's a vital and growing sector of our State's economy, and we need a new farm bill now to provide the kind of certainty going forward for our farmers. Throughout south Louisiana, the agricultural economy is the lifeblood of our rural communities. This is a bipartisan bill containing truly significant reforms, with savings of up to $40 billion.

Given the immense diversity of American agriculture, it's important to have price-loss coverage, which is an important option for our Southern farmers, like our rice farmers. This is critical for their future security.

Additionally, an extension of the U.S. sugar program ensures a level playing field with other nations, which continue to heavily subsidize their sugar industry with unfair trade practices. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1947, the 2013 FARRM Bill. Agriculture is an inherently risky venture. But even in tough times, agriculture remains a bright spot in our economy, and we cannot afford to undermine this success. We should not use the notion of ag producers growing more and wasting less as an excuse to chip away at crop insurance. Thanks to crop insurance design, last year's losses, a result of the worst drought in decades, were not completely borne by taxpayers. Further cuts to this program could mean increased costs to consumers.

This farm bill also provides disaster assistance to livestock producers impacted by severe drought; continues investment into agriculture research, a crucial component of food safety; and builds upon conservation efforts already undertaken by landowners across America.

While this is not a perfect bill, we are here to allow the legislative process to work. I'm hopeful we can pass this bill, go to conference with the Senate, and ensure producers have the opportunity they need to continue to feed the world.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from Minnesota has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chair, I would note that I am the last speaker and would conclude, and would ask if the gentleman would yield me an extra minute or two.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota yields 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma to control.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, we've heard some very good debate this evening about the merits and the challenges that we face in putting this bipartisan bill together. I'd like to take just a moment to focus on the nutrition title and the spirit and the logic that went into crafting this.

The focus of the committee was that the savings should be achieved across all areas of the farm bill, and that $40 billion, approximately, we have saved does achieve savings in the commodity title, the conservation title, as well as the nutrition title. Everybody under the jurisdiction of the farm bill contributes to the reforms.

Now, in the nutrition title for just a moment, I just want to stress to my colleagues the committee tried to achieve savings in a way that would not deny an individual who was qualified under present law by income or assets from receiving help. We just simply say in the committee draft that things like automatic food stamps, categorical eligibility, something that's evolved out of the 1996 welfare reform, we simply say everybody needs to show they qualify, and we'll help you.

The LIHEAP program, where States in some cases give as little as $1 to help their citizens pay their home heating costs that triggers a whole month's worth of food stamps, we say in the bill: States, you've got to give $20 to trigger that.

The goal of the committee was never to work hardship on anyone. The goal of the committee, in a time of $16 trillion national debt, annual trillion-dollar deficits, was to achieve savings across the board. But it requires that the folks who need help come in and demonstrate they qualify. If you don't like the asset level or the income level, that's a different debate. We just simply say if you need the help, show us you qualify and we'll help you. That's a $20.5 billion savings, according to CBO. Will that be the way it's implemented? I don't know. But we operate by CBO scores, and there's almost $40 billion in overall savings in all areas of the farm bill.

I would challenge all my friends, if every other committee in every other jurisdiction would achieve these kinds of savings across the board, we'd be in a different situation with our operating annual deficit.

The Ag Committee has done its work, and we've done it in a thoughtful way. Help us over the course of the next few days with the amendment process. Don't, by affection, offer amendments simply to prevent the process from happening. Don't do things that are intended not to make the bill a better piece of legislation, but to prevent it. Be good legislators; be thoughtful legislators. Do what's right, whether it's to help the people raise the food, or that other part of our society that needs help on a month-to-month basis. Do them all right. I have faith in you. I believe through good debate and good discussion on good amendments, perfections will be made. A consensus will be achieved. We'll move forward. I have faith in you, my colleagues.

With that, Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1640

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. ROBY). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) having assumed the chair, Mrs. ROBY, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1947) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 1947.

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

There was no objection.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 266, I call up the bill (H.R. 1797) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 266, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–15 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1797

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

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act''.

SEC. 2. LEGISLATIVE FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY FOR ENACTMENT.

Congress finds and declares the following:

(1) Pain receptors (nociceptors) are present throughout the unborn child's entire body and nerves link these receptors to the brain's thalamus and subcortical plate by no later than 20 weeks after fertilization.

(2) By 8 weeks after fertilization, the unborn child reacts to touch. After 20 weeks, the unborn child reacts to stimuli that would be recognized as painful if applied to an adult human, for example, by recoiling.

(3) In the unborn child, application of such painful stimuli is associated with significant increases in stress hormones known as the stress response.

(4) Subjection to such painful stimuli is associated with long-term harmful neurodevelopmental effects, such as altered pain sensitivity and, possibly, emotional, behavioral, and learning disabilities later in life.

(5) For the purposes of surgery on unborn children, fetal anesthesia is routinely administered and is associated with a decrease in stress hormones compared to their level when painful stimuli are applied without such anesthesia. In the United States, surgery of this type is being performed by 20 weeks after fertilization and earlier in specialized units affiliated with children's hospitals.

(6) The position, asserted by some physicians, that the unborn child is incapable of experiencing pain until a point later in pregnancy than 20 weeks after fertilization predominately rests on the assumption that the ability to experience pain depends on the cerebral cortex and requires nerve connections between the thalamus and the cortex. However, recent medical research and analysis, especially since 2007, provides strong evidence for the conclusion that a functioning cortex is not necessary to experience pain.

(7) Substantial evidence indicates that children born missing the bulk of the cerebral cortex, those with hydranencephaly, nevertheless experience pain.

(8) In adult humans and in animals, stimulation or ablation of the cerebral cortex does not alter pain perception, while stimulation or ablation of the thalamus does.

(9) Substantial evidence indicates that structures used for pain processing in early development differ from those of adults, using different neural elements available at specific times during development, such as the subcortical plate, to fulfill the role of pain processing.

(10) The position, asserted by some commentators, that the unborn child remains in a coma-like sleep state that precludes the unborn child experiencing pain is inconsistent with the documented reaction of unborn children to painful stimuli and with the experience of fetal surgeons who have found it necessary to sedate the unborn child with anesthesia to prevent the unborn child from engaging in vigorous movement in reaction to invasive surgery.

(11) Consequently, there is substantial medical evidence that an unborn child is capable of experiencing pain at least by 20 weeks after fertilization, if not earlier.

(12) It is the purpose of the Congress to assert a compelling governmental interest in protecting the lives of unborn children from the stage at which substantial medical evidence indicates that they are capable of feeling pain.

(13) The compelling governmental interest in protecting the lives of unborn children from the stage at which substantial medical evidence indicates that they are capable of feeling pain is intended to be separate from and independent of the compelling governmental interest in protecting the lives of unborn children from the stage of viability, and neither governmental interest is intended to replace the other.

(14) Congress has authority to extend protection to pain-capable unborn children under the Supreme Court's Commerce Clause precedents and under the Constitution's grants of powers to Congress under the Equal Protection, Due Process, and Enforcement Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment.

SEC. 3. PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1531 the following:

''§ 1532. Pain-capable unborn child protection

''(a) UNLAWFUL CONDUCT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, it shall be unlawful for any person to perform an abortion or attempt to do so, unless in conformity with the requirements set forth in subsection (b).

''(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR ABORTIONS.—

''(1) The physician performing or attempting the abortion shall first make a determination of the probable post-fertilization age of the unborn child or reasonably rely upon such a determination made by another physician. In making such a determination, the physician shall make such inquiries of the pregnant woman and perform or cause to be performed such medical examinations and tests as a reasonably prudent physician, knowledgeable about the case and the medical conditions involved, would consider necessary to make an accurate determination of post-fertilization age.

''(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the abortion shall not be performed or attempted, if the probable post-fertilization age, as determined under paragraph (1), of the unborn child is 20 weeks or greater.

''(B) Subject to subparagraph (C), subparagraph (A) does not apply if—

''(i) in reasonable medical judgment, the abortion is necessary to save the life of a pregnant woman whose life is endangered by a physical disorder, physical illness, or physical injury, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself, but not including psychological or emotional conditions; or

''(ii) the pregnancy is the result of rape, or the result of incest against a minor, if the rape has been reported at any time prior to the abortion to an appropriate law enforcement agency, or if the incest against a minor has been reported at any time prior to the abortion to an appropriate law enforcement agency or to a government agency legally authorized to act on reports of child abuse or neglect.

''(C) Notwithstanding the definitions of 'abortion' and 'attempt an abortion' in this section, a physician terminating or attempting to terminate a pregnancy under an exception provided by subparagraph (B) may do so only in the manner which, in reasonable medical judgment, provides the best opportunity for the unborn child to survive, unless, in reasonable medical judgment, termination of the pregnancy in that manner would pose a greater risk of—

''(i) the death of the pregnant woman; or

''(ii) the substantial and irreversible physical impairment of a major bodily function, not including psychological or emotional conditions, of the pregnant woman;

than would other available methods.

''(c) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—Whoever violates subsection (a) shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

''(d) BAR TO PROSECUTION.—A woman upon whom an abortion in violation of subsection (a) is performed or attempted may not be prosecuted under, or for a conspiracy to violate, subsection (a), or for an offense under section 2, 3, or 4 of this title based on such a violation.

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section the following definitions apply:

''(1) ABORTION.—The term 'abortion' means the use or prescription of any instrument, medicine, drug, or any other substance or device—

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

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

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

''(ii) to remove a dead unborn child.

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

''(3) FERTILIZATION.—The term 'fertilization' means the fusion of human spermatozoon with a human ovum.

''(4) PERFORM.—The term 'perform', with respect to an abortion, includes induce an abortion through a medical or chemical intervention including writing a prescription for a drug or device intended to result in an abortion.

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

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

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

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

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

''(10) WOMAN.—The term 'woman' means a female human being whether or not she has reached the age of majority.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 74 of title 18,

United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''1532. Pain-capable unborn child protection.''.

(c) CHAPTER HEADING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CHAPTER HEADING IN CHAPTER.—The chapter heading for chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ***''PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTIONS''*** *and inserting* ***''ABORTIONS''****.*

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 1797, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) be permitted to control the balance of my time.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am wondering why a member of the Judiciary Committee is not managing on the part of the majority. The chairman is here. We recessed our markup so that all members of the Judiciary Committee could be present.

It is generally our practice for members of the committee of jurisdiction to manage on both sides, and so the inquiry is why are we departing from that practice?

Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. It is the prerogative of the committee to choose the appropriate people to manage time. I notice that the ranking member is not managing on the Democratic side. We choose to ask someone who is not a member of the committee, and that's appropriate under the rules of the House.

Ms. LOFGREN. I will not object. I just thought it was an unusual procedure.

I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have to tell you, Madam Speaker, so often we come to the floor and we will hear Members say, we are doing this for the children or that for the children, and I have to tell you, this is one of those days that we truly can stand and say, yes, indeed, we are taking an action that will enable so many children to enjoy that first guarantee, that guarantee to life. And indeed, that is the reason that we stand here.

The Unborn Child Protection Act is based in science. This is an area that has overwhelming public support, and it is, indeed, an appropriate response to Kermit Gosnell's house of horrors and the similar stories that we are hearing emanate from across the Nation about what is happening in these abortion clinics.

What this does is to limit abortion at the 6th month of pregnancy and includes exceptions so that we can send the clearest possible message to the American people that we do not support more Gosnell-like abortions.

It does nothing to ban abortion before the 6th month of pregnancy. It does not affect Roe v. Wade, and we know that it is a step that needs to be taken to protect life.

You know, scientific evidence tells us that unborn babies can feel touch as soon as 8 weeks into the pregnancy. They feel pain at 20 weeks. Indeed, some of these marvelous, marvelous fetal surgeries that are performed, they administer an anesthesia to these unborn babies.

And as I said, public opinion polling shows that 60 percent of all Americans, Madam Speaker, they support limiting abortion during the second trimester, and 80 percent during the third trimester. So we think that it is incumbent upon this body to take the step that we bring before the Chamber today and to recognize science, to bring the law in line with the majority of public opinion, and to stand against what has transpired in the Kermit Gosnell-like abortion clinics.

Indeed, I think it is so noteworthy that Mr. Gosnell's attorney, Jack McMahon, stated that he thought the law should be back to 16 or 17 weeks. He said that 24 weeks was not a good determiner, and that it would be a far better thing to have that ban at 16 or 17 weeks.

We're not pushing back that far. We're at 20 weeks. We think that this is an appropriate step.

At this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I rise in opposition to this bill. This will be the 10th vote we've had to restrict women's access to health care since Republicans took control of the House in 2011, and there are plenty of other things we should be doing.

The bill imposes a nationwide 20-week abortion ban. It's unconstitutional, but it's also dangerous to the health and safety of American women. The narrow health exception in the bill only allows for abortions that are necessary to save the life of a pregnant woman. It's shortsighted at best and cruel at worst.

Many things can go wrong in pregnancy, and this bill would force a doctor to wait until a woman's condition was life-threatening before performing an abortion.

Nonlife-threatening conditions couldn't be treated if this bill were law, which could result in permanent health problems for some women, including infertility.

Severe or fatal conditions may also arise with a fetus later in pregnancy and, if enacted into law, this bill would require some women to carry a fetus to term, even in the situation where that fetus has been diagnosed with a lethal medical condition, a heartbreaking scenario.

The rape and incest exceptions are insulting and excessively narrow. The rape and incest exceptions that were added to the bill after the committee's markup are just incredibly disappointing. They require reporting the crime to law enforcement prior to seeking care. It shows a distrust of women and a lack of understanding of the reality of sexual assault.

Only 35 percent of women report sexual assaults, and there are many reasons for that that are complex, including fear of reprisal—78 percent of rape victims know their offender—shame, wanting to put the incident behind them.

Also, this bill is unconstitutional. It's a direct challenge to Roe v. Wade, where the Court held that, prior to viability, abortions may be banned only if there are meaningful exceptions to protect the woman's life and health. For over four decades these principles have been upheld, and this bill blatantly disregards them.

□ 1650

Finally, I want to urge my colleagues to oppose this bill. It's an attack on women's health, on our constitutional freedoms, and it seeks to take important medical decisions out of the hands of women, their doctors and their families and instead entrust those decisions to Congress. It's a misguided effort.

I oppose the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to one of our great pro-life advocates, Mrs. BLACK from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACK. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Madam Speaker, when I first became a nurse over 40 years ago, I took a vow to ''devote myself to the welfare of those committed to my care.'' And it is in this spirit of both protecting life and women's health that I'm proud to rise today in support of H.R. 1797, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

Now, this bipartisan legislation would ban late-term abortion after 20 weeks. I want to say that again. It would ban late-term abortion after 20

weeks, with the exception provided for when the life of the mother is endangered.

H.R. 1797 is based on undisputed scientific evidence which tells us that unborn children at 20 weeks and older can feel pain—these are babies, they can feel pain—and that late-term abortions pose severe health risks also for the mother. For example, a woman seeking an abortion at 20 weeks is 35 times more likely to die from an abortion than she was in the first trimester. There are medical reasons for this. At 21 weeks or more, a woman is 91 times more likely to die from an abortion than she was in the first trimester.

Despite these undisputed facts about a baby's level of development and a woman's health, there is currently no Federal law to protect pain-capable unborn children or their mothers by restricting late-term abortions—even at a day and age when we're seeing premature babies that are born at 22 weeks that survive.

As a society, we celebrate the birth of babies whether it's prematurely born at 22 weeks or delivered at full term, and we hope and pray for good health of that baby and the mother.

Today, with that same spirit in mind, I urge my colleagues to join me in celebrating and protecting life of both the baby and the mother by passing H.R. 1797.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I would yield 2 minutes to a former member of the Judiciary Committee, Representative DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to strongly oppose the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. It has been 40 years since Roe v. Wade, and yet women still have to fight for the right to keep decisions about our bodies between us and our doctors. We shouldn't have to worry that our government will try to intercede in our personal health care decisions.

This bill is extreme, and it's an unprecedented reach into women's lives—into women's personal lives. This is a clear indication that the well-being of women in this country is not something Republicans care to protect. It is clear that the Members who approved this bill, the all-male Republican members on the House Judiciary Committee, are not only disinterested in protecting the well-being of women but are also disinterested in the professional opinion of the medical community.

We have heard a lot of offensive and downright untrue assertions by Republicans throughout the discussion of this bill, including by the previous speaker. These assertions are baseless, completely devoid of medical fact or grounding in consensus among doctors. No evidence has been presented. They just throw statistics out without any citation or reference at all. Just because you say it out loud in the House Chamber doesn't make it true.

The Republican men who brought this bill to the floor—despite the parade of our women colleagues on the House floor today—do not represent the voices of women in America. Every time we let their voices get louder than ours, we are inching back to the truly Dark Ages—where a world of barriers, from physical to legal to financial, stood between women and their constitutional rights. We have worked too hard and come too far to let it all slip away now.

As a mother, when I think about what kind of world I want my daughters to live in, it's one where their rights are sacred and their value is recognized, and that means having access to comprehensive sex education, affordable contraception, and, yes, safe, legal reproductive services.

This bill doesn't work toward creating a better world for future generations of women. It erodes their future by undermining their independence and undercutting their health. I urge a ''no'' vote on this unconstitutional piece of legislation and extreme reach into the personal health and well-being of women.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield 15 seconds to myself to respond.

A USA Today-Gallup poll: 64 percent, abortions should not be permitted in the second 3 months of pregnancy; 80 percent, in the third 3 months. The polling company on March 3, 2013: 63 percent of women believe that abortion should not be permitted after the point where substantial medical evidence shows the baby can feel pain.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. Madam Speaker, it's a privilege to be able to stand here today and to speak on behalf of the unborn. I have a picture that was taken just yesterday. All of us as parents love to take pictures of our babies. This is a picture that was taken of an unborn baby yesterday. This is the age of the baby—the youngest age, at 20 weeks, that this bill is referencing. And this is a picture of the mom. We're here because we care about women. We're here because we care about the unborn. That's why I support this wonderful bill that's before our body today.

You see, we had a very recent, disturbing account of a late-term abortionist. His name was Kermit Gosnell. His actions have made debates like this more important than ever before because, under the guise of being a medical professional, you see, Dr. Gosnell violently ended the life of viable, unborn babies. And, in turn, he seriously hurt or even killed some of the women whom he claimed were his patients.

A few days ago, the minority leader, NANCY PELOSI, referred to late-term abortions as sacred ground when voicing opposition to this bill. I found that to be a stunning statement. What could possibly be sacred about late-term abortion? What could possibly be sacred about dismembering this 6-month-old little baby with a pair of scissors as Kermit Gosnell did? What could possibly be sacred about listening to the whimpers and cries of a baby? Because, you see, we know that babies at this age feel pain when scissors are put into their body as it comes to an early end.

You see, we are the people who make the laws in our society, and therefore, we have the duty to protect the inalienable right to life of every individual, both the mom and the unborn baby. At 8 weeks from conception, an unborn child's heart begins to beat. By 20 weeks, he or she is capable of sensing pain. And babies as young as 21 weeks have survived premature birth.

Madam Speaker, as a woman and as a mom of five natural-born children and 23 foster children, I am appalled by the savage practice of late-term abortion.

There is no such thing as an unwanted child, and that's why this legislation is so important. It not only protects the unborn, it protects the mom against the lethal practices of abortionists like Gosnell. And women deserve better than abortion. Unborn children deserve their inalienable right to life. Pregnancy is wonderful. It can be difficult too. That's why we need to show patience and compassion toward every woman as they carry a human life.

We are, indeed, treading upon sacred ground. But it's because we're dealing with the sanctity of every human life. And out of respect for this mom and out of respect for this unborn child, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this commonsense piece of legislation. I thank Mrs. BLACKBURN, and I thank Representative TRENT FRANKS of Arizona.

Ms. LOFGREN. May I inquire how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 25½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 21¼ minutes remaining.

Ms. LOFGREN. Before yielding to the ranking member, I'd just like to note the situation of my friend, Vicky Wilson, who found out, unfortunately, in the 20th week of her pregnancy that her much-wanted and desired child had all of her brains formed outside of the cranium and would not survive, and if she carried the fetus to term, likely her uterus would have ruptured. Under this bill, Vicky would have been forced into that heartbreaking situation. I think that's simply wrong.

I yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

□ 1700

Mr. CONYERS. Thank you, Ms. LOFGREN. I appreciate this important debate and participating in it.

Members of the House, by imposing a nationwide ban on abortions performed after 20 weeks, H.R. 1797, the so-called Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, is nothing less than a direct attack on a woman's constitutional right

to make decisions about her health. It criminalizes previability abortions with only a narrow exception for the woman's life; it fails to include any exceptions for the woman's health; and it utterly disregards the often difficult personal circumstance women face when confronted with the needs to terminate their pregnancies.

The amended version of H.R. 1797 made in order by the Rules Committee last night attempts to address the nationwide outcry in response to comments by the bill's author at the Judiciary Committee's markup that ''incidents of rape resulting in pregnancy are very low.''

As amended, the bill now includes only a very limited exception for rape and incest that would only be available if the victim could demonstrate that she has reported the crime to the proper authorities. This reporting mandate isn't even required in the Hyde amendment, and it ignores the many reasons why rapes go unreported, including the fear of the abuser, fear of how the legal system may treat the victim, and shame. In short, the majority has determined that a woman's word is not enough to prove that she has been raped or the victim of incest. This pernicious legislation would also impose criminal penalties on doctors and other medical professionals.

But let's consider the facts, beginning with the sponsor's comments that ''incidents of rape resulting in pregnancy are very low'' and that there's no need for an exception.

On the contrary, rape-induced pregnancy—unfortunately, I'm sad to say—occurs with some frequency. For example, the Rape, Abuse, and Incest National Network reported that during 2004 and 2005, 64,080 woman were raped, and of those rapes, 3,204 pregnancies resulted.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee and the other pro-life women who are speaking out in this debate today.

Since the Supreme Court's controversial decision in Roe v. Wade in 1973, medical knowledge regarding the development of unborn babies and their capacities at various stages of growth has advanced dramatically. Even The New York Times has reported on the latest research on unborn pain, focusing in particular on the research of Dr. Sunny Anand, an Oxford-trained neonatal pediatrician who has held appointments at Harvard Medical School and other distinguished institutions. As Dr. Anand has testified:

> If the fetus is beyond 20 weeks of gestation, I would assume that there will be pain caused to the fetus, and I believe it will be severe and excruciating pain.

Congress has the power to acknowledge these developments by prohibiting abortions after the point at which scientific evidence shows the unborn can feel pain with limited exceptions. H.R. 1797 does just that. It also includes provisions to protect the life of the mother and an additional exception for cases of rape and incest.

The terrifying facts uncovered during the course of the trial of late-term abortionist Kermit Gosnell and successive reports of similar atrocities committed across the country remind us how an atmosphere of insensitivity can lead to horrific brutality.

The grand jury report in the Gosnell case itself contains references to a neonatal expert who reported that the cutting of the spinal cords of babies intended to be late-term aborted would cause them ''a tremendous amount of pain.''

The polling company recently found that 64 percent of Americans would support a law such as the Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act—only 30 percent would oppose it—and supporters include 47 percent of those who identified themselves as pro-choice in the poll as well as 63 percent of women.

In the 2007 case of Gonzales v. Carhart, the Supreme Court made clear that: ''The government may use its voice and its regulatory authority to show its profound respect for the life within the woman,'' and that Congress may show such respect for the unborn through specific regulation because it implicates additional ethical and moral concerns that justify a special prohibition.

As The New York Times story concluded, throughout history, ''a presumed insensitivity to pain has been used to exclude some of humanity's privileges and protections. Over time, the charmed circle of those considered alive to pain, and therefore fully human, has widened to include members of other religions and races, the poor, the criminal, the mentally ill, and—thanks to the work of Sunny Anand and others—the very young.''

The Gosnell trial reminds us that when newborn babies are cut with scissors, they whimper and cry and flinch from pain. And unborn babies, when harmed, also whimper and cry and flinch from pain. Delivered or not, babies are babies, and they can feel pain at least by 20 weeks.

It is time to welcome our children who can feel pain into the human family. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, before yielding to the ranking member of the Constitution Subcommittee, I would just like to note that we do not need to change the law. Dr. Gosnell was convicted and he's doing two life sentences in prison for murder under current law.

I yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the Constitution Subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, we're back again considering cruel and unconstitutional legislation that would curtail women's reproductive rights. This bill contains a nearly total ban on abortions prior to viability, which the Supreme Court says violates women's rights under the Constitution.

Just recently, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit struck down a nearly identical Arizona statute, saying:

> Since Roe v. Wade, the Supreme Court case law concerning the constitutional protection accorded women with respect to the decision whether to undergo an abortion has been unalterably clear regarding one basic point . . . a woman has a constitutional right to choose to terminate her pregnancy before the fetus is viable. A prohibition on the exercise of that right is per se unconstitutional.

Perhaps most cruelly, this bill fails even to provide any exception to protect a woman's health. The exception for a woman's life is so narrowly written and so convoluted that even a physician wanting to comply with the law in good faith would have trouble determining when the woman is sufficiently in extremis that her condition qualifies. So the morally arrogant authors of this bill would tell a woman who faces permanent injury or disability that she must bear that calamity by carrying her pregnancy to term.

Recently added language is supposed to take the heat off the recent uproar over the absence of a rape and incest exception in this bill, but the bill would provide an exception for rape or incest only if the victim first reported it to the authorities. In the best of all possible worlds, every assault would be reported and every rapist prosecuted. But we all know that there are many reasons why rapes and incest often don't get reported—the toll our criminal justice system takes on rape victims: the humiliation, the harassment, the psychological trauma.

Why force women to be victimized twice? The only reason we have been given by the supporters of this bill is that women lie about having been raped. So the sponsors are telling us not only that women are not competent to make this very personal decision for themselves and that we here are more competent—we should substitute our judgments for theirs—but women are also too dishonest to be believed when they say they were raped.

This bill would use the trauma of the assault to erect another unnecessary and cruel barrier to a raped woman. Congress should not side with her abuser to force her to carry that abuser's child to term.

The incest exception applies only if the victim was a minor when the incidents occurred. Why? Do my colleagues believe that this was nice, consensual sex? That if a young woman is abused by her father from age 8 and he gets her pregnant at 18, it doesn't count? Or that she asked for it and deserves it?

□ 1710

These restrictions are new. The rape and incest exceptions in the previous legislation passed by this House have no such conditions or restrictions. Even the Hyde amendment, embodied

in the Labor-HHS appropriations bill, says:

The limitations established in the preceding section shall not apply to abortion if the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest.

No conditions, no restrictions, no ifs, ands, or buts.

Some Members want to redefine rape and incest to satisfy an extremist base that wants to outlaw all abortions, even for victims of rape and incest. I hope that we can agree that no woman should ever be forced to carry her abuser's child.

I urge my colleagues to reject this cruel and unconstitutional legislation.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to one of our bright young attorneys, the gentlelady from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY).

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I rise to support H.R. 1797, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

This bill would at last prohibit dangerous, late-term abortions of unborn children at 20 weeks. That's the stage of development which we feel pain. And I say ''we,'' Madam Chairman, for a reason. Many supporters of this bill are taking to Facebook and Twitter using the hashtag #TheyFeelPain to illustrate the brutal reality of late-term abortions.

I applaud their efforts, and I appreciate the many notes of encouragement I've received from constituents back home in support of this bill. I certainly hope that they will keep those Facebook posts coming to get the word out about what we are doing here today.

I use the phrase ''we feel pain'' because I'm afraid too often we speak of this issue like it's someone else we're talking about, some other species. Madam Chairman, we are talking about human beings—human beings—babies far along enough in development to feel touch, to respond to touch. We're talking about us.

We were all 20 weeks at one time. Every Member in this Chamber was. We all reached a particular point of development at which the prayerful hope for life becomes precious potential and viability.

These babies right now are in NICUs all over this country. Having been premature, the babies are laying in a protective environment trying to build stable breath, reaching to hold the fingers of their mommies and daddies. Yet, right now, under Federal law, other babies at 20 weeks are still at risk of being brutally, mercilessly, and painfully killed.

Madam Chairman, this must end. This must end because we feel pain.

I reached out just a few hours ago via Facebook, Madam Chairman, to my constituents to ask for stories about children that were born at or near 20 weeks. I want to share one. A constituent named Terry writes that her baby was born at 24 weeks, weighing only 2 pounds, 3 ounces. After struggling initially, her child grew strong and healthy. That was 19 years ago. Her son is now an adult living out west.

I ask my colleagues to support and vote ''yes'' for H.R. 1797.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chairman, I would like to yield 1 minute to the Democratic leader, Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI, from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Chairman, do you ever wonder what the American people think when they tune into C–SPAN to see what business is being attended to on the floor of the House? Do you ever wonder what the American people think when they are saying, What is happening to create jobs? What is happening to agree to a budget that will promote growth and reduce the deficit for our country? What is happening to make progress for the American people? Do you ever wonder about that, when they tune in and see debate on bills that are going no place? Do they think, Well, here it is, just another day in the life of the Republican-controlled Congress; another day without a jobs bill, another day without a budget agreement, another day ignoring the top priorities of the American people by the Republican majority?

Our constituents have made it clear time and time again we must work together to create jobs, to strengthen the middle class, and to grow the economy. Yet, once again, Republicans refuse to listen. Instead, we are debating legislation that endangers women's health and that disrespects the judgment of American women and their doctors on how to make judgments about women's health.

This bill would deny care to women in the most desperate circumstances—sad and desperate circumstances. It is yet another Republican attempt to endanger women. It is disrespectful to women; it is unsafe for families; and it is unconstitutional.

At the start of Congress, Republicans took great pride—and we joined them in that pride—in reading the Constitution, start to finish. It is a great day; it is a great document. Then the Republicans proceeded to ignore it. One example: this clearly unconstitutional bill.

Each day, Republicans claim they want to reduce the role of government, except when it comes to women's most personal decisions about their reproductive health. Leading groups of medical professionals and experts across the country believe that this legislation is dangerous and wrong.

That is the message we have seen from doctors and health care providers who have pointed out that this legislation would put medical professionals in an ''untenable position'' when treating ''women in need.''

That is the same message we've heard from national religious organizations, who have called on us to ''offer compassion, support, and respect for a woman and her family facing these difficult circumstances.''

I have a copy of a letter from 16 national religious groups that was sent to Speaker BOEHNER and to me, as Democratic leader, which I wish to submit for the RECORD.

Just another day in the Republican Congress: more extremism, more dead-end bills, and less progress on the real challenges facing all Americans. The American people want bipartisanship. They want progress. They don't want obstruction and delaying tactics.

Enough is enough. Let's vote ''no'' on this dangerous bill and let's get to work together to work on a fair budget that replaces the across-the-board cuts of the sequester with a plan to create jobs, grow the economy, and strengthen the middle class as we reduce the deficit.

Let's act now to put people to work and strengthen the middle class. I say it over and over.

Let's discard this assault on women's health and work together to make real progress for the American people.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

JUNE 18, 2013.

16 NATIONAL RELIGIOUS GROUPS OPPOSE BAN ON ABORTION CARE AFTER 20 WEEKS

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

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND MADAM LEADER: We, the undersigned national religious groups, urge you to oppose H.R. 1797, the ''District of Columbia Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act'' sponsored by Representative Trent Franks (R–AZ), which would create a nationwide ban on access to abortion care 20 weeks after fertilization, with only burdensome exceptions for cases of rape or incest. It explicitly bans later abortion care for a woman whose mental health would threaten her life or her health. We stand united across our faith traditions in opposing this extreme legislation.

Proponents of this bill have cited the Kermit Gosnell case as a reason to push this intrusive policy, but the fact is that the lack of access to safe and affordable abortion care is precisely the circumstance that drove women to an unscrupulous person like Gosnell, as it did to so many women before Roe v. Wade. The existence of his clinic is a ghastly warning sign of what happens when abortion is so restricted and expensive that a woman in need feels that she has nowhere else to turn.

A family with a wanted pregnancy that goes terribly wrong is confronted with awful decisions that none of us ever want to face. Our religious values call us to offer compassion, support, and respect to a woman and her family facing these difficult circumstances. H.R. 1797 will only make a challenging situation worse. When a woman needs an abortion, it is critically important that she have access to safe and legal care.

It is telling that Representative Franks, in a press release announcing that he would be expanding the focus of H.R. 1797 from the District of Columbia to a nationwide ban, does not make even a single reference to a woman, her family, or her situation.

Like all Americans, Rep. Franks is free to have and share his own religious beliefs about issues related to pregnancy and parenting. Liberty is an American value. However, H.R. 1797 is a clear attempt to impose one particular religious belief on the whole nation, and thus represents a gross violation of the freedom to which every American is

entitled by the Constitution. The proper role of government in the United States is not to impose one set of religious views on everyone, but to protect each person's right and ability to make decisions according to their own beliefs and values.

We believe—and Americans, including people of faith, overwhelmingly agree—that the decision to end a pregnancy is best left to a woman in consultation with her family, her doctor, and her faith. Our laws should support and safeguard a woman's health—not deny access to care. Please show compassion for women and respect for religious liberty by opposing H.R. 1797.

In faith,

Anti-Defamation League, Catholics for Choice, Disciples Justice Action Network, Hadassah, The Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc., Jewish Council for Public Affairs, Jewish Women International, Methodist Federation for Social Action, Metropolitan Community Churches, Muslims for Progressive Values, National Council of Jewish Women, Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice, Religious Institute, Union of Reform Judaism, Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations, Unitarian Universalist Women's Federation, United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries (f).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

When we talk about what is dangerous and wrong, let me tell you what is dangerous and wrong: condoning the actions of Kermit Gosnell or Doug Karpen or what transpired in New Mexico or what we found out from Delaware or from Virginia or from West Virginia. The house of horrors goes on and on.

At this point, I would like to yield 3 minutes to a member of our House Republican leadership team, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee for yielding and for advancing this legislation.

Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of life, in support of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Life begins at conception. Throughout the years, as science and technology have evolved and continue to advance, we are changing hearts and minds. We have more and more evidence that life does, indeed, begin at conception.

We know that after 3 weeks, the baby has a heartbeat. After 7 weeks, the baby begins kicking in the womb. By week 8, the baby begins to hear and fingerprints start to form. After 10 weeks, the baby is able to turn his or her head, frown, and even hiccup. By week 11, the baby can grasp with his or her hands. And by week 12, the baby can suck his or her thumb. And by week 20, not only can the baby recognize his or her mother's voice, but that baby can also feel pain.

While killing an unborn child is unacceptable at any time, it is especially abhorrent at the 20-week mark when a child is able to feel the pain of an abortion. Madam Chairman, it is not only the pain of the child that we must be concerned with, but also the pain of the mother.

□ 1720

The other side has deemed abortion a ''sacred right.'' They tout that they are champions for women, telling women they have the right to do with their bodies whatever they want. The problem here is that everyone talks about the right to choose, but no one discusses the implications of that choice.

I recently had the opportunity to speak with Joyce Zounis, who had multiple abortions between the ages of 15 and 26. She told me that the abortionists told her everything would be over very quickly, but they didn't tell her about the physical and the psychological implications that would stay with her for life. Not once did the abortionists relay to her the physical risks that she suffered later. That does not include the emotional damage she also suffered—uncontrollable anger, depression, seclusion, and the inability to trust anyone.

Madam Speaker, I am for life at all stages. I am for the life of the baby, and I am also for the life of the mother. I will continue to work towards the day when abortion is not only illegal but is absolutely unthinkable.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BERA of California. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. BERA of California. Will the Speaker inform us as to when we might consider legislation to address the needs of a generation of college students whose interest rates are about to reset in a few weeks and double—instead of this bill, which is a direct attack on women's rights.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to a member of the Judiciary Committee, the gentlelady from Texas, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, to those who are gathered here today, I have already heard my leader indicate partly why we are here, taking away from the serious work of this place in trying to provide jobs for the thousands and millions of Americans who are unemployed, but I have another question.

I want to know why we are on the floor of the House, debating a dangerous and inhumane legislative initiative. I also want to know why there are those who would rise presumptuously and arrogantly to suggest they know my heart. Why is there someone suggesting in this body that I have not experienced pain or do not know pain or do not know the pain of my constituents?

The same question can be asked, How do they know what a mother, whose health is in jeopardy, is feeling?

Why would they be so presumptuous as to suggest that we could not, or that we are saying to some woman that you can't do with your body as you desire? It is between your God, your doctor and your family.

How outrageous this legislation is. It is patently unconstitutional. Griswold says it's a violation of the right to privacy. Doe v. Bolton, which was passed on the same day as Roe v. Wade, specifically said that the health of the mother had to be taken into consideration. This violates any kind of adherence to the health of the mother.

For us to refer to the heinous, disgusting actions in Pennsylvania suggests that I don't care about it. I am glad that the justice system persecuted and prosecuted this villain and sent that doctor to jail, but I don't want America's doctors and mothers and people of faith to be sent to the jailhouse because we are so presumptuous and arrogant.

Let's be very clear about a young woman by the name of Vikki Stella, a diabetic who discovered months into her pregnancy that the fetus she was carrying suffered from several major anomalies and who had no chance of survival. They wanted to induce labor or perform a Caesarean section, but her physician said she could not survive it, and they had to use another procedure. If they had not used a procedure like an abortion, she would not be able to have children again.

Do we want to go back to the time when women were running into back alleys?

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1797, the ''Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.'' Last year I opposed this irresponsible and reckless legislation when it was brought to the floor under a suspension of the rules and fell well short of the two-thirds majority needed to pass. I opposed the bill, which arbitrarily bans a woman from exercising her constitutionally protect right to choose to terminate a pregnancy after 20 weeks, last year for the same reasons I do now. This purely partisan and divisive legislation:

1. Unduly burdens a woman's right to terminate a pregnancy and thus puts their lives at risk;

2. Does not contain exceptions for the health of the mother;

3. As introduced and considered in the Judiciary Committee, unfairly targeted the District of Columbia; and

4. Infringes upon women's right to privacy, which is guaranteed and protected by the U.S. Constitution.

Madam Speaker, the rule governing debate on this bill also set the terms of debate for the Farm Bill that makes drastic reductions in SNAP funding and nutrition programs that help the women, children, infants, and the poor.

Coupling these two bills together under one rule sends the uncaring message that it is right and good to force a woman to carry an unwanted pregnancy to term and then withhold from her and her infant the support necessary for them to maintain a nutritious and healthy diet.

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

H.R. 1797 seeks to take the misguided and mean-spirited policy of these states and make it the law of the land. In so doing, the bill poses a nationwide threat to the health and wellbeing of American women and a direct challenge to the Supreme Court's ruling in Roe v. Wade.

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

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

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

H.R. 1797 hurts women like Vikki Stella, a diabetic, who discovered months into her pregnancy that the fetus she was carrying suffered from several major anomalies and had no chance of survival. Because of Vikki's diabetes, her doctor determined that induced labor and Caesarian section were both riskier procedures for Vikki than an abortion. Because Vikki was able to terminate the pregnancy, she was protected from the immediate and serious medical risks to her health and her ability to have children in the future was preserved.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I also strongly oppose H.R. 1797 because it lacks the necessary exceptions to protect the health and life of the mother. In fact, the majority Republicans rejected an amendment offered by our colleague, Congressman NADLER, which would have added a ''health of the mother'' exception to the bill.

During the markup of H.R. 1797 in the Judiciary Committee, Republicans even rejected an amendment I offered that would have provided a limited exception in cases where ''the pregnancy could result in severe and long-lasting damage to a woman's health, including lung disease, heart disease, or diabetes.''

Imagine, Madam Speaker, an amendment permitting an exception in the case where a woman risked heart or lung disease was rejected by Judiciary Republicans as too lenient and compassionate toward women!

I offered my amendment again to the Rules Committee but again, Committee Republicans refused to make it in order.

Madam Speaker, it is an additional measure of just how incredibly bad this bill is that when it was introduced and considered in the Judiciary Committee, it did not even include an exception for rape or incest!

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

Madam Speaker, last and most important, I oppose H.R. 1797 because it is an unconstitutional infringement on the right to privacy, as interpreted by the Supreme Court in a long line of cases going back to Griswold v. Connecticut in 1965 and Roe v. Wade decided in 1973. In Roe v. Wade, the Court held that a state could prohibit a woman from exercising her right to terminate a pregnancy in order to protect her health prior to viability. While many factors go into determining fetal viability, the consensus of the medical community is that viability is acknowledged as not occurring prior to 24 weeks gestation.

By prohibiting nearly all abortions beginning at ''the probable post-fertilization age'' of 20 weeks, H.R. 1797 violates this clear and long standing constitutional rule.

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

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

Supreme Court precedents make it clear that neither Congress nor a state legislature can declare any one element—''be it weeks of gestation or fetal weight or any other single factor—as the determinant'' of viability. Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. 379, 388–89 (1979). Nor can the government restrict a woman's autonomy by arbitrarily setting the number of weeks gestation so low as to effectively prohibit access to abortion services as is the case with the bill before us.

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

Madam Speaker, the constitutionally protected right to privacy encompasses the right of women to choose to terminate a pregnancy before viability, and even later where continuing to term poses a threat to her health and safety. This right of privacy was hard won and must be preserved inviolate. For this reason, I offered an amendment before the Rules Committee that would ensure that the legislation before us is to be interpreted to abridge this right. The Jackson Lee Amendment #2 provided:

Sec. 4. Rule of Construction. Nothing in this Act shall be construed or interpreted to limit the right of privacy guaranteed and protected by the United States Constitution as interpreted by the United States Supreme Court in the cases of Griswold v. Connecticut, 381 U.S. 479 (1965); Eisenstadt v. Baird, 405 U.S. 438 (1972), and Roe v. Wade, 410 U.S. 113 (1973).

Regrettably, the Rules Committee did not make this amendment in order. Unregrettably, I strongly oppose H.R. 1797 and urge all members to join me in voting against this unwise measure that put the lives and health of women at risk.

[From Planned Parenthood Federation of America]

PROTECT ACCESS TO SAFE AND LEGAL ABORTION—REJECT THE NATIONWIDE 20-WEEK ABORTION BAN

The misleadingly named ''Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act'', offered by Congressman Trent Franks (AZ), is a dangerous attempt to restrict women's access to safe and legal abortion. This bill would ban all abortions after 20 weeks with extremely limited exceptions. H.R. 1797 is clearly unconstitutional, and is a blatant attempt to challenge Roe v. Wade at the expense of the health of our nation's women. Abortion is a deeply personal medical decision that should be left to a woman and her family, with the counsel of her doctor or health care provider, not politicians.

The Franks 20-week abortion ban is dangerous for women's health.

Nearly 9 in 10 abortions in the United States occur in the first trimester.

Many women who have abortions after the first trimester do so because of medical complications or other barriers resulting in delays to accessing an abortion.

H.R. 1797 would further harm women in need by creating additional obstacles to receiving a safe and legal abortion. Women need support, not additional barriers, to obtaining timely, safe health care.

The Franks 20-week abortion ban lacks a reasonable exception for victims of rape and incest.

H.R. 1797 marginalizes the needs of women by only allowing a very narrow exception for life-saving abortions.

After the backlash against Trent Franks' ignorant comments about pregnancies resulting from rape, the House Majority snuck in an extremely limited exception allowing victims of rape or incest to access abortion at 20 weeks—but only if they can provide proof that they have alerted the police about the crime.

The Franks 20-week abortion ban is unconstitutional, and is a clear attempt to challenge Roe v. Wade.

20-week abortion bans are unconstitutional as they are in clear violation of the right to an abortion pre-viability, Supreme Court precedent set in Roe v. Wade and affirmed in Planned Parenthood v. Casey.

Proponents of these laws are outspoken in their goal to challenge the Roe v. Wade decision via 20-week abortion ban legislation.

Americans overwhelmingly support the Roe v. Wade Supreme Court decision. A January 2013 Wall Street Journal/NBC poll found that 70 percent of Americans support Roe v. Wade.

Leading medical groups agree that doctors, in consultation with women and their families, should make medical decisions. Not politicians.

Leading medical groups oppose political attempts to interfere with the doctor-patient relationship.

The American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists opposes the 20-week abortion ban, calling it part of legislative proposals ''that are not based on sound science (and that) attempt to prescribe how physicians should care for their patients.''

The American Medical Association ''strongly condemn(s) any interference by the government or other third parties that causes a physician to compromise his or her medical judgment as to what information or treatment is in the best interest of the patient.''

Women don't turn to politicians for advice about mammograms, prenatal care, or cancer treatments. Politicians should not be involved in a woman's personal medical decisions about her pregnancy.

The Franks 20-week abortion ban is unconstitutional legislation that threatens the health of women in an effort to challenge longstanding, Supreme Court precedence regarding access to safe and legal abortion. This one-size-fits-all ban leaves women in potentially vulnerable and dangerous positions, and does nothing to protect women's health. Congress must reject these attempts to limit women's access to safe and legal health care.

MAY 23, 2013.

16 NATIONAL RELIGIOUS GROUPS OPPOSE BAN ON ABORTION CARE AFTER 20 WEEKS

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We, the undersigned national religious groups, urge you to oppose H.R. 1797, the ''District of Columbia Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act'' sponsored by Representative Trent Franks (R–AZ), which would create a nationwide ban on access to abortion care 20 weeks after fertilization, with no exceptions in cases of rape, incest or fetal anomalies. It explicitly bans later abortion care for a woman whose mental health would threaten her life or her health. We stand united across our faith traditions in opposing this extreme legislation.

Proponents of this bill have cited the Kermit Gosnell case as a reason to push this intrusive policy, but the fact is that the lack of access to safe and affordable abortion care is precisely the circumstance that drove women to an unscrupulous person like Gosnell, as it did to so many women before Roe v. Wade. The existence of his clinic is a ghastly warning sign of what happens when abortion is so restricted and expensive that a woman in need feels that she has nowhere else to turn.

A family with a wanted pregnancy that goes terribly wrong is confronted with awful decisions that none of us ever want to face. Our religious values call us to offer compassion, support, and respect to a woman and her family facing these difficult circumstances. H.R. 1797 will only make a challenging situation worse. When a woman needs an abortion, it is critically important that she have access to safe and legal care.

It is telling that Representative Franks, in a press release announcing that he would be expanding the focus of H41797 from the District of Columbia to a nationwide ban, does not make even a single reference to a woman, her family, or her situation.

Like all Americans, Rep. Franks is free to have and share his own religious beliefs about issues related to pregnancy and parenting. Liberty is an American value. However, H.R. 1797 is a clear attempt to impose one particular religious belief on the whole nation, and thus represents a gross violation of the freedom to which every American is entitled by the Constitution. The proper role of government in the United States is not to impose one set of religious views on everyone, but to protect each person's right and ability to make decisions according to their own beliefs and values.

We believe—and Americans, including people of faith, overwhelmingly agree—that the decision to end a pregnancy is best left to a woman in consultation with her family, her doctor, and her faith. Our laws should support and safeguard a woman's health—not deny access to care. Please show compassion for women and respect for religious liberty by opposing H.R. 1797.

In faith,

Anti-Defamation League; Catholics for Choice; Disciples Justice Action Network; Hadassah, The Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc.; Jewish Council for Public Affairs; Methodist Federation for Social Action; Metropolitan Community Churches; Muslims for Progressive Values; National Council of Jewish Women; Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice; Religious Institute; Union of Reform Judaism; Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations; Unitarian Universalist Women's Federation; United Church of Christ; Justice and Witness Ministries.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. We do a lot of things here in Washington and discuss many types of legislation, and sometimes the impact of what we do gets lost in the debate. Today, I want to remind my colleagues that this bill impacts people and why it's important.

There is an injustice occurring in our society.

One unborn baby who is 6 months along develops a medical condition. The doctor gives anesthesia in the womb to that baby because it can feel pain, and an operation is conducted to correct the problem so the baby can be brought to full term. Another unborn baby who is 6 months along, down the street at a clinic, does not receive anesthesia, and is ripped apart limb by limb by an abortionist, who crushes the skull to complete the abortion.

This is wrong.

I rise today in support of H.R. 1797, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, which would prohibit an abortion of an unborn child who has surpassed 20 weeks on the basis that children at this stage of development can feel pain. In light of the recent trial of Kermit Gosnell, we have seen firsthand the very gruesome nature of what is currently taking place in America's abortion industry—the reality that abortion involves not a choice but the taking of a human life. Late-term abortions are agonizingly painful, and they are happening all around the Nation.

A leading expert in fetal pain has said ''the human fetus possesses the ability to experience pain from 20 weeks of gestation . . .'' and that the pain felt by a fetus may be more intense than that perceived by full-term or older children. This pain is inflicted through a procedure known as D&E, in which the doctor literally tears apart the little body of the child after removing him from the womb and finally crushes the child's skull.

Science and the American public are united on this issue. This gruesome practice has no place in our society. In fact, a recent poll found 63 percent of women believe abortion should not be permitted where substantial medical evidence says that the unborn child can feel pain. There is also a risk to the mother.

Drawing a line at 20 weeks is not arbitrary. The child suffers great pain, and the mother is placed drastically in danger. A woman seeking an abortion at 20 weeks is 35 times more likely to die from abortion than she was in the first trimester. At 21 weeks or more, the chance of death is 91 times higher. Jennifer Morbelli was the recent victim of such a dangerous abortion procedure, at 33 weeks, in Maryland. This abortion was done in a residential condominium complex in Baltimore last February—a tragic end to a young mother and an agonizing death for her child.

As a society, it is time to speak out for those who cannot speak for themselves and to stop this heinous practice.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her inquiry.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. When will the House consider legislation to address the veterans' —

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a much-valued member of the Judiciary Committee, the gentlelady from California, Congresswoman JUDY CHU.

Ms. CHU. Imagine a world in which the Federal Government actually prevents women from receiving the medical procedures that would save their lives. Innocent, law-abiding Americans—young and old—would live or die by government decree.

If you think this is some kind of Orwellian fantasy, think again, and take a good look at the abortion bill being pushed by Republicans today. With only a narrow exception to protect life but not the woman's health, it could

very well be a death sentence to countless women in the most desperate of circumstances.

□ 1730

This bill is a blatant attack on a woman's right to choose, and the people who will pay the most will be those who are most in need of help.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this nationwide 20-week abortion-ban bill, and I call on the Republican Party to stop pushing bills that endanger American women.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), who chairs the Republican Study Committee.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise proudly in support of life and in strong support of H.R. 1797, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

Scientific studies have proven that babies can feel pain as early as 20 weeks after conception, and passage of this bill is a major step forward in the defense of life.

The Gosnell murder trial refocused Americans on the horrors of late-term abortion, and the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act sends a loud message that our great Nation stands up in defense of life.

I'm proud that Americans United for Life ranked Louisiana as the number one pro-life State in the Nation. I have an example of that. If a woman who is pregnant is murdered in Louisiana, not only is the murderer charged with the murder of the mother, but also for the murder of the unborn child. I think it's a proud day that we're here standing up in defense of those babies after 20 weeks saying this country will not allow those babies' lives to be terminated.

I proudly support this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it, as well.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 14¼ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Tennessee has 9 minutes remaining.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to another member of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. DEUTCH of Florida.

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank my friend from California.

Madam Speaker, today I want to give voice to real women and girls who sought abortions after 20 weeks.

The sad truth is that for disenfranchised women, it often takes more than 20 weeks to overcome the roadblocks encountered on the path to what is a constitutionally protected procedure. They may struggle to pay for the procedure, risk losing their jobs if they request time off or lack full information about their bodies, having never received sex education or seen a gynecologist.

Each woman facing these decisions is unique. Their voices have gone unheard in this Chamber, but they are Americans who deserve laws that protect them. So before this vote, I wanted to share their stories.

Sandra and her husband had no car, no Internet, and no health care. It took them weeks to find an abortion provider. They had to save up for the procedure for time off of work, for child care for their kids, for the 80-mile taxi ride from Clewiston, Florida, to West Palm Beach. By that time, the facility they found could not help her. They had to start over and save up even more, take even more time off to see a Fort Lauderdale doctor who could help them.

At 17, Helga was in a witness protection program. She was raped as a child and later bore a daughter who was later taken in by protective services. After leaving drug treatment in Florida, Helga was 20 weeks pregnant, but she wanted a chance to put that path behind her. It was only the compassion and generosity of her abortion provider, her doctor, who gave her that chance. Today she's taking care of herself and reconnecting with her daughter.

At 13, Michelle often had irregular periods. Yet when she skipped two, thought she had one and skipped another, she got scared and told her mom. She didn't know she was pregnant. Her disabled mother was barely able to feed Michelle and her four siblings as it was. So Michelle and her mother agreed that Michelle needed to have an abortion. But this whole process took time. Finally at 22 weeks, Michelle and her mom secured an abortion with a provider, a doctor who could assume the costs.

I ask my colleagues to please answer these women with compassion and vote down this bill.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM).

Mrs. NOEM. Madam Speaker, a few moments ago we heard the minority leader here on the floor say that we needed to be about doing serious work, that we needed to deal with bills that dealt with jobs and the economy that the American people cared about.

Well, Americans support ending late-term abortions. Just look at the graphic that we have up here that says 64 percent of Americans believe abortion should not be permitted in the second 3 months of pregnancy; 80 percent of Americans believe abortion should not be permitted in the last 3 months of pregnancy.

Americans recognize that H.R. 1797, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, needs to be passed, and it needs to be done because it is the right thing to do. I've always been pro-life. I believe as a lawmaker I have a duty to protect those that are the most vulnerable.

Recently, we've seen atrocities committed in this country against unborn babies, babies that were born alive, atrocities against these babies and their mothers. The details of that trial only highlight the need for us to protect women and to protect these babies from people like Gosnell and prevent crimes like this from ever happening again.

This bill stops abortions after the 20th week of pregnancy, right after the 6th month. Scientific evidence shows that babies can feel pain at this point of the pregnancy. We're talking about babies that if they were born and simply given a chance, that they could survive outside of the womb. They just need a chance.

The topic of abortion is very personal for many around the country. It stirs emotions on both sides. If we disagree on this issue, I hope we can do it respectfully. Unfortunately, I don't find a lot of the rhetoric that I've heard today very respectful. They've said there's a war on women. Madam Speaker, I am not waging a war on anyone. I'm not waging a war on my two daughters or any other woman in this country.

Regardless of your personal belief, I would hope that stopping atrocities against little babies is something that we can all agree to put an end to. This legislation would do exactly that.

I encourage my colleagues to support its passage.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ISRAEL. I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Speaker, under House practice and procedure, is it not customary for someone on the committee of jurisdiction to manage time on the floor, or is it because the Republicans have no women on the House Judiciary Committee that the gentlewoman from Tennessee manages the time on the floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry and is instead engaging in debate. The gentleman has not been recognized for debate.

The gentlewoman from California is recognized.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to a member of the Judiciary Committee from New York, an excellent lawyer and a new Member of the House, Representative HAKEEM JEFFRIES.

Mr. JEFFRIES. This bill is a violent assault on reproductive rights here in America and an unnecessary intrusion into the doctor-patient relationship. It is a continuation of the Republican war against women and an unconstitutional effort to repeal a 40-year Supreme Court decision. It is dead on arrival in the Senate. The White House and the President will veto it. A majority of the Supreme Court will declare it unconstitutional.

So why are we here wasting the time and the money of the American people

on a futile and extreme legislative joyride?

This is not Barry Goldwater conservatism. This is not even Ronald Reagan conservatism. This is conservatism gone wild. We can only hope for the good of the country that our friends on the other side of the aisle can get the extremism out of their system today so that we can return to the business of the American people tomorrow.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, there is something especially disturbing about the cruel violence that accompanies the termination of unborn children who, as evidence shows, could survive if they were just given the chance.

This debate is not some waste of time. This is not some exercise in extremism. The fact that we are having this debate at all demonstrates that our society is actually failing women, and our culture is very deeply conflicted. There is something very dark about the topic of late abortion.

□ 1740

It is uncomfortable to enter into this conversation, but we must.

During the past several decades, the marvels of science, Madam Speaker, have opened up a window to show us life in the womb, which the prophets of old, by the way, tell us is sacred. The images of children developing week by week, month by month, speak to us more eloquently than any words can.

Madam Speaker, there are some lines that we should all agree should be drawn. I think we are capable—I hope we are capable—of agreeing that a child in the womb deserves that protection.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I am honored to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding to me.

Anti-choice groups tried and failed to use D.C. to nullify Roe v. Wade just last year. They are now using a single criminal case in Philadelphia to go after the reproductive health of all the Nation's women. We will defeat this bill, too, with its bogus science, man-made myths about rape in a bill reported to the floor by an all-male majority of the Judiciary Committee. They are already losing ground; witness the changes forced on them in the language of the bill and the stripping of the rightful manager of the bill.

This bill is part of a parade of 20-week abortion bills moving through conservative States. None will succeed. They will not succeed not only because they are clearly unconstitutional, but because women won't have it. This bill goes down the same road that helped women elect Barack Obama as President of the United States. In the end, whatever happens here today, women will win.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Republican Women's Policy Committee, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS).

Mrs. ELLMERS. Madam Speaker, I thank my esteemed colleague for handling the time here on the floor in this very important issue.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1797, an important bill that will protect women and unborn children. This legislation is supported by reliable scientific research that shows that an unborn child at 20 weeks' gestation can feel pain. Coupled with the now-known dangerous acts of an abortionist like Kermit Gosnell, it is clear that Congress must act.

We can all agree that a woman facing an unexpected pregnancy can be in a crisis situation, not knowing what she should do or what choices she can make. That is why it is vital to put into place protections for women and ensure that people like Kermit Gosnell can never harm again.

We have a duty to protect American women and the unborn children of this country from harm. I urge my colleagues to vote for this important bill and support H.R. 1797.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I am honored to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), a leader for women's health.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, at a time when Americans want their elected officials to focus on jobs and building our economy, here we are again focusing our efforts on limiting a woman's ability to make her own health care decisions.

As I have heard time and time again from women across this Nation, women don't want politicians imposing their extreme beliefs on them when they're making tough decisions. I keep hearing about polls from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Well, here's a poll. We just heard about it today. Congress' popularity is at an all-time low of 10 percent, and bills like this are exactly why.

Last session we wasted a lot of the American people's time debating and voting on legislation designed solely to take a woman's health care decision out of her hands and that of her doctor and instead to allow politicians to step in and substitute their judgment. Now, this time it did take the majority 6 months of the new session, but here we go again, right back down that same rabbit hole.

Today, we're voting on another extreme policy that's dangerous to women's health, interferes with the doctor-patient relationship, and is also patently unconstitutional. As introduced, the bill provided no exceptions for victims of rape and incest; but last week, after some of us pointed that out, the bill's sponsors maneuvered to add an attempted exception for rape and incest victims. But even this latest attempt is deeply offensive.

The bill now requires a woman to prove that she had reported the rape to authorities in order to have access to a legal medical procedure. Let me say that again: a woman would now have to prove she actually reported the rape to obtain a necessary medical procedure, making her into a two-time victim.

This kind of logic demonstrates a callous, almost willful ignorance towards the health needs of women across the Nation, and it shows how the proponents have no respect for women's ability to make their own decisions.

Vote ''no'' on this ill-conceived bill.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I would like to ask how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from California has 7 minutes remaining.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. At this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), a nurse and valued member of our delegation.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from California for her leadership in opposing this unconstitutional and cruel bill. I rise in strong opposition to it.

This legislation ignores the very real medical challenges that are faced by so many women, erecting barriers to women who are trying desperately to access medical care, who are making some of the most personal and difficult choices and decisions. This is a cold-hearted political maneuver that is being played out upon this House floor today.

Women need the confidence to be able to make these difficult decisions in consult with their doctors, with their families, with their spiritual advisors. Politicians have no place in that equation.

If we really wanted to protect life, let's support efforts to reduce unintended pregnancies, improve maternal health, improve funding for WIC, for early child care, for support for women and families who are raising children in the most difficult circumstances. Let us trust women to make decisions that are right for them. And let us show a little compassion instead of offering condescending lectures, as the other side did last month to a very courageous witness who shared her life story.

It is long past time that this Congress learn to trust women to make their own decisions.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. At this time, I would continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING), a former prosecutor and valued Member of our Congress.

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, for 12 years, I've worked with victims of rape and incest. And for those of you who think you're carving out an exception for rape and incest, you're not.

□ 1750

If you were truly carving out an exception, you wouldn't be making it contingent on things that silence victims, things they have no control over, like being traumatized, like being threatened with your life if you talked, like not knowing the law because you're a minor and a victim of statutory rape. These are reasons why more than half the rapes are never reported.

As a district attorney, I've had cases where the victims didn't even report; yet we were able to convict the perpetrators with other evidence. Reporting wasn't even necessary to convict criminals; but in this bill, it's necessary for a crime victim to exercise their constitutional right to privacy.

Fundamentally, those who support the language in this bill don't understand that rape and incest are crimes. These are crimes of violence, crimes that you bring penalties to the perpetrator. This bill brings penalties to the victim.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. I wonder if the gentlelady has additional speakers, because I would reserve. We have no additional speakers at this time, and if she has additional speakers, she can call them, then we will both wrap up.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, we have no additional speakers. If you want to complete, then I will close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlelady from California has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentlelady from Tennessee has 5 minutes remaining.

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

I think this is, in many ways, a very sad day for this House. As we know, last week there was an uproar in the country relative to a statement that few women become pregnant from rape. That, of course, is not correct. There's no science to support that.

And of course, this week, we have a bill that's been altered to add a very limited exception for rape and incest that would be available only if the victim has reported the crime to the authorities.

And of course, as our last speaker has indicated, this actually makes the situation for the victim of violence, a victim of rape more onerous than for the perpetrators of the violence, something that I think is really quite wrong.

The bill attacks the rights of women, guaranteed by our Constitution, to seek a safe, legal procedure when they need it.

I have two children. I was thrilled when I became pregnant. Most women are thrilled and look forward to a safe childbirth. But for some, pregnancy can be dangerous, and the restrictions that are imposed in this bill that do not have adequate health exceptions can endanger these women.

At the subcommittee, we heard from a witness, a professor at George Washington University, Ms. Christy Zink, about her story. She courageously told her story of seeking abortion care after her much-wanted pregnancy was diagnosed with severe fetal anomalies at the 21st week; in fact, an anomaly that would mean that the much-wanted child would not survive and that, in fact, her health could be compromised had she proceeded.

Under this bill, she would not have the opportunity to preserve her own health. She would be required to carry a nonviable fetus to term, and I just think that's wrong. I don't think that's something that the country is asking the Congress to do.

The idea that the exception for incest only applies to those under 18 is another mystery. If a girl is molested and raped by her father at age 18, is she less worthy of the protection of her health and the right to get abortion care than her sister at age 17? I think not. It simply makes no sense at all for that provision.

I'd like to comment also briefly on the repeated discussion of Dr. Kermit Gosnell. He is a monster. There's no one that I have heard in this Congress or in this country who defends what Dr. Gosnell did. In fact, he's in prison, serving a double life sentence for murder.

What he did was illegal, in addition to being abhorrent in every way. We don't need to change the law to put someone like Dr. Gosnell behind bars. In fact, he's behind bars right now.

I think that the use of this case as a rationale for denying American women health care that they may need is terribly wrong. I would urge a ''no'' vote on the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This has been an interesting debate, and I have to tell you, we have heard every descriptive adjective that there can possibly be coming from the negative of why our colleagues on the other side of the aisle think that this debate is inappropriate.

I do think that some of the most interesting has been the parliamentary inquiries to ask about what we're doing about jobs and student loans and veterans. And I have to tell you all, I agree. This Obama economy has been brutal to especially women and the female workforce; and, indeed, we would love to see our colleagues in the Senate and the administration work with us on those issues.

But let me refocus us on why we are here. We are here because it is imperative that we take an action, and that we address these Gosnell-like abortions. We have stood on the floor today, and we have talked about what transpired with the conviction of Kermit Gosnell in Philadelphia, 21 felony counts, performing illegal abortions beyond the 24-week limit, manslaughter for the death of a woman seeking an abortion at his clinic, three counts of killing babies born alive, and dozens of other heinous crimes.

We have heard about how the necks are snipped, the heads are punctured. We even heard the statement from his attorney who said 16 to 17 weeks should be the limit.

We are going at 20 weeks. We have heard of other atrocities, whether they are the Carpin case in Texas, the case in New Mexico. Nurses, pro-choice nurses out in Delaware recently quit their jobs at a big abortion business to save their medical licenses. They said the clinic was, I'm quoting them, ''ridiculously unsafe, where meat-market style, assembly-line abortions were happening.''

Another abortionist, Leroy Carhart, recently stated he's performed more than 20,000 abortions on babies after 24 weeks gestation, and he's perfectly happy to do elective abortions on babies at 7 months gestation.

We know that at 8 weeks babies feel pain. When they have these prenatal surgeries, we know that they're given anesthesia. We know they respond to pain, and we know these late-term abortions are incredibly, incredibly painful.

So that is why we stand today. We want parity for these babies, for these unborn children. We can see them. We have seen some of the ultrasounds. And you know what is so amazing? When you see these ultrasounds, and when people are waiting for the arrival of these precious children, they go ahead, they name them. They're expecting them. They are waiting for them. And they know that these children feel pain when they are harmed.

□ 1800

Science tells us so. The American public is with us on this. Sixty-four percent of all women think abortions should be eliminated when these unborn babies feel pain. Out of all Americans, 60 percent—60 percent—this is a Gallup/USA Today poll. Sixty percent says second-trimester abortions should be eliminated. Eighty percent say third-trimester abortions should be eliminated.

So for those reasons, that is why we stand here today. To support these women and these unborn children, to end these atrocities, to stand together, to make certain that that first guarantee, the guarantee to life—the guarantee to life—so that you can pursue liberty and enter into the pursuit of happiness, that is why we stand here today.

Madam Speaker, I've been honored to work with my colleagues. I know some don't like the fact that a former Judiciary Committee member has come to the floor to handle this bill. I've been so honored to be joined by so many

pro-life women as we have discussed this issue, as we have come together to stand for this.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1797, the Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

As Members of Congress, we should not reach into the private lives of our constituents with decisions that are this personal. We are not qualified to make complex medical decisions, and the government is certainly not in the position to interfere in the doctor-patient relationship. But that is exactly what this bill would do by increasing medical liability for doctors, and criminalizing procedures that are safe and legal.

A woman should be able to make decisions about her health in consultation with her family, her individual faith and health professionals. Restricting access to safe abortions is clearly not the answer. With the continued economic challenges facing this country, we should be focused on getting Americans back to work, not preventing women from making choices that are best for their families and their health.

Throughout my years in Congress, I have been against any government funding of abortion, and I believe that some guidelines are important and reasonable. However, this bill clearly goes over the line and serves not to protect the health of women and children, but rather as a direct challenge to the Supreme Court decision in Roe v Wade.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote no on this bill.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, today's vote on H.R. 1797 marks the 10th time since 2011 that House Republicans have held a vote to restrict women's health care options, and as a result endanger the health and well-being of women all across this country.

In the last six months, the House has failed to enact a single jobs bill into law. This is unconscionable—especially at a time that families across our country are still struggling just to make ends meet, and so many Americans are still out of work.

And yet, here we stand, not discussing ways that Republicans and Democrats can work together to get our economy moving again, but instead we're relitigating the culture wars and actually voting on a bill that would allow Washington politicians to make medical decisions that should be made between women and their doctors.

As the Obama Administration has said, this bill is nothing short of an ''assault on a woman's right to choose.''

H.R. 1797 subverts Roe v. Wade and uses pseudoscience to tell women that they're not allowed to make their own health care decisions after the 20th week of a pregnancy.

Madam Speaker, rather than using political wedge issues to score points with their electoral base, Republicans should be working with Democrats to put men and women across our country back to work and start growing the economy again.

In the strongest terms possible, I urge my colleagues to oppose this extreme proposal.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, there are so many reasons why my colleagues should reject H.R. 1797, the misnamed Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

I am sure my Democratic colleagues that oppose the bill will be able to speak to many of those reasons, but I want to focus on an issue that will shock the American people, once they find out what this bill really does.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act will force, let me repeat that, force a woman to carry an unviable fetus to full term and delivery. Even when doctors agree that it is impossible for the fetus to survive outside the womb, if it is over 20 weeks, if H.R. 1797 passes, it will have to be carried to full term and delivered. By making the woman carry this fetus to full term and deliver it even though it will never survive, we are adding to the unimaginable pain of having a child that will not survive outside the womb. Instead of being allowed to grieve for months, this legislation would only prolong the inevitable heartbreak she will experience. The Republican majority may be completely fine with subjecting women to repeated and unnecessary heartbreak, but I am not!

Not to mention the unnecessary pain and physical discomfort throughout the pregnancy for the woman. She is forced to go through all the trials of a normal pregnancy and the tremendous pain of childbirth, just so the Republican Majority can once again intrude into the lives of women and impose their will on them. This should be a private, personal decision between the woman and her doctor.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1797 is simply outrageous. No one should be able to force a woman to carry an unviable fetus to term and then deliver it against her will. This bill has so many provisions that are just a continuation of the Republicans War on Women. And they claim there is no war on women. How can they say that when they try to pass bills like this?

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1797, the Pain-Capable Child Protection Act. This bill takes important steps to protecting the most vulnerable in our society—unborn children—by placing a federal ban on abortions after 20 weeks from conception. This ban would be an important first step in restoring respect for life in our nation.

I believe that H.R. 1797 strikes the right balance as it allows for exceptions in cases of child–incest, rape, or when a mother's life is in danger, but it also requires that mothers report any instances of abuse to law enforcement prior to seeking an abortion. While many would argue that this provision is too narrowly written, I believe that it is better than the present unrestricted and unaccountable legal system that makes it far too easy to get an abortion.

I support H.R. 1797 and its intent in ensuring that the most vulnerable in our society are protected and given the opportunity for life. I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, as humans and as a people, we have no greater responsibility than to care for the vulnerable—to be a voice for those who cannot speak for themselves and a defender of those who cannot fight for themselves.

I, like all Americans, was disgusted to learn of the horrific and illegal abortion procedures performed by Kermit Gosnell. Gosnell preyed upon women who trusted him in their most vulnerable moments and systematically murdered children at their most helpless stage. We must protect women from these atrocious and unsafe abortions, and we must save children from these excruciating deaths.

In the grand jury report on the Gosnell trial, a neonatal expert reported that the cutting of a baby's spinal cord during a late-term abortion causes them, 'a tremendous amount of pain.' Furthermore, according to a report by fetal pain expert Dr. Kanwaljeet S. Anand, 'the human fetus possesses the ability to experience pain from 20 weeks of gestation, if not earlier, and the pain perceived by a fetus is possibly more intense than that perceived by term newborns or older children.'

By banning abortion after 20 weeks, today's bill will save the lives of innocent children from enduring the excruciatingly painful death of a late abortion.

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

As modern science advances, we are gaining a better understanding of childhood development from conception to birth. While decades ago doctors believed a pre-natal child's central nervous system was too under-developed to experience pain, scientists are now finding that by 20 weeks after conception babies have an ''increase in stress hormones in response to painful experiences.'' In essence, by month 5, children can experience pain.

Many of the abortions conducted by Dr. Gosnell were near and even after the 20th week where the child could feel the pain of what was being done. I stand by the millions of Americans who are deeply shocked and emotionally horrified by the actions of Dr. Kermit Gosnell—the crimes for which he was convicted are too many to mention and too disturbing to describe.

While our hearts go out to Dr. Gosnell's victims, we must also act to prevent future Gosnell's from having the ease and opportunity to perform abortions as he did. That is why I support The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This bill provides national protection to unborn children who are capable of feeling pain by penalizing any doctor who provides a Gosnell-style abortion with up to 5 years in prison and/or up to a $250,000 fine.

Dr. Gosnell's trial and new scientific evidence around pre-natal childhood development has compelled us to re-examine how late-term abortions are conducted and the impact on the unborn child. This legislation will help further reduce the pain and anguish that abortions can cause.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support for H.R. 1797, legislation that will protect the most vulnerable members of society.

The womb should be the safest place in the world for the most weakest among us.

Sadly, it is not.

The heart-wrenching case of Kermit Gosnell showed why. The Gosnell case exposed the abortion industry's lies and showed that abortion is anything but safe and it certainly isn't rare.

Kermit Gosnell murdered newborn babies. He jabbed scissors into the necks of newborn babies. He severed their spines. And he stuffed their bodies into freezers. Now that a Pennsylvania jury delivered their verdict, we here in the House, acting on behalf of the American people, must render our verdict on abortion's grizzly truth.

Kermit Gosnell's barbaric crimes shock the conscience of civilized people across this country. However, there is absolutely no moral distinction between ending a baby's life five seconds after birth or five weeks before.

Madam Speaker, despite all the euphemisms and bumper-sticker slogans we've heard from the other side of the aisle, the issue at hand is clear: abortion businesses like Planned Parenthood regularly perform abortions on unborn babies who, like Gosnell's victims, are capable of feeling pain.

Kermit Gosnell brought us face to face with abortion's ugly truth. The American people cannot turn their back on that truth now.

Gosnell, just like late-term abortionists across this country, sold lies to young women. Madam Speaker, my heart breaks for these women. These are young women who find themselves in a seemingly impossible situation. They're young women like my mother.

Madam Speaker, on a December night in 1975, my 17-year old mother discovered she was pregnant with her first child. That night, alone and terrified, she decided to find a way to make the 40 mile trip to Kalamazoo, Michigan, to "take care of her situation." If she had, Madam Speaker, I wouldn't be standing here on the House floor today.

Just a few months ago, my mom shared her story with me. After we cried together, I had to think "what if there had been a 'Gosnell' clinic four miles away instead of 40?"

Madam Speaker, I can't imagine how scared my mom must have been and how alone she felt. So many women find themselves in a similar situation and so many are told lies by the abortion industry.

Since 1973, more than 55 million inno ent babies have been killed because of Big Abortion's lies. Madam Speaker, my mother had the courage to reject these lies. Today, here in Congress, we have to ask ourselves if we do too.

Let's outlaw these Gosnell-style abortions. Let's stand up for those who cannot speak for themselves and end barbaric procedures that have no business here in the civilized world.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1797, the "Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act." This bill represents a new line of attack on women's reproductive rights. It would criminalize abortions twenty weeks after fertilization, limiting women's ability to make their own choices about their pregnancies and their lives.

I am not pro-abortion, but I am pro-choice. The Constitution guarantees all of us a right to privacy and freedom of religion. A woman must be free to make the difficult decision about the future of her pregnancy in conjunction with her family, religious advisers, and health care professionals.

The narrow exceptions to this blanket ban on abortions after twenty weeks are insufficient to guarantee women's health and safety. They do not change the fact that this bill would deny women the care they need, even in emergencies or in the case of unreported sexual assault.

H.R. 1797 is a direct challenge to Roe. v. Wade, and would significantly erode women's freedom and right to individual choice. I strongly believe that protecting women's rights and guaranteeing women's safety must be our priority. I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1797 and support women's right to choose.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I would like to submit the following:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, June 14, 2013.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 1797, the "District of Columbia Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act," which your Committee reported on June 12, 2013.

H.R. 1797 contains provisions within the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform will forego action on the bill. This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DARRELL ISSA,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2013.

Hon. DARRELL ISSA,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ISSA: Thank you for your June 14 letter regarding H.R. 1797, the "Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act," which the Judiciary Committee ordered reported favorably to the House, as amended, on June 12, 2013.

I am most appreciative of your decision to forego consideration of H.R. 1797, as amended, so that it may move expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you are waiving formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in the bill. In addition, if a conference is necessary on this legislation, I will support any request that your committee be represented therein.

Finally, I am pleased to include this letter and your June 14 letter in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 1797.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1797, which would violate the constitutional rights of every woman in America.

Why is the majority proposing a bill that treats women as second-class citizens? A female constituent in Trenton wrote to me and asked,

Why is it that any person, feels entitled to make a personal decision of this magnitude his business? How in any way is he qualified to make any decisions about my future, my body, my children? The Congress and Senate are spouting politics in what is completely personal matters. I do so heartily wish that Congress would spend our tax dollars on legitimate affairs of state and country—not affairs that do not concern them in any way whatsoever.

But we're not spending our time on important issues of state and country, such as fostering job creation or helping middle class families afford college.

Instead, once again, the Majority is asking Congress to play doctor. This bill is an attempt to ban safe, legal, and often medically-necessary abortion services for women. It's unconstitutional, and it is a direct assault on the dignity and independence of each American woman.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the bill, H.R. 1797.

At a time of enduring economic troubles we should not bog down the House of Representatives with this type of legislation. I know my Republican colleagues are sincere in their pursuit to end abortions after 20 weeks and probably before 20 weeks too. We've heard their concerns, but they're just plain wrong.

The decision to have an abortion is a private one. It should be made by the patient, in consultation with her physician, her family, and faith leader, if she chooses. Congress has no place micromanaging the practice of medicine by deciding what medical procedures are appropriate and at what time. We should not be intruding on the privacy and medical decisions of individuals.

The right for a woman to make her own medical decisions has been rightfully upheld by our courts. Those of us in this chamber may not believe that abortion is moral or right and we are free to disagree with those who seek abortion. We have already stated numerous times that federal funds may not be used to provide the procedure.

But, we must end this pursuit to erode access to types of healthcare we do not like. It will drive women to much less safe alternatives and criminalize doctors who wish to provide a safe environment. We should not go back in time.

Instead, it is time for us to really tackle the issues that confront our country: growing our economy, achieving comprehensive immigration reform, and putting our Nation on the track for prosperity for years to come.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, here they go again.

Once more, the Republican controlled House is seeking to limit women's access to safe reproductive health care through this legislation, the "Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act." While it is couched in the language of protecting unborn fetuses from pain, this bill is nothing more than a poorly disguised effort to force women and their families to give up their constitutionally protected rights (so far). The bill is not going anywhere and it inflames an issue that is among the most sensitive.

Roe vs. Wade, which was decided 40 years ago, is the law of the land. But still we have to go through this annual charade as Republican leadership tries to force those of us who support women's control over their health and potential to have children in the future to take a "hard vote." I am no political Pollyanna; I understand the politics behind this strategy. But let me say, unequivocally, that this is no "hard vote" for me.

It is not hard for me to stand with the millions of women who depend on access to

safe, legal abortion. It is not hard for me to vote against any bill that imposes the will of an intolerant, albeit vocal, minority on our mothers, sisters, and daughters. It is not hard for me to protect freedom of choice, because it is right and it is just.

We have real challenges to address as a country, and yet Republican leadership is choosing to focus its efforts on this bill that would trump women's health, override family decisions, and compromises the ability to decide when and if to start a family. It's a blatant attack on women and it's not hard for me to say that it is wrong.

Ms. SINEMA. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation. This bill places severe restrictions on a woman's ability to make personal health care decisions with her family and her doctor. Women and their families should be able to plan for their lives and their future free from the government's interference.

Instead of arguing over ideologically motivated bills, Congress should work to create jobs and support middle class families. Today's vote is a sad distraction from the work we should be doing together for the American people.

Instead of wasting taxpayers' dollars with a debate and vote on blatantly unconstitutional measures such as this, we should focus on bipartisan legislation to create jobs and restore our nation's fiscal health.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 266, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam 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 question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1815

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: passage of H.R. 1797, and the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1896.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 1797) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children in the District of Columbia, 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 passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 196, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 251]

YEAS—228

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—196

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woodall

NOT VOTING—10

Bonner
Campbell
Hunter
Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Pascrell
Rogers (KY)
Schock
Yarmuth

□ 1844

Messrs. HOLT and LANGEVIN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Ms. SCHWARTZ changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: ''A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.''

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL CHILD SUPPORT RECOVERY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1896) to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to ensure that the United States can comply fully with the obligations of the Hague Convention of 23 November 2007 on the International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance, 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 Washington (Mr. REICHERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 394, nays 27, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 252]

YEAS—394

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
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
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
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
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
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
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—27

Amash
Bachmann
Blackburn
Broun (GA)
Collins (GA)
Duncan (SC)
Foxx
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Harris
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Jones
King (IA)
Kingston
Labrador
Marchant
Massie
Mulvaney
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Weber (TX)
Westmoreland
Woodall
Yoho

NOT VOTING—13

Bonner
Campbell
Cleaver
Hunter
Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
McNerney
Nugent
Pascrell
Rogers (KY)
Schock
Yarmuth

□ 1852

Messrs. POE of Texas, GINGREY of Georgia, and PRICE of Georgia changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to state that today, June 18th, I regrettably missed several rollcall votes. Had I been present I would have voted: 'nay''—rollcall Vote 248—On Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 266—Providing for consideration of H.R. 1947, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through FY 2018; and providing for consideration of H.R. 1797, to amend title 18, U.S. Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children in the District of Columbia; ''nay''—rollcall Vote 249—On Agreeing to the Resolution on H. Res. 266—Providing for consideration of H.R. 1947, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through FY 2018; and providing for consideration of H.R. 1797, to amend title 18, U.S. Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children in the District of Columbia; ''aye''—rollcall Vote 250—On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 1151—To direct the Secretary of Taiwan at the triennial International Civil Aviation Organization Assembly, and for other purposes; ''nay''—rollcall Vote 251—On Final Passage of H.R. 1797—Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act; and ''aye''—rollcall Vote 252—On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 1896—International Child Support Recovery Improvement Act of 2013.

REPORT ON H.R. 2410, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014

Mr. ADERHOLT, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–116) on the bill (H.R. 2410) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUDSON). Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the House just passed the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act which will protect the unborn from some heinous conduct by certain physicians. I know I have good colleagues. There are good citizens on both sides of the abortion issue, and they are heartfelt. But a free, honest, and caring society cannot, at any term, tolerate the conduct by the physician in Philadelphia and those like him who would create the most savage, barbaric abortion methods to take the life of children that were 20 weeks or older.

This bill goes a long way toward addressing that cruelty that we cannot let stand in this country. I'm proud of my colleagues who voted for it this evening, and I appreciate the passage of this bill.

FARRM ACT WILL SERVE AMERICA WELL

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the 2013 FARRM Bill, which will help ensure a safe, affordable, and abundant food supply for all Americans. I represent one of the largest agricultural districts east of the Mississippi, and I'm proud to represent Florida's dairy and vegetable farmers, citrus and sugar growers, and beef cattle ranchers. This bill will serve them well, and it will serve Florida's taxpayers well, too.

The FARRM Bill includes much-needed reforms to agricultural programs. It provides relief from unnecessary Federal mandates. It saves the taxpayers $35 billion and reduces the size of government by eliminating or consolidating more than 100 programs.

In particular, I am pleased that this bill addresses the growing problem in my district of citrus disease. Diseases like greening have already wiped out over one-quarter of the citrus acreage in Florida. If we don't reverse this trend soon, we won't have enough crop to sustain our existing processing plants, and the problem will only spiral from there. Florida will lose jobs and our economy will suffer. But this will impact all Americans, because if Florida isn't growing oranges, you won't be putting orange juice on your breakfast table.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to have a safe, abundant, and affordable food supply, we need to pass the FARRM Bill.

□ 1900

DREDGING OUR NATION'S SMALL PORTS

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

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the issue of dredging our Nation's small ports, a critical issue for hard-working folks in Washington State, southwest Washington, in particular, in Wahkiakum County, Chinook, Ilwaco and other parts of my district.

This is a job issue in my region and for those along waterways throughout our Nation. The issue is this: ports are lifelines to several towns and communities across the Columbia River and the Pacific Coast in my district, and they are literally being choked off by lack of maintenance dredging.

One of my local newspapers, the Chinook Observer, commented, if a farmer were unable to ship his wheat because a road became impassable within our Federal highway system, the Federal Government would rightly fix this issue immediately.

It is no different for the dire circumstances facing our Nation's navigable waterways. We need to address this issue as soon as possible.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I've taken action in search of a swift solution. And thankfully, the committee included $1 billion out of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for dredging and maintenance of waterways in our Energy and Water Development appropriations bill.

We must maintain our Nation's maritime ports.

END HUNGER NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this time to address my colleagues about one of the most important issues that we face in this country, and that is hunger.

We have a problem in the United States of America, I'm sad to say, where we have 50 million of our fellow citizens who are hungry; 17 million are kids. This is the case in the richest, most powerful Nation on the planet.

We should be ashamed of ourselves. Food is not a luxury. It is a necessity, and everybody in this country ought to have a right to food, and that should not even be controversial.

Yet, we have a FARRM Bill that we will begin debating tomorrow that cuts SNAP, which used to be the food stamp program. It cuts it by $20.5 billion. That's billion with a B.

What does that mean?

It means that 2 million people who currently receive the benefit today, tomorrow will lose it. It means that over 200,000 kids who are eligible for free breakfast and lunch at school today will lose that benefit tomorrow.

Those aren't my numbers. Those aren't the numbers of some liberal think tank. Those are the numbers by the Congressional Budget Office, CBO. They say that if the FARRM Bill passes, and if those numbers stay in, 2 million of our fellow citizens will lose their food benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I find that unconscionable. We are trying to emerge from one of the worst economic recessions in our history. Record job losses over the last few years. We've had people of all backgrounds lose their jobs, find themselves working now in jobs that don't pay very much, struggling, trying to keep their families afloat.

And one of the lifelines during this difficult economic time has been the SNAP program. It has enabled many families to be able to put food on the table.

You can't use SNAP to buy a flat-screen TV. You can't use SNAP to buy a car. You can only use SNAP to buy food. That's what this is all about.

And in the FARRM Bill, for whatever reason, it was decided that, rather than looking for savings in the crop insurance program, which we know is rife with abuse, rather than looking for savings in some of these special kind of giveaways to agribusinesses, these sweetheart deals, rather than trying to find savings there to put toward balancing our budget, it was decided to go after, almost exclusively, this one program, SNAP.

Mr. Speaker, I heard up in the Rules Committee, during our consideration of the amendments today, people, a number of people say, well, all we're doing is eliminating categorical eligibility.

A lot of people don't know what categorical eligibility is. A lot of people who are supporting these cuts don't know what categorical eligibility is.

Basically, this was a Republican idea to kind of streamline a lot of bureaucracy and paperwork at the State level. So if you qualified for welfare, then you would automatically be enrolled in the SNAP program. It doesn't mean you would automatically get a benefit. It means you would be enrolled in the program, and if you qualified for the benefit, you would get it.

It was kind of one-stop shopping for people who were poor, for people who found themselves experiencing a difficult situation.

It has saved States lots and lots and lots of money. It has made it easier for people, during these economic difficulties, to be able to get the benefits that, quite frankly, they're entitled to.

And so when you eliminate categorical eligibility, what do you is you put an extra burden on States. States will end up having to pay more for additional bureaucracy. There'll be more paperwork. There'll be more confusion.

The other thing that happens when you get rid of categorical eligibility is that you will make it more difficult for people who are eligible to get the benefit and, therefore, many people who are still experiencing tough times, who are eligible for a food benefit, will not be able to get it.

Mr. Speaker, this used to be a bipartisan issue. And I remember, during the 2008 farm bill, you know, one of the things that saved that farm bill was the food and nutrition part of the farm bill. Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO,

whom I'll yield to in a few minutes, working with then-Speaker NANCY PELOSI, and I was happy to play a little bit of a role in it, helped fight to up the nutrition program in the farm bill in 2008.

As a result of that, we were able to pass a farm bill. And as a result of that, we were able to help millions and millions and millions of families. That's a good thing.

But, for whatever reason, in 2013, programs that help poor people have become controversial. My Republican friends have diminished and demeaned this program called SNAP. They have diminished the struggle of poor people.

I said in the Rules Committee today, I reminded my colleagues in the Rules Committee today that the average food stamp benefit, the average SNAP benefit is $1.50 a meal, $1.50 a meal, and $4.50 a day. That's like one of those fancy Starbucks coffees. That's what this is.

This is not some overly generous benefit. This is not even an adequate benefit, quite frankly. But in some cases it is a lifeline for many families. That's what it is.

A number of us, over this last week, have been trying to dramatize the fact that this is a modest benefit, so we have lived on a food stamp budget for this last week. I've got two more days to go, but I've lived on $1.50 a meal, $4.50 a day. It's hard.

It's hard to be poor. It's hard to shop when you're poor. It's hard to plan meals when you're poor. Given the opportunity between being poor or being able to be self-sustaining, to be able to buy whatever food you want, whenever you want it, you would prefer the latter. Nobody enjoys being on this benefit.

Some of my friends say that this creates a culture of dependency. Well, I remind those people who think that that there are millions and millions and millions and millions of people in this country who work for a living who earn so little that they still qualify for SNAP. They rely on SNAP to put food on the table.

And by the way, that's not enough, so they go to food banks and food pantries to be able to add to their ability to be able to put food on the tables for their families.

In 1968, there was a CBS documentary entitled ''Hunger in America,'' and it created quite a stir, because a lot of people in this country looked the other way and didn't realize that hunger was as bad as it was.

George McGovern, a liberal Democrat from South Dakota, and Robert Dole, a conservative Republican from Kansas, got together and helped create the food stamp program, now known as SNAP, helped create WIC, helped expand school meals for kids in schools, made sure that poor kids had access to meals during the summer.

They worked in a bipartisan way, and proudly, in a bipartisan way, doing what they could to make sure that nobody in this country went hungry. And in the late 1970s, by the late 1970s, we almost eliminated hunger in America. I mean, this kind of bipartisan coalition produced incredible results that almost eliminated hunger in this country.

And then in the 1980s we started taking steps backwards, and today we have 50 million of our fellow citizens who are hungry.

I would say to my friends who are thinking about how to vote on this FARRM Bill, you know, we should not have to choose between a good and adequate nutrition part of the FARRM Bill and good and adequate farm programs. They should go together.

□ 1910

In fact, the only thing you can buy with SNAP is food, so who benefits from food purchases? Well, farmers grow food, so farmers benefit from those purchases. So they're not separate and distinct. In fact, they're very, very much related. And this marriage between nutrition and farm programs has resulted in the passage of many important farm bills over the years. But for whatever reason, we find ourselves in a situation where that kind of coalition is breaking apart, and I regret that very, very much.

I want a farm bill. I represent a lot of agriculture in my part of Massachusetts. But I want a farm bill. I want a good farm bill. But I'm not going to vote for a farm bill that makes hunger worse in America. That's not the legacy I think we want to have here in this Congress. I think what we want to be able to do is to tell our constituents that we passed a good farm bill that not only helps our farmers but also helps people who are struggling.

There is nothing wrong—in fact, there is everything right—about our dedication to helping the least fortunate among us. Those who have said that, well, we don't want to be known as the food stamp Congress, I would respond to them as follows: I am proud to live in a country that has a social safety net. I am proud to live in a country where we don't let people starve. I am proud to live in a country that has programs like SNAP, like WIC and like school feeding to make sure that our citizens have enough to eat. Why is that all of a sudden controversial?

I'm going to tell you that SNAP is not a perfect program. Yes, there has been some abuse in the program to be sure. And to the credit of USDA and Secretary of Agriculture Vilsack, under his leadership, there has been a concerted effort to go after those who abuse the program. Anybody who abuses this program, in my opinion, ought to have the book thrown at them. These are taxpayer dollars going to support a program to help people get enough to eat. And when people abuse the program or misuse it, we ought to throw the full extent of the law at them. They ought to be fined and, in some cases, even arrested when they abuse taxpayer dollars.

But I will also say to my colleagues that SNAP, according to the General Accountability Office and according to a whole bunch of other studies, has one of the lowest error rates of any Federal program. I only wish some of the missile programs under our Pentagon's jurisdiction had as low an error rate and had as low a record of abuse of taxpayer dollars as the SNAP program has.

This is a good program. This is a good program. It can be better, and we should make it better. But let me say this: if you want to make it better, then maybe what we ought to have done in the Agriculture Committee is actually have a hearing. When people say that there are reforms in the FARRM Bill with regard to SNAP, I kind of cringe because how did you get to that number? How did you get to this so-called ''reform'' when there wasn't a single hearing in the Subcommittee on Nutrition? There wasn't a single hearing in the full Committee on Agriculture.

It is important that we make this program as perfect as it possibly can be. It is important that we try to make sure that every bit of abuse and fraud is taken away from this program, but there's a right way to do it. We deliberate. That's what we're supposed to do in Congress. You hold hearings, you listen to all different sides, you listen to how you can improve the program, and then we come together and we make those improvements.

But we ought to also understand that we need a larger discussion in this country on how to end hunger. We need to understand, as we debate the FARRM Bill, that SNAP is one tool in the anti-hunger toolbox. It doesn't solve everything. It doesn't solve everything. What it is is one program to help alleviate hunger. What we need, and I've called for, is the President of the United States to bring us all together under the auspices of a White House Conference on Food and Nutrition. Let's talk about this issue holistically. Let's take on some of these big issues of how do you end hunger in America.

Let's deal with that. And in convening such a summit, the President could bring all the different agencies in our Federal Government that have a piece of the pie in terms of battling hunger in America because not all of these programs fall into one agency. They fall into multiple agencies. Let's bring them all together. Let's figure out how we can better connect the dots. Let's call in our State and local governments. Let's call in businesses, the philanthropic community, our hospitals, our schools and our nutritionists. Let's call in our food banks, our food pantries and all the NGOs that have been out there struggling to end hunger for decades. Let's get everybody in a room together and lock the door until we have a plan.

If you want to end hunger, the first thing is you ought to have a plan. We

in this country, quite frankly, do not have a plan. So until we get to that point where we get a plan, what we ought not to do is take away from these programs that at this point do help alleviate hunger. We ought not to undercut the importance of SNAP. We ought not to throw 2 million more people off the program and hundreds of thousands of kids off free breakfast or lunch programs.

What do we do? I asked a question when I was reading the CBO numbers about how many people would lose their benefits. My question is, Where do these people go? What do they do? What do they do without a food benefit? Do they just show up at food banks, 2 million more people just show up at food banks? Talk to your local food banks. Talk to your local food pantries. They're at capacity. They can't take any more people. This notion that somehow charity will just pick up all the slack is a bunch of nonsense. Talk to the charities. Talk to the churches. Talk to the synagogues. Talk to the mosques. Talk to the food banks and food pantries. They can't handle what they're dealing with right now.

Just one final thing, and then I'm going to yield to my colleague from Connecticut. I also want my colleagues to understand another thing. Over the years, we have used SNAP as kind of an ATM machine to pay for other programs. As a result, come November of this year, if we cut nothing else, if we cut nothing else, people's benefits are going to go down. The average family of three will lose about $25 to $30 a month. That may not seem like a lot of money to some of my colleagues here in Congress, but $25 or $35 a month might be a week's worth of groceries. It might be what keeps somebody afloat for a week. It is a big deal to somebody who is in poverty, and we ought not to diminish that. We ought not to diminish that.

I'd also say that it really troubles me when I hear people demonize these programs and again diminish the struggle of those who need to take advantage of these programs. Listening to some of my colleagues testify before the Rules Committee today, you would think that our entire Federal deficit and our debt is all because we have programs like SNAP. They are wrong. They are wrong. SNAP didn't cause the debt that we have right now. What caused the debt are two unpaid-for wars that are in the trillions of dollars, tax cuts for wealthy people that weren't paid for, a Medicare prescription drug bill that wasn't paid for, and bad economic policies. Not this. Not this. This is a safety net; and it's a safety net that, yes, can be improved, but it's a safety net.

One of the things that we in Congress are supposed to be focused on is how we help people, help people who are in need. Donald Trump doesn't need our help. He's got all the money in the world. He's fine. But there are lots of people who don't live on Wall Street, but who live on Main Street who are just holding on by their fingertips, who, in some cases, their Sundays are spent trying to figure out how to just put food on the table for their families. There is not a congressional district in America—not a single one—that is hunger-free. There is not a community in America that is hunger-free.

□ 1920

If you've ever met a child who is hungry, it breaks your heart. And it just shouldn't be. It just shouldn't be. We are a better country than that.

So rather than going after this program, rather than going after WIC and SNAP and programs to help poor people put food on the table, we ought to be talking about the larger question about how to end hunger now.

Having said that, let me yield some time to my colleague from Connecticut, who's been a leader on this issue and who, in 2008, helped boost up the nutrition components of the farm bill, which made it a better farm bill and helped millions of people. So I yield to Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO.

Ms. DELAURO. I want to thank my colleague, Congressman MCGOVERN.

And I want to say a thank you to you. You have been steadfast and courageous on this issue. I know the strong and personal relationship that you had with Senator McGovern, who, with every fiber of his being, was devoted to making sure that both in the United States domestically and overseas that people, and particularly children, had enough to eat. And I think it was so special that he partnered with Bob Dole of Kansas.

When you take a look at the federally commissioned report that you spoke about, when you take a look at the people who were involved, the strength of that commission on hunger in America was its bipartisanship. Since this effort has begun, Members of both sides of the aisle have focused on this as a substantial problem. Therefore, as a Nation, we have to come together to try to address it.

Unfortunately today, in the environment, in the atmosphere, in this body, in this institution, in the Congress, there seems to be not much view that this is a problem and one that we have the opportunity, the capacity, and the ability to do something about. What we lack, as you've said so often in the past, is the will, the political will to do something.

We are highlighting tonight the severe, the immoral cuts made to antihunger and nutrition programs, particularly the food stamp program in the House FARRM Bill. Again, as you pointed out, millions of families are struggling in this economy.

We've had the worst recession since the Great Depression, and people are trying to survive. We're looking at an unemployment rate that is 7.5 percent. We are looking at incomes which are not increasing, but wages that are decreasing. Why we would pick this moment really to throw more people into poverty?

You can take a look at all kinds of statistics, and I'll quote some in a few minutes, that talk about the food stamp program and how it has kept people from falling into poverty and how it has kept kids from going hungry. And we would choose this moment to increase that poverty number and to say to children and disabled and seniors, I'm sorry, you're on your own. That's what this is about. It is immoral.

You know, you talked about the 50 million Americans—almost 17 million children—suffer with hunger right now. It's a problem across the country.

You talk about my district, the Third District of Connecticut. Connecticut, statistically, is the richest State in the Nation. We have a very affluent portion of the State, which is known as Fairfield County, sometimes referred to as the ''Gold Coast.'' Lots of people on Wall Street come to live in Fairfield County in Connecticut. Yet, in my congressional district, the Third District, one out of seven go to bed hungry at night. They don't know where their next meal is coming from.

One out of seven individuals nationwide take part in the food stamp program. People today who never thought they would have to rely on food stamps are having to do so because they lost their job, they lost their income, and they're looking for a way to feed their families.

I was at the Christian Cornerstone Church in Milford, Connecticut, just a few days ago. A young woman, Penny Davis, she was working, taking care of herself, taking care of her family. She lost her job. She didn't think much about it. She would get another job. She hasn't been able to get another job in this economy. In the meantime, in the interim, she's become separated from her husband. She is now responsible for herself and her family.

She didn't know what she was going to do. She called on the Christian Cornerstone Church. She called on the food bank to help her, to see what she could do. She spoke eloquently about wanting to work and not being able to find a job. So today she has accessed a program that she never thought she would have to use—the food stamp program.

Why can't we be there to help people bridge that gap? Because the genius of this program is that, in difficult times, the numbers of participants go up, but when the economy gets better, those numbers come down. And the numbers are coming down. So why, at this moment, would we jeopardize these folks' livelihoods, their well-being, and their ability to eat and to feed their families?

We've got a wonderful, wonderful phrase these days that we use about people being ''food insecure.'' Plain and simple—and you know this, Congressman MCGOVERN—this is people being

hungry. They're hungry. It makes you feel good to talk about food insecurity, but it's hunger. I talked about my district, but let's take a look.

Mississippi, 24.5 percent suffer food hardship. They're hungry. Nearly one in four people. West Virginia and Kentucky, that dropped to just over 22 percent, one in five. In Ohio, nearly 20 percent. California, just over 19 percent. The estimates of Americans at risk of going hungry here in the land of plenty are appalling, and we have a moral responsibility to do something about this.

Our key Federal food security programs become all the more important at this time, which, as you know and I know and so many others know, it is true of the food stamp program. It is the country's most important effort to deal with hunger here at home, and it ensures that American families can put food on the table—47 million Americans, half are kids.

This is about helping low-income children's health and development, reducing hunger in America, and continuing to have an influence so that those youngsters can have positive influences and opportunity into adulthood.

You stated it. Food stamps has one of the lowest error rates of any government program at 3.8 percent. I was upstairs at that Rules Committee meeting as well. You know, I loved the discussion about program integrity. Many, many times in the Agriculture Appropriations Committee, where I did serve as chairman for a while—I'm still a member of the committee, probably 16, 18 years on that committee—program integrity. Let's cut back on the waste, the fraud, and the abuse. The only programs that get debated in those efforts are WIC, food stamps, other nutrition programs. No one bothers to take a look at the defense bill. No one bothers to take a look within the FARRM Bill of other instances of waste, fraud, and abuse.

□ 1930

We believe in program integrity for every program in the Federal Government, not just one or two or pick out the programs that you don't like and focus in on them.

I sat on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture for the last 16 or 17 years. I chaired that Appropriations Subcommittee. I was part of a conference committee on the farm bill in 2008. In fact, as you've heard me say in the past, appropriators don't usually get onto a conference committee. But the then-speaker, NANCY PELOSI, appointed me there, particularly for the nutrition issues. Some of the conferees were a little nervous. As I've said, they thought I was some sort of invasive species in this context.

We worked hard on that farm bill. You know it because you worked hard on it. We said it was a safety net, and it is a safety net. The farm bill is a safety net, but it is a safety net for American farmers and for American families. We need to have that safety net. With then-Speaker PELOSI's strong support and leadership we passed a farm bill. We supported nutrition and antihunger programs. We made investments in the programs that targeted specialty crops and organic production. We were there and we voted for that bill.

I am for a farm bill, but that's not the case this time around. It's a different set of circumstances and a different environment, which is why, like you, I cannot support this farm bill.

The changes that you talk about, in addition to the $20 billion in cuts to beneficiaries, you talk about the eligibility program and the tool that States use to streamline the administration of the program; went back years in working this system out. They would unravel all of that.

Then they would like to talk about the food stamp program and the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program. They are two separate issues—categorical eligibility and the tie with food stamps and the LIHEAP program, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program. They'll say that if you get LIHEAP, then you're automatically on the food stamp program. That's not true. You have to qualify. I want to get to a couple of points that talk about qualifying and what people are forced to qualify and those who are not forced to qualify for the benefits that they receive in this farm bill.

It's important I think to note that we were able to get funding for the food stamp program in the Economic Recovery Program. You worked hard at that, I worked hard at that, the chair of the Appropriations Committee at that time, Mr. Obey, fought for those dollars. That has come to an end, the Economic Recovery Program.

Come the beginning of the next fiscal year every single recipient of food stamps will see it is $37—we got confirmation—$37 a month in a cut. What's happening in this farm bill will only add on.

It is important to note that our colleagues will say: Well, we have a deficit and we are going to use this money and we are going to pay down the deficit. Very interesting to know. In the past 30 years, every major deficit reduction package signed into law on a bipartisan basis was negotiated on the principle of not increasing poverty or inequality in deficit reduction.

Simpson-Bowles, the latest iteration of a deficit reduction package which so many people said went too far in changing the aspects of the social safety net, did not cut the food stamp program to achieve its deficit reduction. We need to follow this bipartisan effort in the same way that we did in these instances on deficit reduction and follow that bipartisan road, the same way we did in the recognition of the problem and the willingness to do something about it.

I've got two other points. You may hear from some that the direct payments—they'll say, well, we're cutting direct payments in the farm bill, and that the bill also makes very real reforms to the crop support programs. The bill finally ended direct payments, saving about $47 billion over 10 years. The commodity title of the bill only says that they're saving $18.6 billion. Why? Why the differential?

Because the rest of those savings are being plowed back into the commodity support programs. It creates a brand new program, which is called a ''price loss program,'' to protect these commodities if prices change. In essence, that safety net is working for farmers. I don't begrudge that. If you want to provide a safety net for farmers, fine.

But where's the safety net, where's the safety net for the benefits of the food stamp program? They're not there. The food stamp beneficiaries have nowhere else to go, as you pointed out, nowhere else to go in the farm bill to be made whole. Those who were receiving direct payments, they're going to be held harmless, if you will, through crop insurance and a new program, a shallow loss protection program that protects them if the commodity prices begin to fluctuate.

Where is the protection for the food stamp beneficiaries? It's not there. The only people who are going to lose benefits are the most vulnerable in our society today. It's wrong and, again, it's immoral.

The bill, as I said, expands the crop insurance program. I think it is important for people to understand that crop insurance—again, safety net, useful, good concept, very good, I wish it applied to our part of the country as it does to other parts of the country—but I don't know that the American taxpayers know this about the crop insurance program: taxpayers, U.S. taxpayers, foot the bill for over 60 percent of the premiums for beneficiaries, plus U.S. taxpayers pick up the tab on administrative and operating costs for the private companies that sell the plan, including multinational corporations, some of whom trace back to companies in tax havens. Switzerland, Australia, Ireland, Bermuda, that's where these companies have their headquarters, so they're making out like bandits. We pick up the tab, they don't pay their fair share of taxes in the United States. It really is quite incredible.

You and I talked about, Congressman MCGOVERN, that $4.50—there's an income threshold, there's a cap on the amount of money they can receive on the assets that they hold. This program on crop insurance where 26 individuals received at least $1 million in a subsidy, at least $1 million, they're protected statutorily and we can't find out who they are. We don't know who they are. They have no income test, no cap, no income threshold, no asset test that they go through. They just get the money—they get the money. Do you know what? They're eating and they're eating more, more than three squares a

day I bet, but not our kids, not our kids.

□ 1940

Our kids are going to bed hungry, and this program, by the way, does not even require the minimum conservation practices that other farm programs have on the books. It is pretty extraordinary when you think about a family of four when you have to qualify for this program for eligibility. It is at less than 130 percent of poverty, which means that a family of four has to live on $2,200 a month. As for our colleagues in this institution who are taking the food stamp challenge and doing it for a week—some may do it less, and some may do it more—do you know what? They're not doing it every single day with their kids.

There are serious problems with this FARRM bill. There really are very, very serious problems, and they need to be addressed. It should never have come out of the committee with $20 billion in cuts—never. It shouldn't have happened. I might also add that the President, as my colleague knows, has issued a veto threat primarily because of the food stamp cuts.

There are just a couple of quotes that I think are important.

The U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops said last year:

> We must form a circle of protection around programs that serve the poor and the vulnerable in our Nation and throughout the world.

Catholic leaders last month wrote:

> Congress should support access to adequate and nutritious food for those in need and oppose attempts to weaken or restructure these programs that would result in reduced benefits to hungry people.

We received a letter today asking us and asking Representatives—my God, there must be 80 or 90 organizations, probably over 100 organizations, that are saying don't do this, including the bulk of the medical profession. We've got Bread for the World, Children's HealthWatch, the Jewish Council for Public Affairs, First Focus, Network, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Public Health Association, Share Our Strength, and the list goes on.

Harry Truman said:

> Nothing is more important in our national life than the welfare of our children, and proper nourishment comes first in attaining this welfare.

I will close with the piece that was put out today by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities:

> New research shows that the food stamp program is the most effective program pushing against the steep rise in extreme poverty. One reason the SNAP program is so effective in fighting extreme poverty is that it focuses its benefits on many of the poorest households. Roughly 91 percent of monthly SNAP benefits go to households below the poverty line, and 55 percent go to households below half the poverty line. That's about $9,800 for a family of three. One in five SNAP households lives on a cash income of less than $2 per person a day.

Earlier in the article, it reads that the World Bank defines poverty in developing nations as households with children who live on $2 or less per person per day.

This is the United States of America. This is not a debate about process. It is not a debate about deficit reduction. It's not about politics. This is a debate about our values and our priorities in this great Nation. Let's go back to the days of George McGovern and Bob Dole and of those who came forward to say, There are those in this country who are starving. There are those who are without food.

We sit in the most deliberative body in the world. We can do something about it. Let's do something about it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank my colleague from Connecticut for her eloquent remarks. I think tomorrow, hopefully, we can do something about it. I will have an amendment, I hope, if the Rules Committee makes it in order, to restore the SNAP cuts, to reverse the $22.5 billion worth of cuts. Members on both sides of the aisle will have an opportunity to vote up or down on it. I think how we vote on that is a statement of our values and whether we think that government has a role and, indeed, whether our community has a role to be there for the least among us.

I tell people all the time that hunger is a political condition. You can't find anybody in this place who is pro-hunger or who at least will admit it, but somehow the political will doesn't exist to end this scourge once and for all. We can end it. The maddening thing about this problem is that it is solvable. When people say to me, Well, we can't spend any more money, my response is, The cost of hunger is so astronomical that we need to figure out a way to end it. If that means spending a little bit more in the short term to help extend ladders of opportunity for people to be able to get out of poverty, then we ought to do it.

Hunger costs. I mean, kids who go to school who are hungry don't learn. They can't concentrate. They don't learn. Senior citizens who can't afford their medications and their food and who take their medications on empty stomachs end up in emergency wards. One of the pediatricians at Boston Medical Center told me about young children who have gone without food for periods of time who end up getting something that is nothing more than a common cold, but their immune systems are so compromised that they end up spending several days in the hospital.

So if you're not moved by the moral imperative to end this problem, then you ought to be moved by the bottom line, which is that it costs us a lot of money to not solve this problem.

There was this great film that just came out a couple of months ago called, ''The Place at the Table.'' Two great young filmmakers—Kristi Jacobson and Lori Silverbush—directed this film. It documents hunger in urban, rural, and suburban America. It shows the face of hunger in America—young, middle-aged, old. I mean, it is there and it is heartbreaking.

We brought up to our Democratic Caucus in a meeting a few weeks ago some SNAP alumni, people who grew up and were on food stamps and who came back to say thank you for investing in them, for helping them get through a difficult time. Many of them now are doctors and lawyers and engineers and professors and have been very successful in paying back much more than we invested in them.

We want success stories. This place, this Congress, should be about lifting people up, not telling us how bad things have to be, not telling us that we have to put people down in order to move forward—trample over people—because that's what we do when we cut programs like this. We ought to be thinking big and bold about ''how do you end hunger?'' and ''how do you end poverty in this country?'' There is a way to do it. We saw what happened in the 1970s with George McGovern and Robert Dole. Things have obviously changed.

Let's perfect this program, but let's connect the dots so that we are creating a circle of protection that actually helps lift people out of poverty. I would like to think the goal of those of us on the Democratic side and the goals of those on the Republican side are to help people become self-sufficient—to succeed. That's what we want, but you are not helping people succeed when you take away food. That's what is at stake in this FARRM bill.

I know the gentlelady agrees with me, and I know she feels very strongly about this, but we will have an opportunity, hopefully tomorrow, to be able to have a debate and a vote up or down on whether we should cut this program in a very draconian way—to throw 2 million people off the benefit, hundreds of thousands of kids off free breakfasts and lunches. What happens to those people? What do we tell them to do—go to your local charity?

□ 1950

Ms. DELAURO. You were talking about the effect. It's about growth and development. There is wonderful material which we sent out to our colleagues from Dr. Deborah Frank, who talks about what happens to children. It isn't just concentrating, but it is their ability to grow, to develop, to be physically well. And the cost of dealing with what happens to the health issues only adds to our health care costs. I'm of the view that if you can't deal with humanity, let's deal with the economics of this. The studies are so clear about what happens with the absence of food, particularly with children.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I would say to the gentlelady that the points she raises are very important because the health of our children should be first and foremost, and we are now experiencing in this country a record level of obesity.

There is a tie-in between food security, hunger, and obesity.

People who are struggling in poverty do not have the resources to be able to buy nutritious food. Sometimes they live in food deserts and they rely basically on food items that just kind of fill them up with empty calories. So now we're dealing with that.

So if we looked at this issue holistically, we could solve a whole bunch of problems in this country. I'd like to think that there is a lot of bipartisan consensus on what we can do in ending hunger and promoting better nutrition and trying to build those ladders of opportunity to help people get out of poverty, perfecting these programs to go after the waste, to go after the abuse, to go after those who are outliers in this program who choose to try to basically rob the American taxpayer. Let's go after them, but let's not throw the baby out with the bathwater here. Let's not just turn our backs on the success stories.

Ms. DELAURO. I would just say this to the gentleman. The program has worked very hard, as you know, over the years to decrease that error rate in this program. I don't see the same concentration and the same effort in other programs.

And I mentioned here the crop insurance program. There's an article in the paper today that talks about the program is rife with fraud. Why aren't people interested in looking at that effort and the billions of dollars that we are losing every year? For the life of me, I don't understand it. People who view themselves as fiscal hawks, that we have to watch every dime and every dollar, they are only focused on nutrition programs and antihunger programs.

I think you may have alluded to this earlier, Congressman MCGOVERN. I think so many times that those who would cut these programs and do it in such a savage way just don't have much respect for the people who find themselves in a position to have to participate in the food stamp program. They think they're dogging it. They think they don't want to work, and they think they're looking for charity. It is such a misconception and a lack of understanding of the difficult economic times that people find themselves in today.

Sometimes we ought to walk in people's shoes and understand the lives that they're leading and what they're trying to do, like those of us here who believe we work hard and care and et cetera. People work hard. They care about their families. They want to make sure their kids are eating. Quite frankly, when it comes to feeding your kids, you'll do whatever you have to do in order to make that happen.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Let me say to the gentlelady that I couldn't agree more.

I've met with countless parents who have tearfully told me the anguish that they experience when they're not quite sure whether they'll be able to put food on the table for their children's dinner or for their breakfast or for their lunch.

I'm the parent of two children, an 11-year-old daughter and a 15-year-old son. I can't imagine what it would be like to not be able to provide them food. I think as a parent nothing could be worse because your kids are your most precious and important things in your life.

This is for real. This is real life.

Ms. DELAURO. In Branford, Connecticut, a woman with three boys, 18, 14, and 12, said that they eat one meal a day. In Hamden, Connecticut, there's a woman who says that she has just enough food to feed her children, but she has to say ''no'' if they want to invite someone over. She said sometimes she feeds the boys a little bit more because they're hungrier than the girls. We've heard about this internationally where the girls get short shrift when it comes to both education and food. My God, it's happening here. It is happening here.

We have the obligation—and I know you take it seriously. Our colleagues need to have that sense of moral responsibility to turn this around and do something that's better, do the right thing. Say ''no'' to $20 billion in cuts to the food stamp program.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentlelady for her comments and for her passion and for her efforts on this issue.

I hope that my colleagues, in a bipartisan way, will indeed say ''no'' to these terrible cuts.

It's hard for me to believe that we're going down this road, that we're going down a road where 2 million people are going to lose their food benefits, hundreds of thousands of kids are going to lose their access to a free breakfast and lunch, and we're all just kind of saying, ''It is what it is.'' Well, it isn't. This is a big deal.

I don't quite know why it's easier to pick on programs that help poor people versus programs that help rich people. You outlined earlier all these kind of little sweetheart deals and special interest kind of giveaways that kind of go untouched, such as how crop insurance oversight is not what we all think it should be. Yet a lot of times lucrative interests get those monies and get those benefits. Maybe there's a political consequence if you take on a powerful special interest. Maybe they won't show up to your fundraiser. Maybe they'll contribute to a super PAC and say that you're bad.

By contrast, poor people don't have a super lobby, don't have a super PAC. So maybe there's a debate going on of where will I get the most heat and not what is the right thing to do.

Ms. DELAURO. The most disingenuous thing is there are a number of people in this body who talk about this issue and themselves are getting subsidies and they have commodities or whatever it is. That's been information that's been in the paper. They will deny food stamps to families who have no wherewithal, but they're taking in sometimes, in some cases, several million dollars in subsidies that are coming from the Federal Government. Then it's okay.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Where's the justice in that?

Ms. DELAURO. There is no justice in that.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I received a postcard from a young mother who is on SNAP and who is kind of watching this entire debate unfold. She sent a very simple message to me that said, ''Don't let Congress starve families.''

We should be about lifting people up. This is not about a handout. It's about a hand up. This is not about a culture of dependency. This is about making sure that there is an adequate safety net in this country to deal with people who have kind of fallen on hard times.

Ms. DELAURO. With farmers and with families.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Absolutely.

We want a farm bill that supports our farmers, that supports small- and medium-sized farmers in particular, that helps promote good nutrition, that helps deal with the challenges that farmers all across this country face, but it cannot sacrifice the well-being of some of the most vulnerable people in this country.

I thank the gentlelady for her participation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2000

FATHERHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, Father's Day was this past Sunday, and I am very thankful that I had an opportunity to spend some time with my father, with my sister and her family. Everybody was there. I had an opportunity to thank him for the role that he has meant and continues to mean in our lives, and to thank him for that. It was also an opportunity for my daughter and I to do something special for my husband.

But, you know, Father's Day also presents us with the great opportunity to focus on the importance of fathers in this country. The presence of a father has such a tremendous impact on the life of each and every child and adult in America. A father serves to provide a sense of protection, guidance, and above all, love for their child. Fathers also push their children to pursue their dreams and to never give up.

I think of my own father, Ted Zellmer, and the profound influence that he has had on my life. Not only has he taught me the meaning of hard work and dedication, but he has supported me throughout my entire life to where I am today, representing the

good people of Missouri. That's what good fathers do and why they are so important. We learn a lot from fathers—whether it's how to drive a tractor and shoot a free throw, like my dad showed me, or how to fix an engine or play baseball. Dads teach us. They also show us how to live by example.

Children learn the importance of work and dedication to providing for the family when they see their dad leave for his job each day. They learn the importance of faith when he takes his family to church on Sunday. And they learn the value of family when he prioritizes his time to eat dinner with them each night, or to coach their Little League team.

We need good fathers now more than ever. Their importance is paramount to another discussion taking place in our Nation, and that is the value of marriage in America. Along with Father's Day, June will also bring an important announcement: the Supreme Court's much-anticipated rulings on both the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) and Proposition 8. These cases have put the national spotlight on this issue in a new way, and provide an opportunity for Americans to discuss the question: What is marriage?

It's not complicated. Marriage exists to bring a man and woman together as husband and wife, to become the father and mother for any children that come from that union. Marriage is based on the biological fact that reproduction depends on a man and a woman and the reality that children need a mother and a father. Redefining marriage would further distance marriage from the needs of children. It would deny as a matter of policy the ideal that a child needs a mom and a dad. We know that children do best when raised by a mother and a father.

President Obama is also a strong advocate for the importance of a strong male figure in a child's life. With firsthand experience of growing up without a father, the President works every day to be a great dad for his two daughters. The Obama administration has created many new programs under his Fatherhood Initiative Program, including under Fatherhood Buzz and Healthy Marriage and Responsible Fatherhood Initiative.

During his speech, President Obama said:

> Too many fathers are missing from too many lives and too many homes, having abandoned their responsibilities, acting like boys instead of men.

And then he goes on. The President says:

> We know the statistics—that children who grow up without a father are five times more likely to live in poverty and to commit crime, nine times more likely to drop out of schools, and 20 times more likely to end up in prison. They are more likely to have behavioral problems or to run away from home or become teenage parents themselves, and the foundations of our community are weaker because of it.

Clearly, we all agree on the critical role fathers play in the lives of their children, which is why we should continue to affirm marriage as the union of a man and a woman in the interest of children. Every child deserves a mom and a dad. You cannot say that fathers are essential while also making them optional. That's why we're here tonight, to make a case for fathers. Too many times in society, they are viewed as optional. Hollywood shows often depict them as buffoons. We know different, and are here to set the record straight. It's time to honor the fathers of America for the vital role they play in not only our families, but also the stability and the well-being of our Nation. It's time to show the respect that is due them, encourage men to be better fathers for their children, and champion the vital role they play in marriage.

I'm joined tonight by several of my colleagues, and I appreciate them taking the time to visit about this very, very important topic. I have my good friend from Kansas, TIM HUELSKAMP here, and he certainly is a person who knows a lot about being a good father because he certainly is one, and I yield to TIM HUELSKAMP.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Thank you, Congresswoman HARTZLER. I appreciate you leading our efforts and discussion tonight on a very important topic. Obviously, as you do mention, it is oftentimes a forgotten topic. I'm certain we all have our stories about our dads, and I was really blessed and still blessed with a very active and involved father. I will just say as a farm kid, probably the most poignant story I do recall with my dad was after a hailstorm. You know, being a farm gal yourself, the damage a hailstorm does to the family, does to the economy, and does to your crops. We were sitting out in the yard, and there were 3 or 4 inches of hail all around. And we listened to it bounce off the roof of the pickup for 30 minutes, and then it stopped. I said, Oh, gosh what's going to happen next? What's dad going to say?

He put the pickup in gear, and then we drove around in silence for another hour, and then we got out and we went back to work. That's the kind of message that I learned from my dad—you don't give up. You roll with the punches, and you keep doing that.

But tonight, I don't want to talk just about my father or my children, although I would love to do that. My wife and I have not been blessed with any of our own biological children. We have been blessed with four adopted children. So there are four sets of moms and dads out there that have dedicated children that are in our care.

One thing I do want to speak directly to fathers who are listening today, and fathers, I want to challenge you to be a hero for your children. I want to challenge you to be responsible, committed husbands to the mothers of your children. I challenge you to live out fatherhood courageously, but to live this courageous, responsible, heroic role as father, it requires marriage: marriage truly understood as the exclusive and permanent union between one man and one woman coming together to become husband and wife, mother and father to the children.

I would also like to speak to all of America, as I know my colleague has done. It is vital that we encourage fatherhood in the context of marriage and uphold policies that reflect the truth, the truth that fathers are not optional, but they play a vital role to their families, and restoring America must begin on the home front. It begins with encouraging and supporting committed, responsible fatherhood in the context of marriage.

We know who the victims of the vicious fatherless cycle are: they are our children. It is our children, the children of America, who are left to suffer the scars of the abandonment of their absentee fathers. As my colleague noted and quoted the President, he was accurate when he said we know the statistics, and yet I'll repeat them because they're so powerful:

> Children who grow up without a father are four times more likely to live in poverty and to commit crime; nine times more likely to drop out of schools and 20 times more likely to have behavioral problems or run away from home. The foundations of our community are weaker because of fatherlessness.

Furthermore, absent fathers don't just hurt our children, they wound society. It is a fact that the welfare state has to expand when marriage and families decline. It has been estimated over $229 billion in welfare costs from 1970 to 1996 can be attributed to the breakdown of marriage. And specifically, a study in 2008, 1 year alone, estimating that divorce and unwed childbearing cost American taxpayers over $120 billion a year.

□ 2010

This was a study of more than 5 or 6 years ago. Where there are absentee fathers, it's you, I, your families, our families, our communities, our churches, our neighbors, our cities, and the government, we're all forced to step in and try to pick up the broken pieces of these shattered marriages.

This is not fair to mothers and children. Wives deserve committed husbands. Children deserve protective, responsible fathers.

The facts speak for themselves. But one story I will note, and then I'll close quickly, is it was not far from here a few weeks ago I was crossing a crowded street here in Washington, D.C., and there was a line of kids. I think they were with a babysitter. And there was about a 2-year-old young boy, and he looked at his babysitter as he's crossing the street. She's dragging him across. And he asked again, I could hear him. He says, ''Who is my daddy? Who is my daddy?'' And that babysitter didn't have an answer. ''Shhh. Don't worry about that.'' He kept asking the question, ''Who is my daddy?''

We should have an answer. We should have an answer for that little boy. We

should have an answer because we should know. We should expect, we should demand, we should promote, we should push fathers, encourage them, demand of them to hold up their responsibilities, because there is a disease in America, and it's the disease of fatherlessness.

We must overcome the myths in society that see no difference in whether a mom or a dad is involved in a child's life, because it is, there is no doubt. You can look at tons and tons of social science data over and over. It's very clear.

But for that 2-year-old boy, that 3-year-old boy, we have to have an answer who is his daddy. And the daddy is not the government. He has a daddy. He should be involved. Our policies should reflect that goal, because every child deserves both a mom and a dad.

And I look forward, hopefully, as we continue to press forward and solve these problems, we promote marriage and promote fatherhood.

I appreciate your leadership tonight, VICKY, for your efforts here.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you so much, TIM. I think you spoke so eloquently to the importance of fathers and the cost that we have, as a society, when fathers are not present and why it's important to have a policy that promotes the father being there for their children.

And now I'd like to yield to the gentleman from Georgia and hear what he has to say about the importance of fathers. Thank you, PHIL GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate so much the gentlelady from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) for leading this time on fatherhood. And what a perfect time to do it this evening. We all just came back from our districts and celebrated Father's Day or Grandfather's Day.

And of course we're also awaiting, some time soon, before the end of June, a decision, a momentous decision from the Supreme Court in regard to two particular decisions: the one ballot initiative from California, Proposition 8, where the people of California fairly convincingly decided what is a definition of traditional marriage; and, of course, the other thing is the Defense of Marriage Act passed right here on this floor and signed into law by President Clinton back in 1996.

So this is timely, and I commend the gentlewoman from Missouri for bringing it forward and giving us an opportunity to join with our colleagues and talk about something as important as this, that is, the definition of fatherhood and how important a father is to a child.

But maybe even more important than that, a mother and a father. We don't always have the ideal situation, but that's certainly no reason to throw up our hands and say let's forget about our faith and family and traditional values and what's best, what is the best circumstance for a child.

My colleagues, I think a lot about my own children. Of course they're adults now, and among them, they have 13 grandchildren—our grandchildren, their children. And at least one of my son-in-laws had no father present when he was growing up. And that father didn't come to his wedding. That father was not there for the birth of any of his four children. That father just basically denies his existence.

And I watch that particular son-in-law, and my son and my other son-in-laws, but particularly him, because of the experience that he went through as a child, how much he loves his children, how kind and caring and loving he is and how important he is in their lives.

And I realize today that the ''Father Knows Best'' and that traditional view that we all had back in the old days of television is different. It's changed, and I do understand that.

Of my three daughters and one daughter-in-law, they all work. They all work, some of them full-time, some of them part-time. But they're still there as moms. And when they come home and take over that responsibility, they need a shared partner, and that partner is that partner for life. And I'm talking about, of course, the father.

And so I really appreciate the opportunity to be with my colleagues tonight and just say that, you know, maybe part of the problem is we need to go back into the schools at a very early age, maybe at the grade school level, and have a class for the young girls and have a class for the young boys and say, you know, this is what's important. This is what a father does that is maybe a little different, maybe a little bit better than the talents that a mom has in a certain area; and the same thing for the young girls, that, you know, this is what a mom does and this is what is important from the standpoint of that union which we call marriage, and we have called it that since the beginning of this country and long before the beginning of this country.

So as I close and yield back to the gentlelady and thank her for giving me some time, I stand strongly for the Defense of Marriage Act and traditional marriage as we know it, and don't take that right away from our States.

But this is a wonderful opportunity to say, young men, you've got a great responsibility. You're not a father unless you prove it.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you so much, PHIL. That's well spoken from a proud grandfather as well as a father, and certainly brought up the importance of fatherhood as well as these decisions that are coming up from the Supreme Court.

You know, the people have spoken on that. The people of California spoke two times, and they said, This is what we think is wise public policy for the families and the citizens of California. And the people spoke on the Defense of Marriage Act through their elected representatives here in Congress, a huge vote, bipartisan. And President Clinton signed the bill. The people have spoken on this.

And what we don't want is to have the Supreme Court impose their view or be activists and impose their view of what marriage should be on the citizens who have spoken, so it's going to be interesting to see how they rule.

But certainly, I agree with you, PHIL, that it's very important that the people have spoken and that we uphold marriage.

Next we have a Representative from Oklahoma, a friend of mine, JAMES LANKFORD, who not only is a great dad and father, but has worked with teenagers for many years and, I'm sure, has seen the importance of fatherhood as it relates to young people.

So go ahead, JAMES LANKFORD.

Mr. LANKFORD. I thank the gentlelady for hosting this time.

There's a lot of things I've talked about in the well of this House. I've talked about budget. I've talked about a growing economy, about jobs. I've talked about transportation. I've talked about the relationship of the individual citizen and their government and how that relationship works—or sometimes it doesn't work lately.

But this is a time just to be able to pause for a moment and not talk about necessarily some new government law or some new regulation, but to celebrate, for just a moment, dads, with Father's Day this past weekend, and to be able to hesitate again and to be able to say thanks to my own dad, but to also talk about the fact that it is the love of our life for men to be able to enjoy their children, just like it is for ladies to be able to enjoy their children, as well, as a mom.

There is something very unique—and I believe firmly that every child needs a mom and needs a dad. They come at parenting from two different directions and they, together, make such a dramatic difference in the life of a child, to have a mom and to have a dad.

It's interesting to me that the last verse in the Old Testament, in that verse from Malachi 4:6 in that minor prophet book, it ends that Old Testament by saying the role of the prophet will be to turn the hearts of the children to their fathers and to turn the hearts of their fathers to the children, to be able to see that restoration.

□ 2020

In that time period, there was a collapse for a moment in the families, and they suffered as a nation and saw that. We see that today in our own families. Fifteen million children live life without a father—15 million. In 1960, there were only 11 percent of the homes that didn't have a father. Today, it's over one-third of the homes that don't have a father. As we watch all the consequences that occur with that in our own economy, in our own family, and in our own culture, it's just the separation that happens.

We see a greater emphasis right now with trying to figure out what to do in

schools as parents seem to be disconnected from their children and teachers struggle in the community, and things have changed in our schools with an absence of fathers.

As we've seen the families collapse, we've seen an increase in poverty. Some colleagues were here earlier speaking about hunger in America, which is rampant and is a huge issue for us as a nation. They mentioned that in the 1970s we had a very low hunger rate in America. It's interesting for us to come here now and talk about fathers and how that has changed, and from that point in 1970 when we had a very low hunger rate in America, we look at the difference now with a very high hunger rate in America and also a very low presence of fathers in the lives of their children. We've seen something different happen in families as fathers disconnect from their children and they no longer see a role to be able to be a provider and they've required government to go be the provider for children when it was never designed to be that way. And that's not where it is best.

Children have a higher risk of poverty. Children have a lower graduation rate from high school and have a lower entry rate into college. There is not a safe environment for children when there's an absence of a dad and a mom. It's different for them as they grow up and as they process through things without the stability that can come to a child with the presence of a mom and of a dad.

So what do we do about it is the challenge. Well, quite frankly, there are issues in our marriage laws right now as a nation that we have where there are penalties to be married in our tax law. There are penalties even in our disability benefits as we try and reach in and help families as they're disabled, but yet if they're married, it's a lower rate. So we look at that, and we ask the question: Why would we punish a family for being married because one of the individuals there is disabled? That doesn't make sense for us.

So we need to look at our policies that we have and be able to encourage rather than discourage marriage. Because we know when that happens—it's the reason that the Federal Government is involved at all in the marriage relationship is because we know what happens in the lives of children when a man and a woman are committed to each other for life. That commitment, the reason the government is connected to that is because of what happens in the lives of children and how it benefits people in the days ahead. So we need to look at the marriage penalty that's occurring in our tax law and our disability rules and such.

But, quite frankly, most of the issues that deal with fatherhood and from the absence of fathers won't happen because of a change in Federal law. It will happen when families turn and mentor young couples and they get personally involved in the lives of young families. Some individuals have never seen a functioning man and a woman married and committed to each other for life. They've never seen that in their community, and they haven't experienced that in their own family. It's so important for older couples to mentor young couples and to pass on the wisdom that they have gained.

It is, quite frankly, very important at the marriage altar for two individuals to truly commit to each other for life. That brings stability not only to those two individuals, but it also brings stability to the children where they grow up in a home where there's some emotional security and safety and not the constant fear of separation and of loss of either the mom or the dad. So for individuals to be committed to each other for life makes a big difference in that.

So what can happen? I talked about the Federal policies, but it's really individuals, individuals mentoring other individuals, and it's two individuals when they approach the marriage altar knowing that we're going to commit to each other and we're going to work through the problems that we have because that's what's best for our Nation, and that's what's best for the children that are coming up to provide them that stable home where they can grow up.

Do we always get it perfect? No. But we know economically and we know emotionally that the strongest homes and what's best for our children is for a mom and a dad. And I want to honor dads that do commit to walk through the hard, difficult days and to say to them, Keep going. Don't give up, dads. And as you face through hard times, your children need you.

The single most difficult part of my job is getting on an airplane on Monday mornings and flying away from my two daughters and my wife. No other moment of my week is harder than that one, because I know the importance of being a dad to my daughters, and they need me.

I encourage dads today to live out the commitment that you have made to your wife and the commitment that you've made to your children.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Great, great words. Thank you, James. What a word of encouragement, how to commit and to keep on going and to be good dads and the need to strengthen marriage in this country. So thank you for those very, very excellent comments.

Now I would like to call on another colleague from Oklahoma, a freshman this year who has hit the ground running, and we are really glad he is here. JIM BRIDENSTINE, I would like to yield to you and hear what you would like to share about the importance of fathers.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. I appreciate that. It is an honor to be here, and thank you for inviting me to participate in this.

I have been certainly accused of maybe being critical of the President from time to time, as many of us Republicans are sometimes, but I'd like to share a few points where we agree, the President and I. I've got a number of quotes here, and I think these quotes cross party lines and certainly indicate how important fathers are in the lives of their children.

Here is a quote from our President, Barack Obama:

> We need fathers to realize that responsibility doesn't end at conception. We need them to realize that what makes you a man is not the ability to have a child; it's the courage to raise one.

Here is another quote from our President:

> I wish I had a father who was around and involved.

That's a profound statement, and certainly it shows a great deal of courage by our President to say that.

I remember when I was a young child in the Cub Scouts, the Pinewood Derby came around every year. My father, my brother, and I would spend a great deal of time weighing our little Pinewood Derby car to make sure that it weighed precisely 5 ounces. We would spend all night graphiting the wheels because we wanted our little Pinewood Derby car to be the absolute fastest car that we could possibly make it. Whether we won or lost, it didn't matter. We were going to make this little car as fast as we could possibly make it.

I also remember not too long ago my 7-year-old, who was 6, wanted to participate in the Pinewood Derby in the Cub Scouts himself. And because of my relationship that I had with my father and the time that we spent involved in that project, it was a desire of my heart to be involved in his Pinewood Derby to the same extent. And I'm proud to say that when I was a child, we won the Pinewood Derby; and I'm proud to say that as Walker's dad, together we won the Pinewood Derby when he was 6 years old. These are the things that I think are critically important in the life of a child.

Some other quotes from our President: Obama has said that his hardest but the most rewarding job is being a father. I think that is absolutely true, as well.

I want to quote some statistics here:

Currently there are 24 million children in America living in a home without their biological father.

The World Family Map report by Child Trends found that even when controlling for income, children who live with both parents have better educational outcomes than children living with one or no parents. Fathers play an important role in teaching children life lessons and preparing them to succeed in school and in life.

Some other quotes:

According to the National Fatherhood Initiative, a father's involvement in education of his children is associated with a higher probability of A's for their children.

Interestingly, I remember when I was in fourth grade, there was a competition called Math Olympiads. My dad

was a mathematician, and he came from a family of mathematicians. And my dad would spend hours with me working on these math problems that were really college-level math problems. We would go over and over these problems again and again. I remember in fourth grade, when it came time to do Math Olympiads, there were just five problems, and if you could get one or two of them right, it was really tremendous for a fourth grader. I remember at the end of the first Math Olympiad, I had four out of five correct. And it wasn't because I was smart, and it wasn't because I was brilliant. It had nothing to do with that at all—in fact, quite the contrary. But what it had to do with was the fact that I had a dad who was so engaged, so involved, and so interested in making sure not that I would get an A in the class—quite frankly, that was really not relevant to him. What he cared about was whether I learned the material.

□ 2030

I remember taking tests in sixth grade. I would do the math problems entirely different than how the teacher taught and the teacher would count it wrong. My dad would go to the school and he would say, you know, he may have done it differently than you taught him, but he did it the way we taught at home because he's preparing for higher math in a different year.

Having a dad involved in your education that way is something that was tremendously important to me as I was growing up. And certainly, now that I am a father myself and I have a child in first, now soon to be second grade—and of course other children on the way that are entering kindergarten and a 1-year old at home, these are areas where it's important for me.

There is a generational trend. When a child has that impact from their father, certainly it's an impact on them that they want to have on their own children. So that's why it is so important for fathers to be involved in the lives of their children. That's my personal experience.

Children with involved fathers are more likely to do well in school. They have a better sense of well-being, they have fewer behavioral problems. When fathers are actively involved in the upbringing of their children, their children demonstrate greater self control and a greater ability to take initiative.

Along with Father's Day, this June will also bring an important announcement—the Supreme Court's much-anticipated rulings on both the Defense of Marriage Act and Proposition 8. These cases have put the national spotlight on this issue in a new way and provide an opportunity for Americans to discuss the question: What is marriage?

Marriage exists to bring a man and a woman together as husband and wife, to be a father and a mother to children, and the institution of marriage is intended for life. This is very important when it comes to the rearing of children.

A few more statistics. In 2012, about one-third of all children lived in families without their biological father present. According to some estimates, as many as 50 percent of children who are currently under age 18 will spend or have spent a significant portion of their childhood in a home without their biological father.

Research indicates that children raised in single-parent families are more likely than children raised in two-parent families, with both biological parents, to do poorly in school, have emotional and behavioral problems, become teenage parents, and have poverty-level incomes.

In 2011, the poverty rate for children living in homes without a father was 48 percent, compared with 11 percent for children living with married-couple families. Single-parent families are more likely to be poor than two-parent families, especially if the lone parent is the mother. That's why it's so important for fathers, and that's why I commend the President when he talks about the importance of fathers.

Here's a final quote from our President:

> As fathers, we need to be involved in our children's lives not just when it's convenient or easy, and not just when they're doing well, but when it's difficult and thankless, and they're struggling. That is when they need us most.

With that, I thank the gentlelady from Missouri.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you so much, Jim. I really enjoyed hearing the stories about your father and the role that he played. You know, I think every child in that derby was a winner who had a father who helped make their little pine box with them. It really is important and makes a huge difference. So thanks for sharing that.

Now I'd like to yield my time to Congressman TRENT FRANKS from Arizona, who is certainly a champion for so many of these issues that are so important to us today, and to fathers and families.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Well, I just thank the gentlelady, Mr. Speaker, because she has demonstrated such a wonderful presence in this body. She has been a gift to all of us. I know that each person who has preceded me at this platform is grateful for Congresswoman VICKY HARTZLER. I wish there were about another 200 like her and I might just go home. But I really appreciate her so much.

Mr. Speaker, it's been said that a father is a man who expects his children to be as good as he meant to be. I have yet to meet a father who doesn't want to convey his own mistakes to his children. He wants his children to learn from his mistakes, to give his children the best possible start in life, serving as a springboard from which to face the day-to-day challenges that ultimately come. But I really don't think that's such a comprehensive definition.

Those of us who are privileged to be in a Christian family believe that there is a loftier image of fatherhood, that there is One after whom we model our inevitably flawed attempts to raise our children with love and wisdom, a perfect father who gives us ''every good and perfect gift,'' who is a father to the fatherless and a help in times of need to the widow and the oppressed. And it is only in having children sometimes that we begin to understand just a little glimpse of how our heavenly Father feels about the rest of us.

To most women, their father was their first love. To most men, their father was their first larger-than-life idol. The role a father plays in the life of his children simply cannot be overstated. That fact, Mr. Speaker, that knowledge that little eyes are watching every move we make, often emulating what they see for good or bad, no matter what we do, we will never feel quite fully equipped to do justice to the sacred responsibility to which God has entrusted us.

There is a famous saying that the greatest gift a father can give his children is to love their mother. And the point of that quote of course is that a healthy, intact home gives a child the best possible chance at pursuing and achieving their dreams.

But for all its difficulties, what a sweet and blessed honor it is to be entrusted with the task of raising these little human images of unconditional love. I've said it before, Mr. Speaker, and I believe with every passing day that every baby that is born comes with a message from God that He has not yet despaired of mankind on Earth. Yet I look around at the state of the American family, Mr. Speaker, that bedrock institution that is responsible more than any other factor for inculcating the truth into the hearts and minds of each new generation, and I believe that it is facing a grave and profound challenge in America.

A mentor and a friend of mine, Gary Bauer, recently wrote an article on this very subject. He was highlighting the state of affairs in which so many Americans find themselves without the firm, guiding, loving hand of a father.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, 40 percent of children are now born to unmarried parents, including a majority of children born to women 30 years old or younger. A recent study in Richmond, Virginia, found that 60 percent of families in the city have just one parent—usually the mother—at home. Among black residents, it's 86 percent of homes that are single parents.

A related Pew study estimated that women, when they are the prime breadwinners—and they are in 40 percent of American households—that, unfortunately, the majority of these households are led by a single mother who averages just $23,000 in annual income, whereas intact families average about $80,000 a year in income, by comparison.

Eighty-five percent of all young men—or even, for that matter, middle-

aged men—in prison came from a family that never had a functional father figure in their midst—85 percent.

Mr. Speaker, it is an understatement to suggest to you that children are so desperately in need of both a mother and a father. And I know no better way to really illustrate that than just to try to tell the story of three fathers.

The first story I will tell is of one father named Earl Carr. He was my grandfather. Earl Carr was a coal miner. When he was just in his mid-twenties, a terrible cave-in crushed his friends, killed most of them, and broke his back. So as a child, I remember growing up when my grandfather could carry a coal bucket for maybe 40 or 50 feet, but then he would have to sit down. But he never abandoned his family, and he was always there in every way that he could be.

Just to illustrate to you how sometimes a grandfather can have a big impact on a grandson, more than 45 years has passed—and I hope I can remember it—but he used to be very fond of the ''Coal Miner's Ode,'' and it goes something like this:

Come and listen, you fellers, so young and so fine, and seek not your fortune in the dark dreary mine. It will form as a habit and seep in your soul 'til the stream of your blood runs as black as the coal.

Because it's dark as a dungeon, damp as the dew where the danger is double and the pleasures are few.

Where the rain never falls and the sun never shines, it's dark as a dungeon way down in the mines. And I hope when I'm gone and the ages shall roll, my body will blacken and turn into coal. And I will look from the door of my heavenly home and I'll pity the miner digging my bones. Because it's dark as a dungeon, damp as the dew, where the danger is double and the pleasures are few,

where the rain never falls and the sun never shines, it's dark as a dungeon way down in the mines.

□ 2040

I don't remember the last time I said that, Mr. Speaker, but I do know that it was over 40 years ago that I learned it, and a grandfather does have a lasting impact on our lives.

So now I will tell you another story of another father, and he's my father—a man named Taylor Franks. I won't go into—because I don't remember—how he was there for me when I was a baby and had some congenital defects and probably wouldn't have had the opportunity to be standing in this well had it not been for a faithful father, but I'll tell you just one story.

Years ago in the little town when I was growing up, I came away from the playground one day when I was about 5 or 6 years old, maybe 6 years old. And I came through an alley, and you know how it always is. There is sometimes a bunch of guys that want to demonstrate their macho capability. I walked past the fence and one of them yelled something at me and there was a rock fight that ensued. Now, they were behind the fence and there were several of them. I was out there alone and I was losing this battle very demonstrably. I would pick up one rock and throw it back because I didn't want to be discomforted by this band of ruffians, you understand. But I was losing, and I thought, Boy, what am I going to do? I am going to have to run, it looks like. And just at the moment when I was probably in the peak of my panic, all of a sudden the rocks stopped, everything was still, and I could see them peaking over the fence at me. I noticed a little carefully. It seemed like they were looking at something behind me. I turned and it was Taylor Franks. He said, How about me evening up the sides here just a little bit? He evened up the sides many, many times.

He's 87 years old now. But I'll tell you, if the communists ever come to this country to take us over, they better go around that old gentleman's house because they'll get more than they bargained for. This is a man that loves his country, loves his God, and loves his family. I have no words to express my gratitude to him.

So I will tell you about another father, who almost didn't think he was going to be one. But he calls his little boy ''little feller,'' because that's what his daddy called him. And his name is Joshua Lane, and he's my boy. He's got a sister, a twin sister. She's 5 minutes younger. Of course he takes care of her. But I can say to you that there is no greater gift on this Earth than these children.

Somehow, I guess, the point of all this, Mr. Speaker, is just to remind all of us that are fathers what they meant to us and what we mean to our children. Sometimes I have to watch mine grow up at a distance, but they know their daddy loves them and they know their daddy is here so that we can make a better future for them.

I guess my challenge to the fathers of this country is to be reminded that your children grow up so quickly and your impact on them will be profound beyond any words that I could ever articulate. They say that great societies finally come when old men plant trees under whose shade they will never sit. I believe that to be true, that our greatest jobs as fathers is to make sure that our children have the inculcated truths that will help them find their way home and through the great storms of life. We should always remind ourselves that they are, indeed, the living messages that we send to a time we will never see ourselves.

I hope that somehow that fathers of this country will recognize the gift that they've been given and they will recognize the impact that they will have, and that the rest of society will recognize that if we displace fathers in our country, we will bankrupt us all trying to replace them.

With that, Mr. Speaker and Congresswoman HARTZLER, I yield back.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you so much, Representative FRANKS. I couldn't say it any better I think. Thank you.

The heritage that he has given his children and that his father gave him and his grandfather gave him, that's what it's about is being able to pass on that heritage to your children. That's why we have a policy in our country that encourages fathers to be there for their children, so that every child has a chance to have a mother and a father.

I am glad to be joined today by a gentleman from California, DOUG LAMALFA.

Thank you for coming tonight. I look forward to hearing what you have to share on this very important topic.

Mr. LAMALFA Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mrs. HARTZLER, for holding this time here tonight for us.

Let's talk about the importance of fatherhood and what all that means. I really appreciate the words of my colleague from Arizona who just spoke and his eloquent way of doing that.

We are in a nation here that really cries out for the type of values that are represented by what is called the nuclear family—kids these days, with so many temptations and so many things out there that will pull them in all different directions. They need a mom and they need a dad.

We know statistically, just talking numbers, that the chances of success for children to grow up and be successful in their own lives, not in poverty, not in abusive situations, the percentages are so much higher when there's a loving mom and a dad in their lives.

We have very important tasks, very important jobs here in this place. Mr. Speaker, when we make policy here, we always need to make it in such a way that supports the family, that strengthens the family and doesn't weaken it or in some fashion even use the State, use the government, as usurping the role of the parent or of a dad like we've seen so much with maybe the start of the great society—well-intentioned things that have gone on to, in many ways, replace the father in people's lives. There needs to be that accountability to come back and bring that unit together.

Thinking of my own dad—we lost him almost 5 years ago now—he was always a strong and pretty quiet leader, but he could just give you ''the look'' pretty much and set you back on track. He had to spend a lot of hours out on the farm. We didn't always get to see him all the time when it was busy in the springtime with planting or with harvest, but we always knew, my sisters and I, that he was there for us. He didn't get to every ball game, but we always knew. We never had to question his dedication and commitment to us and to our mother, because moms are in it, too. We know that certainly because, typically, mostly the caregiver for kids a lot of times, she needs that support, too, that comes from that committed family unit.

So we have to make policy, we have to make things that support that in

this place. I'm so disappointed with the direction our country has gone the last 40 to 50 years that has broken that apart.

I have an obligation to my wife and my four kids. One of the most difficult things in contemplating what goes on with this role of service that I've been blessed with by the voters in my district is the time away from home. Being from the west coast, it's a heck of a commitment. With a 5-hour plane ride each way and all that, you don't just get to pop in like when I was in the State legislature in Sacramento and you get home most nights.

That's the kind of thing that keeps me worrying sometimes, worrying a little bit: Am I doing right by my kids? We do this here—I think anyone that runs for office—ostensibly with the idea that we're trying to help the next generation and preserve the country and preserve our freedoms. But there's a sacrifice in this job. It kind of all comes back to perspective.

Father's Day, the other day, I got to spend home with the family. All my kids either got me a little something or made a little card. Very, very touching things said in those cards reminded me that, yeah, we are here trying to do something for them, preserve their rights, their opportunities, their liberties, and that they understand, even though I don't always get to be home, that it is for them.

□ 2050

So that makes me feel good about doing this—about taking on the huge issues here, the long hours, the sometimes fruitless battles, and people looking at us from the outside with our, maybe, 10 percent approval rating, wondering, What the heck are you doing back there in Washington, D.C.? We all know we're here for a good reason.

We have an obligation as dads to be there for our wives and for our kids, which is nothing new, but it's the dedication. They need to know that we're there for them, that we're fighting for something, whether it's our more day-to-day jobs—if you're a butcher or a baker or a candlestick maker—or if you're back here getting to be part of the U.S. Congress.

The importance of a dad to a son can't be overstated. You need a man in the life to guide your son to the right path, to be that strong voice, to keep your son in the position, first of all, of respecting his mother, of respecting his sisters, of respecting women—of what that role is supposed to be. They need that, and a lot of them have lost out on that. It's sad. We see the tragedy. Some of these kids are walking the streets, and they grow up to be in gangs and so much because they didn't have that.

A dad has a very strong role with his daughters—to ensure that they know they have value, that they aren't something to be out there to be traded, as so often happens when they don't have that fatherly voice saying, You have value, and you have self-respect—that is so key to you. It keeps so many times young girls out of trouble and on that good path.

You can't overstate that role of a father on both sons and daughters and, of course, that very strong support that's needed for your wife, who has to watch the home fires when we're off doing things like this. She needs that.

So what I'm saying to the men who are already fathers or who are would-be fathers is, you've got a very important task, extremely, the most important task—to be that leader of your household. You need to stick with them through thick and thin.

And men, be men. Don't be something else. Grow up. You need to cast off childish things when you've made that commitment to a woman and to fatherhood, because they're watching you. Your neighborhood is watching you. It's the most important thing you'll ever do.

So, Mr. Speaker, I conclude tonight with the thought that, for there to be one Nation under God, men have a very key role in that. That's being that father, and that's holding the family together. No matter what might come and affect it, no matter what legislation or court decision might try to affect or break that family union or make confusing decisions for our children, we have that role, and we can be that guide for their whole lives. It is rewarding for all of us.

With that, I appreciate the time, and I appreciate the gentlelady from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) for leading this discussion here tonight.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank the gentleman. That was very, very well said, and I appreciate your encouraging the men to be leaders of their households and to make a difference for their children—the next generation.

I appreciate all of my colleagues who have come tonight so that we could talk about the importance of the fathers and how important it is to have marriage strong in our country.

Every child deserves a mom and a dad. You cannot say that fathers are essential while also making them optional. The presence of a father has such a tremendous impact on the lives of each and every child and on every adult in America. Fathers not only represent the success of our children but also the success of our Nation.

As we get closer to the Supreme Court's ruling concerning the Defense of Marriage Act, it is crucial that we weigh the entirety of the impact such a decision will have on families. My colleague from Oklahoma earlier cited the President in this quote when he stressed the importance of fathers. I think it's very, very good, and I want to repeat it.

President Obama said:

As fathers, we need to be involved in our children's lives not just when it's convenient or easy and not just when they're doing well—but when it's difficult and thankless, and they're struggling. That is when they need us most.

Every single child in this country deserves the opportunity to have a mother and a father. That is why we must uphold marriage. Not only must we represent the future of our children but also the future of our Nation.

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

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 8 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 0045

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NUGENT) at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1947, FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–117) on the resolution (H. Res. 271) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1947) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, 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:

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for June 17 through June 19 on account of medical reasons.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

AMENDMENT TO THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY FOR THE 113TH CONGRESS

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on June 18, 2013, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology adopted the attached amendment to its Committee Rules:

Rule VI (b) of the Rules of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology is amended to read as follows:

(b) SUBCOMMITTEES AND JURISDICTION. There shall be five standing Subcommittees of the Committee on Science, Sp-ace; and Technology, with jurisdictions as follows:

The Subcommittee on Energy hall have jurisdiction over the following subject matters:

all matters relating to energy research, development, and demonstration projects therefor; commercial application of energy technology; Department of Energy research, development, and demonstration programs; Department of Energy laboratories; Department of Energy science activities; energy supply activities; nuclear, solar, and renewable energy, and other advanced energy technologies; uranium supply and enrichment, and Department of Energy waste management; fossil energy research and development; clean coal technology; energy conservation research and development, including building performance, alternate fuels, distributed power systems, and industrial process improvements; pipeline research, development, and demonstration projects; energy standards; other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman; and relevant oversight.

The Subcommittee on Environment shall have jurisdiction over the following subject matters: all matters relating to environmental research; Environmental Protection Agency research and development; environmental standards; climate change research and development; the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, including all activities related to weather, weather services, climate, the atmosphere, marine fisheries, and oceanic research; risk assessment activities; scientific issues related to environmental policy, including climate change; remote sensing data related to climate change at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA); earth science activities conducted by the NASA; other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman; and relevant oversight.

The Subcommittee on Research and Technology shall have jurisdiction over the following subject matters: all matters relating to science policy and science education; the Office of Science and Technology Policy; all scientific research, and scientific and engineering resources (including human resources); all matters relating to science, technology, engineering and mathematics education; intergovernmental mechanisms for research, development, and demonstration and cross-cutting programs; international scientific cooperation; National Science Foundation, university research policy, including infrastructure and overhead; university research partnerships, including those with industry; science scholarships; computing, communications, networking, and information technology; research and development relating to health, biomedical, and nutritional programs; research, development, and demonstration relating to nanoscience, nanoengineering, and nanotechnology; agricultural, geological, biological and life sciences research; materials research, development, demonstration, and policy; all matters relating to competitiveness, technology, standards, and innovation; standardization of weights and measures, including technical standards, standardization, and conformity assessment; measurement, including the metric system of measurement; the Technology Administration of the Department of Commerce; the National Institute of Standards and Technology; the National Technical Information Service; competitiveness, including small business competitiveness; tax, antitrust, regulatory and other legal and governmental policies related to technological development and commercialization; technology transfer, including civilian use of defense technologies; patent and intellectual property policy; international technology trade; research, development, and demonstration activities of the Department of Transportation; surface and water transportation research, development, and demonstration programs; earthquake programs and fire research programs, including those related to wildfire proliferation research and prevention; biotechnology policy; research, development, demonstration, and standards-related activities of the Department of Homeland Security; Small Business Innovation Research and Technology Transfer; voting technologies and standards; other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman; and relevant oversight.

The Subcommittee on Space shall have jurisdiction over the following subject matters: all matters relating to astronautical and aeronautical research and development; national space policy, including access to space; sub-orbital access and applications; National Aeronautics and Space Administration and its contractor and government-operated labs; space commercialization, including commercial space activities relating to the Department of Transportation and the Department of Commerce; exploration and use of outer space; international space cooperation; the National Space Council; space applications, space communications and related matters; Earth remote sensing policy; civil aviation research, development, and demonstration; research, development, and demonstration programs of the Federal Aviation Administration; space law; her appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman; and relevant oversight.

The Subcommittee on Oversight shall have general and special investigative authority on all matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 330. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish safeguards and standards of quality for research and transplantation of organs infected with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce; in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 46 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, June 19, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1893. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Dual and Multiple Associations of Persons Associated With Swap Dealers, Major Swap Participants and Other Commission Registrants (RIN: 3038-AD66) received June 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1894. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Process for a Designated Contract Market or Swap Execution Facility to Make a Swap Available to Trade under Section 2(h)(8) of the Commodity Exchange Act; Swap Transaction Compliance and Implementation Schedule; Trade Execution Requirement under Section 2(h) of the CEA (RIN: 3038-AD18) received June 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1895. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Organic Program (NOP); Amendments to the National List of Allowed and Prohibited Substances (Crops and Processing) [Document Number: AMS-NOP-12-0016; NOP-12-07FR] (RIN: 0581-AD27) received June 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1896. A letter from the Management Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Postdecisional Administrative Review Process for Occupancy or Use of National Forest System Lands and Resources (RIN: 0596-AB45) received June 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1897. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the amount of purchases from foreign entities in Fiscal Year 2012, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 113 note; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1898. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Defense Trade Cooperation Treaties with Australia and the United Kingdom (DFARS 2012-D034) (RIN: 0750-AH70) received June 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1899. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report to Congress regarding additional Reserve Component equipment procurement and military construction; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1900. A letter from the Director, Division of Coal Mine Workers' Compensation, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Black Lung Benefits Act: Standards for Chest Radiographs (RIN: 1240-AA07) received June 14, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1901. A letter from the Executive Director, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's 2012 Annual Report to the President and Congress; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1902. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Irradiation in the Production, Processing, and Handling of Animal Feed and Pet Food; Electron Beam and X-Ray Sources for Irradiation of Poultry Feed and Poultry Feed Ingredients; Correction [Docket No.: FDA-2012-F-0178] received June 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1903. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the combined seventh, eighth, and ninth quarterly reports on Progress Toward Promulgating Final Regulations for the Menu and Vending Machine Labeling Provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1904. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal

Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Connect America Fund (WC Docket No.: 10-90) received June 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1905. A letter from the Division Chief, Regulatory Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Application Procedures, Execution and Filing of Forms: Correction of State Office Address for Filings and Recordings, Including Proper Offices for Recording of Mining Claims; Oregon/Washington [LLOR957000-L63100000-HD0000] (RIN: 1004-AE31) received June 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1906. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 120306154-2241-02] (RIN: 0648-XC651) received June 14, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

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. ADERHOLT: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2410. A bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 271. Resolution providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1947) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for the other purposes (Rept. 113–117). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself, Mr. GIBSON, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 2407. A bill to reauthorize the Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself and Mr. AMASH):

H.R. 2408. A bill to prohibit the Department of Justice from tracking and cataloguing the purchases of multiple rifles and shotguns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 2409. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to permit a State to require an applicant for voter registration in the State who uses the Federal mail voter registration application form developed by the Election Assistance Commission under such Act to provide documentary evidence of citizenship as a condition of the State's acceptance of the form; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2411. A bill to prohibit the Federal Government from contracting with an entity that has committed fraud or certain other crimes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BARBER (for himself and Mr. HECK of Nevada):

H.R. 2412. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to consider the best interest of the veteran when determining whether the veteran should receive certain contracted health care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. HARRIS):

H.R. 2413. A bill to prioritize and redirect NOAA resources to a focused program of investment on near-term, affordable, and attainable advances in observational, computing, and modeling capabilities to deliver substantial improvement in weather forecasting and prediction of high impact weather events, such as tornadoes and hurricanes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DAINES, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 2414. A bill to require automobile manufacturers to disclose to consumers the presence of event data recorders, or ''black boxes'', on new automobiles, and to require manufacturers to provide the consumer with the option to enable and disable such devices on future automobiles; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. LANCE, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. PETERS of California):

H.R. 2415. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include information on the coverage of intensive behavioral therapy for obesity in the Medicare and You Handbook and to provide for the coordination of programs to prevent and treat obesity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. WATT, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 2416. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study regarding the proposed United States Civil Rights Trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. STEWART, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. KLINE):

H.R. 2417. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to protect the bulk-power system and electric infrastructure critical to the defense and well-being of the United States against natural and manmade electromagnetic pulse (''EMP'') threats and vulnerabilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. GRIFFIN of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 2418. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to prohibit an individual who is the subject of an outstanding arrest warrant for a felony from receiving various cash benefits under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2419. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to provide coverage under such Act for credit cards issued to small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2420. A bill to authorize the Benjamin Harrison Society to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia to honor the patriots of the American Revolutionary War and the War of 1812; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PETERS of California:

H.R. 2421. A bill to provide biorefinery assistance eligibility to renewable chemicals projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PETERS of California (for himself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BERA of California, Ms. CHU, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HALL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. HAHN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 2422. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Sally K. Ride in recognition of her exemplary service as an astronaut, physicist, and science education advocate; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RUNYAN:

H.R. 2423. A bill to improve the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts with private physicians to conduct medical disability examinations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIRES (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. MENG, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 2424. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban development to establish a program enabling communities to better leverage resources to address health, economic development, and conservation concerns through needed investments in parks,

recreational areas, facilities, and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, 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. TIERNEY (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 2425. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide protection for company-provided retiree health benefits; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 2426. A bill to better integrate engineering education into kindergarten through grade 12 instruction and curriculum and to support research on engineering education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BONNER, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BARTON, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. COLE):

H.J. Res. 50. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to parental rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H. Res. 269. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1947) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H. Res. 270. A resolution permitting official photographs of the House of Representatives to be taken while the House is in actual session on a date designated by the Speaker; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. STEWART introduced a bill (H.R. 2427) to provide for the relief of Lori L. Rogers; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2407.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 2408.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 2409.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress' authority to regulate congressional elections derives primarily from Article I, Section 4, Clause 1 of the Constitution (known as the Elections Clause). The Elections Clause provides that the states will prescribe the ''Times, Places and Manner'' of congressional elections, and that Congress may ''make or alter'' the states' regulations at any time, except as to the places of choosing Senators. The courts have held that the Elections Clause grants Congress broad authority to override state regulations in this area. Therefore, while the Elections Clause contemplates both state and federal authority to regulate congressional elections, Congress' authority is paramount to that of the states.

By Mr. ADERHOLT:

H.R. 2410.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2411.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Mr. BARBER:

H.R. 2412.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.R. 2413.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 2414.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 2415.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 2416.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

THE COMMERCE CLAUSE: section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 2417.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas:

H.R. 2418.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2419.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section Eight of the U.S. constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2420.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clauses 1 and 18 of section 8 of article I, and clause 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution.

By Mr. PETERS of California:

H.R. 2421.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. PETERS of California:

H.R. 2422.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. RUNYAN:

H.R. 2423.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 2424.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. TIERNEY:

H.R. 2425.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2426.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I

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.

Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 2427.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.J. Res. 50.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Parental Rights Amendment is introduced pursuant to Article V: ''The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution . . .''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 75: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 129: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 148: Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 164: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 182: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 198: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 272: Ms. CHU, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 292: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 310: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 318: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 335: Mr. ALEXANDER.
H.R. 352: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 451: Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 460: Mr. POCAN and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 485: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 525: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 641: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 647: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 664: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 685: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. LATTA, Mr. STEWARD, and Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 693: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 698: Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 721: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 725: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 755: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TONKO, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BARBER, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 763: Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 795: Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 797: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 809: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 904: Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 940: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 961: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 963: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 1015: Ms. NORTON and Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 1024: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1076: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 1094: Mr. CLYBURN.
H.R. 1102: Mr. TIERNEY and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1122: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1125: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1148: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1151: Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 1155: Mr. RADEL.
H.R. 1179: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PERRY, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 1187: Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 1213: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 1250: Mr. PETERS of California and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 1274: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 1403: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1405: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1416: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1427: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 1466: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RUSH, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1474: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1485: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 1508: Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 1528: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1553: Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1595: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1620: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1622: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1643: Mr. O'ROURKE and Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 1653: Mr. HANNA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HURT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. LONG, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 1666: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1692: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1731: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1733: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 1750: Mr. HUELSKAMP and Mr. BARROW of Georgia.
H.R. 1761: Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 1767: Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 1771: Mr. FORBES and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 1781: Mr. RADEL.
H.R. 1792: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1809: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1812: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 1823: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 1825: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 1829: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 1830: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 1852: Mr. ENYART, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 1861: Mr. KLINE and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 1871: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 1900: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 1908: Mrs. BACHMANN and Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 1921: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. CAPPS, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 1999: Mr. O'ROURKE and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2003: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 2004: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2009: Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 2011: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 2016: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 2019: Mr. UPTON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 2020: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 2030: Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2052: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 2053: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 2068: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 2072: Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. JONES, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 2084: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 2093: Mr. BRIDENSTINE and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 2112: Mr. REED, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. NADLER, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 2132: Mr. BERA of California.
H.R. 2146: Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 2172: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2182: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 2195: Mr. POCAN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2208: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 2218: Mr. OLSON, Mr. SALMON, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 2220: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 2238: Mr. GOWDY.
H.R. 2250: Mr. HANNA, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 2273: Mr. HANNA, Mr. LATTA, and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 2277: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 2288: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CROWLEY, and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2290: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 2305: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 2310: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 2317: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 2328: Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. LATTA, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 2352: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2383: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 2384: Ms. NORTON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DELANEY, and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2399: Mr. YOHO, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2403: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H. J. Res. 34: Mr. KILMER.
H. J. Res. 47: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mrs. LUMMIS.
H. Con. Res. 4: Mr. BARROW of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 16: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. PAULSEN.
H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H. Res. 30: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Res. 104: Mr. RUIZ.
H. Res. 123: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
H. Res. 136: Mr. WOLF.
H. Res. 212: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H. Res. 229: Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H. Res. 238: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H. Res. 263: Mr. FORBES and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H. Res. 265: Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

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. 1896, the International Child Support Recovery Improvement Act of 2013, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

SUBMITTED FOR PRINTING PURSUANT TO CLAUSE 9 OF RULE XXI

The amendment to be offered by Representative MCGOVERN or a designee to H.R. 1947, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.