



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2015

No. 135

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, September 21, 2015, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2015

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 18, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Once again, we come to ask wisdom, patience, peace, and understanding for the Members of this people's House. At a time when, once again, strong sentiments stand in opposition, we ask discernment for the Members, that they might judge anew their adherence to principle, conviction, and commitment.

Protect them from the deafness toward one another, lest they slide uncharitably toward an inability to work together to solve the important issues of our day.

Give them the generosity of heart and the courage of true leadership to work toward a common solution which might call for compromise, even sac-

rifice on both sides. In the end, may we all, as Americans, be proud of the processes of elective, democratic government.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. TSONGAS 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

IRAN DEAL

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, last week, the House of Representatives thoughtfully voted three times to oppose the Iranian nuclear deal. This bipartisan effort represented the will of the American people, where the majority oppose this deal. The first vote was a sense of Congress that the President failed to comply with the law to submit all agreements to Congress. The second vote was to defeat the deal, and the third vote was to prevent the President from lifting sanctions on Iran until 2017.

I am grateful to Chairman ED ROYCE for his leadership in holding hearings and advancing legislation to fight this dangerous deal. Sadly, they are blocked in the Senate by Democrats who fail to see the threats of "death to America," "death to Israel."

This is a historic mistake. The President is flooding billions of dollars to the Iranian regime to fund terrorist attacks and has paved the way for Iran to develop nuclear weapons. The President's legacy in the Middle East, failing to enforce the red line in Syria, has led to the refugee crisis and chaos, with children drowned at sea. American families deserve peace through strength.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President by his actions never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H6141

HONORING MIKE HARPER ON HIS
88TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. ASHFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend, Mike Harper, on his 88th birthday. Mr. Harper served as the CEO of ConAgra, an agricultural giant and Fortune 500 company headquartered in the heart of my district.

In 1975, Mike came to Omaha to take the helm at ConAgra and presided over a massive expansion of business in Nebraska. By 1987, though, Nebraska was emerging from the farm crisis and feared the loss of significant corporate presence. Mike personally spearheaded the effort to reform State taxes and regulations that made corporate investment burdensome.

Between 1975, when Mike took over as CEO of ConAgra, and 1987, the profits of ConAgra soared, as did the fortunes of business in Nebraska. Thanks to Mike's leadership in business and politics, Nebraska now has one of the lowest unemployment rates in the country. My district in particular enjoys a well-balanced economy, including manufacturing, agriculture, and a wide array of services.

On this day, I wish to rise to applaud this giant of the agriculture industry and a major contributor to the expansion and preservation of Nebraska's local economy.

Happy birthday to Mike Harper.

HONORING NAPPANEE MAYOR
LARRY THOMPSON ON HIS RE-
TIREMENT

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Nappanee Mayor Larry Thompson on his retirement. A devoted husband and proud father, Mayor Thompson has dedicated his life to serving his community. He and his wife, Linda, grew up in the Nappanee area and, along with his two children, run their family funeral home business.

Since his election in 1995, he has been instrumental in making Nappanee one of the most vibrant cities in the State of Indiana. He helped establish the Boys and Girls Club of Nappanee and created the West Industrial Park.

In the aftermath of an F3 tornado that struck Nappanee in 2007, Thompson led a coalition of community leaders to help rebuild the parts of the city that had been destroyed or damaged.

In addition to his work in the public sector, Mayor Thompson is an active member of the community, involved with Kiwanis and the American Red Cross. He has dedicated his life to public service.

God bless you, Larry, in your retirement.

REPUBLICAN CALENDAR OF
CHAOS

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

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Speaker, House Republicans are giving us a fall calendar of chaos. We have 5 legislative days before they shut the government down.

Madam Speaker, this is a bad rerun of bad policy. Two years ago, people said they would never shut it down, and they did it. When they shut it down, it cost the economy \$24 billion, and 120,000 jobs were lost; and they are going to do it again in 5 days.

That is not the only deadline, Madam Speaker, in this calendar of chaos. They have missed a deadline for the highway trust fund, costing more jobs. We are careening towards another fiscal cliff with the debt ceiling. They missed the deadline for the Export-Import Bank, which cost a bunch of jobs, 500 lost jobs, as a result of this calendar of chaos.

And there is more. Madam Speaker, the American people, everyday Americans, do not deserve this Republican calendar of chaos.

FEDERAL WILDLAND
FIREFIGHTER RECOGNITION ACT

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, this year, 8½ million acres so far have been consumed due to wildfire. This is approaching the record that we don't want to break of 10 million that happened in 2006.

Recently, the Forest Service in this year's wildland fire season has spent \$243 million just in the last week of August alone. We have 30,000 American firefighters deployed, as well as hundreds from Australia, New Zealand, and Canada. Despite this dedication, the current Federal firefighters are given erroneous job titles, such as wildland technician or forestry technician.

H.R. 3363, the Federal Wildland Firefighter Recognition Act, would give them the proper title of wildland firefighters and allows those who risk their lives to be recognized properly and given the respect they deserve. Let's pass H.R. 3363 to give them their proper title.

STOP PUTTING WOMEN'S HEALTH
AT RISK

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Madam Speaker, we have less than 5 legislative days here in Washington before the end of this fiscal year, but instead of funding the government, House majority leadership is focused on defunding Planned Parenthood.

For nearly a century, Planned Parenthood has been one of the Nation's leading providers of high quality, affordable health care for women. It has fundamentally changed attitudes towards women's reproductive freedom, which has been essential to women's health and given women more control over their health care decisions.

One in five women has relied on a Planned Parenthood health center for care in her lifetime. They are often one of the few affordable places for women to turn when they are searching for care. Cutting Federal funds to Planned Parenthood means taking away money for cervical cancer screenings, breast care screenings, and other types of necessary care.

Madam Speaker, I urge my friends on the other side of the aisle to come to the table and negotiate a way to fund the government and to stop these political games that put women's health at risk.

RECOGNIZING CHRISTOPHE
JEANNIN AND HIS FAMILY ON
BECOMING U.S. CITIZENS

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

Mr. DOLD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Citizenship Day, observed yesterday, September 17, to recognize all who have become citizens of our great Nation.

The 10th Congressional District in Illinois is a place where thousands of immigrants have started and grown their businesses, raised their families, and achieved the American Dream.

Madam Speaker, I believe America is a place where goals can be accomplished and the doors of opportunity are always open for those who work hard.

Earlier this week, I had the privilege of attending a Naturalization Oath Ceremony for some very good friends, the Jeannin family in Chicago. It was a ceremony in Judge Sam Der-Yeghayan's chambers, and Christophe, Natalie, Audrey, and Alex all raised their right hand to swear allegiance to the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, Christophe came to the United States with his family in the late seventies. His mother and father—Gerard and Madeline—and his sisters—Dominique, Sophie, and Ann—were all here and were contributing members of our community. They have all since left, but Christophe has remained.

Madam Speaker, the Jeannin family is just one example of immigrants who have made a tremendous impact in our community. We are stronger and a more diverse community because of immigrants that call our Nation home.

I want to congratulate Christophe, Natalie, Audrey, Alex, and all of the citizens this week that have become United States citizens. Congratulations.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

□ 0915

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

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, last night, nearly 80 of my colleagues joined me in sending a letter to Speaker BOEHNER urging him to keep the House in session every day until we reach a solution that prevents a government shutdown.

In 2013, we saw how badly a shutdown damaged our economy: \$24 billion in lost economic activity, 120,000 fewer private sector jobs created during the shutdown, and 20,000 veterans disabilities claims per week that were stalled. And yet even though we have nearly 2 weeks left before a shutdown would happen, there are only 5 days of scheduled activity in this House Chamber.

The American people can't afford another self-inflicted Washington wound on our economy. The stakes are just too high to take even a day off. We owe it to working families, seniors, and veterans across our Nation to get the job done right now.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF IRANIAN TERRORISM ACT

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to seek justice for victims of Iran's state-sponsored terror.

One of those victims is Chief Petty Officer Robert Stethem. In June 1985, Petty Officer Stethem, 23 years old, was murdered by Hezbollah terrorists aboard hijacked TWA Flight 847 in Beirut. He was executed when the hijackers realized he was a United States servicemember. They tortured him, and then they murdered him in cold blood before leaving his body on the tarmac below the plane.

Madam Speaker, Hezbollah is one of Iran's most lethal terrorist proxies. In 2002, a Federal judge ordered Iran to pay more than \$320 million to Stethem's family and other victims of Flight 847's hijacking. It is one of the more than 80 judgments that require Iran to pay \$43 billion to victims of its radical allies. Not one dime has been paid.

Despite Iran's refusal to compensate its victims, it will soon get a \$150 billion windfall from the end of the sanctions under the proposed nuclear deal. In short, Iran's hardliners will get a payday while their victims await billions of dollars in compensation.

Madam Speaker, I have introduced legislation, the Justice for Victims of Iranian Terrorism Act, which prohibits the removal of sanctions until Iran pays every penny it owes. It is the least we can do for victims like Chief Petty Officer Stethem and the families that suffered at Iran's hands, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. GALLEG0 asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GALLEG0. Madam Speaker, the GOP's dysfunction has real consequences for the hard-working Americans who elected us and who are trying to make ends meet for their families.

Rather than pass a long-term highway bill that invests in our crumbling infrastructure and creates jobs, Republicans instead keep catering to the most radical elements of their base.

Madam Speaker, this is irresponsible. The American people deserve better. It is time for the Republican Congress to come to its senses and for this Congress to come together for the good of the people who elected us.

BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 421, I call up the bill (H.R. 3504) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a healthcare practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 421, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3504

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds as follows:

(1) If an abortion results in the live birth of an infant, the infant is a legal person for all purposes under the laws of the United States, and entitled to all the protections of such laws.

(2) Any infant born alive after an abortion or within a hospital, clinic, or other facility has the same claim to the protection of the law that would arise for any newborn, or for any person who comes to a hospital, clinic, or other facility for screening and treatment or otherwise becomes a patient within its care.

SEC. 3. BORN-ALIVE INFANTS PROTECTION.

(a) REQUIREMENTS PERTAINING TO BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS.—Chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1531 the following:

"§ 1532. Requirements pertaining to born-alive abortion survivors

"(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR HEALTH CARE PRACTITIONERS.—In the case of an abortion or attempted abortion that results in a child born alive (as defined in section 8 of title 1, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Born-Alive Infants Protection Act')):

"(1) DEGREE OF CARE REQUIRED; IMMEDIATE ADMISSION TO A HOSPITAL.—Any health care practitioner present at the time the child is born alive shall—

"(A) exercise the same degree of professional skill, care, and diligence to preserve

the life and health of the child as a reasonably diligent and conscientious health care practitioner would render to any other child born alive at the same gestational age; and

"(B) following the exercise of skill, care, and diligence required under subparagraph (A), ensure that the child born alive is immediately transported and admitted to a hospital.

"(2) MANDATORY REPORTING OF VIOLATIONS.—A health care practitioner or any employee of a hospital, a physician's office, or an abortion clinic who has knowledge of a failure to comply with the requirements of paragraph (1) shall immediately report the failure to an appropriate State or Federal law enforcement agency, or to both.

"(b) PENALTIES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Whoever violates subsection (a) shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(2) INTENTIONAL KILLING OF CHILD BORN ALIVE.—Whoever intentionally performs or attempts to perform an overt act that kills a child born alive described under subsection (a), shall be punished as under section 1111 of this title for intentionally killing or attempting to kill a human being.

"(c) BAR TO PROSECUTION.—The mother of a child born alive described under subsection (a) may not be prosecuted under this section, for conspiracy to violate this section, or for an offense under section 3 or 4 of this title based on such a violation.

"(d) CIVIL REMEDIES.—

"(1) CIVIL ACTION BY A WOMAN ON WHOM AN ABORTION IS PERFORMED.—If a child is born alive and there is a violation of subsection (a), the woman upon whom the abortion was performed or attempted may, in a civil action against any person who committed the violation, obtain appropriate relief.

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

"(A) objectively verifiable money damage for all injuries, psychological and physical, occasioned by the violation of subsection (a);

"(B) statutory damages equal to 3 times the cost of the abortion or attempted abortion; and

"(C) punitive damages.

"(3) ATTORNEY'S FEE FOR PLAINTIFF.—The court shall award a reasonable attorney's fee to a prevailing plaintiff in a civil action under this subsection.

"(4) ATTORNEY'S FEE FOR DEFENDANT.—If a defendant in a civil action under this subsection prevails and the court finds that the plaintiff's suit was frivolous, the court shall award a reasonable attorney's fee in favor of the defendant against the plaintiff.

"(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.—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."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after

the item pertaining to section 1531 the following:

“1532. Requirements pertaining to born-alive abortion survivors.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU) 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 to include extraneous materials on H.R. 3504, 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 yield myself such time as I may consume.

Millions of people have viewed videos of representatives of the organization Planned Parenthood, which performs some 40 percent of all abortions each year. Those videos, recorded undercover, include discussions of instances in which during the course of an attempted abortion a baby is born “intact.”

As one doctor caught on tape said: “Sometimes . . . if someone delivers before we get to see them for a procedure, then they”—the babies—“are intact. But that’s not what we go for.”

Another business executive said: “If you had intact cases, which we’ve done a lot, we sometimes ship those back to our lab in its entirety.”

A procurement manager says on a video: “I literally have had women come in and they’ll go in the OR”—the operating room—“and they’re back out in 3 minutes, and I’m going, ‘What’s going on?’ ‘Oh, yeah. The fetus was already in the vaginal canal whenever we put her in the stirrups. It just fell out.’”

A former employee of the same company told investigators that she was shown the results of one abortion by a doctor, and she recalls: “This is the most gestated fetus and the closest thing to a baby I’ve seen . . . and she”—the doctor—“taps the heart and it starts beating . . . The nodes were still firing and I don’t know if that means it’s technically dead or it’s alive. It had a face. It wasn’t completely torn up. Its nose was very pronounced. It had eyelids . . . Since the fetus was so intact, she said, ‘Ok. Well, this is a really good fetus and it looks like we can procure a lot from it. We’re going to procure a brain . . . That means we’re going to have to cut the head open.’ She takes a scissors and she makes a small incision right

here”—at the chin—“and goes, I would say, maybe a little bit through the mouth, and she’s like, ‘Ok. Can you go the rest of the way?’ . . . And so she gave me the scissors and told me that I have to cut down the middle of the face. And I can’t even describe what that feels like.”

The House Judiciary Committee, which I chair, is undergoing a comprehensive investigation of the issues raised by these videos. But as that and other investigations continue, Congress must move immediately to protect any children born alive during the course of a failed abortion.

The bill before us today is simple, yet profound, insofar as it might be a reflection of the Nation’s conscience.

Its operative provisions provide that, in the case of an abortion that results in a child’s being born alive, any healthcare practitioner present must exercise the same degree of professional care to preserve the life of the child as he or she would render to any other child born alive at the same gestational age. The bill also provides that the child must be immediately transported and admitted to a hospital.

If a baby born alive is left to die, the penalty can be up to 5 years in jail. If the child is cut open for its body parts or some other overt act is taken, the punishment is that for first degree murder, which can include life in prison or the death penalty.

Babies are born alive during failed abortions. Just last week, the committee heard direct testimony by two grown women who, as babies, survived attempted abortions. The mother of one of them, Gianna Jessen, was advised by Planned Parenthood to have an abortion.

But, as Ms. Jessen testified, “Instead of dying, after 18 hours of being burned in my mother’s womb, I was delivered alive in an abortion clinic in Los Angeles.” Her medical records state clearly that she was “born alive” during an abortion.

She continued: “Thankfully, the abortionist was not at work yet. Had he been there, he would have ended my life with strangulation, suffocation, or leaving me there to die. Instead, a nurse called an ambulance, and I was rushed to a hospital. Doctors did not expect me to live. I did. I was later diagnosed with cerebral palsy, which was caused by a lack of oxygen to my brain while surviving the abortion. I was never supposed to hold my head up or walk. I do. And cerebral palsy is a great gift to me.”

Just think of that for a moment. Ms. Jessen says cerebral palsy is a gift to her because it came with the gift of life. Ms. Jessen presented a picture at the hearing, showing the results of the sort of abortion she survived.

Today, I ask the Nation to see in its collective mind the body of a baby, much like this one, on the floor, born alive during a failed abortion. I ask that we collectively reach down into our hearts and, also, reach down to the floor.

As we vote today, I ask that we, as a nation, grasp the value of life and, also, grasp that baby’s back, lift its tiny body off the ground, and take it to a hospital—and not leave her with the abortionist.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Contrary to its misleading title, this bill is not about protecting children born alive. Its real intent is to further undermine a woman’s right to choose, a right that has been constitutionally guaranteed for more than 42 years by *Roe v. Wade*.

Not only does this bill attempt to politicize women’s health and to limit women’s access to abortion, it would interfere with the sacred doctor-patient relationship and substitute a physician’s best judgment with the judgment of a handful of politicians’.

We must not forget that this bill has come to the floor at the same time as the push to defund Planned Parenthood.

This attack on a venerable and respected provider of high-quality health care would have a devastating impact on women, especially women in rural communities, low-income women, and women of color, and it would deny women access to preventive care, life-saving cancer screenings, and family planning services.

Approximately one woman in five has relied on Planned Parenthood for health care at some point in her lifetime. It is a blatant attack on women and families to defund an organization that uses Federal funds to prevent abortions and to help families stay healthy and cannot even use Federal funding for abortion.

It would be the saddest of ironies that, by defunding Planned Parenthood’s critical contraception and other reproductive health services in the name of opposing abortion, we would see more unintended pregnancies and, therefore, more abortions.

Among its flaws, H.R. 3504 proposes a standard of care for abortion providers that could interfere with the ability of physicians to make medical decisions for their patients.

In doing so, the bill represents an unprecedented level of intrusion by the government into medical decisions.

For instance, the bill requires an abortion provider to immediately transport a fetus to a hospital in some cases even if the fetus is not viable under existing law and under the standards of care applicable to neonatal physicians.

This requirement is so broad and the penalties so severe—up to 5 years in prison—that one can only conclude that the real purpose of the bill is to intimidate abortion providers out of service.

The bill also requires doctors and employees of hospitals and clinics that provide abortion services to report any violations of the bill’s standard of care

to State or Federal law enforcement authorities.

Any person who fails to comply with these requirements is threatened with fines and up to 5 years in prison. This is not just the doctors but the cleaning crew and the receptionists.

On top of this, the language in this bill completely fails to distinguish between a viable and non-viable fetus, which is the constitutional line that separates abortions that may be performed without restrictions from those that may be regulated or prohibited.

The bill's vague and broad mandates, combined with severe penalties, will effectively intimidate doctors and ultimately drive them away from the abortion practice, which appears to be the true intent of this troubling bill.

This is why so many organizations are opposed to this bill, those like the National Women's Law Center, the AAUW, the ACLU, and Physicians for Reproductive Choice and Health.

In fact, the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, which represents 58,000 physicians, opposes H.R. 3504 because it represents a gross interference in the practice of medicine, inserting a politician between a woman and her doctor.

By intimidating doctors and thereby making abortion unavailable as a practical matter, abortion opponents seek to accomplish, in fact, what they have not accomplished in the courts or in public opinion. Simply put, H.R. 3504 is yet another attack on women's health and rights.

When the Born-Alive Infant Protection Act, or BAIPA, became law 13 years ago, the bill's sponsors clarified that the law was not intended to affect abortion practice or a woman's right to choose.

We did not want to constrain or chill medical decisions regarding patient care. That is why Judiciary Committee Democrats voted to support it.

The bill before us today appears to directly contradict those assurances. Let's not forget that politicians are not doctors.

We should be concerned about doing our jobs and fully funding high-quality women's health care instead of trying to keep doctors from doing theirs. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this dangerous bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS), the chairman of the Constitution and Civil Justice Subcommittee and the author of this legislation.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman. I also thank the gentleman for his commitment to protecting these little babies.

Madam Speaker, the United States of America is an exceptional nation, whose unique core premise is that declared conviction that we are all created equal and that each of us is endowed by our Creator with the inalienable right to live.

Abraham Lincoln called upon all of us in this Chamber to remember those words of America's Founding Fathers and "their enlightened belief that nothing stamped with the divine image and likeness was sent into the world to be trodden on or degraded and imbruted by its fellows."

He reminded those he called posterity that "when in the distant future some man, some factions, some interests should set up a doctrine that some were not entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that 'their posterity'—that is us, Madam Speaker—"might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began."

□ 0930

Madam Speaker, the sincerest purpose of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act is to renew that noble battle to respect and protect those little fellow human beings among us who are this moment being trodden on and degraded and imbruted by their fellows.

Not long ago, in the land of the free and the home of the brave, authorities entered the clinic of Dr. Kermit Gosnell and found a torture chamber for little born-alive babies that defies description within the constraints of the English language.

The grand jury report at that time said, "Dr. Kermit Gosnell had a simple solution for unwanted babies: he killed them. He didn't call it that. He called it 'ensuring fetal demise.' The way he ensured fetal demise was by sticking scissors in the back of the baby's neck and cutting the spinal cord. He called it 'snipping.' Over the years there were hundreds of 'snippings'."

Ashley Baldwin, one of Dr. Gosnell's employees, said she saw babies breathing, and she described one as 2 feet long that no longer had eyes or a mouth, but, in her words, was making like this screeching noise and it "sounded like a little alien."

And now, in recent days, Madam Speaker, numerous video recordings have been released that demonstrate that Kermit Gosnell was just the tip of the iceberg of the abortion industry's unspeakable cruelty to these little children of God.

The veil has now been pulled back, and all of us now see the walls behind the abortion industry and the horrifying plight of its little human victims, who we must not forget, are also the least of these, our little brothers and sisters.

Our response, as a people and a Nation, to these horrors shown in these videos is vital to everything those lying out in Arlington National Cemetery died to save.

The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, Madam Speaker, protects little children who have been born alive. No one in this body can obscure the humanity and the personhood of these little born-alive babies, nor

can they take refuge within the schizophrenic paradox *Roe v. Wade* has subjected this country to, for now, more than 40 years.

The abortion industry has labored all these decades to convince the world that unborn children and born children should be completely separated in our minds, that while born children are persons worthy of protection, unborn children are not persons and are not worthy of protection.

But, Madam Speaker, those who oppose this bill to protect born-alive babies now have the impossible task of trying to join born children and unborn children back together again and then trying to convince all of us to condemn them both as inhuman and not worthy of protection after all.

To anyone who has not invincibly hardened their heart and soul, Madam Speaker, an honest consideration of this absurd inconsistency is profoundly enlightening.

Because, you see, this country has faced such paradox and self-imposed blindness before. There was a time that our own House rules banned any discussion or debate in this Chamber about the effort to end human slavery in America.

But, Madam Speaker, that debate did come and with it came a time when the humanity of the victims and the inhumanity of what was being done to them became so glaring even to the hardest of hearts that it moved an entire nation of people to find the compassion and the courage in their own souls to change their position.

Now, to this generation, Madam Speaker, that time has come again.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), an outstanding and leading member of our Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, God bless the United States Supreme Court for its *Roe v. Wade* decision that liberated the women of this country to make their own decisions, to exercise their own consciences in the most intensely private matter of whether they should carry a pregnancy to term.

Now, I recognize, of course, that there are those who hold the religious conviction that a one-celled organism—one cell, two cells—is a fully formed human being.

They are entitled to religious conviction. They are not entitled to impose that religious conviction on all the women of this country who may not share it. That is essentially the abortion debate.

We are not debating abortion today, although some people would like to. We are debating this ridiculous Born-Alive Survivors Protection Act.

Fifteen years ago, I stood on this floor and supported the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act. I said it was unnecessary. It simply repeated existing law.

It has always been the law that, if an infant is born, whether that birth was

intentional or not is irrelevant, that that is a person. If you kill that infant, you are guilty of murder or manslaughter, as the case may be. You certainly may not do so intentionally.

The Born-Alive Infant Protection Act did not change that. It just added superfluous language to the law. Its only purpose was to try to paint people who support the right to choose and supporters of infanticide.

So we said, no, it is silly because it doesn't add anything to the law. It simply duplicates the existing law, but we will support it so we cannot be slandered that way.

Now we have this bill, which does essentially two things. One, it repeats, in different language, exactly the same provisions from 15 years ago.

It doesn't change the law that we enacted 15 years ago, and it doesn't change the law that preexisted in every State of the Union. If you kill a child, it is murder, period.

Dr. Gosnell, I would point out, is in jail for life because he committed multiple murders. Nobody, but nobody, supports what he does and nobody, except in some of their fantasies that Mr. FRANKS says, thinks that Planned Parenthood or anybody else supports such actions.

This bill, however, cannot be supported because it does one harmful thing. This bill says that the born-alive child must be given the same standard of care whether he is born alive in an attempted abortion or from a regular birth.

That is already the law. Of course, it is the law. It ought to be the law. It must be the law. It always has been the law.

What it also does is it says that, as soon as the doctor has given that child the proper standard of care, he must rush him to the hospital, regardless of whether that might be good or bad for the child, regardless of the standard of care, regardless of whether the nearby hospital has neonatal intensive care units.

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

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. NADLER. Of course, everybody associated with the doctor, under existing law, has the duty of giving the best possible medical care under any circumstances. That may be to transport the baby to the hospital. It may be that the baby is too frail to transport.

But along comes this bill that says: We don't care about the real situation that doctor faces with that infant. We know how to practice medicine in every situation—we, in Congress—so we are going to say it must be brought to the hospital even if that might kill the child.

It is just stupid, and that is why this bill must be opposed, not because it changes the standard of law or has anything to do with born-alive infants, but because it mandates that a child be

brought to the hospital when medical care might indicate that that child in that situation should not be brought to the hospital. It may kill children. That is why we must oppose this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Speaker, as a physician, a father and a grandfather, let me first respond and say that, in the process of a birth, an abortion, there is no way one can tell whether that child is viable until you actually apply health-saving tools and techniques to that baby. So that argument that viability and all of that made in advance really makes no sense whatsoever.

Look, committing abortions is not health care for women. The baby dies a horrifically painful and ghastly death. Her tiny hands and feet, brain, and spinal tissues are dissected and sold to the highest bidder, and her mother is agonizing over the loss of a child.

What happens if a child survives this barbaric and inhumane murder attempt? Abortionists have been known to snip babies' spines, throw children into plastic bags, or leave the infant to die, away from a human touch and healing care.

Today's bill, however, will put a stop to the double murder attempt on a baby's life. It will protect children, infants, who are born alive, affording these tiny patients immediate medical attention.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I stand in strong opposition to this punitive and intrusive bill. I am both disturbed and offended that this latest attempt to restrict women's access to reproductive health care is based on a series of videos that have been found to be grotesquely deceptive and purposefully misleading.

This is politics at its most manipulative, and politics should never be permitted to come between a patient and her doctor.

This bill attempts to criminalize legal medical care and punish millions of women by rolling back reproductive choices. It wages a kind of guerilla warfare against Roe v. Wade by threatening doctors with jail time for providing care to their patients.

The American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists calls the vague requirements and drastic penalties—unnecessary requirements like going to the hospital—scare tactics that are unnecessary and wrong.

This bill would have the Federal Government threaten doctors who do their job taking care of their patients with up to 5 years' imprisonment.

To make it all even more outrageous, this bill is based on a series of unsupported allegations and it ignores the fact that there has been no evidence of wrongdoing by Planned Parenthood.

In fact, five States have now conducted their own investigations into the charges against Planned Parenthood and have found that no laws have been broken.

Instead, the backers of this bill rely on misleading, badly doctored videos released by an extreme antichoice group as the basis for a slew of legislation to decrease access to care for women in this country who can least afford it. Millions of women rely on Planned Parenthood for their basic health care.

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

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. There is no choice in this country which has been guaranteed by our Supreme Court without access to choice. This bill attempts to stop the access to choice by putting doctors in jail by absurd requirements.

I urge my colleagues to respect the relationship between women and their doctors, respect their need for affordable and available health care, and vote "no" on this punitive and intrusive bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. Madam Speaker, my heart is heavy with this debate. My heart becomes very heavy when I hear the descriptions of this awful procedure.

My heart becomes even heavier, Madam Speaker, when I listen to the twisted logic and the distortions of people who find themselves implicitly defending this.

President Obama has said that he will veto this because it is related to abortion services. Yet, Mr. NADLER moments ago said this has nothing to do with abortion, that everybody agrees that these babies are born and deserve the protections of the law. He says, basically, it is a sideshow. It is either one or the other, Madam Speaker, and they don't get to argue it both ways.

But I think we ought to be able to agree on this, that we are talking about people who are born, who are breathing, whose hearts are pumping, whose fingers are twitching, who have full feeling and deserve every benefit of the doubt and every protection of the law.

□ 0945

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ), a leading physician in our Congress.

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, as an emergency physician I am deeply disturbed by the provisions in this legislation. The Born-Alive Infants Protection Act was signed into law in 2002. The pro-choice community did not oppose it, and it passed the House by a voice vote under suspension of the rules. It was consistent with the already high medical and ethical standards within the physician community.

This new bill, however, is unnecessary and dangerous. It criminalizes physicians who make serious and compassionate decisions based on their deep desire to do what is best for the mother, her health, and life. It creates a police state and forces healthcare staffs that do not have medical training to inform law enforcement of their nonmedical questioning of a physician's sound judgment under the threat of prosecution and imprisonment. This also gives anti-choice lawyers the ability to bully, threaten, and harm a physician's reputation and practice.

Infanticide is already illegal in this country. This bill is highly intrusive to the patient-doctor relationship. Let's be clear. This is yet another attempt by anti-choice bully politicians to restrict a woman's right to choose and doctors' ability to provide sound, compassionate, and safe care for women. It is an aggressive, bullish scare tactic that puts the relationship of the woman and her physician in jeopardy and forces politicians in the middle of decisions that they have no business being involved in.

I agree with the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists and other physician groups in opposing this legislation. I stand with the women across this great country that have continued to fight for decades to defend their legal right to choose.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), a champion of this cause.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, undercover videos by The Center for Medical Progress have again brought into sharp focus that some babies actually survive abortion.

Dr. Ginde, medical director of Planned Parenthood Rocky Mountains, says: "sometimes we get—if somebody delivers before we see them for a procedure that they are intact . . ." That is, Madam Speaker, born alive, breathing, crying, gasping for air. One fetal tissue broker describes in the video watching a fetus that just "fell out" and was left to die.

We have a duty to protect these vulnerable children from violence, exploitation, and death. Humanitarian due diligence requires that born-alive babies be taken to a hospital to obtain care and enhance his or her prospects of survival. Abortion clinics, to the contrary, do not have neonatal intensive care units. They are not equipped to protect those children. They are in the business of killing those children—not saving them.

The grand jury in the abortionist Kermit Gosnell case said: "Gosnell had a simple solution for unwanted babies. He killed them." He euphemistically called "snipping" the born-alive baby's spinal cord "ensuring fetal demise."

Last week, Gianna Jessen, as BOB GOODLATTE noted earlier, an abortion survivor, told his Committee on the Judiciary she had survived a Planned Parenthood late-term, multihour abor-

tion because "the abortionist had not yet begun the work. Had he been there, he would have ended my life with strangulation, suffocation, or leaving me there to die."

The Born Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, authored by pro-life champion TRENT FRANKS, simply says any child who survives an abortion must be given the same care as any other premature baby born at the same gestational age. This legislation builds on the landmark Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002, authored by STEVE CHABOT, by adding important enforcement provisions.

Tragically, President Obama, the abortion President, has vowed to veto this pro-child, human rights legislation, a position that is extreme, antichild, inhumane, and indefensible.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), the ranking member of our Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, these are very important bills—this bill and the next bill—to the women of this Nation and to the people in America because these are rights that are being under attack. There is this Born-Alive bill, which came to the floor through the Committee on Rules, and the next bill, which stops funding of Planned Parenthood, but they are all part of the same thing. They are the same bill. They are the same message. Because what we are doing here in this Congress is messaging, and the message is the Republican Party wants to defeat Roe v. Wade. They think that that was a bad bill and that it is wrong to have legalized, in America, for women to have choice. Most of the Democrats don't think that.

Neither of these bills went through the committee process, which is really abhorrent. In fact, yesterday, we passed a bill about new and novel ideas, saying that you get sanctions, you would be sanctioned as a lawyer, if you brought some case that was frivolous and didn't really come through the proper procedures.

If we had that kind of rule in Congress, these bills wouldn't be allowed to be on the floor, because they are supposed to go through committee where the public has notice, the public has an opportunity to have a witness. The majority side has three witnesses; the minority side has one witness. There is a discussion; there are questions; there are answers; there are statements; there is thought; there is input; there is due process; there is petitioning grievances.

All of this has been abrogated—no due process, no regular order. These come straight to the floor because these are messaging bills for the American public. The Republican Party and parts of the Republican Party often say: We want our country back. What they want back is a country that is pre-1971, before Roe v. Wade. What they

want is a country that is pre-Brown v. Board of Education. What they want is a country that is pre-Voting Rights Act, which has been limited by the Supreme Court and which has not been renewed by this Congress, nor has it gotten a vote. What they want is a country that is free of many of the immigrants who have come to this country and made it great, particularly from South America, the Caribbean—and that country is not going to come back.

In my State of Tennessee, the Republicans have filed a bill to declare the Supreme Court decision on same-sex marriage as illegal in Tennessee, nullification dripping from their lips, as George Wallace would say, in the courthouse door.

It is the same thing today: Take our country back—no Hispanics, no women's choice, no civil rights, no voting rights, Dwight D. Eisenhower's 1950 America. And Dwight D. Eisenhower wasn't at fault. He tried to bring us forward.

These bills are part of that same attack on the progress that we have made in America. They have not gone through the proper process, and they are attempts to change America in a way that would affect American women adversely. This bill has a definition of abortion that is new, shouldn't be done.

I oppose both bills and the rule.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, a few years ago, a so-called doctor in Philadelphia by the name of Kermit Gosnell was killing babies—literally. He ran an abortion clinic there, and as can happen in these houses of horror, some of these innocent, unborn children were actually born alive before they could be exterminated in the womb.

So there you have a little now-born baby squirming, kicking, sometimes crying right there in front of you on the table. So what did Gosnell do? He would take a pair of scissors, plunge them into the baby, and sever his or her spinal cord. No care whatsoever about the pain involved. One of Gosnell's employees who witnessed this barbarism described the baby's scream as follows: "I can't describe it. It sounded like a little alien."

Well, this wasn't an alien. It was a human being, just like you and me, although in an earlier form of development. Gosnell, thank God, is in prison. But we have now learned that the largest abortion provider in this country, Planned Parenthood, is not only destroying the lives of little unborn children, but selling their body parts for profit.

I might add that Planned Parenthood aborts more babies each year in this country than the population of the city of Cincinnati that I represent. That is every single year, the population of a city, Cincinnati.

We have got to stop this slaughter. I introduced a bill called the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, which was passed by the House and by the Senate and signed into law by President Bush back in 2002. It helped. The legislation before us today, introduced by Congressman TRENT FRANKS, improves that law and will protect more innocent babies.

Please, for God's sake, let's pass it today and protect those among us who cannot protect themselves.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to reiterate, this is a bill that has been introduced with virtually no process. This was introduced less than 48 hours ago, with no hearings and no expert testimony. In fact, those on the other side of the aisle are citing, as evidence, videos that have been shown to be highly edited, that are misleading and fraudulently obtained. There were 47 edits in the video that are shown. Even though Planned Parenthood doctors said 10 times that such procedures were not done for profit, that was all edited out.

This is legislation based on sound bites and anti-choice rhetoric and not on facts.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Madam Speaker, earlier this year, many of my colleagues and I stood on this floor condemning abortionist Kermit Gosnell for his barbaric murder of babies born alive during attempted abortions. Instead of providing compassionate care for these precious little babies, Gosnell muffled their cries by snipping the back of their necks with scissors, and we have people on the floor today defending that.

No child should be treated with such violence, and no man or woman should be free to perform such heinous acts of murder.

As an adoptive parent of four incredible children, I cannot help but think of the countless couples across America who would have given anything to care for these babies.

This bill rightly affirms the humanity of all babies born alive, rightly affords them the full protection of the law, and punishes any abortionist who denies these infants their dignity and right to life.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 12½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. Madam Speaker, what does it say about this Congress that today we are here on the House floor debating the killing and harvesting of aborted babies? How can there possibly be two sides to this? I don't understand. How can we not take a step back and look at this objectively?

The gentlewoman from California mentioned that these videos were highly edited. I don't know if they have watched the videos, but if you watch the videos, how can you say that the doctor who is pulling salad from a salad bowl and mentions that she can take the babies and crush the top and the bottom parts of the babies and harvest the body parts in between is highly edited? This is not. These are not. This information on these videos shows the barbaric activity.

These bills before us today deal with this problem. Madam Speaker, I implore that this Chamber take a step back and look at what is on these videos and the information that we have on these videos and realize that we must move forward on these two bills and stop this barbaric action.

□ 1000

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Madam Speaker, this is a fundamental American value. For our Founders, life was the first right. They understood that there is an order to things that even nature teaches us. They understood and fully embraced that the first and foremost right is life because, without life, there is no liberty; without life, there is no pursuit of happiness; without life, there is no discussion of a right to privacy or a right to choose; because, without life, there is nothing to choose.

Life presupposes and precedes all other rights. Our Founders understood this, but somewhere along the way to where we are now, we have gone from protecting the right that is the basis of all rights to deciding that unborn children and even children born alive can have their lives taken because their organs and tissues are more valuable than they are.

It is inconceivable that a nation founded on the idea that life is the indispensable right, the indisputable right, could be at this place in our history when living children in their mother's womb—and even some who have been born alive—can be killed with the callousness and cold-bloodedness that none of our forefathers would have dreamed could exist in America.

This decision whether to continue funding this barbaric practice is really about exposing the charade of the Federal Government supporting women's health care, when in fact it is really

about subsidizing the killing and mutilation of babies with taxpayers' money. This has to stop.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA), an outstanding doctor.

Mr. BERA. Madam Speaker, as a doctor, I find these bills troubling. The oath I took is to do what is best for my patients.

One of these bills that is coming up today criminalizes the practice of medicine and questions doctors' judgments. It attempts to intimidate doctors from providing safe, evidence-based medicine and from doing our job, which is to sit with our patients, answer their questions, and give them the best medical advice and let them make the decisions that affect their lives.

This is unprecedented. It sets a precedent where those without any medical training can dictate medical practice and make choices for patients. This definitely oversteps any legal bounds. These are choices that should be made between doctors and patients.

Congressional interference into how we practice is overreach. It is a dramatic overreach, and it is dangerous because it sets a dangerous legislative precedent.

What makes the healthcare delivery system in America so great is that it is accessible to folks and that we understand and protect the doctor-patient privilege. That is at the very foundation of the oath we take when we enter the profession of medicine.

Now, the other bill that we are voting on today also dramatically restricts access. If you think about the number of women in America who get their care from Planned Parenthood, the preventive health services that Planned Parenthood provides is remarkable.

One in five women in this country have used a Planned Parenthood facility. It is a remarkably effective way for women to get their health care—and it is not just women; many men also use Planned Parenthood.

We should be having the exact opposite debate. We should be talking about how we can improve access to care, how we can make sure every American has access to all of their reproductive options. We should want to be talking about how we strengthen the doctor-patient relationship, how we take the government out of the exam room, how we leave some of the most intimate choices to the doctor and the patient.

Again, the oath that I took when I entered the profession was to sit with my patients, answer their questions, but then empower them to make the choices that fit their life circumstances. That is what we should be fighting for. Those are our principles. That is who we are as Americans with those freedoms.

Madam Speaker, let's talk about how we improve access to care. Let's talk about how we strengthen the doctor-patient relationship. This is about protecting people.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, last week, the Judiciary Committee heard testimony from people who had survived abortions. They spoke as part of the House's ongoing investigation into the practices depicted in the horrific videos that we have all seen.

One of these people who spoke was Gianna Jessen. She told the committee that, when her biological mother was 7½ months pregnant, she went to Planned Parenthood, where they advised her mother to have an abortion. That is what her mother did.

By a miracle—and despite the best efforts to end her life—Gianna was born alive; and because she was born before the abortionist had gotten into work, a nurse called an ambulance. Gianna was rushed to the hospital—and she lived—though she suffers from cerebral palsy because of the attempted abortion.

There are so many others who aren't as lucky as Gianna. The Born-Alive Survivors Protection Act—that is what we are voting on today—will help save the lives of those children. It would impose criminal penalties on any medical professional who fails to give the same medical attention to children born after an abortion as they would to any other premature newborn baby.

The simple fact is that, when a baby is born alive, it doesn't matter how he or she was born. They are living human beings who deserve our care.

We are also here today, Madam Speaker, to talk in particular about Planned Parenthood, the organization that tried to take Gianna's life. I think, for the purpose of this debate, it is very important to understand what this organization is.

Many on the other side say that they are just devoted to women's health. The facts say something different. In the last year on record, they performed 327,653 abortions. That was in 1 year. Anyone who tells you that they are not in the abortion business doesn't know that number.

Some defend them because they provide women's health services, but they don't have a monopoly on women's health. There are tens of thousands of alternatives all across the country for women, from community health centers to pregnancy health centers to maternity homes, medical clinics, and more. Community health clinics actually outnumber Planned Parenthood clinics by the thousands, and they offer the same health services to women, if not more.

If we know that this organization performs hundreds of thousands of abortions per year and we know that women have access to other sources for care, the question is: Should we force taxpayers to fund a business that spends its money aborting 372,653 children per year? Should we force taxpayers to fund an organization whose barbaric practices, as vividly shown in

those videos, disregard and devalue the sanctity of the most innocent human lives?

The gruesome videos that we have seen opened the eyes of America. As we struggle to understand how something so barbaric could happen in this country, we need to get all the facts. Are patients giving sufficient informed consent? Were the body parts of babies sold for profit?

These—and more—are the questions we need to answer. While we find those answers, we have a moral responsibility to put a moratorium on the funding. There is no reason the American people should be forced to give their money to such an organization. There is no reason—absolutely no reason—that we must choose between funding women's health and compelling taxpayers to support abortion.

As we approach this vote, I want every Member to ask themselves a simple question: In the face of these videos and with all the alternatives women have for health, why would you want to force your constituents to pay for something so evil?

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Madam Speaker, to reflect on what the gentleman from California was saying, recalling the testimony last week of survivors of abortion, their stories are remarkable. They show the deep appreciation that they have for their lives, and they are so grateful to have survived the attacks on their life. So many others who did not survive will never have the chance to express such gratitude.

We also know that ultrasound technology allows us to see how unborn children grow and develop; their humanity is abundantly clear and so should be their right to life.

Our Declaration of Independence recognizes that the right to life is inalienable. It is given by our Creator. Indeed, President Kennedy, 54 years ago, pushed back against those who would undermine this fundamental precept of our Nation when he recognized that “the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe—the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God.”

Giving abortion survivors the same care and legal protection that any other child born at the same level of gestation would receive at birth is humane and essential. It also complies with the equal protection bedrock of our country.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER), the chairman of

the House Republican Policy Committee.

Mr. MESSER. Madam Speaker, Provverbs 31:8 calls us all to speak for those who can't speak for themselves. That is why I am here today.

I refuse to say nothing while Planned Parenthood executives are revealed casually putting a price tag on human life and haggling over the dollar value of an aborted child's lungs, kidneys, and heart. These actions are unthinkable.

This legislation is actually a modest proposal that would place an immediate 1-year moratorium on all Federal funding of Planned Parenthood. It also funds women's health by taking the half-billion dollars that taxpayers send to Planned Parenthood every year and putting it instead in the hands of community organizations and health clinics that focus on saving lives, not ending them.

Madam Speaker, no matter where you fall on the abortion debate, we can all agree that no unborn child should be dismembered and sold part by part. Where that is happening, let's stop it and join together to speak for those who can't speak for themselves.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to reject these bills and to get to work. The U.S. Federal Government is set to shut down in a matter of days. Shouldn't we be working together to stop a preventable crisis that will hurt our economy and tarnish our Nation's image? It is our job. That is what we are here to do.

Instead, we are debating a bill that is based on a false premise. I am not talking about some debunked and discredited viral videos on the Internet, nor am I talking about the lie that defunding Planned Parenthood will prevent Federal dollars from funding abortion.

□ 1015

As many of my colleagues have already pointed out, our laws have long prohibited Federal dollars from being used to pay for abortion.

What I am talking about, Madam Speaker, is the 28 men who wrote Speaker BOEHNER this summer demanding—demanding—that we either defund Planned Parenthood or stop funding the Federal Government; 28 men who, I guarantee you, have never relied on just one health provider in their community to get a Pap smear; 28 men who, I guarantee you, have never had to end a sentence about their educational goals or their financial or career aspirations with the phrase, “unless I get pregnant”; 28 men who hatched this plan to deny basic health care to millions of women—millions of women, I might add, that have been marginalized by this Congress. Their voices are not being heard today nor are they being represented, not in these bills.

Why?

Because Speaker BOEHNER would rather let 28 men set the agenda for this entire House than seek out bipartisan support needed to fund education programs, health care, veterans programs, and services for our seniors. That is what we should be doing.

Madam Speaker, these bills defund access to health care that has nothing—absolutely nothing—to do with abortion unless, Madam Speaker, I should say that we are talking about the more than 350,000 abortions that Planned Parenthood prevents every year by providing contraception and health care and education.

I understand that my colleagues don't recognize the reproductive rights of women. I understand that is their view. I, Madam Speaker, recognize that women have those rights, and I urge my colleagues to reject these bills.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, we must pass this bill today, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

We have seen the gruesome videos. They are not doctored.

I dare say, none of these folks that we are hearing from the other side of the aisle have watched them all. How can they make a recommendation or an appraisal?

They show senior Planned Parenthood officials, former employees, and a tissue procurement company discussing the sale of "intact" unborn baby parts. This is disgusting. It is inhumane.

A society and culture that refuses to stand up and say this will not be tolerated is a society that is in grave danger.

A child born alive during an abortion procedure is the most vulnerable living human being on Earth, and they should be granted full legal protections. Medical practitioners who fail to provide necessary care for that baby must be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law, and this bill does just that.

While it is so sad that an act of Congress is required to ensure such compassionate care, we must do all we can to provide for the safety of babies that are born alive as a result of failed abortion procedures. It is absolutely necessary that we end this inhumane practice today.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support today of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. I would like to thank the chairman and Mr. FRANKS for their leadership on this issue.

This issue is very personal to me. My mother chose life, and I was adopted as a newborn.

When a baby is born alive after an abortion, healthcare professionals only have seconds to react. These children deserve the same level of commitment and care as a child facing any other medical emergency.

This bill holds healthcare professionals accountable for making the health and well-being of a baby who survives an abortion their first priority and for making every effort to provide the resources needed to keep that child alive.

This bill should not divide us. It is about saving lives. We all talk about giving voice to the most vulnerable children in our communities and to the elderly with disabilities. Who is more vulnerable than a child whose life begins just as someone tries to end it?

My mother gave me the gift of life, and I believe every child should receive that same gift.

This is not about the "Wizard of Oz" strategy the other side wants to portray and that doesn't pay any attention to the man behind the curtain. This is about the true sense of protecting life.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). The gentleman from Virginia has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, my wife and I are adoptive parents. We have a family only because two women in very difficult situations chose life. So this issue of protecting the unborn is dear to me and my family, which is why, whether you are pro-choice or strongly pro-life, as I am, I think Americans can agree, we should never use taxpayer dollars to fund these abortions, and we should never use taxpayer dollars to reward organizations that harvest the unborn lives or tissues for profit or compensation. These are gruesome practices.

It is time to defund any organization, Planned Parenthood or others, and to begin to seek criminal penalties against those who profited from the sale of body parts of unborn children. This is the true human rights issue of our time, and those who defend this funding or these gruesome practices are on the wrong side of history.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I do thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding and, again, I

want to thank Chairman BOB GOODLATTE for doing such an extraordinarily effective job as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, a true human rights champion and a man who really understands these issues.

Last week's hearing with Gianna Jessen and another abortion survivor underscores the fact that there are abortion survivors. I remember, years ago, there was a Philadelphia Inquirer article, called, "The Dreaded Complication," and it was all about all of the children who survived later-term abortions.

And do you know what the response of the abortion lobby was? We need a better death ensuring method of abortion, a more effective and efficacious method, to destroy those babies. That was part of the genesis of the hideous partial-birth abortion method—a method that actually suctions out the brain tissue of a child before birth, thus ensuring there won't be a child born alive.

Let me also say, people on the other side were talking earlier about the relationship between doctor and patient. What about the new patient, that unborn child who is now a newly born child? Where is the doctor-patient relationship to help that child?

Abortion clinics are in the business of exterminating children through dismemberment and chemical poisoning. That is what abortionists do. Getting this child to a hospital ensures that lifesaving care will be provided. Healers have a mindset that says we need to save these children, the means to do so, including intensive care capability. Abortionists believe abortion means dead baby—born or newly born.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart. Having spent over 30 years as a practicing OB/GYN physician, delivering almost 5,000 babies and trying to save every life of every mother and every baby, I don't see why this is not something that brings us all together.

Whether you are pro-life or pro-choice, if a baby survives an abortion, we should do everything we can to save that baby's life and to give it the same chance that everybody else has.

I am getting emotional here because it is an emotional issue for me. I cannot imagine, as a physician, standing beside a baby that has been delivered—no one in this room can; I don't believe there is another person in this room that has done what I have—and not try to save that baby's life.

I strongly support this bill. It should pass overwhelmingly, and it should be the law of the land.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I have just one speaker remaining, and I believe I have the right to close.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I have one speaker remaining, and then I will be prepared to close.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, I just want to say that there is the implication in the testimony and in the speeches that are made here that the other side of the aisle is somehow more concerned about the life of a child born alive, that somehow Democrats just don't care about that, and I just want to tell you I resent that so very, very much.

We unanimously voted to protect that life. And if, in fact, a baby is born into this world and can survive and is alive, it is considered homicide to kill that baby. There are laws. There are laws that would protect the life of an infant, a real child that is born that can sustain life.

I just want to tell you that somehow making this division about people who really care about a living person that is born is just false. And I think I am speaking for all people, for all Democrats and, clearly, for all Republicans, that we need to make sure that we protect that life. But I believe that we have every law in place.

What this bill does is go further and create fear among physicians, healers, people who are educated and committed to health and life, and put fear into them that if they don't provide for the exact procedures that you are talking about, that they could spend 5 years in jail for providing the healthcare services that a woman needs. That is, I believe, part of this ongoing effort to say that we should end the full range of health services that are available to women. This is a further attack on women's health.

We all agree on what the outcome should be, and let's not get into this ongoing fight against women's health.

□ 1030

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this bill politicizes women's health and limits women's access to abortion. It interferes with the sacred doctor-patient relationship and substitutes a physician's best judgment with the judgment of a handful of politicians—and, in fact, male politicians. I would note that not a single woman on the other side of the aisle has spoken on this bill.

Let me note, it is already illegal to fail to provide care to an infant born alive. There was a bill passed 13 years ago, the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, and that bill was not intended to affect abortion practices or a woman's right to choose. In fact, that is why Judiciary Committee Democrats voted to support it.

But what this bill does is to vilify abortion providers. This bill is so broad

and the penalties are so severe—up to 5 years in prison—that one can only conclude that the real purpose of this bill is to intimidate abortion providers out of practice.

This bill requires doctors and employees of hospitals and clinics that provide abortion services to report any violation of the bill's standard of care to State or Federal law enforcement authorities, and any person—remember, we are talking doctors, cleaning crew, receptionists—that fails to comply with these requirements is threatened with fines and up to 5 years in prison.

That is why the 58,000 physicians of the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists oppose this bill and says: "This legislation represents gross interference in the practice of medicine, inserting a politician between a woman and her trusted doctor."

Let us not forget, politicians are not doctors. We should be concerned about doing our jobs and fully fund high-quality women's health care instead of trying to keep doctors from doing theirs.

I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this dangerous bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the House majority whip for the purpose of closing our debate.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act offered by my friend and colleague from Arizona, TRENT FRANKS.

Madam Speaker, this bill is about standing up for the sanctity of life. Specifically, this bill deals with babies that are born alive.

Whether it was the result of an abortion or a normal birth, all people in this country deserve that same protection. Madam Speaker, why should a baby that is born alive be denied that same right?

Our Founding Fathers, in the Declaration of Independence, made it crystal clear: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

Madam Speaker, the first unalienable right mentioned by our Founders—and these were not rights given to us by our Founders; they were given to us by our Creator—that first right is life.

If a baby is born alive, they ought to have that protection. That is what this bill is about. It is about giving that protection that is enumerated in the Constitution and in the Declaration of Independence itself to say they ought to have that protection in law, that if they are born alive, that they ought to have that same medical protection.

So, Madam Speaker, when you saw the President come out yesterday and

say that he would veto this bill, how extreme can somebody be to say they would not stand up for a baby that is born alive to have the same protection that the Declaration of Independence enumerates as an "unalienable right"?

This should be a place where we can all come together, a place where we can all agree that we, as a House, can come together and stand up and give that protection in law to those babies that are born alive.

I would hope that all of my colleagues would join in, that we could send this bill over to the Senate, that they can have the same debate and agree to pass that on, and that, ultimately, the President would recognize that this is a bill that ought to become law.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3504, the "Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act."

Contrary to its misleading title, H.R. 3504 is not about protecting children born alive. Its real intent is to further undermine a woman's right to choose, a right that has been constitutionally guaranteed for more than 42 years by *Roe v. Wade*.

H.R. 3504 constitutes an unprecedented level of intrusion by the government into medical decision making.

It also completely fails to distinguish between a viable and a non-viable fetus, which is the constitutional line that separates abortions that may be performed without restriction from those that may be regulated or prohibited.

These restrictions, in conjunction with the bill's draconian criminal penalties, will effectively intimidate doctors, thereby making abortion services unavailable as a practical matter.

Further yet, there is absolutely no need for this legislation. No evidence has been uncovered that necessitates congressional interference in the doctor-patient relationship.

Even if wrongdoing were to occur, many federal and state laws already protect babies "born alive."

In truth, abortion practice is safe, legal, and humane and any evidence of wrongdoing can and should be handled under existing law. For example, the criminal Kermit Gosnell, who ran an illegal abortion front in Philadelphia, was prosecuted under existing law and is rightfully in prison serving multiple life sentences.

In sum, the bill's vague and broad mandates, combined with its severe penalties, will undermine the ability of women to access safe affordable abortion services, which unfortunately appears to be the underlying intent of this flawed legislation.

As the Administration, in its Statement of Administration Policy, warns "H.R. 3504 would impose new legal requirements related to the provision of abortion services in certain circumstances, which would likely have a chilling effect, reducing access to care."

In addition, this legislation is opposed by Planned Parenthood, which states that H.R. 3504 would "add new criminal penalties against doctors and clinicians as a scare tactic that serves the sole purpose of scaring women away from seeking safe, legal, abortion."

Further, NARAL Pro-Choice America correctly observes that H.R. 3504 is "part of an unprecedented assault on reproductive rights."

And, the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists explains that this "legislation represents gross interference in the practice of medicine, inserting a politician in between a woman and her trusted doctor."

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 3504, an anti-choice, anti-woman, and thoroughly unnecessary measure.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 421, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

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.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

DEFUND PLANNED PARENTHOOD ACT OF 2015

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 421, I call up the bill (H.R. 3134) to provide for a moratorium on Federal funding to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc., and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 421, the amendment printed in House Report 114-262 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3134

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) State and county health departments, community health centers, hospitals, physicians offices, and other entities currently provide, and will continue to provide, health services to women. Such health services include relevant diagnostic laboratory and radiology services, well-child care, prenatal and postpartum care, immunization, family planning services (including contraception), cervical and breast cancer screenings and referrals, and sexually transmitted disease testing.

(2) Many such entities provide services to all persons, regardless of the person's ability to pay, and provide services in medically underserved areas and to medically underserved populations.

(3) All funds that are no longer available to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc. and its affiliates and clinics pursuant to this Act will continue to be made available

to other eligible entities to provide women's health care services.

(4) Funds authorized to be appropriated, and appropriated, by section 4 are offset by the funding limitation under section 3(a).

SEC. 3. MORATORIUM ON FEDERAL FUNDING TO PLANNED PARENTHOOD FEDERATION OF AMERICA, INC.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, subject to subsection (b), no funds authorized or appropriated by Federal law may be made available for any purpose to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc., or any affiliate or clinic of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc., unless such entities certify that Planned Parenthood Federation of America affiliates and clinics will not perform, and will not provide any funds to any other entity that performs, an abortion during such period.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to an abortion—

(1) if the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest; or

(2) in the case where a woman suffers from a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness that would, as certified by a physician, place the woman in danger of death unless an abortion is performed, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself.

(c) REPAYMENT.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Agriculture shall seek repayment of any Federal assistance received by Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc., or any affiliate or clinic of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc., if it violates the terms of the certification required by subsection (a) during the period specified in subsection (a).

SEC. 4. FUNDING FOR COMMUNITY HEALTH PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated, and appropriated, \$235,000,000 for the community health center program under section 330 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b), in addition to any other funds made available to such program, for the period for which the funding limitation under section 3(a) applies.

(b) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized or appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) may be expended for an abortion other than as described in section 3(b).

SEC. 5. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to reduce overall Federal funding available in support of women's health.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their designee.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam 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 H.R. 3134.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 3134, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015.

Madam Speaker, we all remember the images of Kermit Gosnell killing babies who were born alive after a botched abortion.

We know that those are sickening, and we know that they have renewed the demand for accountability from the American people. That is why we come before you today with H.R. 3134, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015.

New documentation of these heinous practices that we have seen in videos, videos that have come out of Planned Parenthood abortion clinics of harvesting the body parts of babies as part of the abortion process, have raised serious questions about the possible systematic and repeated violation of State and Federal laws.

H.R. 3134 provides a 1-year moratorium, a freezing—a freezing—on the Federal funding to Planned Parenthood Federation of America and all of its affiliates while investigations are ongoing regarding the practices of the abortion industry.

Madam Speaker, most people think that is common sense. If there is reason to investigate, then there is reason to withhold taxpayer dollars during that period of time. Those dollars would be given to other facilities that provide women's health services.

The American taxpayer has been very clear for a long time that they do not want taxpayer money spent on abortion; 68 percent of Americans oppose it. What is so interesting to me is that we know that 71 percent of all millennials oppose this.

I would remind my colleagues, Madam Speaker, there is no difference between men and women on this. There is bipartisan opposition from men and women to this practice. Additionally, the majority of Americans are opposed to the sale of body parts of babies obtained after abortion.

So the discussion today is not about videos or women's health access. We know there are other ways to get that access. It is about our most basic right. It is about the right to life.

It is also about doing what the taxpayers sent us to D.C. to do. It is also about continuing the process to protect our most vulnerable citizens, innocent little babies.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the "Deny Women Health Care Act."

Madam Speaker, congressional approval ratings are at an all-time low, and here is another example of why:

Republicans in Congress have failed to fulfill their fundamental responsibility to our great Nation again.

Republicans have pushed America to the brink of another government shutdown, and we are a mere 5 legislative days away.

Republicans in Congress have refused to sit down and negotiate a bipartisan appropriations plan despite the urging of Democrats, business leaders, military servicemembers, and citizens all across America.

The bill brought to the floor today is an attempt by Republican leaders to distract the American public from their failure to do their job.

Last spring, we urged Republicans in Congress to sit down and hammer out an appropriations plan. They refused.

Instead, the Congress adjourned at the end of July. Nothing happened in August. Nothing has happened since the Congress has returned after Labor Day.

Now the Republican dysfunction in this House will have very serious consequences for our neighbors back home.

A Republican shutdown would hurt thousands of disabled veterans, disadvantaged children, small businesses, working families, and taxpayers.

The last time Republicans shut down the government for 16 days, the economy lost \$24 billion and 120,000 private sector jobs.

Here is what happened: The Republican shutdown stalled veterans disability claims, creating additional needless delays for our heroes seeking help.

Hundreds of critically sick Americans were prevented from enrolling in the NIH clinical trials, with 98 percent of the National Science Foundation, nearly three-quarters of NIH, and two-thirds of CDC employees furloughed.

Head Start grantees, serving thousands of children, were forced to close. American entrepreneurs and small businesses were cut off from millions of dollars in SBA loans.

Small businesses with government contracts faced abrupt payment delays and cutbacks. Almost \$4 billion in IRS refunds were delayed.

The Republican Congress' continuing dysfunction and inability to govern are having real impacts on hard-working Americans. The American people are tired of their relentless failure to govern and the culture of crisis.

Again and again Republicans have chosen to put their radical special interest agenda ahead of the priorities of hard-working Americans.

The American people deserve better, especially in this case, because the Deny Women Health Care Act is a cynical attack on the ability of women across America to receive the health services that they need at trusted Planned Parenthood clinics.

□ 1045

I know many are passionate about these personal issues. That is why the Republicans advance this bill on this topic. They know it is sure to inflame passions. But to date, despite congressional inquiries into these false videotapes, there has been no wrongdoing uncovered whatsoever, no evidence to substantiate the allegations. What has emerged since the false videos were

posted on YouTube is a coordinated, broad-based smear campaign based upon false, manufactured videos that are full of distortions and misinformation.

The bill is one more assault in the long list of Republican assaults on women's health care over the last two decades because simply defunding Planned Parenthood would leave millions of American women without key preventative services, including birth control, family planning, lifesaving cancer screenings, testing and treatment of infections, well-women exams, and advice on family planning.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I was beginning to think that we were off on a different bill there for just a moment.

Madam Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to myself to respond.

Madam Speaker, we are not on a bill about a government shutdown. We are on a bill that will make certain that women have access to health care, H.R. 3134. I will remind my colleagues that it does remove the funds from Planned Parenthood, and it does enable them to go to women's health clinics.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), who is the author of this legislation and has been such an advocate for addressing women's healthcare needs.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, as a nurse for more than 40 years and a believer in the God-given purpose of every human being, I am passionately pro-life. But do you know what? You don't have to agree with me to support this bill. No matter our views on abortion or the party label beside our name, we should all have an interest in ensuring that laws are followed and that the taxpayer dollars are spent responsibly. If a law is broken, particularly by those receiving government money, that should be remedied. That is not a political statement. That, quite literally, is our job here in Congress.

Two months ago, Madam Speaker, a series of undercover videos were released implicating Planned Parenthood in the illegal trafficking of aborted baby tissue and organs. Now, some of my colleagues have tried to dismiss these videos even without ever watching them. I get it. It is easier to try to discredit the source than to defend what is happening on these tapes.

Well, Madam Speaker, I did watch these videos, and I saw full conversations of Planned Parenthood employees in their own words discussing potentially lawbreaking activities. Congressional investigations are underway, but there are more than enough lingering questions to stop the flow of money—taxpayer dollars—to this abortion giant until our work is complete.

For this reason, I have introduced the Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015. This legislation enacts a 1-year

moratorium on all Federal money going to Planned Parenthood. It does not reduce women's health funding by a single dime. As a matter of fact, we actually increase women's healthcare funding by over \$200 million. Instead, this legislation reallocates the funding to more than 13,500 facilities nationwide that provide true preventative care to those who need it the most, and they do not perform abortions.

What is more, Planned Parenthood can get their money back. Read the bill. They can get their money back if they fully commit to what they talk about in doing women's health care and stop performing abortions for this year.

Madam Speaker, if there exists even a possibility that Planned Parenthood violated our laws, as I believe they did, then pro-life and pro-choice Members of Congress alike must act to reallocate the funds now so that we are not trying to chase down the taxpayer dollars that already went out the door later on. This is ensuring that our laws are followed, that Americans know how their money is being spent, and that the conscience rights of taxpayers are respected.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 3134.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I will reiterate again, there is no evidence whatsoever of any wrongdoing, and I maintain that this is a distraction from the Republican's fundamental failure to pass a budget 5 legislative days before a government shutdown.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I listened to the previous Republican speaker, and the deception that she poses to this Congress is unbelievable in my opinion.

First of all, she talks about these videos which we know have been misleading—edited, all kinds of changes have been made to them. The accuracy of them is totally unacceptable. They are not accurate. Then she says, well, just because they may be accurate that we should pass this bill defunding Planned Parenthood.

Well, when did this Congress get into the business of saying, well, before we decided whether you have actually broken the law and before we have any evidence that you have done so, we are just going to shut you down? That is not the way we operate. That is not due process. That is not the American way.

Then, Madam Speaker, she suggests that somehow this money is going to be given to other providers. I think she is probably talking about community health centers. Well, I will tell you, from my own experience with community health centers, that they don't have the ability to provide the women's health needs that are being proposed here that are actually provided

by Planned Parenthood. That is not going to happen. Those women are going to be deprived of health care.

So let's not continue with this deception about what is actually going on here. The Republicans just want to shut the government down if we don't defund Planned Parenthood. That is what they are all about.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and vice chair of the Health Subcommittee.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3134.

This bill would defund Planned Parenthood and its clinics for 1 full year. This summer, a series of disturbing videos shined a light on the gruesome practice being done in clinics across the country. No one has ever disputed that the employees of Planned Parenthood said what they said in the video. These videos have shocked and appalled countless Americans.

Federal dollars should not be going to an agency that is involved in such a horrific and disturbing practice. I have voted in the past to defund Planned Parenthood, and I will do so again today.

Madam Speaker, life is a precious gift, and I firmly believe we should do all we can to advance and support it. Today, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation to stop Planned Parenthood from continuing these practices.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. We are here because some have again chosen to reignite the same tired battles of years past—and bring our government to the brink of shutdown—to restrict women's control over their own health and bodies. I should not be deciding what is best for a woman's health. She should, and her doctor should.

That we are even having this debate—based on contrived, unsubstantiated allegations—about an organization that provides critical care to more than 2 million Americans is not only outrageous, it is downright irresponsible.

More than half of Planned Parenthood centers are in rural or medically underserved areas where access to health care is already too limited. Yet my colleagues want to make it even harder for women and men there to access HIV and STI tests, breast cancer screenings, cervical cancer screenings, and other lifesaving services.

Madam Speaker, this attempt to demonize Planned Parenthood is disgraceful.

Again, it is important to underscore that Federal insurance coverage of abortion is already restricted, so to defund Planned Parenthood is to

defund the preventative services that keep our constituents healthy. I urge a "no" vote.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to myself to respond.

Again, Madam Speaker, refocusing us on the bill, we are talking about being certain that there is access to health care. Cancer screenings and prevention services from Planned Parenthood have been cut in half over the past 7 years. They do not perform mammograms. They perform over 300,000 abortions annually.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the vice chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Defund Planned Parenthood Act, a bill I am proud to cosponsor.

Madam Speaker, as the Energy and Commerce Committee continues its investigation into the troubling Planned Parenthood videos, it is crucial we do everything in our power to protect human life and hold organizations such as Planned Parenthood accountable.

With this legislation, we have the opportunity to both save lives and respect the rights of the American people. Taxpayers should not be forced to financially support organizations whose behavior is at best unethical and possibly illegal.

When it comes to defunding Planned Parenthood, the issue should not be partisan. This is about protecting the rights of taxpayers, but also, more importantly, protecting the basic right of human life.

Madam Speaker, I will continue to give a voice to our most fragile Americans who cannot speak for themselves. I thank Representative BLACK for her efforts on this important piece of legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, Planned Parenthood provides basic health services to millions of Americans: Pap smears, breast cancer screenings, family planning, and birth control. In fact, there were over 4 million visits to Planned Parenthood clinics last year, and over 90 percent of this was basic women's health care and not abortions.

So why are we talking about this today? Why are we talking about this legislation?

Planned Parenthood does these services and no Federal funds are spent on abortion services that Planned Parenthood does provide, but yet the majority will take the radical step of denying women the basic health care they need. This radical agenda is wrong. It is wrong for American women, and it is wrong for us when the Federal budget expires in just 13 days.

Madam Speaker, I, too, have reviewed the videotapes. Our committee reviewed the videotapes, and, as Ms. CASTOR said—and it bears repeating—no wrongdoing was shown. There are no criminal charges. There are no charges at all that are pending whatsoever against Planned Parenthood.

Madam Speaker, yesterday in the Energy and Commerce Committee, my Republican colleagues in their radical effort went so far as to show a photo of a stillborn baby, implying that that baby was a fetus being used for fetal tissue development. What is worse, that photo was shown without the woman's consent. It had no relation to Planned Parenthood. It was used without the mother's consent.

What I want to know from the majority: Is this the evidence that you are using to decide that you are going to deny funding for Planned Parenthood and all the well-women visits women use?

Madam Speaker, my colleagues ought to be ashamed of showing this, and my colleagues ought to be ashamed of putting this bill on the floor today. We are seeing shamelessness right here on the floor today.

My colleagues on the other side are trying to do everything they can to insert themselves between American women and their right to make their own healthcare decisions. It is wrong, and I urge a "no" vote on this legislation.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I will never be ashamed of standing up and defending life—ever—and I find it so interesting that our efforts to protect life are termed "radical." That is an interesting turn of events, if I say so myself.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

□ 1100

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, with all due respect, a radical agenda is protecting an organization that dismembers body parts and sells them for profit.

For the record, I am probably the only Member of this body to have operated on babies as young as 23 weeks' gestation. In fact, the smallest baby I operated on weighed only 650 grams.

As a physician, I spent my career caring for patients regardless of their situations. So I take access to health care very seriously.

I find it troubling that those on the other side, most of whom have never spent a day caring for patients, continue to mislead the American people about the facts of Planned Parenthood.

Here are a few: By its own statistics, Planned Parenthood only treats 2 percent of the Nation's women for any reason.

Planned Parenthood doesn't offer women some of the most basic primary care. It doesn't provide services like mammograms, cardiovascular blood tests, or bone mass measurements.

Over the past 10 years, Planned Parenthood cut cancer screenings by half while it increased abortion services by 40 percent.

Across the country, we have 13,000 federally qualified or rural health centers that can provide basic health services compared to only 700 Planned Parenthood facilities that really don't provide these services at all.

Madam Speaker, taxpayers should not be forced to fund this organization when we have so many other alternatives.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, the previous speaker said something completely false. Planned Parenthood does not sell fetal tissue.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Illinois will suspend.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I withdraw.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, a complete falsehood was just stated. Planned Parenthood does not sell any body parts for profit. That is a fact.

So here we go again: Republicans threatening to shut down the government in order to deny women access to health care. When the Republicans took control of the House in 2011, the first thing they did was nearly shut down the government over funding for Planned Parenthood, and 4 years later, Republicans are once again seriously considering shutting down the government over the exact same thing.

This time, they have manufactured a witch hunt based on heavily edited videos that were clearly intended to mislead the public and the Congress. They have wasted time and resources on futile investigations that have produced absolutely no evidence of wrongdoing on behalf of Planned Parenthood. In contrast, there is growing evidence that The Center for Medical Progress broke several laws.

I recently sent a letter to the Department of Justice and to the California Attorney General, asking them to investigate the practices of this organization.

My letter raises concerns about fake identification that was used to gain access to Planned Parenthood facilities, fraudulent tax documents that were filed to create a fake corporate entity, and violations of California's Invasion of Privacy Act.

In response, the California Attorney General has initiated an investigation. There are also several legal actions pending against The Center for Medical Progress.

Enough is enough. I urge my colleagues to oppose this harmful bill for women's health.

Here we go again—Republicans threatening to shut down the government to deny women access to health care.

When the Republicans took control of the House in 2011, the first thing they did was

nearly shut down the government over funding for Planned Parenthood.

Four years later, Republicans are once again seriously considering shutting down the government over the exact same thing.

This time, they've manufactured a witch hunt based on heavily edited videos that were clearly intended to mislead the public and Congress.

They've wasted time and resources on futile investigations that have produced absolutely no evidence of wrongdoing on behalf of Planned Parenthood.

In contrast, there is growing evidence that the Center for Medical Progress broke several laws.

I recently sent a letter to the Department of Justice and the California Attorney General asking them to investigate the potentially illegal practices of this organization.

My letter raises concerns about fake identification that was used to gain access to Planned Parenthood facilities, fraudulent tax documents that were filed to create a fake corporate entity, and violations of California's Invasion of Privacy Act.

In response, the California AG has initiated an investigation. There are also several legal actions pending against the Center for Medical Progress.

But we all know that Republicans are not really interested in the truth here. This entire charade is a thinly veiled attempt to erode a woman's ability to make decisions about her own body.

For proof, look no further than their budget proposal.

Their budget eliminated Title X, the only federal grant program dedicated to providing women with family planning services, and cuts the Teen Pregnancy Prevention Program by over 80 percent—programs that would reduce the need for abortion.

Republicans have made it clear that women are fair game. They can't even pass a continuing resolution without interfering in the personal lives of American women.

Republicans can't overturn *Roe v. Wade* so they try every other way possible to erode this fundamental right.

They try to cut off funding to the clinics that provide abortions, they try to criminalize doctors who perform abortions, and they restrict access for millions of women every year through the Hyde Amendment.

Enough is enough. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this terrible bill and to stop interfering in the personal lives of American women.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the chairman of the Republican Women's Policy Committee.

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for holding this important discussion today.

I would like to thank Chairman UPTON, Chairman PRITS, and the full committee and staff of Energy and Commerce for their hard work.

Madam Speaker, I support H.R. 3134, and I proposed an amendment to be included within that bill, which redirects \$235 million to health centers across this country.

I am a nurse, and my husband is a general surgeon. One of our favorite places in the world is our back porch in Dunn, North Carolina, where we sip scuppernong wine and have a wonderful time, and we discuss good health care in this country. Let me tell you and the American people that Planned Parenthood is not good health care.

You can see that this chart clearly shows that the 13,000 federally qualified healthcare centers in this country provide comprehensive health care for women.

You can see this chart is just a mere example of 17 provided basic healthcare services for women to Planned Parenthood's 6.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. I thank the gentlewoman.

Basically, what you have been told and what women in this country have been told is a false choice for American women from Planned Parenthood.

That false choice says that, if one Planned Parenthood facility is defunded, thousands of women and children who are in need will go without health care.

Let me tell you, if that false logic follows in Dunn, North Carolina, it basically says, if there are 18 grocery stores and 1 closes its doors, thousands of families, including my own, will starve.

This is absolutely untrue. We need to support everything we can in this country for good women's health care. This chart provides the actual truth—the truth. Good health care takes care of the whole woman, not just parts.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has established that not all services currently provided by Planned Parenthood could be furnished by other health clinics and medical practitioners if Planned Parenthood were defunded.

A George Washington University professor confirmed this in a column this week. The reason is that so many of the services provided relate to gynecological services and personal female healthcare needs.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank my colleague from Florida for the recognition.

Madam Speaker, it is important that we do get our facts straight.

This year, over 2 million babies will be born to women on Medicaid. That is nearly half of all of the births in this country.

At the same time, more than half of the Medicaid providers in our country are not accepting new patients. That leaves hundreds of thousands of expectant mothers without access to essential prenatal care and treatment, and

that is where Planned Parenthood comes in.

Beyond just prenatal care, they provide life-saving cancer screenings, STD tests, and compassionate counseling to millions of women, men, and families who often have nowhere else to turn for their basic health needs.

Eighty percent of the patients that Planned Parenthood serves have incomes at or below 150 percent of the poverty line.

Those patients are sitting inside waiting rooms at Planned Parenthood centers across the Nation at this very moment who are facing some of the most emotional decisions and challenging tests of their entire lives.

The practitioners and nurses who will treat them won't just tend to their immediate medical needs. They will make sure that the patient knows that he or she is not alone.

If we pass this bill, we are turning our backs on those patients. We are telling low-income families in every corner of this country that we count their health and happiness less.

I urge my colleagues to consider those patients and the impact of this legislation.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 5 seconds to respond.

For 98.5 percent of the pregnant women who received a pregnancy-related service at Planned Parenthood, that service was an abortion.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Speaker, North Dakotans affirm life every day through strong, stable family structures and a culture that values life and that, frankly, values ending the circumstances that cause a woman to believe that her best option is an abortion.

We have over 70,000 square miles and thousands of women who need healthcare services, but we don't have a Planned Parenthood clinic because North Dakota women somehow don't meet its business model.

There are, however, compassionate providers offering more comprehensive services across my State. This map shows the localities of 71 federally qualified health centers that provide quality care to underserved and low-income women in rural and urban communities throughout my State.

The patients who go through the doors of these clinics are treated as valued community members, not as a fee for service and certainly not as a \$45 specimen.

This Congress and its relevant committees must complete a thorough investigation of the disturbing accusations evidenced—yes, evidenced—in the Planned Parenthood videos that we all have seen before another taxpayer dollar goes to this controversial organization. These funds can be better used to provide legitimate health services for women in places like North Dakota.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act, but we should call it the “Depriving Women of their Health Care Act.”

This bill is just the latest political attack on millions of American women. This bill is a step backward for our Nation's healthcare system.

Defunding Planned Parenthood would deprive American women and their families of access to preventative services like cancer screenings and access to contraception and to prenatal counseling that helps women maintain healthy pregnancies.

Sadly, I am not surprised that my Republican colleagues continue this relentless attack on the autonomy of women. We have seen it countless times before: Congress telling this country that a politician's judgment is superior to that of an American woman's.

What does surprise me, however, is that now Republicans are willing to shut down our government and put our economy at risk in order to deny women access to the healthcare providers of their choosing.

We can't allow Members of Congress to substitute their judgment for a woman's right to make decisions about her own body.

This bill does nothing more than take away healthcare options for low-income women because of a difference in beliefs over just 3 percent of the many vital services that Planned Parenthood provides.

Congress needs to get back to work on the real issues facing American women and their families.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Pro-Life Caucus.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, undercover videos show and expose Planned Parenthood directors cheerfully talking about dismemberment and crushing babies to death all while altering abortion methods in a way that preserves organs and body parts for sale.

Watch the videos.

One senior director who talks about preserving a liver says they use ultrasound guidance because that is where they will know where to put the forceps. Of course, forceps are used to literally rip the child to pieces in what is called a dismemberment abortion.

One technician, Holly O'Donnell, talks about getting brain tissue. She said her supervisor “gave me the scissors and told me that I had to cut down the middle of the face. I can't even describe,” she says, “what that feels like.”

Some of our colleagues on the other side have said that there is no evidence. Watch the videos. There is ample evidence.

I would suggest and I would ask Congresswoman CASTOR to join us in a letter that asks the Attorney General of the United States to investigate this. Will you?

I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, the repeated reference to these false videos is a true disservice to this Congress and to the people all across America. These false claims against Planned Parenthood have been widely discredited.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, the repeated references to these false videos do a real disservice to this Congress and to people all across America. The false claims against Planned Parenthood have been widely discredited.

The videos that so many have referenced are heavily edited. They have edited content out, and they have edited false images in.

Politicians who are latching onto this smear campaign do so to further their personal agendas to the detriment of women's health care across America.

What has happened here since these videos were released in July is a coordinated smear campaign against trusted Planned Parenthood clinics. Let me give you some evidence directly from my home State of Florida.

□ 1115

In July, with absolutely no evidence of wrongdoing, Florida Republican Governor Rick Scott ordered investigations of Planned Parenthood clinics. It had all the trappings of a witch hunt.

In August, after the Agency for Health Care Administration had determined and written a draft press release that said: “However, there is no evidence of the mishandling of fetal remains at any of the 16 clinics we investigated across the State.”

That didn't fit Governor Scott's political narrative, so his office scrubbed the press release of that language.

I submit for the RECORD a copy of the press release that was drafted by the Agency for Health Care Administration for Florida before Governor Scott's office scrubbed the language on the finding.

[For Immediate Release—Aug. 5, 2015]

ORIGINAL PROPOSED RELEASE FROM AHCA TO THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE

PLANNED PARENTHOOD INSPECTIONS FIND DEFICIENCIES AT CLINICS

Agency findings include issues with the record keeping of fetal remains at one clinic and unlicensed procedures being performed at three clinics

TALLAHASSEE, FL.—Our investigations last week into Planned Parenthood clinics found three facilities performing procedures beyond their licensing authority, as well as one facility not keeping proper logs relating to fetal remains. However, there is no evidence of the mishandling of fetal remains at any of the 16 clinics we investigated across the state.

[For Immediate Release—Aug. 5, 2015]

FINAL VERSIONS THAT WAS RELEASED TO THE MEDIA

PLANNED PARENTHOOD INSPECTIONS FIND DEFICIENCIES AT CLINICS

Agency findings include issues with the record keeping of fetal remains at one clinic and unlicensed procedures being performed at three clinics

TALLAHASSEE, FL.—Our investigations last week into Planned Parenthood clinics found three facilities performing procedures beyond their licensing authority, as well as one facility not keeping proper logs relating to fetal remains.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. In fact, the press secretary for the agency said: “I would have thought a line on no handling of fetal remains would be included, as that is what questions will be on.”

The agency’s secretary wrote back, and she said she agreed.

Reporters subsequently obtained the scrubbed press release. Apparently, these had to go to the Governor’s office to be purified and sanctified.

What happened earlier this week is that the communications director for the Florida Agency for Health Care Administration resigned. This is another example of the coordinated smear campaign based upon the false videos that have captured attention. They are outrageous, but they are false, and they have been proven to be false.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to respond.

We are hearing words such as “denied,” “deprived,” “detriment” to women’s healthcare. We are increasing women’s health care. Tennessee has four Planned Parenthood clinics and 26 federally qualified health clinics.

Also, I would remind my colleagues the investigation is ongoing. It is ongoing. It started yesterday at Energy and Commerce. We will continue through this to get to the bottom of it.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), the chairman of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, as a people, we have no more sacred values; and the right to life is foremost among these.

Recently, shocking, appalling, horrific videos have come to light that show senior employees at Planned Parenthood casually discussing the harvesting and selling of organs of aborted children in ways to alter their procedures in order to “obtain intact fetal cadavers,” which they refer to as “line items.”

In perhaps the most chilling video, we see one of these so-called intact fetal cadavers with its heart still beating. Madam Speaker, its heart was still beating.

Madam Speaker, whether one considers themselves pro-life or pro-choice, can we not agree that the harvesting and trafficking of baby organs violates the sanctity with which every

child created in the image of God is entitled to? How can a fair, civilized, and compassionate society come to any other conclusion?

Madam Speaker, today I rise to plead with my colleagues to speak up for the voiceless and the defenseless by voting to deny Planned Parenthood further taxpayer subsidies for the harvesting of baby body parts.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs).

Ms. CAPPs. Madam Speaker, I rise today in staunch opposition to this dangerous bill. Planned Parenthood provides exactly the types of interventions that prevent unintended pregnancies and the need for an abortion in the first place, like birth control options and medically accurate sexual health education.

If this bill becomes law, these important services Planned Parenthood brings to our communities will disappear, and the health of our communities will pay the price.

We keep hearing that the work of Planned Parenthood would be done by other healthcare providers, mostly community health centers, and while that might sound like an easy shift, it doesn’t work that way.

Madam Speaker, I have a letter here from the California Primary Care Association. In it, they write: “Eliminating Planned Parenthood from our State’s comprehensive network of care would put untenable stress on remaining providers. We do not have the capacity for such an increase in care.”

This is the direct quote from the health centers that the majority expects to pick up the slack if Planned Parenthood is defunded. It would be untenable.

Supporters of this bill are willfully putting their heads in the sand. They think it is no big deal to shut down hundreds of clinics offering essential services that are not available anywhere else. They think it is worth shutting down the government to achieve this goal. This political theater has to stop.

We need to trust women and their healthcare providers to make their own medical decisions. It is not the government’s business.

I strongly urge a “no” vote on this dangerous bill.

I insert the letter from the California Primary Care Association into the RECORD.

CALIFORNIA PRIMARY CARE ASSOCIATION,

Sacramento, CA, September 17, 2015.

Hon. LOIS CAPPs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN CAPPs: The California Primary Care Association has recently become aware of new legislation, H.R. 3134 combined with the Ellmers amendment, by Congresswoman Diane Black that would redirect federal funding from Planned Parenthood to federally qualified health centers. The purported goal of such legislation is to

prevent a decrease in federal funding for women’s health services, while putting a moratorium on Planned Parenthood as a healthcare provider for a year while Congress conducts a full investigation of the organization’s activities.

As the state-wide representatives of community clinics and health centers in California, who serve 5.6 million patients annually, we believe this action would negatively impact the health of our community.

Planned Parenthood currently operates 115 health centers in California and serves nearly 800,000 patients through 1.5 million encounters annually. Eliminating Planned Parenthood from our state’s comprehensive network of care would put untenable stress on remaining health centers. We do not have the capacity for such an increase in care, even for a year, and should Congress seek to extend the moratorium building such capacity would require significant capital investment on par with the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act expansion.

Even then, the legislation would still eliminate patient’s ability to choose the provider with which they feel most comfortable. Planned Parenthood is seen by many as women’s health centric, which provides their patients with a level of comfort that cannot be easily replicated. The women’s health focus allows them to be a provider of choice to hundreds of thousands of women who seek out a variety of services that include well woman exams, breast exams, birth control and sexually transmitted disease testing.

In 2013 alone, Planned Parenthood conducted 733,641 tests for Chlamydia—the leading cause of preventable infertility—that resulted in 37,014 positive results and follow-up treatment.

Planned Parenthood is a vital component of the health care system in California and for that reason, we are opposed to legislation that will diminish their capacity to provide care in our state. We respectfully request that you oppose this legislation.

Sincerely,

CARMELA CASTELLANO GARCIA, ESQ.,

President and CEO,

California Primary Care Association.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), who chairs the Subcommittee on Human Resources at Ways and Means.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, as a newly minted physician fresh out of medical school, I took an oath to protect life. As a cardiovascular surgeon, I worked day and night performing thousands of cardiovascular operations on premature infants, all the way up to the elderly. Now, in Congress, I intend to uphold that oath that I took to save life.

The practices we have seen described recently released in the undercover videos of top Planned Parenthood executives detailing the methods they employ to harvest tissues and organs during abortions performed at these clinics is nothing short of atrocious.

After the release of the first video in July, I joined my pro-life colleagues to call immediately for thorough investigations into this activity, and now, these investigations are underway. The American people deserve and they need to know the truth. While these investigations are ongoing, it is important that we take action to prevent taxpayer dollars from going to this type of activity.

I have long supported legislation to end funding for Planned Parenthood and am proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill. It is a very important bill.

I urge my colleagues to defend the culture of life in this country, and let's vote in favor of this bill.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, Planned Parenthood provides 865,000 pap smears and breast exams a year. That is more than the entire population of States like Wyoming, South Dakota, North Dakota.

I want to introduce you, Members on the other side of the aisle, to Colleen from Albany, New York, who is 27 years old. I want you to look into her eyes, and I want you to tell me that you would rather see her dead because Colleen went to Planned Parenthood because she was in between jobs and sought health care.

She received a breast cancer exam at Planned Parenthood. She had stage II breast cancer, and she is alive today because it was identified at a Planned Parenthood clinic. They operated, and she is healthy.

She is not the only one. There are 86,000 men and women who seek services at Planned Parenthood every year for breast cancer or for pap smears for cervical cancer who are identified as having a positive test result. As a result, they get care—86,000. What you are saying is that it is okay for 86,000 people to die because that is how they were accessing their health care.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to respond to some of the comments and to remind my colleagues this investigation that we are conducting is ongoing.

Cancer screenings and prevention services have been cut in half at Planned Parenthood over the past 7 years. They do not perform mammograms; they outsource it. They perform over 300,000 abortions annually; that is their own number.

Madam Speaker, 98.5 percent of the pregnant women who go there go for an abortion.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), the chairman of the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, this morning we are debating, actually, two bills. One is the delay of funds to Planned Parenthood until the investigation is over and redistributing that money to the rural and federally qualified community health clinics of which there are over 13,000—only 656 Planned Parenthood clinics—and they actually do women's health, like mammograms, as we have heard, and other issues, not just refer. I would urge support for that.

The other bill we are debating, which is sometimes infants are born alive after an abortion. We had two witnesses last week before the Judiciary

Committee who were survivors. One of them said she was in contact with 203 other abortion survivors.

All we are doing is putting enforcement language, some penalties in there because born alive is the law, but it is not enforced, and this would permit that to be enforced.

Finally, with Pope Francis coming next week, he said: "The defense of the unborn life is closely linked to the defense of each and every other human right. It involves the conviction that a human being is always sacred and inviolable in any situation, every stage of development."

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, while the investigation may be ongoing, there have been no cases of born alive. The one case from some time ago, a doctor is in prison for that. This simply is not accurate. Now, what we know from ongoing investigations here currently is there has been no substantiated allegation against Planned Parenthood.

What we have seen is this Center for Medical Progress that posted these YouTube video. They have made a number of misrepresentations that may have broken several Federal and State laws, including violating Federal tax laws, violating criminal laws, violating the Invasion of Privacy Act out of California, violating California's penal code by making false charitable solicitations.

Now, we have heard that the attorneys for the director, Mr. Daleiden, for CMP, his attorneys have advised a Federal district court that he intends to invoke his Fifth Amendment in the investigation of him for his violation of Federal and State laws.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015. This bill is possibly the most dangerous bill for women's health to come to the House floor of this Congress.

State and Federal investigations of Planned Parenthood have produced no evidence of violations of laws or medical standards, and independent auditors confirm the videos referenced were heavily altered.

What really happens in Planned Parenthood clinics every year is this: 2.7 million Americans receive critical health services, 78 percent of which live below the poverty level; doctors deliver approximately 400,000 pap smear exams; and women receive nearly half a million breast exams, including screenings to 88,000 women whose cancer was detected early.

This legislation threatens those services and the health of patients, including 7,000 women in my district annually who rely on Planned Parenthood for health care.

As a woman, mother, and breast cancer survivor, I refuse to take that threat lying down. Republicans' own

investigations turned up nothing; yet some of their Members are willing to risk women's lives just to score political points. Enough is enough.

I urge all Members who truly value women's health to vote against this outrageous witch hunt.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3134, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015.

Recent videos released by brave whistleblowers have definitively shown that it is well past time to defund Planned Parenthood. For far too long and to the tune of one-half billion dollars a year, taxpayers have been forced to subsidize Planned Parenthood's abortion on demand.

Thanks to these unsettling revelations, we now know that taxpayers have also been subsidizing the trafficking of aborted baby body parts. This is not health care, Madam Speaker.

There are over 13,000 publicly supported health centers in our country that do provide excellent women's health care. In my home State of Colorado, there are 240 such healthcare alternatives versus 21 Planned Parenthood locations.

This important legislation will not remove funds from women's health care, but shift it to responsible providers. Taxpayers won't have to fund Planned Parenthood's deplorable barbarism.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

□ 1130

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, this legislation is the latest attempt to take essential healthcare services away from women.

Our Republican colleagues know that none of the Planned Parenthood Federal funds are used for abortion, per the Hyde amendment. They know there is no evidence that Planned Parenthood has violated any Federal laws. They know that 90 percent of Planned Parenthood services go to essential cancer screenings, family planning counseling, pregnancy tests, contraceptive care, and other things.

This bill will deny women those services. When this bill fails in the Senate, our Republican colleagues are apparently prepared to shut down the government in order to shut down those women's health services.

Madam Speaker, our Republican colleagues are entitled to their views, but they should not harm our economy; they should not harm America's women; they should not shut down the government to try to impose their views on the country.

Madam Speaker, I rise to raise my opposition to H.R. 3134, Defund Planned Parenthood

Act of 2015. This bill would prohibit all federal funding for Planned Parenthood health centers for one year.

Instead of using their majority to pass a clean budget and govern responsibly, the Republicans are willing to hold our country hostage to further their harmful agenda against women.

The Defund Planned Parenthood Act is just another shameful attempt to take essential healthcare services away from women. Republicans are so focused on defunding Planned Parenthood that they are willing to shut down the government again, and cause billions of dollars of damage to our economy.

Planned Parenthood has been investigated multiple times and each investigation has shown that Planned Parenthood has not violated any federal laws. Moreover none of Planned Parenthood's federal funds are used to perform abortions, in accordance with the Hyde Amendment. Republicans are ignoring facts and relying on doctored footage to continue their crusade against women's healthcare.

This bill will have a devastating impact on women. Approximately one in five American women, in her lifetime, has relied on a Planned Parenthood center for care. It serves a total of 2.7 million patients per year—women and men.

More than ninety percent of their much-needed services go toward providing essential health services that includes contraceptive care, family planning counseling, pregnancy tests, prenatal care, and essential cancer screenings.

There are not enough community health centers to care for all of those who would lose access to healthcare if this bill is passed. A direct threat would be posed to seventy-eight percent of Planned Parenthood patients who earn incomes of 150 percent of the federal poverty level or less.

It is time to focus on this country's real concerns and stop trying to deprive women of essential health services. I strongly oppose this bill and any other efforts to defund Planned Parenthood.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to respond.

Madam Speaker, they sure want that government shutdown. I do want to remind them that we have over 13,000 community health centers in the country. Planned Parenthood has cut their cancer screening and prevention services in half in the past 7 years, and they do not perform mammograms, but they do over 300,000 abortions.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3134, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015.

As an OB/GYN physician who has delivered close to 5,000 babies, I was sickened and disturbed by the release of several videos showing Planned Parenthood executives casually discussing the dismemberment of babies to sell body parts.

Madam Speaker, this bill isn't about whether you are pro-life or pro-choice, though I am proud to say that I will always be a defender of the right to life.

This is about the gruesome practices of an organization that receives over \$500 million a year from the Federal Government. As legislators, we carry the responsibility and the privilege to protect those who do not have a voice and to ensure that tax dollars are supporting organizations that truly provide health care for women.

I have seen the videos, and I can tell you, that is not health care. I have spent my entire life caring for patients, and it is important to note that there are alternatives for women to receive care besides Planned Parenthood. I strongly support withholding tax dollars from Planned Parenthood until congressional investigators have had a chance to review the matter. I am proud to encourage my colleagues to support this important bill.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, may I please inquire how much time is left on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 11¼ minutes remaining.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, the videos keep being referenced here on the floor. I want Members to understand, I want the American public to understand that the first four short videos released on YouTube have 40 separate splices and edits that remove crucial context. They remove exculpatory statements like, "Nobody should be selling tissue; that is not the goal here," and, "This is not a service they should be making money from. It is something they should be able to offer to their patients in a way that doesn't impact them," or, "We are not looking to make money from this. Our goal is to keep access available." In one of the videos there are at least 16 substantial unexplained edits, including the removal of nine instances where Planned Parenthood staff said there is no profit related to tissue donation.

Doesn't that seem misleading and fundamentally dishonest to remove statements like that, and then base a smear campaign and bring it to the floor of the United States Congress for policymaking? I think so.

That is why these videos have been denounced across the country by independent editorial writers. They have called them distorted and unfair, dishonest, grossly misleading, and politically irresponsible and swift boating.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), my friend.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 3134, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act.

There is nothing thoughtful about this legislation. This is a shameful and shocking sham. This has always been about Republicans wanting to restrict the right of women to make their own healthcare decisions.

Let me say, you know, these doctored videos on YouTube, my children

watch YouTube, and you can see whatever you want on YouTube. You can see a man punt a basketball through a basket from 500 feet. You can see whatever you want. So I am not surprised that these doctored videos are on YouTube.

Mammograms are done in imaging centers, so no health center does an actual mammogram. So let's stop trying to mislead the American people with this sham.

If you like YouTube so much, and that is where you are going to get your information, I have another video you can watch right now on YouTube. It is called, "Dumb and Dumber."

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, it has been said that none are so blind as those who will not see, and so I rise today on behalf of the unborn babies who can't stand up for themselves.

Many of my colleagues have already described the horrifying videos that shock the conscience and have sparked several congressional investigations.

Nevertheless, no matter what party you belong to, we should all agree that taxpayer dollars should not be used for harvesting baby parts for profit. The debate today is about more than these barbaric practices. It is about the very character of our Nation. Will we turn a blind eye to this callous disregard for human life? Is this the country we want to be?

Two weeks ago today, my newest granddaughter, Naomi Gail, was born after an emergency C-section from a doctor who understood the need for life for both the mother and the child. Holding her in my arms was a vivid reminder that all life is sacred, and every child deserves dignity, respect, and a chance for a full life.

America was founded on the values of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Madam Speaker, it all begins with life.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Representative CASTOR for her tremendous leadership.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3134, which is nothing more than yet another ideological attack on women's health care. It would defund Planned Parenthood for a year, leaving millions of women across the country without access to critical healthcare services.

Planned Parenthood centers often serve as a primary care health facility for women seeking birth control, cancer and STI screenings, and other critical preventive care. In 2013 alone, Planned Parenthood provided healthcare services to more than 800,000 Californians and provided more than 93,000 Pap tests and 97,000 breast exams.

Denying access to the healthcare services such as Planned Parenthood provides will harm those who most need these services, including low-income women and women of color. This

bill is shameful. It is disrespectful. It is wrong. Politicians shouldn't be interfering, anyway, in a woman's personal healthcare decisions.

It is past time Republicans stop their war on women and stop these ideological attacks and stop using women's health care to divert attention from a looming government shutdown because Republicans refuse to pass a budget.

Vote "no" on this deceptive and dishonest bill.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds to respond to something.

Our colleagues across the aisle have a colleague from New Jersey who previously spoke. I want to reference a press release that was sent out August 15 from his office on community health centers:

Community health centers attend to hard-to-reach populations and are a vital resource that have a significant impact in improving health in New Jersey.

Talking about reaching hard-to-serve populations, this is what we are doing. Let's put the money where it meets the most needs.

I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), who is the author of H.R. 3495, the Women's Public Health and Safety Act, and commend him for his commitment in those efforts.

Mr. DUFFY. "It is a boy," or, "it is a girl"; any parent knows that phrase. It is one of the most memorable moments that they will ever have in their lives.

Recently, we heard that same phrase, but it was said by an abortion provider at Planned Parenthood, and it was as that provider—we will use that term loosely—was siphoning through the body parts of a little baby, taking hearts and lungs for sale, but noticed it is a boy.

What a perversion. What a perversion of who we are as a people. I think it calls into question this debate. This is not a debate about women's health. We are providing the same amount of money for women's health to great clinics that provide great care. It is about Planned Parenthood.

Why is it about Planned Parenthood? If you watch this debate, you have to ask, how could anybody defend the practices at Planned Parenthood, harvesting body parts? How could anyone defend that? It is an easy answer. Look in political season. Millions of dollars—millions of dollars—are spent by Planned Parenthood to elect Democrats to the House of Representatives and to the Senate. This isn't about babies. This is about money.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, this feels like *deja vu*. Once again, the House is ignoring the challenges facing our Nation in order to attack women's health. Already this year, the House has voted to restrict reproductive

health care in private insurance, enact a sweeping 20-week abortion ban, and allow employers to discriminate against their workers for using birth control.

Now, with just 5 legislative days before a shutdown, we are wasting our time on a bill the President has said he will veto. It is past time for Congress to stop focusing on ideology and start focusing on the facts. The fact is defunding Planned Parenthood would have a devastating effect on women's access to health care. That care includes cancer screenings, immunizations, and birth control.

As my colleagues are well aware, current law already prevents Federal funding for abortion services. It is shameful that the House is allowing the reckless actions of a few extremists to jeopardize the critical safety net provided by Planned Parenthood. We can't let that happen.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

Mr. GIBBS. Madam Speaker, we have seen in the videos released this summer the horrific practices of harvesting the body parts of aborted children for profit. We have also known that Planned Parenthood provides abortion procedures, and the pro-life movement has for years worked very hard to ensure that no taxpayer dollars will be used to fund the procedure of abortion.

Planned Parenthood is not about women's health care. We know this because not one clinic performs mammograms. The despicable actions that were uncovered in these videos show the true nature of Planned Parenthood. It shows their complete disregard for life. It shows how careless they are with the responsibility to treat our most vulnerable and innocent with respect.

We cannot give taxpayer dollars to an organization that profits from the sale of organs from aborted children. Planned Parenthood officials have been caught haggling over the price of body parts from aborted children, and they have been recorded on camera fearing the consequences if their actions were revealed to the world. We have two House committee investigations. We have an obligation to suspend Federal funding to Planned Parenthood while the investigations are being conducted.

Now is the time for all Americans to reflect on the fragile nature of life and how we treat the unborn. I want to thank Congresswoman BLACK for leading the efforts to defund Planned Parenthood. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 8 minutes remaining.

□ 1145

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I stand before you today not as a Republican and not as a Member of this House, but as a fellow human being, and I wonder: How did we get to this point? How do we somehow compromise in our mind what it is that we are talking about today?

I want you to disconnect from any organization or agency and concentrate on the act of what is taking place.

This is not a blob of tissue. This is one of America's sons or daughters waiting to be born. They are taken from the safety of their mother's womb and they are taken out very carefully so they can harvest certain body parts: hearts, lungs, heads.

You can sit here and try to make it something about an agency and turn a blind eye to the act that is taking place in a country that will go to any length to protect life, in a people that believes in the sanctity of life from its very conception to its natural death.

And somehow harvesting the parts from these little baby boys and girls has become a political issue?

This is an issue human being to human being. This is an issue of conscience and conviction. Please, do not make it a political battle.

This is about our sons and daughters. This is about a horrific act that is repulsive and repugnant and has no place in America. America's taxpayers refuse to pay for that type of act. Wake up.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the many colleagues who stood here and stand with me now to rise in support of ensuring that hard-earned taxpayer dollars do not go to private entities that are trafficking in fetal body parts.

We have to put a stop to this heinous practice. We have to ensure that this problem is investigated. We have to ensure that the Federal Government is not condoning these actions.

I believe that we need to ensure that Planned Parenthood understands that the money that they have access to from the Federal Treasury is not mandatory money that is given to that agency.

We need to ensure that women's health is a priority, but let's put the tax dollars into the agencies and the community health centers that are providing access to women's health care every day throughout this great Nation. We can do that.

Let's stand together. Let's ban this heinous practice. Let's make sure we move forward.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Defund Planned Parenthood Act. I want to say this as respectfully as possible, but this bill is dumb, it is foolish, and it is mean-spirited, with only one purpose, and that is to punish one of our country's premier health organizations because it provides women access to an array of services that we need to lead healthy lives. The bill is based upon lies and exaggerations.

Now, if you want to have a truthful debate, then let's talk about the 400,000 Pap smears, the 500,000 breast exams, and the 4.5 million STD and HIV tests that Planned Parenthood does each year. Now, that is saving lives. That is the truth.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. Madam Speaker, many years ago, I was in London with my family at the British Museum and watched a little movie about the development and growth of a baby inside a mother's womb. The video was all about life, tracking the baby's development week by week.

Recently, we have all watched videos where Planned Parenthood executives candidly talked about death. How can anyone defend the sale of a little baby's body parts? Why should Federal taxpayers support organizations that rob little ones of their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?

Planned Parenthood has betrayed the rights and life of America's most defenseless. Today I am asking that you join me in supporting the Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015, which effectively halts Federal funding of Planned Parenthood for 1 year or until they can certify that their affiliates and clinics are not and will not perform abortions.

I thank Congresswoman DIANE BLACK for her leadership on this issue. The character of our Nation is at stake. We must restore the value and sanctity of every life and fight back against those unfathomable acts. Life is precious. Let's cherish each and every one.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Madam Speaker, what we have learned about Planned Parenthood through these videos is appalling, barbaric, and indefensible. Here are some of the quotes:

We've been very good at getting heart, lung, liver . . . so I'm not gonna crush that part.

Using a "less crunchy" technique to get more whole specimens.

We're going to procure brain . . . so what you do is you go through the face . . .

And when discussing the sale of body parts, a Planned Parenthood official asks:

Well, why don't you start by telling me what you're used to paying?

Madam Speaker, our Nation is so much better than this. The cold indif-

ference shown in these videos is the inevitable result for an organization that does hundreds of thousands of abortions every year.

Federally funded clinics that serve women's health and do not perform abortions outnumber Planned Parenthood clinics by between two to one. Let's send the funds to those clinics.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. CASTRO of Florida. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. I don't think anybody on your side has read the bill. It doesn't do anything that you have talked about.

It doesn't stop abortions. It doesn't stop any of those other issues that are already illegal. It does one thing: It shuts down Planned Parenthood clinics.

I represent the largest affiliate of Planned Parenthood in the United States. And guess what. Twenty-two percent of the patients are men. So you are going to deny access not only to women, but to men.

You say: "Oh, we will shift the money somewhere else." There is nowhere else. These are the only clinics around in many of the communities.

So what you are doing is taking this angry white man's caucus on the Republican side that have been for years trying to use this as a political issue, using a bill that says you are going to do all these things. It only does one thing: it penalizes Planned Parenthood.

Penalizing Planned Parenthood penalizes us all. It is about access to health care, particularly, access to health care for women.

Stop beating up on women. Stop trying to make this a political issue. The reason we haven't been able to legislate against abortion is because you can't find a law that can enforce it.

This is really a moral issue and a medical issue that ought to be discussed with women and their doctors. Congress Members ought to stay out of this.

We haven't been successful in solving these problems. This only hurts people, particularly in rural areas, because the majority of Planned Parenthood clinics are in rural areas.

Stop being so mean. Solve problems, not create them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I would encourage all Members to read the bill. It is very short. It is about three pages. What it will do is freeze this funding for a year so we can do the investigation, and it sends it to some of the 13,000 community health centers that are in the country.

We have even got a press release from one of their colleagues extolling the values of these community health centers.

I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The appalling videos that have been released revealing Planned Parenthood's horrific activities should spur deep concern in every American.

In a recent hearing with Secretary Burwell, I asked her whether the Department of Health and Human Services would probe into these allegations, but she refused to commit to an investigation.

We have a moral responsibility to act to investigate this organization's actions and hold them accountable.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Tennessee has ¾ minutes remaining.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, the recent allegations and videos that have come forth have literally shocked the world by showcasing the morally bankrupt practices of Planned Parenthood.

I am honored to stand with my colleagues to try to prevent tax dollars from going to this organization that has now stooped to the practice of trafficking innocent baby parts, they say, for the purpose of advancing medical research, but we all know that there is no excuse that can possibly be given to provide for the moral bankruptcy of Planned Parenthood.

It is time to defund this while the investigation occurs. The blood and body parts of children should be looked at as a sacred entity rather than an industry.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. I thank my friend for yielding and for her excellent remarks on the floor this morning.

Madam Speaker, defunding Planned Parenthood would have a real, profound, negative impact on the 10,000 people in Maine who get health care from Planned Parenthood every year, many of whom have no other access to care.

Planned Parenthood provides basic health care like cancer screenings, vaccinations, wellness exams, and STD testing, basic care that will mean the difference between health and sickness, prosperity and poverty, or even life and death for women in my State.

Let's be clear. Who is really behind the attempts to defund Planned Parenthood? Radical antiabortion groups who want to shut down Planned Parenthood and deny women access to safe and legal abortions. These are groups who want to deny women the right to make a private, personal medical decision.

In the process, they want to take away the access to birth control, family planning services, and even basic

health care. They have orchestrated a false, misleading smear campaign to try and accomplish their goal, a campaign we have heard a lot today about here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” and stand up for women’s rights to make their own decisions about health care and protect their access to basic medical services.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, during the recent Presidential debates Carly Fiorina called and dared President Obama and Hillary Clinton to watch these appalling videos.

I realize we only have a few minutes left, but I want to dare Members on the other side to watch these videos, too. There are computers in the cloakroom where they can watch them.

If they want to send one taxpayer dime to Planned Parenthood after watching it, shame on them. There are much better places to send it, like these community health centers created under President Obama’s bill. There are lots of places women can go for health care, not just Planned Parenthood.

Go watch the videos.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. It is bizarre to watch the manufactured controversy surrounding ambush-type, heavily edited filming used to discredit Planned Parenthood.

These attacks do not reflect my experience and knowledge of the amazing, dedicated, civic-minded men and women—pillars of our community—who have built, supported, and led Planned Parenthood in my community.

There is no question that, because of their efforts, tens of thousands of abortions never occurred. Because of their efforts, 70,000 women in Oregon last year received services.

They are people who know their communities, Planned Parenthood leadership understands that this heated rhetoric, outrageous claims, and attack against service to low-income women is not just false, it is wrong.

It is bizarre to watch the manufactured controversy surrounding ambush-type, heavily edited journalism used to discredit Planned Parenthood.

It’s not just the blatantly manipulative and misleading tactics that are being used, which should be enough for most people to reject the allegations on their face. These attacks do not reflect my experience and knowledge of the amazing, dedicated, civic-minded men and women who have built, supported, and led Planned Parenthood in my community.

For decades, I have admired these pillars of community, leaders in education, religion, business, and other civic affairs that provided the vision, the volunteer effort, and personal

contributions to women’s health and reproductive freedom. There is no question that because of their efforts, tens of thousands of abortions never occurred in our community and those that did occur, did not result in harm to women.

Because of their efforts, Oregon’s 11 Planned Parenthood centers provided care to over 70,000 women in 2013, including over 25,000 breast and cervical cancer screenings. Nationally, Planned Parenthood services over 2.5 million women annually. Planned Parenthood centers serve a greater share of safety-net clients than any other type of safety-net providers. Nearly 80 percent of women using Planned Parenthood have incomes at or below 150 percent of poverty—these clinics offer affordable health care options for women who may have no alternate source of care.

The fact that we are engaged in a concerted assault against the provision of essential services to women, especially women of color and low-income status is appalling. If people would take the time, as I have, to visit these facilities, meet the employees, and most importantly, know these community leaders that have made it possible to protect women’s health, to prevent countless abortions, and to promote wellbeing and education, they would see the lies behind this heated rhetoric and misguided attacks.

□ 1200

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I serve on the board of health in Cincinnati, Ohio, and I am very familiar with FQHCs. I might say that FQHCs provide services, expansive services, not only to women, but men and children as well.

My wife and I are currently in the process of adoption, and it sickens me to see these parts of young children sitting there, knowing that we could take them, love them, and nurture them into a wonderful life. I don’t know how people look at themselves in the mirror and think that this is okay.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The Republican Congress has fundamentally failed to fulfill its basic responsibility to work out an appropriations plan that will keep this government open. This bill, to inflame the passion that is based on false videos, distorted clips that was part of a coordinated smear campaign all across the country, is being used as the foundation to close the government.

I hope it doesn’t happen, but it appears that the dysfunction in the Republican Congress is going to lead us down that path, at the expense of women’s health care, their basic fundamental services all across this country.

Last spring, we asked the Republicans in Congress to sit down and hammer out an appropriations plan. They refused. They adjourned at the end of July. Nothing happened in August. Nothing has happened here in September, except for these inflammatory bills based upon false YouTube videos.

This Republican Congress’ continuing dysfunction and inability to govern are having real effects on hard-working Americans. This “Deny Women Health Care Act” is a cynical attack on the ability of women to receive the health services they need.

I urge a “no” vote, and I urge my Republican colleagues to keep the government open for hard-working Americans.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, where have we gone? Where is the moral compass of the United States? Do we want to continue the issue of taking body parts of babies and selling them on the open market and protecting that enterprise? Or do we want to back up and say, if that is occurring, we are not funding it?

All this legislation does is say: Wait a minute, if that is occurring in America, we are not going to tolerate it. Until we find out, no more money, and it should go to other agencies that don’t harvest the body parts of babies.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I am going to close and draw to an end this debate. I do want to remind all my colleagues that we are not discussing government shutdown. What we are talking about is a bill that would withhold funds from Planned Parenthood for a period of a year, while we have an investigation.

Now, I know they have called this a smear campaign. We are investigating the operations of Planned Parenthood.

Why are we doing this? Planned Parenthood is big abortion in this country—300,000 abortions a year, as opposed to 1,800 adoption services; 98.5 percent of all women who go there for a prenatal service, it is an abortion. Think about that, 98.5 percent.

There is reason to review how they use taxpayer funding, and we are justified in withholding taxpayer funds until we finish that.

Now, our colleagues have chosen to say that we are radical, dumb, shameful, disrespectful, foolish, extremists, deniers, deprivors, mean-spirited, and beating up on women. Think about that. All because we stand for life, for liberty. We stand for life rights, a first right, and these are the names that you attach to people who defend those rights.

Saturday, I went to a baby shower. An excited grandmother said, Meet my granddaughter. It was an ultrasound, a 3-D ultrasound. Her name is Jessica. That is a baby with a life, and Planned Parenthood is aborting 300,000 of those lives each year.

It is time for taxpayer money to be withheld. I support the bill.

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

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, today I speak in support of H.R. 3134, the Defund

Planned Parenthood Act of 2015, to terminate taxpayer support of this deplorable organization.

I'd like to thank my good friend, Congresswoman DIANE BLACK for her leadership on this issue and her unwavering support for the lives of the unborn.

This summer, we have learned of the shocking nature of Planned Parenthood's practice of selling babies' hearts, lungs, livers, brains and other organs, often for a profit, to the highest bidder.

We were disturbed by what we learned about these practices, but perhaps even more so by the cold indifference in which countless employees dehumanized unborn children, effectively turning them into line item revenue sources, rather than human life in its most precious form.

After discovering the grotesque nature of these practices, the U.S. House of Representatives responded to these abhorrent activities by launching investigative hearings, the first of which began in the House Judiciary Committee last week.

Yet the very same week we began investigating the extent of the wrongdoing, the Executive Branch, through the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, awarded Planned Parenthood of Missouri, Iowa and Montana with over \$1 million in taxpayer support.

The only response to this unthinkable action is for the U.S. House of Representatives, the legislative body with constitutional authority over federal funds, to pass legislation expressly prohibiting the federal government from supporting Planned Parenthood.

Madam Speaker, it is not enough for the U.S. House of Representatives to deny funds from a single continuing resolution or omnibus spending package.

Instead we must do so permanently and Congresswoman BLACK's legislation gives Congress an opportunity to continue our investigations into Planned Parenthood and work toward the day when we are no longer funding this abhorrent organization.

In the short term, there is much work to be done.

The U.S. House of Representatives is responsible for acting on behalf of the American people and investigating the extent to which Planned Parenthood's has profited from this activity.

Furthermore we must make sure that Planned Parenthood has not been engaging in illegal partial birth abortions.

We must determine whether or not Planned Parenthood has been breaking the law by altering abortion procedures to preserve certain organs for sale.

We must protect women and unborn children from these dangerous procedures that are designed to increase revenue for this group and profit from the destruction innocent life.

And perhaps most importantly, we must provide funding for other organizations that provide women's health care support and services—without also offering abortions.

And we must not continue taxpayer funding for groups like Planned Parenthood that believe they are above the laws of the United States.

We have a duty, as elected Representatives to stand up for the most vulnerable among us, to lend a voice to the voiceless, and fight back against injustice.

And so I lend my full support to H.R. 3134, so that we may defund Planned Parenthood and provide vulnerable women with better options for their health care needs.

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 3134, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act.

This bill is partisan politics at its worst. The attacks on Planned Parenthood are nothing more than political witch-hunts led by anti-abortion extremists. Their efforts to mislead the public and tarnish the reputation of Planned Parenthood are downright shameful.

Here are the facts: millions of American families, particularly in underserved areas, rely on Planned Parenthood for family planning services and basic women's healthcare. Seventy-eight percent of Planned Parenthood patients live with incomes at 150 percent of the federal poverty level or less, and almost half a million of their patients are Latinos. Were it not for Planned Parenthood, these families, including over 25 thousand in my district, would have nowhere to turn for basic health care needs.

Defunding Planned Parenthood has implications for the 2.7 million Americans across the country who count on Planned Parenthood for STD and STI testing, cancer screenings, contraceptive care, and other health services. These basic and critical healthcare services which account for 97% of those provided at Planned Parenthood, are what is really being defunded here.

It's been 42 years since the United States Supreme Court ruled that a woman has the constitutional right to choose what is best for her health and her body. Since then, anti-abortion extremists have been working tirelessly to chip away at this constitutional protection. This time, Madam Speaker, the ramifications of their efforts extend far beyond abortion. They threaten the health and well-being of millions of hard-working American families in my district and across the country.

The majority always argues for small government. I guess this time they want a government small enough to fit inside the exam room with a woman and her doctor.

Madam Speaker, I'd like to submit a letter signed by 13 Latino advocacy groups in opposition to defunding Planned Parenthood.

AUGUST 3, 2015.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC.
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: As organizations committed to the civil and human rights, health equity, and well-being of Latino/as, our families, and our communities, we the thirteen undersigned organizations urge you to oppose all efforts to defund Planned Parenthood Federation of America (PPFA) or other healthcare providers that Latino/as rely on for high quality care.

The recent manipulated and misleading attacks on PPFA are yet another political attempt to target providers of reproductive health services. The real agenda behind these attacks is to block access to basic health services, particularly for low-income communities, women of color, and young people. These tactics also create an atmosphere of fear and shame intended to intimidate women who seek abortion and those who provide the much needed care.

Such attacks on PPFA, a critical provider of vital health services to low-income women and women of color, threatens to unravel the

reproductive health safety net that our Latino/a community relies on. We have already seen such efforts as in Texas when the state legislature authorized the "affiliate rule" that barred all Planned Parenthood health centers from receiving state funds. In 2012, the first full year following the devastating cuts to family planning funding and implementation of the "affiliate rule," Texas met only 13 percent of the need for publicly funded contraception—less than half of national totals for the same year.

Furthermore, defunding PPFA would have a devastating impact on the Latino/a community which experiences higher rates of reproductive cancers, unintended pregnancy, and sexually transmitted infections than most other groups of people in the U.S. In fact, according to the latest statistics from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Latinas have the highest cervical cancer incidence rates. Latinos/as, including LGBTQ Latinos/as, immigrant women, and women of color experience system barriers such as cost, lack of available clinics, insufficient culturally and linguistically competent health systems, and discriminatory immigration policies that make it difficult for individuals and communities to access routine healthcare. For decades, Latinos/as have been the most uninsured racial and ethnic group.

That is why our communities rely on Planned Parenthood for quality healthcare. In 2013, PPFA's clinics served 575,000 Latinos/as, which was 22 percent of their overall patients. We will not tolerate any attempts to cut Latinos/as off from this care.

We strongly urge you to oppose all proposals to defund PPFA and stand with the undersigned organizations to protect the right to health care for Latinos/as and other persons of color. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Ann Marie Benitez, Senior Director of Government Relations, at National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health.

Signed,

Casa de Esperanza, Farmworker Justice, Hispanic Federation, Labor Council for Latin American Advancement, LatinoJustice PRLDEF, League of United Latin American Citizens, Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, National Alliance of Latin American and Caribbean Communities, National Hispanic Media Coalition, National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health, Presente, U.S.-Mexico Foundation, VotoLatino.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this brazen assault on women's health, which would harm lower income women around this nation.

The legislation we are debating today would mean that women with limited health options will find it harder to secure lifesaving services—like breast exams and pap tests. In New York alone, cutting Planned Parenthood funding would mean that nearly 50,000 fewer breast exams would occur. 37,000 women would no longer receive pap tests. Millions of women nationwide would no longer have access to STI screenings and treatments, to say nothing of additional unplanned pregnancies.

These are just some of the critical treatments and procedures Planned Parenthood provides—some of which save women's lives. If you want to proclaim yourself "pro-life" then you should care about women's lives—not focus on depriving them of health care services and contraception.

Today, we have just a few legislative days left before another Republican-fueled government shutdown. We know this misguided bill

we are debating is going nowhere. It will not pass the Senate. If it did, the President would veto it.

Yet, House Republicans remain obsessed with attacking Planned Parenthood and reducing women's healthcare options—to the point where they are ready to engender another government shutdown.

We need to reject this legislation so we get back to the serious business of governing. Support women's health care, vote no on the bill.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I stand in strong opposition to H.R. 3134, Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015.

This debate and vote are another attempt to deny women basic health care, including reproductive health services. 2.7 million patients—both men and women—all across America depend on Planned Parenthood for critical medical services every year. In my district, if you go to a Planned Parenthood clinic at the end of the day, women, many of modest means, will be lined up through the waiting room and, often, down the street, waiting to be seen.

While supporters of this bill claim women will have other comparable options, the experts tell us that is simply not the case. The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office found that if this bill is passed, as many as 630,000 Planned Parenthood patients could lose access to birth control, STD screening, and other reproductive health services. And researchers at the Guttmacher Institute estimate that in 103 of America's 491 counties, Planned Parenthood is the only safety-net family planning clinic.

I am outraged by this attempt to use a heavily edited and thoroughly discredited video to vilify an organization that plays a vital role in communities across the nation. Planned Parenthood should be celebrated, not demonized, and I hope my colleagues reject this dangerous and disingenuous piece of legislation.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today, I come to the House floor to stand up for women's health.

Republicans are using a heavily edited, agenda-driven series of videos that falsely portray Planned Parenthood's participation in tissue donation programs that support life-saving scientific research. These outrageous and false claims about Planned Parenthood have been discredited. Edited and distorted video should not undermine the incredible work that Planned Parenthood does across this country in providing critical health care to millions of women.

This bill to defund Planned Parenthood would not defund abortion. Only three percent of all health services provided by Planned Parenthood are abortion services, and these services already cannot be paid for with federal funding. What this bill would defund is basic health services for millions of women. Planned Parenthood provides family planning counseling and contraception to 2.1 million patients, 400,000 lifesaving screenings for cervical cancer, nearly 500,000 breast exams, and nearly 4.5 million tests and treatments for sexually transmitted infections, including HIV.

Despite news this week that the number of uninsured Americans decreased by 8.8 million

last year thanks to the Affordable Care Act, 33 million Americans still have no health insurance. Perhaps hardest hit by this defunding effort will be the women who live in one of the 20 states that have declined the Medicaid expansion provided by the Affordable Care Act and who rely on Planned Parenthood for life-saving health care.

Defunding Planned Parenthood would also be devastating for low-income communities, women of color, and young people. It would unravel our nation's reproductive health safety net. Planned Parenthood health centers comprise 10% of all publicly funded family planning centers, and serve 36% of all clients who obtain care from the nation's network of family planning providers. The view of some Republicans that federal funding could simply be redistributed to other health care centers and providers ignores where Planned Parenthood health centers are located. They are not typically on Main Street, but rather in areas and neighborhoods where they are most needed. For example, a new Planned Parenthood center currently under construction here in D.C. is located in an underserved area in Ward 5 whose population greatly needs access to the health services that Planned Parenthood provides.

Unfortunately, we in the District of Columbia know all too well this type of assault on women's reproductive health and Planned Parenthood. Whenever Republicans have controlled the House, they have imposed a devastating rider on the District that prevents us from spending our locally raised taxes on abortion services for low-income women, singling us out as the only jurisdiction in the country that cannot spend its local tax dollars for such purposes. We were successful in getting that rider removed from the Senate's fiscal year 2016 D.C. Appropriations bill, and we will continue to fight to have the rider removed from any final spending bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on this hyper-partisan bill, which would devastate women's access to health services, most drastically in low-income and minority communities.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I rise to express several serious concerns with the flawed process that led to a flawed product, H.R. 3134, the "Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015."

Ten shocking videos released over the last few months document what many already knew was happening at Planned Parenthood facilities around our nation—the selling and trafficking of fetal organs for a profit. For the vast majority of Americans who view human life as sacred, these videos have caused righteous anger and disgust that the taxpayer-subsidized "non-profit organization" is not only extinguishing human life but also making money off of human parts—at the taxpayers' expense.

This is the moment for the pro-life movement to hold this evil organization accountable by completely and unequivocally defunding Planned Parenthood.

Rather than fighting to protect life and actually defunding Planned Parenthood, we are voting today on a weak bill, without teeth, that does not defund Planned Parenthood.

H.R. 3134 only places a one-year moratorium on federal funding of Planned Parent-

hood. Furthermore, it includes exceptions to continue to allow taxpayer dollars to go to Planned Parenthood and its abortion factories.

With all we know about what goes on at Planned Parenthood's abortion factories, why are we voting on a bill to "defund" Planned Parenthood for one year?

What's worse, H.R. 3134 does not defund Planned Parenthood. The exceptions included in this bill allow taxpayer dollars to be used to fund abortions performed at Planned Parenthood. In effect, this bill is a proactive vote by the GOP-controlled House of Representatives to affirmatively fund abortions at Planned Parenthood facilities. The very bill leadership has promoted as the solution to this grisly problem—the taxpayer funded mutilation of fully formed children—actually rubber stamps the existing situation.

Furthermore, the certification process in this bill is ripe for fraud and abuse. All Planned Parenthood needs to do is certify it is already following federal law and the Hyde Amendment to continue to receive funding. Who ensures this certification? Once Planned Parenthood receives federal funding and is found to violate this Act, what is the process for the executive branch to seek repayment of this money? H.R. 3134 does not go far enough to address concerns for fraud and abuse.

Because of my serious concerns with the substance of H.R. 3134, I offered an amendment to the Rules Committee on Wednesday, September 16, 2015. My amendment states:

"No funds authorized or appropriated by Federal law may be made available for any purpose to—(1) Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc.; (2) any affiliate or clinic of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc.; or (3) any successor of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc. or any such affiliate or clinic."

My amendment is simple: no federal funds to Planned Parenthood. Period. No one-year moratorium. No exceptions. That should be the goal of this debate and any legislation to defund Planned Parenthood.

Unfortunately, the Rules Committee did not approve my amendment for debate on the floor or adopt it as part of the underlying bill. If my amendment was considered on the floor, I am confident that my colleagues would have overwhelming support and adopted my amendment into the underlying bill.

The funding fight starts now—this is our marker—H.R. 3134 is not a sufficient vote to defund Planned Parenthood. I expect much stronger language than this in the CR coming up in the next few weeks. Innocent, unborn babies deserve more than just a show vote.

For these reasons, I will cast a present vote.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 421, 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. ESTY. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Ms. ESTY. I am, in its current form.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Esty moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 3134, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 6. NO IMPACT ON FUNDING FOR ORGANIZATIONS PROVIDING WOMEN'S HEALTH SERVICES.

Notwithstanding section 3, nothing in this Act shall impact the amount of funding available for any organization that provides women's health services, such as preventive care and cancer screenings, in appropriations legislation for fiscal year 2016, including any continuing resolution.

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

Ms. ESTY. Madam Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill which will not stop the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, this bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

I rise today as a mother, as a woman, and as a Representative to offer this straightforward amendment to protect women's access to vital health care.

Contrary to what many Americans have been led to believe, the bill before us today is not about abortion. This bill would, however, restrict women's access to health care all across the country by entirely eliminating all Federal funding for Planned Parenthood.

Let's be very clear. No Federal tax dollars go towards abortions, and none have since 1976. That is not what this bill is about.

We all know a woman who has been diagnosed with cancer—cervical cancer, breast cancer, ovarian cancer. It may be your mother, your neighbor, or your wife who sought preventive care or cancer screening from a doctor of her choice.

Yes, we all know a woman who has received quality medical care at Planned Parenthood. In fact, one in five American women have sought medical care from Planned Parenthood. It may be your daughter. It may be your boss. It may be your colleague.

My amendment will ensure that any qualified organization that provides women's health services can receive funding. It is simple, and it is fair.

We need more access to quality health care, not less. We need to stop trying to restrict access to lifesaving cancer screenings, birth control, and well-woman exams. We need to stop fighting 40-year-old battles on women's rights.

Defunding Planned Parenthood would have a devastating impact on women, especially low-income women, women in rural communities, and women of color.

It is not only women who receive health care at Planned Parenthood. Men receive health care at Planned Parenthood, too.

Here are some facts about Planned Parenthood's critical role in providing health services to Americans every year.

Planned Parenthood provides family planning counseling and contraceptive care to 2.1 million Americans, more than 1.1 million pregnancy tests, nearly 400,000 Pap smear tests, and nearly 500,000 lifesaving breast exams.

Let's remember that, in many areas, Planned Parenthood is the only source of family planning services. That is why, in 1976, as a college freshman, I volunteered for Planned Parenthood because I had seen the impact on young women in my rural high school who had no access to family planning services. Too many got pregnant, dropped out of school, and never pursued their dreams.

Today, with only 5 legislative days left, we should be focusing on avoiding a reckless and unnecessary government shutdown.

Do you remember the last government shutdown, the one that cost us \$24 billion? No wonder some don't think America is great right now. Dysfunction in this Congress is undermining the American people's faith in democracy.

We, in Congress, have the power to act. We have the opportunity, and we have the duty to set aside ideological battles and, instead, take up the urgent business of the American people.

We should reauthorize the Export-Import Bank and pass a long-term, well-funded highway trust fund bill, investing in America's infrastructure, to ensure that America will continue to be great throughout the 21st century.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to ensure that American women have access to vital health care, no matter where they live and no matter how much they earn.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, we all know that Planned Parenthood receives hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars. For them to get that money, while they are under investigation for profiting off the sale of body parts, baby body parts, is just absolutely abhorrent.

What this bill does is to put a 1-year moratorium while we conduct the investigation. Let's be real clear about that, a 1-year moratorium while we do our due diligence. That is what you call smart business, doing your due diligence, being a steward of the taxpayers' money.

Now, I have found it so interesting that they continue to say this will cut access to women's health care. No, it will not.

Do you know Planned Parenthood sees less than 2 percent of all American women in a given year? There is an amendment on this legislation by Mrs. ELLMERS, it redirects \$235 million to the FQHCs, the federally qualified health centers.

It will increase access because we have more of those centers in more underserved areas, and they are required to provide services which include diagnostic lab and radiological services.

Planned Parenthood has cut those screenings and cancer screenings and those services in half over the last few years, while they have increased their abortions to 300,000 a year.

□ 1215

We are right in restricting these funds to Planned Parenthood while we conduct this investigation. We are right to be a steward of the taxpayer money.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the motion to recommit and a "yes" vote on the passage of H.R. 3134.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Ms. ESTY. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and passage of H.R. 3504.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 183, nays 245, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 504]

YEAS—183

Adams	Capps	Costa
Aguilar	Capuano	Courtney
Ashford	Carney	Crowley
Bass	Carson (IN)	Cuellar
Beatty	Cartwright	Cummings
Becerra	Castor (FL)	Davis (CA)
Bera	Castro (TX)	Davis, Danny
Beyer	Chu, Judy	DeFazio
Bishop (GA)	Cicilline	DeGette
Blumenauer	Clark (MA)	Delaney
Bonamici	Clarke (NY)	DeLauro
Boyle, Brendan	Clay	DelBene
F.	Cleaver	DeSaulnier
Brady (PA)	Clyburn	Deutch
Brown (FL)	Cohen	Dingell
Brownley (CA)	Connolly	Doggett
Bustos	Conyers	Doyle, Michael
Butterfield	Cooper	F.

Duckworth
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Fattah
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Graham
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hastings
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Kuster
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)

NAYS—245

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Babin
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Benishek
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Blum
 Bost
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Clawson (FL)
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Cook
 Costello (PA)
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Culberson
 Curbelo (FL)
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis

Lawrence
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lieu, Ted
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
 Lynch
 Maloney, Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McNeerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Moulton
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Nolan
 Norcross
 O'Rourke
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rangel
 Rice (NY)

Richmond
 Ruizal-Allard
 Roybal
 Ruffersberger
 RUSH
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Speier
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takai
 Takano
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Vislosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

Issa
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jolly
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Katko
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 Knight
 Labrador
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Latta
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 MacArthur
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McSally
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Messer
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)

Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Neugebauer
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Palmer
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Perry
 Peterson
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Poe (TX)
 Poliquin
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price, Tom
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)

Cárdenas
 Fincher

Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney (FL)
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Royce
 Russell
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Stefanik
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stutzman

NOT VOTING—6

Fortenberry
 Smith (WA)

□ 1239

Messrs. COFFMAN, MULVANEY, and ROGERS of Alabama changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 187, answered “present” 1, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 505]

AYES—241

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Babin
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Benishek
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Blum
 Bost
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buchanan
 Buck

Bucshon
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Duffy
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Clawson (FL)
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Cook
 Costello (PA)
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Culberson
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Denham
 DeSantis

Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Trott
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Young (IN)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

Thompson (CA)
 Wagner

Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffith
 Grothman
 Guinta
 Guthrie
 Hardy
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Heck (NV)
 Hensarling
 Herrera Beutler
 Hice, Jody B.
 Hill
 Holding
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurd (TX)
 Hurt (VA)
 Issa
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jolly
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Katko
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 Knight
 Labrador
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Latta
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 MacArthur
 Marchant

NOES—187

Adams
 Aguilar
 Ashford
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Clawson (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cuellar

Marino
 Massie
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McSally
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Messer
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Neugebauer
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Palmer
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Perry
 Peterson
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Walker
 Poliquin
 Pompeo
 Kline
 Price, Tom
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney (FL)
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam

Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Dent
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Dold
 Doyle, Michael F.
 Duckworth
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Fattah
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Graham
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hanna
 Hastings
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins

Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Royce
 Russell
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Stefanik
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Trott
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Posey
 Webber (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Young (IN)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

Himes
 Hinojosa
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Kuster
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lieu, Ted
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
 Lynch
 Maloney, Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCollum

McDermott	Quigley	Speier	Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo	Rohrabacher	Maloney, Sean	Polis	Speier
McGovern	Rangel	Swalwell (CA)	Frelinghuysen	Long	Rokita	Matsui	Price (NC)	Swalwell (CA)
McNerney	Rice (NY)	Takai	Garrett	Loudermilk	Rooney (FL)	McCollum	Quigley	Takai
Meeks	Richmond	Takano	Gibbs	Love	Ros-Lehtinen	McDermott	Rice (NY)	Takano
Meng	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (MS)	Gibson	Lucas	Roskam	McGovern	Richmond	Thompson (MS)
Moore	Ruiz	Titus	Gohmert	Luetkemeyer	Ross	McNerney	Roybal-Allard	Titus
Moulton	Ruppersberger	Tonko	Gosar	Lummis	Rothfus	Meeks	Ruiz	Tonko
Murphy (FL)	Rush	Torres	Gowdy	MacArthur	Rouzer	Meng	Ruppersberger	Torres
Nadler	Ryan (OH)	Tsongas	Granger	Marchant	Royce	Moore	Rush	Tsongas
Napolitano	Sánchez, Linda	Van Hollen	Graves (GA)	Marino	Russell	Moulton	Ryan (OH)	Van Hollen
Neal	T.	Vargas	Graves (LA)	McCarthy	Ryan (WI)	Murphy (FL)	Sánchez, Linda	Vargas
Nolan	Sanchez, Loretta	Veasey	Graves (MO)	McCaul	Salmon	Nadler	T.	Veasey
Norcross	Sarbanes	Vela	Griffith	McClintock	Sanford	Napolitano	Sanchez, Loretta	Veasey
O'Rourke	Schakowsky	Velázquez	Grothman	McHenry	Scalise	Neal	Sarbanes	Vela
Pallone	Schiff	Vislosky	Guinta	McKinley	Schweikert	Nolan	Schakowsky	Velázquez
Pascarell	Schrader	Walz	Guthrie	McMorris	Scott, Austin	Norcross	Schiff	Vislosky
Payne	Scott (VA)	Wasserman	Hanna	Rodgers	Sensenbrenner	O'Rourke	Schrader	Walz
Pelosi	Scott, David	Schultz	Hardy	McSally	Sessions	Pallone	Scott (VA)	Wasserman
Perlmutter	Serrano	Waters, Maxine	Harper	Meadows	Shimkus	Pascarell	Scott, David	Schultz
Peters	Sewell (AL)	Watson Coleman	Harris	Meehan	Shuster	Payne	Serrano	Waters, Maxine
Pingree	Sherman	Welch	Hartzler	Messer	Simpson	Pelosi	Sewell (AL)	Watson Coleman
Pocan	Sinema	Wilson (FL)	Heck (NV)	Mica	Smith (MO)	Perlmutter	Sherman	Welch
Polis	Sires	Yarmuth	Hensarling	Miller (FL)	Smith (NE)	Peters	Sinema	Wilson (FL)
Price (NC)	Slaughter		Herrera Beutler	Miller (MI)	Smith (NJ)	Pingree	Sires	Yarmuth
			Hice, Jody B.	Moolenaar	Smith (TX)	Pocan	Slaughter	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

King (IA)

NOT VOTING—5

Fincher	Smith (WA)	Wagner
Fortenberry	Thompson (CA)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1247

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 3504) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a healthcare practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion, 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.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 248, nays 177, answered "present" 1, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 506]

YEAS—248

Abraham	Buchanan	Cuellar
Aderholt	Buck	Culberson
Allen	Bucshon	Curbelo (FL)
Amash	Burgess	Davis, Rodney
Amodei	Byrne	Denham
Babin	Calvert	Dent
Barletta	Carter (GA)	DeSantis
Barr	Carter (TX)	DesJarlais
Barton	Cartwright	Diaz-Balart
Benishek	Chabot	Dold
Bilirakis	Chaffetz	Donovan
Bishop (MI)	Clawson (FL)	Duffy
Bishop (UT)	Coffman	Duncan (SC)
Black	Cole	Duncan (TN)
Blackburn	Collins (GA)	Ellmers (NC)
Blum	Collins (NY)	Emmer (MN)
Bost	Comstock	Farenthold
Boustany	Conaway	Fitzpatrick
Brady (TX)	Cook	Fleischmann
Brat	Costello (PA)	Fleming
Bridenstine	Cramer	Flores
Brooks (AL)	Crawford	Forbes
Brooks (IN)	Crenshaw	Fox

Hill	Mooney (WV)
Holding	Mullin
Hudson	Mulvaney
Huelskamp	Murphy (PA)
Huizenga (MI)	Neugebauer
Hultgren	Newhouse
Hunter	Noem
Hurd (TX)	Nugent
Hurt (VA)	Nunes
Issa	Olson
Jenkins (KS)	Palazzo
Jenkins (WV)	Palmer
Johnson (OH)	Paulsen
Johnson, Sam	Pearce
Jolly	Perry
Jones	Peterson
Jordan	Pittenger
Joyce	Pitts
Katko	Poe (TX)
Kelly (MS)	Poliquin
Kelly (PA)	Pompeo
King (IA)	Posey
King (NY)	Price, Tom
Kinzinger (IL)	Ratcliffe
Kline	Reed
Knight	Reichert
Labrador	Renacci
LaHood	Ribble
LaMalfa	Rice (SC)
Lamborn	Rigell
Lance	Roby
Langevin	Roe (TN)
Latta	Rogers (AL)
Lipinski	Rogers (KY)

NAYS—177

Adams	Courtney
Aguilar	Crowley
Ashford	Cummings
Bass	Davis (CA)
Beatty	Davis, Danny
Becerra	DeFazio
Bera	DeGette
Beyer	DeLauro
Bishop (GA)	DelBene
Blumenauer	DeSaunier
Bonamici	Deutch
Boyle, Brendan	Dingell
F.	Doggett
Brady (PA)	Doyle, Michael
Brown (FL)	F.
Brownley (CA)	Duckworth
Bustos	Edwards
Butterfield	Ellison
Capps	Engel
Capuano	Eshoo
Cárdenas	Esty
Carney	Farr
Carson (IN)	Fattah
Castor (FL)	Foster
Castro (TX)	Frankel (FL)
Chu, Judy	Fudge
Cicilline	Gabbard
Clark (MA)	Gallego
Clarke (NY)	Graham
Clay	Grayson
Cleaver	Green, Al
Clyburn	Green, Gene
Cook	Grijalva
Cook	Gutiérrez
Connolly	Hahn
Conyers	Hastings
Cooper	Heck (WA)
Costa	

Stefanik	Stewart
Stivers	Stutzman
Thompson (PA)	Thornberry
Tiberi	Tipton
Trott	Turner
Upton	Olson
Valadao	Walberg
Walder	Walden
Walker	Walorski
Walters, Mimi	Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)	Wenstrup
Westerman	Westmoreland
Whitfield	Williams
Wilson (SC)	Wittman
Womack	Woodall
Yoder	Yoho
Young (AK)	Young (IA)
Young (IN)	Zeldin
Zinke	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Garamendi

NOT VOTING—8

Delaney	Kind	Thompson (CA)
Fincher	Rangel	Wagner
Fortenberry	Smith (WA)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1254

So 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

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, due to extenuating circumstances, I was unable to attend votes for the week of September 14 through September 18, 2015.

On passage of H.R. 1214—National Forest Small Tracts Amendments Act of 2015 (rollcall vote No. 495), had I been present I would have voted "yes."

On passage of H.R. 1949—National Liberty Memorial Clarification Act of 2015 (rollcall vote No. 496), had I been present I would have voted "yes."

On passage of H.R. 758—Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act (rollcall vote No. 501), had I been present I would have voted "yes."

On passage of H.R. 3134—Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015 (rollcall vote No. 505), had I been present I would have voted "yes."

On passage of H.R. 3504—Born Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act (rollcall vote No. 506), had I been present I would have voted "yes."

CONGRATULATING LEW MOHR

(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, I rise in recognition of an exemplary member of my district in Bucks County, Pennsylvania.

For decades, Lew Mohr has been a tireless advocate for Scouting in Bucks County and an outstanding leader for countless young men.

Both in the Playwicki District and the Washington Crossing Council, there

is no doubt that throughout his long career in Scouting Lew has done his best to do his duty to God and country, to obey the Scout law, and to help other people at all times.

This evening, Mr. Mohr is again going to be recognized by the local Scouting community for his decades of great work.

As a fellow Scouter and a friend, it is my honor to congratulate Lew on another well-deserved recognition and highlight a life of Scouting well lived.

□ 1300

LOOMING GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we are going to be in session next week. Normally, as you know, we have a colloquy on the schedule. There is no colloquy today because, essentially, there is no schedule. We don't know what is going to be proposed to fund government, which will shut down in approximately 14 days if this body does not act. Actually, it is less than 14 days. It is 6 legislative days, Mr. Speaker.

The Export-Import Bank has been allowed to essentially go out of business for new loans, and we are losing jobs, Mr. Speaker, but there is no schedule. The highway bill on which States, cities, counties, localities, and private sector relies for some degree of certainty, there is no schedule, Mr. Speaker.

I regret that we do not have a colloquy today. I regret that the Export-Import Bank was not moved yesterday, today, or is not on the schedule for next week.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that the majority party sets forth a schedule to make sure America succeeds.

CHANGE SENATE RULES

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, the American people are sick and tired of talk. They want action.

For 3 years now, Senate Democrats have blocked votes on bills important to all Americans. They have blindly supported the President's failed policies and have shielded him from having to defend his policies to the American people.

House Republicans have heard the American cry for help. We fought to repeal ObamaCare. We fought to stop the reckless Iranian nuclear agreement. Once again, we are fighting to defend the defenseless. We have passed budgets that will reduce our national debt, stop job-killing regulations, provide for our national defense, and get Americans working again.

Republicans control Congress. We have better solutions to the problems

that face our Nation. It is time for the President to go on record for his opposition to commonsense solutions that put America first. This can only happen if the Senate employs the nuclear option. It is time to change the Senate rules and force this President and the Senate to work for the American people instead of against them.

CALLING FOR BIPARTISAN BUDGET AGREEMENT

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

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss an issue of great importance, the need to pass a budget bill and prevent a government shutdown.

I think many of us here on Capitol Hill heard all the buzz when former Daily Show host Jon Stewart came into town, but what I hope is not lost in all the excitement was his reason for coming.

He came to deliver a message to Congress to pass the reauthorization of the James Zadroga 9/11 First Responders Act, of which I am a proud cosponsor. It expires at the end of this month.

Instead of working to subsidize the health care of our courageous first responders, Congress is fixated on creating another manufactured crisis. Instead of providing a firefighter burned so badly while saving a victim of the attack of the Twin Towers or a police officer suffering from lung cancer because of exposure to toxic chemicals free health care and really thanking them for their heroic sacrifices, Congress again took no action.

I truly hope my colleagues recognize the gravity of the situation and come together to get back to conducting the business of this Nation.

NATIONAL POW-MIA DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize today as National POW-MIA Recognition Day, in honor of missing servicemen and -women across our Nation.

Sadly, more than 80,000 American soldiers ranging from World War II, the Korean war, and Vietnam are still unaccounted for. While we are thankful that several nations have worked to assist the United States in research and recovery efforts, there are still hurdles to clear when it comes to negotiations and operations. That is why I drafted H. Con. Res. 56, entitled "Keeping Our Promise to MIAs and POWs."

This bipartisan, noncontroversial resolution seeks to increase cooperation with nations that we enter into trade agreements in the research and recovery of our unaccounted soldiers.

With so many servicemen and -women still unaccounted for, we need

to do everything we can to bring them home with the honor and dignity that they deserve.

I encourage all my colleagues to sign on to H. Con. Res. 56.

ANTISHUTDOWN

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, unless we act soon, our government's functions will cease in 10 days. At the end of October, transportation and highway constructions will halt. Instead, Congress can do the right thing to create jobs for millions of Americans across this country.

This summer, the regular process for funding the government broke down because the majority couldn't figure out its stance on the Confederate flag. Today, partisan extremists are threatening another shutdown over women's health care that would be a self-inflicted hit to our economy.

We know that shutting down the government would be devastating for our economy. Standard & Poor's estimated that the 2013 shutdown cost our economy \$24 billion in economic activity; so instead of flirting with the government shutdown disaster, we should be investing in our future.

Twice this summer, Congress did the bare minimum by passing multiple, short-term extensions to the highway trust fund, mostly through accounting gimmicks. Across the board, from workers organizations to business groups, there is opposition to a government shutdown and support for long-term investments in infrastructure.

We should get to work, making it easier for Americans to grow their businesses and to create high-quality jobs instead of punishing our infrastructure, our military, and our economy with foolish partisanship.

WELCOME POPE FRANCIS

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, in just a matter of days, we will welcome Pope Francis to the Nation's Capital.

Pope Francis is the 266th Bishop of Rome, following a line of succession that goes all the way back to St. Peter 2,000 years ago. The sixteenth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew teaches that Jesus told Peter that he would be the rock on whom Jesus would build his church.

Now, for the first time in history, Peter's successor will address Congress.

Here is an interesting perspective: America remains a young Nation compared to the 2,000-year-old Catholic church. While we have had 44 different Presidents—President Obama is the 45th President because count Grover Cleveland as the 22nd and 24th President—just 16 of the church's 266 popes have governed the church since 1776.

The Pope's visit offers all Americans, Catholics and non-Catholics alike, a chance to reflect on the great issues of the day, including the sanctity of life, threats to the family, religious freedom, economic justice, care for the less fortunate, war and peace, and stewardship of the Earth.

Pope Francis' visit is an invitation to dialogue, and I look forward to his address.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, this week, one of the largest employers in my district, General Electric, announced it would be cutting hundreds of jobs nationwide due to Congress'—due to the leadership in this House—inability to renew the Export-Import Bank.

This politics over people and Republican dysfunction has plagued this body since the GOP won the majority. It has led to a government shutdown, obsession with blocking the President at every turn, and now a loss of hundreds of jobs in my district, Schenectady, New York.

The blame game is played all too often in Washington and at the desks of cable news pundits.

This, however, is a fact: hundreds of jobs in my district are gone because Republican House leadership decided it was more important to appease the extreme conservative flank of their own party than to renew an agency that creates jobs while cutting the deficit.

As the Albany Times-Union accurately phrased it: "This is the price tag of a Congress ruled by drown-government-in-the-bathtub ideologues who have no regard for facts: 500 American jobs bound for France, Hungary, and China."

I invite anyone in this body to visit Schenectady, New York. There, they will find families that work hard and play by the rules and don't expect a handout. In this case, a dysfunctional Congress shut down a program that lost families in my district their jobs. That is morally reprehensible and completely unacceptable.

Let's do our job and not have other people lose their job because of inaction in this House.

FEDERAL AGENCIES NEED MORE OVERSIGHT

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, Congress has a duty to ensure that taxpayer dollars by hard-working Americans are spent wisely and responsibly. However, too often, we have seen Federal agencies that have acted in a way that waste taxpayer money by holding excessive conferences with extravagant gifts, luxuries, and perks.

We all remember the lavish Las Vegas GSA conference that cost \$823,000 for 300 employees, including tens of thousands of dollars spent on gifts. The IRS spent a whopping \$50 million—taxpayer dollars—on conferences alone during a 3-year period.

These agencies need more accountability. That is why my colleague, RON KIND, and I have introduced the bipartisan TRACE Act. This legislation simply requires the head of a Federal agency who is hosting a conference to submit a summary of that event to Congress for review.

This initiative will hold agencies accountable. It will improve oversight and transparency. It will save hard-earned taxpayer money, and it will create a more efficient and effective government.

STANDING UP FOR AMERICA

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this Nation has a great history, and I would ask the question: What would Franklin Delano Roosevelt do, President Eisenhower, or Ronald Reagan, or John F. Kennedy, when a question from someone in the room attacked and presented a negative attitude about Muslims or Catholics or those in the Jewish faith or Protestant?

Well, it happened in a townhall meeting of a Presidential candidate. This person thought that they were maligning and deriding the President of the United States when they called him Muslim and that he was not a citizen; yet no voice rang out in this townhall meeting to oppose that heinous and horrific attitude toward individuals of the Muslim faith, who actually have fought on behalf of the flag of the United States of America. We malign no people for a general issue that all of us know we are all against, the world family is against.

Now, I ask this Congress to likewise fund this government because the last time, when the Republicans shut the government down in 2013, we lost \$24 billion.

Because you are denying women health care, you now want to defund the government and, at the same time, keep jobs away from the American people by not reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank.

Not only were 300 jobs lost, but 400 jobs may be lost by a businessman in Kenya who was waiting for the Export-Import Bank. He is an American, and he had 400 jobs.

I say, Mr. Speaker, stop the foolishness. Act like the history of this Nation, and stand up for what is right.

GIVE AMERICA THE SAME DEAL IRAN GETS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under the President's nuclear deal, the United States agreed to give the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism a billion-dollar oil boom. The United States will allow Iran to export its crude oil, but ironically, it still bans exports of our crude oil.

The administration has the power to lift the American ban on crude oil exports, but the White House seems to be more worried about playing the Chamberlain and appeasing Iran than helping the United States economy.

The United States is the largest crude oil producer in the world. There is a world demand for this oil, but the White House will not allow exports, so the oil stays stagnant in the ground.

This ban is one factor that has led to 70,000 jobs being lost in the energy sector in America. Exporting U.S. crude oil will lower gas prices, create jobs, and increase our influence worldwide.

If the President won't act, Congress must. It is time to stop putting the interests of the mullahs and the haters of the United States above Americans citizens. Export American oil.

And that is just the way it is.

□ 1315

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CRESCENTA VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL JUNIOR ROTC PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Crescenta Valley High School Air Force Junior ROTC.

Under the distinguished leadership of Lieutenant Colonel David Worley, the Crescenta Valley Air Force JROTC is a well-respected and integral part of the foothills communities.

The cadets who participate in this program truly learn the value of community service and personal responsibility. It is a tremendous opportunity for young men and women to embrace the core values of "Integrity First, Service Before Self, and Excellence in All We Do."

The cadets from the program are among the most impressive young people I have had the privilege to meet. We are so fortunate to have a program in our community that provides a structured, vibrant environment to develop future leaders.

I wish to offer my heartfelt congratulations and thanks to Lieutenant Colonel Worley and all the participants at Crescenta Valley High School. I am confident there is no program anywhere in the Nation that is a better representative of the Air Force JROTC. I speak for all my constituents when I say, Job well done.

IF YOU WANT TO DESTROY ISIS, YOU MUST DESTROY BASHAR AL-ASSAD

(Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to speak today, but I just wanted to remind the American people, as I hear that the United States is about to enter talks with Russia over their presence in the Middle East, Russia is there for one reason. They are there to prop up a man named Bashar al-Assad, who has killed a quarter million of his own people.

Many of those people that Bashar al-Assad has killed include women and children. These children may look different or speak a different language, in some cases, than in the United States, but these are children with the same dreams as many American children. They may want to grow up to be police officers or teachers or doctors or pharmacists or work on the family farm and raise a family. These are young lives that have been snuffed out by the barrel bombs of this evil dictator.

As we wrestle with the failures in the Middle East and what to do with it, let me remind the American people that the choice is not between ISIS or Assad, but the choice is if you want to destroy ISIS, you must destroy Bashar al-Assad.

CONSTITUTION DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POLIQUIN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, we have talked about a lot this week. There has been a lot going on in Congress. We haven't gotten to spend much time recognizing that yesterday was Constitution Day, September 17, celebrating that summer in 1787 where they worked all summer long and all the way up until September 17 to craft this document that I would argue has preserved our freedoms for over 200 years. I want to talk about what I would argue is a national threat, a bipartisan threat to those principles embodied in that Constitution.

By way of background, Mr. Speaker, I want to put up a quote from James Madison. You can't see it from where you are, but James Madison says this:

The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands, whether of one, a few, or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, we talk a lot about tyranny in different governments around the globe. What James Madison says is we are not talking about one evil dictator.

Mr. KINZINGER was down here just a moment ago talking about how one evil dictator can change the entire makeup of regional peace and stability. James Madison portrays it even larger. He says it does not matter whether it

is one person or a few people or even many people. It does not matter whether it is hereditary or self-appointed or elective. When you have all of the power located in any one place, tyranny is the result.

We learn at an early age in our schools, Mr. Speaker, about separation of powers. We learn about checks and balances. We learn about the legislative branch on Capitol Hill, the Supreme Court right behind us, the executive branch headquartered at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, and the natural tension that is created within those branches.

John Adams said, Mr. Speaker:

A question arises whether all the powers of government, legislative, executive, and judicial, shall be left in this body.

They were struggling at that time trying to create our form of government. He says:

I think a people cannot long be free, nor ever happy, whose government is in one Assembly.

Constitution Day yesterday, Mr. Speaker, represents the culmination of all of the challenges, all of the thoughts, all of the prayers to spawn a new nation. But what they grappled with for the entirety of that summer was how to create a system that would prevent a return to tyranny.

The accumulation of all powers in the same hands, whether one, few, or many, whether hereditary, whether self-appointed, whether elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny.

James Madison.

I talk about that, Mr. Speaker, here, the day after Constitution Day, because this is something that I have seen come up over and over again in my lifetime in a bipartisan and a bicameral way.

So often we find ourselves talking about President Obama, Mr. Speaker, and I will certainly do that later on in this hour, but I want to begin by talking about President Bush. The headline I have here coming from The Washington Post, Mr. Speaker, says: "Bush's Tactic of Refusing Laws is Probed." The Washington Post says this:

The President is indicating that he will not either enforce part or the entirety of congressional bills, according to the ABA president, a Massachusetts attorney. "We will be close to a constitutional crisis," the ABA president says, "when the President of the United States' use of signing statements is left unchecked."

This is where you are signing a bill into law. We have all seen the "I am just a bill sitting here on Capitol Hill." We all know how laws are made. Congress deliberates, crafts, passes, sends to the President for his signature. Well, a signing statement is when you sign a bill into law and say: Oh, but by the way, this particular part of the law I don't recognize as being valid. Well, the veto pen gives you an opportunity to reject a law if you don't like it. A signing statement says: I like this part, and I am going to enforce it, but I don't like this part, and I am not.

Another headline, "Bush Challenges Hundreds of Laws":

President Bush has quietly claimed the authority to disobey more than 750 laws enacted since he took office, asserting that he has the power to set aside any statute passed by Congress when it conflicts with his interpretation of the Constitution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you and I were not in Congress during the Bush administration. You and I did not have an oversight role of the Bush administration, but I would tell you that Republicans and Democrats are each complicit in their own way in allowing the people's power, not the House's power, but the people's power to slowly drift down Pennsylvania Avenue, away from the people's representatives on Capitol Hill and into the hands of a Chief Executive.

This was going on during the Bush administration. This was a part of the national conversation during the Bush administration, but most Republicans remained silent. This is not a Republican or a Democratic issue. This is an American issue. This is a constitutional issue. If we are to prevent tyranny, we have to stand and be counted.

Mr. Speaker, Barack Obama was in Congress during the Bush administration. While you and I were not, Barack Obama was, and he says this in March of 2008:

I take the Constitution very seriously. The biggest problems that we are facing right now have to do with the President—then President Bush—

trying to bring more and more power into the executive branch and not go through Congress at all. And that is what I intend to reverse when I'm President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, that is almost laughable, as we sit here in September of 2015. The words of then-Senator, now-President Barack Obama:

I take the Constitution very seriously. The biggest problems that we are facing right now have to do with the President trying to bring more and more power into the executive branch and not go through Congress at all, and that's what I intend to reverse when I'm President of the United States.

May of that same year, Mr. Speaker, then Senator Obama, now President Obama says this:

We have got a government designed by the Founders so that there would be checks and balances. You don't want a President who is too powerful or a Congress who is too powerful or a court that is too powerful. Everybody's got their own role. Congress' job is to pass legislation. The President can veto it or he can sign it. I believe in the Constitution, and I will obey the Constitution of the United States. We are not going to use signing statements as a way of doing an end run around Congress.

When President Obama was Senator Obama, he saw separation of powers clearly; he saw the checks and balances clearly. On the campaign trail, while he was seeking to be the next President of the United States, he recognized the transgressions of the Bush administration, and he said:

Not on my watch, I will not follow in that path.

That was an election year, 2008. It seems laughable as we sit here in September of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, I take you to a press conference by President Obama in August of 2013. The Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, was in all the headlines. The President says this:

In a normal political environment, it would have been easier for me to simply call up the Speaker, then Speaker BOEHNER, and say, you know what, this is a tweak that doesn't go to the essence of the law—it has to do with, for example, are we able to simplify the attestation of employers to whether they're already providing health insurance or not.

Mr. Speaker, if you don't recall this press conference, the President, having just begun to implement the Affordable Care Act—remember, it was jammed through Congress, completely partisan vote, wasn't quite ready for prime time, but they lost the Senate election; they had to move through the unfinished product. As that bill is being implemented, obviously there are problems because it was not a conference bill. It was not a bill that had worked its way through the committee process. The President says: Well, ordinarily, when you are trying to fix these kind of problems, I would have just called up the Speaker. I would have said, Mr. Speaker, the law didn't work out quite the way we wanted it to. We need a few tweaks to make the law work.

The President continues. He says: It looks like there may be some better ways to do this, better ways than the way the law was drafted. Let's make a technical change to the law, the President says, what he would have asked for, had he called Speaker BOEHNER. The President says: That would be the normal thing that I would prefer to do, but we are not in a normal atmosphere around here when it comes to ObamaCare. We did have the executive authority to do so—by doing so, he means waiving parts of the Affordable Care Act—and we did so.

As candidate Obama, he saw clearly that the Bush administration was overstepping its bounds as the executive, failing to either veto a law or pass a law, failing to recognize the separation of powers, Mr. Speaker. The President recognized that when he was a United States Senator. He recognized that while he was on the campaign trail, but when he was sworn into the office of President of the United States of America, upholder and defender of the United States Constitution, he says:

What I would have liked to have done was follow the law. What I would have liked to have done was to contact the Speaker and try to change the law, but we are not in normal circumstances around here. So I just did it myself. I had the authority, and I did it myself.

Mr. Speaker, that was one press conference in August of 2013, but the list goes on. I am not having this conversation today to pick on the President of the United States, not this President of the United States in particular, but

something happens when you have all of the power and the responsibility that is vested in the White House—it happened to President Bush; it has happened to President Obama—where you say: I have all of this responsibility, and I am just going to do it. As long as the ends are correct, the means don't matter.

□ 1330

That is not okay. It is not okay for any of us, Republican or Democrat. You may like the way that goes today. As a Republican, we may have liked it when President Bush was doing it. As a Democrat, you might like it when President Obama is doing it.

But it is not the right way to run this country, and it is dangerous—dangerous—to the folks who actually hold the power, and that is each individual citizen of the United States.

I will use the Affordable Care Act, Mr. Speaker, as one minor example. The individual mandate delay said every American must go out and buy health insurance. Well, the plans weren't available.

Again, the law wasn't ready for prime time. We all knew it wasn't going to work. The President knew it wasn't going to work.

Congress introduced not one bill, not two bills, not three bills, but four different bills to fix the individual mandate. These were not Republican bills. These were bipartisan bills.

But the President, in the press conference that we talked about from August 2013, decided by himself to act unilaterally to change the law. It wasn't that Congress wouldn't do it. Congress wanted to do it.

The President said:

No. I don't want to work with Congress to do it. I am going to do it on my own.

He didn't just do it in October of 2013. He waived it again in March 2014 and again in February 2015, all on the one very specific section of the individual mandate.

We could have worked together. The Constitution requires that we work together. The Constitution requires that the law either be followed or be changed.

Changes of the law have to come through Congress, have to be signed by the President. In the case of Barack Obama, neither happened.

The employer mandate delay, Mr. Speaker, again, it is not that the House didn't want to deal with this issue. As you recall, the employers were not ready for this.

Again, this was not a fully baked idea. The White House knew this wasn't going to work. The Congress knew this wasn't going to work.

And so the House, of which I was a Member at that time, didn't just come up with a bill. We passed a bill. There wasn't just one bill.

There were three bills—House bills and Senate bills—to solve this problem that the White House knew existed, that Congress knew existed, and that the American people knew existed.

But the President didn't work with Congress. He went off and acted alone in July of 2013, waiving it once, and in February of 2014, waiving it again. Where is the outcry? Not the outcry over the policy, but the outcry over the process.

There are things that happen in this country, Mr. Speaker, that you and I may agree with the ends. But if the means are not the correct means, we have to stand up and say no.

Any American who works in manufacturing knows that, if you have a flawed process, you are going to produce a flawed product.

Process matters. It matters most when we are talking about protecting individual liberty. But Americans have become so frustrated, Mr. Speaker.

Americans have put that label on Washington, D.C., as either being inept or ineffective, intransigent, not able to work together, not able to move things forward. They have come to a place where they say the ends justify the means. It is a dangerous place to be.

Mr. Speaker, going back to the Affordable Care Act, "The renewal of noncompliant plans" is the headline I have here. I am sure you remember that from May, Mr. Speaker.

These were the plans that the President said are so bad, they are so damaging to American families, we have got to outlaw them. If you have one of these plans, we are going to outlaw these plans, because they are unworthy of Americans.

Well, when it actually came time for that part of the law to go into effect, it turns out there was a reason these plans existed: because folks couldn't afford more of an insurance policy than that. They needed these plans.

So what the President did is he said:

We know this isn't going to work. We know this part of the law is flawed. We have to fix it.

Congress said:

You are absolutely right.

House bill, Senate bill, bipartisan bills to solve the problem. The President acted alone, first in November of 2013, then in March of 2014, waiving the law, saying:

I advocated for this law. I signed this law. I made this language the law of the land. But now I don't like it. Rather than seeking a solution from Congress—which Congress had—I am going to act alone.

And, finally, on the Affordable Care Act, Mr. Speaker, the penalty waivers where you were going to be fined. If you didn't do what the law said you were supposed to do, you were going to be fined by the law. That wasn't going to work.

The system was not in place for Americans to follow the law. The paperwork trail, as you know, is amazingly burdensome. Folks could not comply with the law.

The White House knew it. The Congress knew it. The American people know it. That is why we had not one bill, not two bills, not three bills, but four bills, not just in the House, but in

the House and Senate, not just Republicans, but bipartisan bills to solve that problem.

But the President didn't work with the Congress. The President didn't call the Speaker. The President went and acted alone, first in January 2015, again in February 2015.

Mr. Speaker, I am not down here to argue about the results of what the President did. I supported this legislation to achieve all of the goals that the President achieved by acting alone. But the President cannot write the law. The Congress must write the law.

We, as the American people—not we, as the House of Representatives—we, as the American people, cannot support a President amassing all of that authority to do whatever that President likes alone.

Our Framers knew it. John Adams knew it. James Madison knew it. They worked throughout the summer of 1787 to prevent it from ever taking root here in America. If we fail to keep watch, it is going to be on our watch that those liberties slip away.

I will go back to President George Bush. Because it makes me sad, Mr. Speaker, that when we try to have a conversation where we are critical of the White House, it sounds like we are just picking on a President that is not of our party. Nonsense.

I am not saying that doesn't go on. Of course that goes on. I am just saying that is not where we are today. So I want to take it back to President Bush one more time.

President Bush worked on immigration reform. Goodness knows we need immigration reform. I support immigration reform. We have a system that is broken.

Folks who need to get here can't get here. Folks who shouldn't be here are able to get here. Anyway, it is a problem and challenge that America has been facing not just this year, not last year, but for decades.

President Bush said this:

Legal immigration is one of the top concerns of the American people. And Congress' failure to act on it is a disappointment.

The American people understand the status quo is unacceptable when it comes to our immigration laws. A lot of us worked hard to see if we couldn't find common ground, but it didn't work.

President Bush, wanting to achieve immigration reform, chastised Congress for not acting on immigration reform, championing the cause, asking for Congress to do more, but understanding what his limitations are.

President Obama, March 2011:

With respect to the notion that I can just suspend deportations through an executive order, that is just not the case, because there are laws on the books that Congress has.

In March of 2011, when asked about deportations and what is going on with immigration law and why won't Congress move forward, the President says:

The notion that I can just suspend deportations just isn't the case because there are laws that govern deportations.

President Obama, October 2010:

I am President. I am not king. I can't do these things just by myself. We have a system of government that requires the Congress to work with the executive branch to make it happen.

Mr. Speaker, these are the words of President Obama shortly after he became President. These are the sentiments of President Obama echoing the sentiments of then-Senator Obama when he said there is a way that this government is supposed to run and it takes all three branches to make it happen. Nobody can do it alone.

President Obama, May 2010:

Comprehensive reform. That is how we are going to solve this problem. Anybody who tells you it is going to be easy or that I can just waive a magic wand and make it happen hasn't been paying attention to how this town works.

He knows that it has to be a collaborative effort in order to change the law.

July 2010, President Obama:

There are those in the immigrants' rights community who have argued passionately that we should simply provide those who are here illegally with legal status or at least ignore the laws on the books and put an end to deportations until we have better laws.

That is what folks were asking of President Obama:

Can't you just ignore the laws? If you can't ignore the laws, won't you just put deportations on hold?

The President responded with this:

I believe that such an indiscriminate approach would be both unwise and unfair. It would suggest to those thinking about coming here illegally that there will be no repercussions for such a decision, and this could lead to a surge in more illegal immigration.

Did you see that was a little different conversation than what the President was talking about a little earlier?

Statement after statement, speech after speech, conversation after conversation, the President said:

No, I can't do this because it is against the law. No, I can't do this because the Constitution doesn't give me these powers. No, I can't do this because that is not what a President in the United States of America is allowed to do.

But then the conversation begins to change. What I just read to you, Mr. Speaker, was a quote about policy:

Well, I just don't think it is a good idea to do it.

It is not it is illegal, not it is unconstitutional to do it.

I just don't think it is a good idea to do it.

Mr. Speaker, fast-forward to November of last year. The President talked about his unilateral actions to suspend deportations, exactly as he said years earlier he was not allowed to do under the law.

He says this:

The actions I'm taking are not only lawful, they're the kinds of actions taken by every single Republican President, every single Democratic President of the past half-century.

And to those Members of Congress who question my authority to make our immigration system work better or question the

wisdom of me acting where Congress has failed, I have one answer: Pass a bill.

I want to work with both parties to pass a more permanent legislative solution. And the day I sign that bill into law, the actions I take today will no longer be necessary.

That is pretty powerful, Mr. Speaker.

I wanted Congress to do what I wanted Congress to do, but they didn't. It didn't. So I'm going to do it myself. I have said that I couldn't. I said it was illegal to do. But I have rethought it. I now think it is perfectly legal to do, and I'm going to do it. But good news, Congress, good news, American people. As soon as Congress does do what I want it to do, I'm going to stop doing what I'm not allowed to do.

Where was the outcry? Not the outcry over the policy, Mr. Speaker. The outcry over the process. We heard the outcry from Democrats when President Bush was overreaching. We heard the outcry from Republicans as President Obama has been overreaching.

But where is the outcry from America that says:

You know what? There might just be some wisdom in what John Adams and James Madison had to say. You know what? There might just be some merit to this whole separation of powers, checks and balances idea. You know what? Perhaps the ends don't justify the means. Let's stick with constitutional authority.

Mr. Speaker, this is not just a congressional or an executive branch issue. I quote Jonathan Turley, law professor, one of the eminent constitutional scholars of our time.

He says this:

Our government requires consent and compromise to function. It goes without saying that, when we are politically divided as a Nation, less tends to get done.

I don't believe that shocks you, Mr. Speaker. It certainly doesn't shock me.

However, such division is no license to go it alone, as President Obama has suggested. You have only two choices in our system when facing political adversaries. You can either seek to convince them or you can replace them.

That is pretty powerful. As we talked about Constitution Day yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that is pretty powerful.

When we disagree in this country, we have two options. We can either change one another's minds or we can replace the people that we put in authority to make those decisions.

Jonathan Turley continues:

This is obviously frustrating for our Presidents and their supporters who want to see real change and to transcend gridlock. However, there is nothing noble in circumventing the Constitution. The claim of any one person that they can get the job done unilaterally is the very siren's call that our Framers warned us to resist.

□ 1345

The very notion that anyone can get the job done alone, Mr. Speaker, is the siren's call that our framers warned us to respect. Jonathan Turley continues:

It is certainly true that the Framers expected much from us, but no more than they demanded from themselves.

Mr. Speaker, this was November of 2014, when the President did his last

round of unilateral immigration changes. Headline of the Washington Post, "President Obama's Unilateral Action on Immigration Has No Precedent." February of this year, headline, "Federal Judge Blocks Obama's Executive Actions on Immigration."

These aren't issues for the courts, Mr. Speaker. If Congress passes a law and the President signs a law and that law is unconstitutional, that is the issue for the courts. The issue of whether or not we want Presidents to be able to amass all the power so that they can get the job done alone is not an issue for the courts. It is an issue for every single one of us as citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I went through the Affordable Care Act. I went through immigration. It is not like the list is short.

Climate change, do you remember the climate change bill when Democrats had complete control of the U.S. House and the United States Senate and the White House the first 2 years of President Obama's first term? They worked and worked and worked and worked to pass a climate change bill. They couldn't do it. It was rejected in a bipartisan way on Capitol Hill.

Headline from the Washington Post, last month, August, 2015, "What You Need to Know About Obama's Biggest Global Warming Move Yet, His Clean Power Plan." This is an editorial from Laurence Tribe, another constitutional law professor recognized by absolutely everyone on both sides of the aisle for his knowledge. I would tell you he is not a particularly conservative law professor. I would tell you that he stands with my liberal friends more often than he stands with my conservative friends.

But he is not talking about liberalism. He is not talking about conservatism. He is not talking about public policy. He is talking about constitutional law, and he says this:

As a law professor, I taught the Nation's first environmental law class 45 years ago; and as a lawyer, I have supported countless environmental causes. And as a father and grandfather, I want to leave the Earth in better shape than when I arrived.

All of his policy goals support the environment, support those causes—want to leave the Earth in better shape than I found it. He says:

Nonetheless, I recently filed comments with the Environmental Protection Agency urging the Agency to withdraw its Clean Power Plan, a regulatory proposal to reduce carbon emissions from the Nation's electric power plants. In my view, coping with climate change is a vital end.

Hear that. In his view, solving the problem that the President aims to solve is a vital end.

Laurence Tribe continues:

But it does not justify using unconstitutional means.

Mr. Speaker, I don't admire the men and women in this Chamber who rise to their feet to cheer the causes that they support. I admire the men and women

in this Chamber who do the right thing, even when it is hard to do so.

I admire the men and women who stand up to their party leadership when it is hard to do so. I admire the men and women who put their obligation to their constituents above their obligation to party, who put their obligation to the Constitution above their passions for the direction of public policy.

Taught the first environmental law class 45 years ago. Coping with climate change is a vital end, but it does not justify using unconstitutional means.

I go on, Laurence Tribe:

Even more fundamentally, the EPA, like every administrative agency, is constitutionally forbidden to exercise powers Congress never delegated in the first place.

The brute fact is that the Obama administration failed to get climate legislation through Congress, yet the EPA is acting as though it has the legislative authority to reengineer the Nation's electric generating system and power grid. It does not.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to have this case litigated, and nine men and women in black robes across the street are going to decide this issue. And we know how they are going to decide this issue.

My fear is not that we are not going to get the right decision. We are. This isn't our first rodeo here, Mr. Speaker. Remember the recess appointments from January 2012, where the President stood, and he was giving a speech in a high school in Ohio. He was giving a speech to high school students, and he went and he told the tale, Mr. Speaker, of how there was gridlock in Washington, D.C. He told the tale of how he wanted to get the people's business done and how Congress was standing in the way.

Every time he spoke up and talked about how there was gridlock in Congress, there were boos in the crowd. Every time he spoke up and said, "But don't worry, I'm going to go it alone," there was applause throughout the crowd.

Our students who are studying constitutional principles today, our students who are being trained to be that next generation of leader, that citizen who sits on the board of directors of the United States of America, 330 million of us, stood and applauded when the President said Congress won't do it, so I will do it without them.

He was applauded by Democrats, Mr. Speaker. He was criticized by Republicans. He went right ahead and did what he said he would do. He brought out a legal memorandum that still sits on the Justice Department Web site outlining why it was absolutely permissible to do what he was doing, even though the Constitution clearly said it was not.

That case made its way through the Supreme Court, Mr. Speaker. It was the *NLRB v. Noel Canning* case, and it was decided 9-0.

If you were a Supreme Court Justice appointed by President Reagan, you

told President Obama that he was violating the law. If you were a Supreme Court Justice appointed by President Clinton, you told President Obama he was violating the law. It does not matter whether you were a Clinton, Reagan, Bush, or even Obama appointee, nominee to the Supreme Court. Every single one of them agreed that the President overstepped his bounds.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is: You remember that spring of 2012, but how many American citizens do, those cheering high school students in Ohio, that campaign stop at a high school auditorium to say, I'm going to go it alone. Do they remember when nine Supreme Court Justices said: No, you won't; no, you won't.

Where does it stop, Mr. Speaker?

Congress says: No, you won't. Congress says: This is our responsibility. The President says: You are not getting it done my way; I'm going to go it alone. So it goes to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court says, unanimously: No, Mr. President, you are not going to go it alone.

It is only one short step between the executive branch ignoring the coequal branch of the government that is the legislature and the executive branch ignoring the coequal branch of government that is the Federal courts.

That burden lies on us, Mr. Speaker. It is not a Republican burden or a Democratic burden. It is an American burden.

I signed up to be on the Oversight Committee, Mr. Speaker. You know the Oversight Committee here on Capitol Hill. It has jurisdiction over absolutely everything, and its job is to make sure the executive branch is doing what the executive branch is supposed to do.

I signed up to be on the Oversight Committee because I thought Mitt Romney was going to win the last election, and I wanted to be the guy who said to the next Republican President: No, Mr. President, you can't do that. We are Article I of the Constitution; you are Article II of the Constitution. There is a process here, and process matters.

Well, Mitt Romney didn't win that election, so we are doing oversight over the Obama administration; and every single legitimate issue the Oversight Committee took up, headlines in the papers about just political hacks going after their political opposition. It is not true, and it is too important to dismiss in that way.

James Madison, Mr. Speaker:

The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands, whether of one or few or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny.

This President has just over a year left in the White House, Mr. Speaker. I am not here to talk about President Obama. I am here to talk about our responsibility as 435 Members of the

House. I am here to talk about America's responsibility as 330 million individual members of America's board of directors.

Does process matter or do the ends justify the means? Hold Republicans accountable for not standing up to President Bush. Hold Democrats accountable for not standing up to President Obama. Hold your friends and your neighbors and your coworkers accountable if you hear them say the ends justify the means.

We can only imagine how dangerous these times were. We can only imagine the summer of 1787 as the entire future of the Republic hung in the balance. We can only imagine 1776 when we were declaring our freedom from the world's largest superpower. We can only imagine what it meant to sign our name on a document pledging our lives, our fortunes, and our families' lives to the cause.

And as they grappled with those decisions in 1776, in 1787, they knew one thing with certainty: having all of the power accumulate anywhere, with anyone, was a threat to individual liberties and freedoms.

The President disagrees with me on a lot of public policy, and I welcome him to come down here to Congress and advocate for it; and if you get the votes in this body and you get the votes across the way and you beat me on public policy, fair and square. That is the way it is supposed to be. But when any one of us decides that our priorities, our policy preferences, are so important that the Constitution takes a backseat, we are not long for this form of government, this greatest experiment the world has ever known in self-governance.

It is easy to talk about health care, Mr. Speaker. It is easy to talk about environmental policy. It is easy to talk about water policy. The list goes on and on and on. What is hard is changing that policy, and it is deliberately so. It is deliberately so.

As the Courts have taken these challenges on, Mr. Speaker, 9-0, reining in the President from his overreach. And in that 9-0 case, Noel Canning, just 2 years ago, the Supreme Court said this:

The recess appointments clause—that was what they were arguing about at the time—is not designed to overcome serious institutional friction. It simply provides a subsidiary method for appointing officials when the Senate is away during a recess.

Here, as in other contexts, global warming, health care, water policy, on and on and on, here, as in other contexts, friction between the branches is an inevitable consequence of our constitutional structure.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge you to go home to your constituents, as townhall meeting after townhall meeting after townhall meeting talks about the gridlock in Washington, D.C. Friction between the branches is an inevitable consequence of our constitutional structure. We must celebrate that friction, Mr. Speaker.

We have two ways to change policy in this country: You can either change your neighbor's mind, or you can replace your delegate to office. Changing minds and changing people are the only two methods we have in this country. It is the consequence of our constitutional structure.

I do not fear gridlock. I am not concerned that we cannot find a pathway forward. I do fear one man, one group, one party having all of the control.

□ 1415

I do fear folks short-circuiting a process that our Founders put in place to keep us safe for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you will join me, as Constitution Day has just passed, in celebrating the wisdom in that summer of 1787 and committing ourselves—Republicans and Democrats alike, House Members and Senate Members alike—to ensuring that policy does not trump process, to ensure that we get to where all of America wants us to be, but that we get there the right way, not just because it matters, but because that is what the Constitution and the law requires.

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

BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RATCLIFFE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I have a special guest with me tonight, my son Joshua, who was allowed the privileges of the floor. He has given me a speech tonight, and I appreciate it very much.

Mr. Speaker, the United States of America is an exceptional Nation whose unique core premise is that declared conviction that we are all created equal and that each of us is endowed by our Creator with the unalienable right to live.

Abraham Lincoln called upon all of us in this Chamber and beyond to remember those words of the Founding Fathers and "their enlightened belief that nothing stamped with the divine image and likeness was sent into the world to be trodden on or degraded and imbruted by its fellows."

He reminded those he called posterity that "when in the distant future some man, some factions, some interests should set up a doctrine that some were not entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that 'their posterity'—that is us, Mr. Speaker—"that their posterity might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began."

Mr. Speaker, the sincerest purpose of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act that we voted on today is to renew that noble battle, to respect

and protect those little fellow human beings among us who are at this moment being trodden on and degraded and imbruted by their fellows.

Not long ago, in the land of the free and the home of the brave, authorities entered the clinic of Dr. Kermit Gosnell and found a torture chamber for little born-alive babies that defies description within the constraints of the English language.

The grand jury report at the time said, "Dr. Kermit Gosnell had a simple solution for unwanted babies: he killed them. He didn't call it that. He called it 'ensuring fetal demise.' The way he ensured fetal demise was by sticking scissors in the back of the baby's neck and cutting the spinal cord. He called it 'snipping.' Over the years, there were hundreds of 'snippings.'"

Ashley Baldwin, one of Dr. Gosnell's employees, said she saw babies breathing and that she described one as 2 feet long that no longer had eyes or a mouth, but, in her words, was making like this "screeching" noise and that it "sounded like a little alien."

Now, in recent days, Mr. Speaker, numerous video recordings have been released that demonstrate to the world that Kermit Gosnell is just the tip of the iceberg of the abortion industry's unspeakable cruelty to these little babies.

The veil has now been pulled back, Mr. Speaker, and all of us now see behind the walls of the abortion industry and the horrifying plight of its little human victims who, we must not forget, are also the least of these, our little brothers and sisters.

Our response, as a people and a nation, to these horrors shown in these videos is vital to everything those lying out in Arlington National Cemetery died to save.

Before any Senator, Mr. Speaker, decides to join a Democrat filibuster in the Senate against legislation that would protect little born-alive human babies, I hope they ask of themselves one question in the core of their own souls: Is filibustering against a bill to protect born-alive human babies from a torturous death at the hands of monsters like Kermit Gosnell who I truly am?

Now, I know that legislation like this has been attacked by President Obama and even others because of the many obvious similarities these born-alive children have with late-term, pain-capable, unborn children.

Mr. Speaker, this was an unborn child, but she was born alive and she survived. As hard as it is to consider that that could happen, she did.

President Obama explained his reasons for voting four times—Mr. Speaker, let me say that again. President Obama explained his reasons for voting four times against the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, which would have protected children born alive.

He was afraid it might give born-alive babies personhood under the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment.

He said:

It would essentially bar abortions because the Equal Protection Clause does not allow somebody to kill a child. And if this is a child, then this would be an antiabortion statute.

It is impossible to deny that President Obama had a very sad and ironic, if also completely merciless, point.

Indeed, it does require enormous deliberate self-deception to say that those who deliberately kill a child who is born alive after 5 months of pregnancy are guilty of murder and deserve prison, but those who deliberately kill the same exact pain-capable child at the same exact age and development, but are not yet born—those individuals are merely furthering freedom of choice and should actually get paid for doing it.

But it still bears repeating, Mr. Speaker. The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act that we voted on today and passed out of this Chamber protects little children who have been born alive.

No matter how blind opponents try to make themselves or convince others to be, no one can truly obscure the humanity and personhood of these little born-alive children of God, nor can they take refuge within the schizophrenic paradox *Roe v. Wade* to which this country has been subjected for now more than 40 years.

The abortion industry has labored for all these decades to convince the world that born children and unborn children should be completely separated in our minds, that while born children are persons worthy of protection, unborn children, on the other hand, are not persons and are not worthy of protection.

But, Mr. Speaker, those who oppose this bill today or those who might oppose it in the Senate that protects born-alive children now have the impossible task of trying to rejoin born children and unborn children back together again and then trying to convince us all that to condemn them both as inhuman and not worthy of protection after all is the thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, to anyone who has not invincibly hardened their heart and soul to this absurd inconsistency, there is an opportunity for a profoundly enlightening moment because, you see, Mr. Speaker, this country has faced such paradox and self-imposed blindness and heartlessness before.

There was a time that our own House rules banned any discussion or debate in this Chamber about the effort to end human slavery in America. But, Mr. Speaker, that debate did come.

And with it came a time when the humanity of the victims and the inhumanity of what was being done to them became so glaring that even the hardest of hearts began to see the truth, and it moved an entire generation of people to find the compassion and the courage within their own souls to change their position. And now to this generation, Mr. Speaker, that time has come again.

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

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2015, TO TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2015; AND ADJOURNMENT FROM TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2015, TO THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 2015

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourns to meet at 4 p.m. on Tuesday, September 22, 2015; and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 8:30 a.m. on Thursday, September 24, 2015.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FORTENBERRY (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of attending a family funeral.

Mr. HASTINGS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today for the second and third vote.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. THORNBERRY, on Thursday, September 17, 2015:

H.R. 23. An act to reauthorize the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker pro tempore, Mr. THORNBERRY, on Wednesday, September 16, 2015, announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 230. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation located in Bethel, Alaska.

S. 501. An act to make technical corrections to the Navajo water rights settlement in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 22, 2015, at 4 p.m.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Ralph Lee Abraham, Alma S. Adams, Robert B. Aderholt, Pete Aguilar, Rick W. Allen, Justin Amash, Mark E. Amodei, Brad Ashford, Brian Babin, Lou Barletta, Andy Barr, Joe Barton, Karen Bass, Joyce Beatty, Xavier Becerra, Dan Benishek, Ami Bera, Donald S. Beyer, Jr., Gus M. Bilirakis, Mike Bishop, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Diane Black, Marsha Blackburn, Rod Blum, Earl Blumenauer, John A. Boehner, Suzanne Bonamici, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Mike Bost, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Brendan F. Boyle, Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Dave Brat, Jim Bridenstine, Mo Brooks, Susan W. Brooks, Corrine Brown, Julia Brownley, Vern Buchanan, Ken Buck, Larry Bucshon, Michael C. Burgess, Cheri Bustos, G. K. Butterfield, Bradley Byrne, Ken Calvert, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Tony Cardenas, John C. Carney, Jr., André Carson, Earl L. "Buddy" Carter, John R. Carter, Matt Cartwright, Kathy Castor, Joaquin Castro, Steve Chabot, Jason Chaffetz, Judy Chu, David N. Cicilline, Katherine M. Clark, Yvette D. Clarke, Curt Clawson, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Mike Coffman, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, Chris Collins, Doug Collins, Barbara Comstock, K. Michael Conaway, Gerald E. Connolly, John Conyers, Jr., Paul Cook, Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Ryan A. Costello, Joe Courtney, Kevin Cramer, Eric A. "Rick" Crawford, Ander Crenshaw, Joseph Crowley, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Carlos Curbelo, Danny K. Davis, Rodney Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, John K. Delaney, Rosa L. DeLauro, Suzan K. DelBene, Jeff Denham, Charles W. Dent, Ron DeSantis, Mark DeSaulnier, Scott DesJarlais, Theodore E. Deutch, Mario Diaz-Balart, Debbie Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Robert J. Dold, Daniel M. Donovan, Jr., Michael F. Doyle, Tammy Duckworth, Sean P. Duffy, Jeff Duncan, John J. Duncan, Jr., Donna F. Edwards, Keith Ellison, Renee L. Ellmers, Tom Emmer, Eliot L. Engel, Anna G. Eshoo, Elizabeth H. Esty, Blake Farenthold, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Stephen Lee Fincher, Michael G. Fitzpatrick, Charles J. "Chuck" Fleischmann, John Fleming, Bill Flores, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Bill Foster, Virginia Foxx, Lois Frankel, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Marcia L. Fudge, Tulsi Gabbard, Ruben Gallego, John Garamendi, Scott Garrett, Bob Gibbs, Christopher P. Gibson, Louie Gohmert, Bob Goodlatte, Paul A. Gosar, Trey Gowdy, Gwen Graham, Kay Granger, Garret Graves, Sam Graves, Tom Graves, Alan Grayson, Al Green, Gene Green, H. Morgan Griffith, Raúl M. Grijalva, Glenn Grothman, Frank C. Guinta, Brett Guthrie, Luis V. Gutiérrez, Janice Hahn, Richard L. Hanna, Cresent Hardy, Gregg Harper, Andy Harris, Vicky Hartzler, Alcee L. Hastings, Denny Heck, Joseph J. Heck, Jeb Hensarling, Jaime Herrera Beutler, Jody B. Hice, Brian Higgins, J. French Hill, James A. Himes, Rubén Hinojosa, George Holding, Michael M. Honda, Steny H. Hoyer, Richard Hudson, Tim Huelskamp, Jared Huffman, Bill Huizenga, Randy Hultgren, Duncan Hunter, Will Hurd, Robert Hurt, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Sheila Jackson Lee, Hakeem S. Jeffries, Evan H. Jenkins, Lynn Jenkins, Bill Johnson, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. "Hank" Johnson, Jr., Sam Johnson, David W. Jolly, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, David P. Joyce, Marcy Kaptur, John Katko, William R. Keating, Mike Kelly, Robin L. Kelly, Trent Kelly, Joseph P. Kennedy III, Daniel T. Kildee, Derek Kilmer, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Adam Kinzinger, Ann Kirkpatrick, John Kline, Stephen Knight, Ann M. Kuster, Raúl R. Labrador, Darin LaHood, Doug LaMalfa, Doug Lamborn, Leonard Lance, James R. Langevin, Rick

Larsen, John B. Larson, Robert E. Latta, Brenda L. Lawrence, Barbara Lee, Sander M. Levin, John Lewis, Ted Lieu, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Billy Long, Barry Loudermilk, Mia B. Love, Alan S. Lowenthal, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Ben Ray Lujan, Michelle Lujan Grisham, Cynthia M. Lummis, Stephen F. Lynch, Thomas MacArthur, Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean Patrick Maloney, Kenny Marchant, Tom Marino, Thomas Massie, Doris O. Matsui, Kevin McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Tom McClintock, Betty McCollum, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, David B. McKinley, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNeerney, Martha McSally, Mark Meadows, Patrick Meehan, Gregory W. Meeks, Grace Meng, Luke Messer, John L. Mica, Candice S. Miller, Jeff Miller, John R. Moolenaar, Alexander X. Mooney, Gwen Moore, Seth Moulton, Markwayne Mullin, Mick Mulvaney, Patrick Murphy, Tim Murphy, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Randy Neugebauer, Dan Newhouse, Kristi L. Noem, Richard M. Nolan, Donald Norcross, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Richard B. Nugent, Devin Nunes, Alan Nunnelee*, Pete Olson, Beto O'Rourke, Steven M. Palazzo, Frank Pallone, Jr., Gary J. Palmer, Bill Pascrell, Jr., Erik Paulsen, Donald M. Payne, Jr., Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Ed Perlmutter, Scott Perry, Scott H. Peters, Collin C. Peterson, Pedro R. Pierluisi, Chellie Pingree, Robert Pittenger, Joseph R. Pitts, Stacey E. Plaskett, Mark Pocan, Ted Poe, Bruce Poliquin, Jared Polis, Mike Pompeo, Bill Posey, David E. Price, Tom Price, Mike Quigley, Amata Coleman Radewagen, Charles B. Rangel, John Ratcliffe, Tom Reed, David G. Reichert, James B. Renacci, Reid J. Ribble, Kathleen M. Rice, Tom Rice, Cedric L. Richmond, E. Scott Rigell, Martha Roby, David P. Roe, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Todd Rokita, Thomas J. Rooney, Peter J. Roskam, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Dennis A. Ross, Keith J. Rothfus, David Rouzer, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, Raul Ruiz, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Steve Russell, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Matt Salmon, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, Mark Sanford, John P. Sarbanes, Steve Scalise, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Aaron Schock*, Kurt Schrader, David Schweikert, Austin Scott, David Scott, Robert C. "Bobby" Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Terri A. Sewell, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Kyrsten Sinema, Albio Sires, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Jason Smith, Lamar Smith, Jackie Speier, Elise M. Stefanik, Chris Stewart, Steve Stivers, Marlin A. Stutzman, Eric Swalwell, Mark Takai, Mark Takano, Bennie G. Thompson, Glenn Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Patrick J. Tiberi, Scott R. Tipton, Dina Titus, Paul Tonko, Norma J. Torres, David A. Trotter, Niki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Fred Upton, David G. Valadao, Chris Van Hollen, Juan Vargas, Marc A. Veasey, Filemon Vela, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Ann Wagner, Tim Walberg, Greg Walden, Mark Walker, Jackie Walorski, Mimi Walters, Timothy J. Walz, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Bonnie Watson Coleman, Randy K. Weber, Sr., Daniel Webster, Peter Welch, Brad R. Wenstrup, Bruce Westerman, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Ed Whitfield, Roger Williams, Frederica S. Wilson, Joe Wilson, Robert J. Wittman, Steve Womack, Rob Woodall, John A. Yarmuth, Kevin Yoder, Ted S. Yoho, David Young, Don Young, Todd C. Young, Lee M. Zeldin, Ryan K. Zinke

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2843. A letter from the Director, Budget and Performance Management, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's proposed rule — Changes to Fees and Payment Methods (RIN: 0518-AA05) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2844. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing ten United States Marine Corps officers to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, as indicated, in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2845. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations (Clay County, MO, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2015-0001] received September 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2846. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Removal of Certain References to Credit Ratings and Amendment to the Issuer Diversification Requirement in the Money Market Fund Rule [Release No.: IC-31828; File No.: S7-07-11] (RIN: 3235-AL02) received September 17, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2847. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Missouri; Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration (CISWI) Units [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0514; FRL-9933-97-Region 7] received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2848. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Missouri; Sewage Sludge Incinerators [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0543; FRL-9933-95-Region 7] received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2849. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revision to Control Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Storage Tanks and Transport Vessels [EPA-R06-OAR-2011-0079; FRL-9932-51-Region 6] received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2850. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluensulfone; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0375; FRL-9933-02] received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-

121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2851. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Halosulfuron-methyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0574; FRL-9933-00] received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2852. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a notification that the national emergency declared with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism, declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, is to continue in effect beyond September 23, 2015, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2853. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a semi-annual report detailing telecommunications-related payments made to Cuba pursuant to Department of the Treasury licenses during the period from January 1 through June 30, 2015, as required by Sec. 1705(e)(6) of the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992, as amended by Sec. 102(g) of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996, 22 U.S.C. 6004(e)(6), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2854. A letter from the Director, Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Government Contractors, Prohibitions Against Pay Secrecy Policies and Actions (RIN: 1250-AA06) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2855. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's modification of fishing seasons — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions #14 and #15 [Docket No.: 150316270-5270-01] (RIN: 0648-XE054) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2856. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 141021887-5172-02] (RIN: 0648-XE139) received September 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2857. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2015-2016 Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments [Docket No.: 140904754-5188-02] (RIN: 0648-BF27) received September 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2858. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's modification of fishing seasons — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial, Recreational, and Treaty Indian Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions #16

Through #21 [Docket No.: 150316270-5270-01] (RIN: 0648-XE11) received September 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2859. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2015 Recreational Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Hogfish [Docket No.: 120403249-2492-02] (RIN: 0648-XE088) received September 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2860. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's modification of fishing seasons — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions #7 through #13 [Docket No.: 150316270-5270-01] (RIN: 0648-XE020) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2861. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2015 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for Gulf of Mexico Greater Amberjack [Docket No.: 1206013412-2517-02] (RIN: 0648-XE028) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2862. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Possession Limit Adjustments for the Common Pool Fishery [Docket No.: 150105004-5355-01] (RIN: 0648-XD984) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2863. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Kamchatka Flounder in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 141021887-5172-02] (RIN: 0648-XD974) received September 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2864. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Security Zone, Seward, AK [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0800] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2865. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulations; Marine Events held in the Sector Long Island Sound Captain of the Port Zone — Correction [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0705] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2866. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Ocean Dumping: Modification of Final Site Designation [EPA-R06-OW-2015-0121; FRL-9934-25-Region 6] received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2867. A letter from the Chief Impact Analyst, Regulation Policy and Management Staff, Office of the General Counsel (O2REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Copayments for Medications in 2015 (RIN: 2900-AP15) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2868. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Bureau of the Fiscal Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Offset of Tax Refund Payments to Collect Certain Debts Owed to States (RIN: 1530-AA02) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2869. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations — Determination of Minimum Required Pension Contributions [TD 9732] (RIN: 1545-BH71) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2870. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Update to procedures for entering into a FET closing agreement based on provisions of an income tax treaty (Rev. Proc. 2015-46) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2871. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Procedures for Requesting a Waiver of the Electronic Filing Requirements for Form 8955-SSA and Form 5500-EZ (Rev. Proc. 2015-47) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2872. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final and temporary regulations — Clarification of the Coordination of the Transfer Pricing Rules with Other Code Provisions [TD 9738] (RIN: 1545-BM72) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2873. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — No-Rule on Certain Section 355 Transactions (Rev. Proc. 2015-43) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2874. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Revenue Procedure Applying the Controlled Group Rules to Certain Fund of Funds (Rev. Proc. 2015-45) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2875. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue

Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Companion Notice to Rev. Proc. 2015-43 Announcing Issues Under Study and Requesting Comments [Notice 2015-59] received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2876. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations — Controlled Group Regulation Examples [TD 9737] (RIN: 1545-BK96) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2877. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Disclosure of Information for Certain Intellectual Property Rights Enforced at the Border [Docket No.: USCBP-2012-0011] (RIN: 1515-AD87) received September 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2878. A letter from the Chairman and Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's budget request for fiscal year 2017, in accordance with Sec. 7(f) of the Railroad Retirement Act; jointly to the Committees on Appropriations, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means.

2879. A letter from the Chair, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's fiscal year Office of Management and Budget 2017 budget request, pursuant to 52 U.S.C. 30107(d); jointly to the Committees on House Administration, Appropriations, and Oversight and Government Reform.

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. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. S. 136. An act to amend chapter 21 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that fathers of certain permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be included with mothers of such veterans as preference eligibles for treatment in the civil service (Rept. 114-263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 3089. A bill to close out expired grants, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-264). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 692. A bill to ensure the payment of interest and principal of the debt of the United States (Rept. 114-265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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. GRIJALVA (for himself, Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. NORCROSS):

H.R. 3556. A bill to prepare the National Park Service for its Centennial in 2016 and for a second century of protecting our national parks' natural, historic, and cultural resources for present and future generations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Education and the Workforce, 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. GARRETT (for himself and Mr. HURT of Virginia):

H.R. 3557. A bill to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to require the Financial Stability Oversight Council to hold open meetings and comply with the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, to provide additional improvements to the Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 3558. A bill to provide for the issuance of a forever stamp to honor the sacrifices of the brave men and women of the Armed Forces who are still prisoner, missing, or unaccounted for, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 3559. A bill to establish minimum standards of disclosure by franchises whose franchisees use loans guaranteed by the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 3560. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land to Washington County, Utah, to authorize the exchange of Federal land and non-Federal land in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3561. A bill to amend the section 484(r) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to exclude certain marijuana-related offenses from the drug-related offenses that result in students being barred from receiving Federal educational loans, grants, and work assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 3562. A bill to prohibit the pay of Members of Congress during periods in which a Government shutdown is in effect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. MASSIE (for himself, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. JONES, Mr. BRAT, Mr. POLIS, Mr. AMASH, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 3563. A bill to authorize the interstate traffic of unpasteurized milk and milk products that are packaged for direct human consumption; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. JONES, Mr. BRAT, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 3564. A bill to prohibit Federal interference with the interstate traffic of unpasteurized milk and milk products that

are packaged for direct human consumption; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 3565. A bill to expand the boundary of the California Coastal National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. BARLETTA, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. KING of Iowa):

H.R. 3566. A bill to prohibit an alien who is not in a lawful immigration status in the United States from being eligible for post-secondary education benefits that are not available to all citizens and nationals of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. BRAT (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 3567. A bill to repeal the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 3568. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the authority of the Internal Revenue Service to require truncated social security numbers on Form W-2 wage and tax statements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLEGO (for himself, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 3569. A bill to require the Attorney General to establish a "Good Neighbor" code of conduct for federally licensed firearms dealers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 3570. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for education in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 3571. A bill to extend and modify certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 relating to fuel cells and hydrogen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 3572. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reform, streamline, and make improvements to the Department of Homeland Security and support the Department's efforts to implement better policy, planning, management, and performance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself and Mr. BABIN):

H.R. 3573. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to require the enactment into law of a joint resolution approving the number of refugees who may be admitted in any fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 3574. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage hiring unem-

ployed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself and Mr. RENACCI):

H.R. 3575. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny tax exemption to organizations which violate the Federal prohibitions regarding human fetal tissue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 3576. A bill to increase transparency, accountability, and community engagement within U.S. Customs and Border Protection, provide independent oversight of border security activities, improve training for U.S. Customs and Border Protection agents and officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and 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. PETERS (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 3577. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the printing and distribution of paper copies of Congressional documents; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE (for himself and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 3578. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to strengthen and make improvements to the Directorate of Science and Technology of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 3579. A bill to amend section 5542 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that any hours worked by Federal firefighters under a qualified trade-of-time arrangement shall be excluded for purposes of determinations relating to overtime pay; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 3580. A bill to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a continuing medical education program for non-Department medical professionals who treat veterans and family members of veterans to increase knowledge and recognition of medical conditions common to veterans and family members of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 3581. A bill to require full funding of part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 3582. A bill to support the development, implementation, and evaluation of innovative strategies and methods to increase out-of-school access to digital learning resources for eligible students in order to increase student and educator engagement; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. FORBES):

H. Con. Res. 78. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President in consultation with the Department of the Treasury should apply economic sanctions against Chinese businesses and state-owned enterprises that can be linked to cyberattacks against United States entities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLEMING (for himself, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. CULBERSON):

H. Res. 430. A resolution calling upon the President to declare a National Day of Prayer to end targeted violence against law enforcement officers and schedule appropriate public events in support of such a day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. BURGESS):

H. Res. 431. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives in disapproval of the Senate's modern filibuster rule; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H. Res. 432. A resolution expressing support for designating of February 2016 as "National Spine Ability Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

131. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 19, urging the Congress of the United States to enact legislation allowing immigrants to serve in the military if they are eligible under the President's Executive Order for Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals or Executive Order for Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and the Judiciary.

132. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 18, urging the Congress of the United States to support H.R. 167, the federal Wildlife Disaster Funding Act; ; jointly to the Committees on the Budget, Agriculture, and Natural Resources.

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. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 3556.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8, cl. 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

U.S. Cont. art. IV, sec. 3, cl. 2, sen. a

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States;

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 3557.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (The Congress shall have Power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States and within the Indian Tribes") and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (The Congress shall have Power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof").

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 3558.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States and Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 3559.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and 3.

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 3560.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 allows that "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3561.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 3562.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress can determine salaries and compensation of Members of Congress under Article 1, Section 6 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 3563.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution gives Congress the power to regulate commerce among the States, and therefore grants Congress the power to prevent federal agencies from interfering with citizens' ability to purchase, sell, or distribute unpasteurized milk across state lines.

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 3564.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution gives Congress the power to regulate commerce among the States, and therefore grants Congress the power to prevent federal agencies from interfering with citizens' ability to purchase, sell, or distribute unpasteurized milk across state lines.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 3565.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 3566.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 (the Naturalization Clause) and Section 5 of Amend-

ment XIV (the Enforcement Clause). In *Oregon v. Mitchell*, the Supreme Court declared that Congress may ban state actions that violate the Fourteenth Amendment. Furthermore, in the *Chamber of Commerce v. Whiting and Cox v. Shalala*, the Supreme Court found that state laws are preempted if they conflict with federal law.

By Mr. BRAT:

H.R. 3567.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Much financial regulation is purportedly authorized as necessary and proper (Article I, Section 8, Clause 18) for carrying into execution Congress' power to "provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States" (Article I, Section 8, Clause 1) in the form of expenditures associated with federal credit programs. Regardless, Congress has the power to repeal existing statutes whether or not they were passed pursuant to the Constitution's enumerated powers.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 3568.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8.

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 3569.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 3570.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 3571.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8, Article I

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 3572.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 3573.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4: "Congress shall have Power To . . . establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization . . ."

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 3574.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 3575.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution and amendment 16 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 3576.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 3577.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE:

H.R. 3578.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 3579.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 3580.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 3581.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 3582.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 27: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
 H.R. 140: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
 H.R. 281: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
 H.R. 343: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 576: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 592: Mr. KNIGHT.
 H.R. 619: Mr. NORCROSS.
 H.R. 638: Mr. NUGENT.
 H.R. 662: Mr. CLEAVER and Mrs. BLACK.
 H.R. 713: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 745: Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 757: Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 799: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
 H.R. 822: Mr. LONG.
 H.R. 836: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
 H.R. 842: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 879: Mr. FORBES, Mr. TROTT, and Mrs. WALORSKI.
 H.R. 885: Mr. COSTA.
 H.R. 920: Mrs. LOVE.
 H.R. 932: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. JEFFRIES.
 H.R. 962: Mrs. LOVE.
 H.R. 963: Mr. CLAY and Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 969: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. BEYER.
 H.R. 973: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
 H.R. 1057: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 1215: Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 1220: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 1222: Mr. HONDA and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1258: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
 H.R. 1286: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
 H.R. 1312: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. GIBSON.
 H.R. 1342: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Ms. SINEMA.
 H.R. 1384: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 1464: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 1475: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. KENNEDY.
 H.R. 1516: Mr. NORCROSS.
 H.R. 1546: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. HASTINGS.
 H.R. 1553: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 1559: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
 H.R. 1598: Mr. DENT.
 H.R. 1604: Mr. NORCROSS.
 H.R. 1610: Mr. HURD of Texas.
 H.R. 1624: Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H.R. 1684: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 1708: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H.R. 1714: Mr. PALLONE.
 H.R. 1728: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H.R. 1769: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. NORCROSS.
 H.R. 1786: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. DOLD, Ms. MOORE, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 1805: Mrs. LOVE.
 H.R. 1814: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. GRAYSON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. HAHN, Mr. CLAY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. HASTINGS.
 H.R. 1856: Mr. TAKANO.
 H.R. 1934: Mr. HUDSON.
 H.R. 1943: Mr. KIND and Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 2017: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. HUDSON.
 H.R. 2023: Mr. MOULTON.
 H.R. 2030: Ms. TSONGAS.
 H.R. 2050: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 2061: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. ISSA.
 H.R. 2096: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. REED, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 2124: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 2141: Mr. JOLLY, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, and Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 2169: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 2264: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 2282: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 2404: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2406: Mr. NUGENT.
 H.R. 2477: Mr. MESSER.
 H.R. 2494: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
 H.R. 2515: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2553: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 2568: Mr. BABIN and Mr. KNIGHT.
 H.R. 2692: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
 H.R. 2697: Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 2698: Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 2737: Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 2799: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
 H.R. 2811: Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H.R. 2847: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 2855: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 2862: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 2863: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H.R. 2867: Mr. BEYER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 2894: Mr. JOLLY, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 2903: Mr. SCHRADER.
 H.R. 2918: Mr. JOLLY.
 H.R. 2937: Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 2957: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
 H.R. 2989: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
 H.R. 3018: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
 H.R. 3025: Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 3107: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 3115: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 3137: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia and Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 3177: Mr. NORCROSS.
 H.R. 3183: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 3189: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. PITTENGER.
 H.R. 3215: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 3247: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 3284: Mr. POCAN, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. VISLOSKEY.
 H.R. 3299: Mr. FLORES.
 H.R. 3312: Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 3326: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 3337: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 3338: Mrs. WAGNER.
 H.R. 3340: Mr. PITTENGER and Mr. TIPTON.
 H.R. 3351: Mr. SABLAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 3364: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. FUDGE.
 H.R. 3365: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 3381: Mr. KNIGHT.
 H.R. 3393: Mr. TIPTON.
 H.R. 3423: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 3442: Mr. BOUSTANY.
 H.R. 3455: Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 3457: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. MARCHANT.
 H.R. 3459: Mr. PALMER, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. LONG, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. ABRAHAM.
 H.R. 3463: Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 3471: Mr. AMODEI.
 H.R. 3472: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. ABRAHAM.
 H.R. 3477: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 3495: Mr. GARRETT, Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H.R. 3522: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DEUTCH, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 3546: Mr. HUNTER.
 H.R. 3555: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.J. Res. 22: Mr. LOEBACK.
 H.J. Res. 48: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. HECK of Washington.
 H. Con. Res. 65: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. LEE, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. BECERRA.
 H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. LONG, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. HONDA.
 H. Con. Res. 76: Mr. MCCAUL.
 H. Res. 28: Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. CICILLINE.
 H. Res. 54: Mr. DOGGETT and Ms. TSONGAS.
 H. Res. 277: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
 H. Res. 293: Mr. COOK and Mr. STIVERS.
 H. Res. 294: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H. Res. 343: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. STIVERS.
 H. Res. 346: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.
 H. Res. 393: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CUMMINGS and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H. Res. 394: Mr. RUSH and Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H. Res. 402: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H. Res. 417: Mr. ABRAHAM.
 H. Res. 419: Ms. LEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. HANNA.

September 18, 2015

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H6181

H. Res. 425: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HASTINGS, and
Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Res. 427: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WENSTRUP,
and Mr. TURNER.