



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 28, 2014

No. 16

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 28, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DANIEL WEBSTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

A WOMAN'S RIGHT TO CHOOSE

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, as Yogi Bera once said, "It's *deja vu* all over again."

How many times can we have the same argument?

Forty-one years ago, the Supreme Court affirmed a woman's constitutional right to choose. Yet, four decades later, this Chamber will vote yet again to rob women of their right to control their own bodies.

Today, the Hyde amendment prohibits the use of taxpayer dollars to

pay for abortion services. While I oppose this restriction, it is important to emphasize that this statute is already the law. It was passed in 1976. Yet the legislation we are considering today would take that restriction even further.

My friends on the other side of the aisle are no longer content with simply banning Federal funding for abortions. Now even private funding for this constitutional right is up for debate. A vote in favor of this bill will authorize for the first time penalties for private insurance companies that offer plans that cover abortion services. Let me say that again. This bill will allow the Federal Government to use tax policy to punish private companies that even offer coverage for abortion as part of their insurance plans.

And the penalties don't stop at insurance companies. This bill also goes after consumers, penalizing those who choose insurance plans in the Federal exchange that include coverage for abortion services by removing their eligibility for income-based subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, the hypocrisy is staggering.

Every day on the floor, my colleagues lecture about their mission to keep the Federal Government out of the daily lives of the American people, but apparently those principles don't extend to a doctor's office or to the most private and intimate choices a woman can make about her own body. A woman who makes the choice to end her pregnancy should not have her motives questioned. It is a choice no one wants to make, but the unfortunate reality is that many people have to. If my colleagues are looking to end abortion, let's take actions that will actually reduce the number of abortions instead of making policies that embarrass and demonize women.

Here are a few suggestions:

Let's invest in family planning programs that help men and women have

more control over when and how they start their families; let's support comprehensive sex education so that teenagers know how to be safe and prevent unintended pregnancies; let's make adoption easier for loving families so that no child is left spending his entire youth as a ward of the State.

Mr. Speaker, I know that many of us will never agree on the very personal and emotional issue of abortion, but instead of rehashing the same fights, let's focus on things we can agree on. Let's reconsider the definition of "pro-life" to include efforts that improve the quality of life for people in America. Being pro-life should mean supporting programs like Head Start and school lunches, which help our young people succeed. Being pro-life should mean supporting investments in job training programs to help people find well-paying jobs so they can provide for their families. Being pro-life should mean supporting a raise in the minimum wage so a single mother who is working 40 hours a week isn't living below the poverty line. Being pro-life should mean supporting SNAP benefits so that working families don't have to choose between feeding their children and paying their rent.

The list of things this Congress can do to support the lives of Americans whom we represent is endless. It is a shame we waste so much time having the same old arguments. I am afraid we have lost sight of what our constituents sent us here to do. Let's stop attacking women's health, and instead let's focus on making investments in our future that will help Americans realize their full potential and live the American Dream.

A QUIET LEGACY OF CONVICTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY) for 5 minutes.

□ 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.

H1433

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most enjoyable parts of our job is speaking to children at schools, and you get some tough and interesting questions. A couple of months ago, a precious child at a school in upstate South Carolina asked me who was the most famous person I had ever met. That is a very good question, I told the child. I have met President Bush; I have met President Obama; I have met JOHN LEWIS; I have met PAUL RYAN; I have met Bono, the lead singer of U2; I have met McGruff, the Crime Dog—I have even met TIM SCOTT—but I told the child the most famous person I had ever met was his teacher, and we all smiled and laughed.

But it did get me thinking, Mr. Speaker, that we are surrounded by fame. We fly into an airport named for Reagan. We work in a town named for Washington. We pass monuments to Jefferson and Lincoln and Dr. King. The buildings we work in are named for famous people, and within those buildings are statues and portraits of still more famous people. We are surrounded by fame, Mr. Speaker, and it is easy to forget that, while those people made contributions to our country, the country was built, is being built, and will continue to be built by average, ordinary women and men who lead quiet lives of conviction and courage—average folks doing above average things, ordinary folks doing extraordinary things. That is the essence of who we are as a people, and while there may not be a monument or a portrait dedicated to those ordinary men and women, there is something even better, and it is called a legacy. So, in honor of those women and men, Mr. Speaker, who lead quiet lives of conviction, I want to honor a man who was just like them.

Bruce Cash was a pharmacist in my hometown of Spartanburg. He was buried last week—way too soon, in my opinion, but such are the ways of the Lord. He was a pharmacist, so we saw him when we were sick, and more importantly, we saw him when our children were sick. He was compassionate, and he was kind, and he acted like you were the only person he was taking care of that day. He was active in his church, doing everything from driving a bus on choir tour, to being chairman of the Board of Deacons, to taking his vacation time to chaperone other people's children while they went and sang to prisoners in prisons.

He was a devoted father and husband. He and his wife, Kitty, had six children and scores of grandchildren; and when you walked into his pharmacy, Mr. Speaker, you didn't see his business license, and you didn't see his pharmacy license—you saw a picture of his children. He wanted to quietly signal to you that that was the most important thing in his life.

I would tell you, Mr. Speaker, to look up Bruce Cash on the Internet, but you are not going to find much. In fact, he never even bothered to change the

name of his pharmacy. He left on his pharmacy the name of the man who owned it before him.

He had the quality that best defined the Lord Jesus that he believed in, which is humility. He didn't want to talk about himself; he wanted to talk about you. He didn't want to tell you his opinion; he wanted to ask you your opinion. He didn't want to talk about his illness; he wanted to talk about your illness. He didn't want to talk about how life had dealt him an unplayable hand of cards; he wanted to talk about grace and hope and things that last beyond our lifetime.

In conclusion, Bruce was humble, and he believed it was more important to live a sermon than to preach one.

So I want to thank you, Bruce, for setting an example of average, ordinary people building this country, and the next time a child asks me who the most famous person is I have met, I will tell him it is you.

THE STATE OF OUR ECONOMIC UNION

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, this evening, from the dais behind me, President Obama will deliver his annual State of the Union message; and while there are hopeful signs and a brightening of the economic outlook for the country as a whole, the President will almost certainly concentrate on the battles ahead.

Even as America struggles to shake off the effects of the worst downturn since the Great Depression, our economy and our society are being challenged by a yawning inequality gap that affects tens of millions of American families and threatens to erode the underpinnings of our social contract.

Last fall, economists Emmanuel Saez and Thomas Piketty released an analysis of 2012 tax returns, and they found that the top 10 percent of American earners took more than half of the country's total income in 2012—the highest level ever recorded. The top 1 percent received more than 20 percent of the income earned by Americans, a level not seen since 1928, the year before the stock market crash and the beginning of the Great Depression. Top earners have also recovered more quickly over the last 3 years as their wages and investments have recouped value at a much brisker clip than those of the rest of Americans.

Inequality has also been a persistent political theme here and around the world, and it helped to launch the Occupy Wall Street movement. Last year, Pope Francis spoke out against what he termed an "economy of exclusion" while New York City's new mayor, Bill de Blasio, won the election by highlighting inequality there. President Obama, himself, made expanding opportunity a major theme in a speech in

December, and he discussed the issue at length in his past two State of the Union addresses. I expect him to return to the theme tonight and in the coming months of the 113th Congress as we prepare to go to the polls in November.

There is a broadly held, national consensus that an overly high concentration of wealth spawns a host of economic social and political ills, but that agreement has not fostered a concerted strategy on expanding opportunity and closing the wealth gap. America has always rewarded hard work, and the possibility for a better life has been part of the attraction for generations of immigrants and others struggling to climb the economic ladder; but economic mobility, as a recent study from Harvard and Cal demonstrates, varies greatly within the United States, and while economic mobility has not changed significantly over time, it is consistently less prevalent in the United States than in most developed countries. We should never seek to punish success or to, as some describe it, soak the rich, but we must take steps to address the problem of growing inequality both in the short term and in the long term.

I believe there are three things that Congress and the President can do to give Americans and the middle class and those who aspire to join it the chance to move up:

First, we need to extend emergency unemployment assistance for those who are still looking for work and who cannot find a job on their own. The weekly litany of those who are losing benefits is disheartening, and we must not turn our backs on our fellow Americans;

Second, we need to raise the minimum wage nationwide, and it is shameful that it has been 5 years since the last increase. In fact, according to one study, the minimum wage today is actually worth \$2 less than in 1968. Raising the minimum wage to just over \$10, as I support, would push millions of hardworking Americans out of poverty and stimulate economic activity throughout the country;

These two steps can be part of a short-term solution that stops the bleeding, but real change requires giving American workers the education and training to compete domestically and internationally for the high-skilled, high-wage jobs that are the ticket to the middle class and beyond. Investing in education and building schools and curricula for the 21st century is a long-term project, but it is the one that has the greatest potential in terms of economic growth and increased opportunity while preserving the spirit of free enterprise and entrepreneurship that built this country.

Mr. Speaker, tonight the President will challenge us to join him in an effort to reinvigorate the American Dream for another generation. Let us join him in that sacred task.

THE DARRELL GWYNN
FOUNDATION

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Darrell Gwynn Foundation, a national organization that for almost 12 years has made its mission "to provide support for people with paralysis and prevent spinal cord injuries."

On Friday, May 9, this important foundation will be holding an event in my congressional district to assist in providing power wheelchairs to children and young adults with spinal cord injuries.

Darrell Gwynn, son of former NHRA drag racing world champion Jerry Gwynn, seemed destined to replicate his father's achievements when his life took a tragic turn at the young age of 28. While participating at a demonstration race in England, Darrell's car broke apart, then veered into a retaining wall at 240 miles an hour.

□ 1015

He sustained life-threatening injuries, but faith and determination allowed Darrell to survive this ordeal.

In response to his new circumstances, Darrell was motivated to help others who face similar challenges, and he founded the Darrell Gwynn Foundation. The Foundation's cornerstone, the Wheelchair Donation Program, provides the gift of mobility and independence to those living with paralysis.

Darrell's spirit and relentless efforts to offer support to people living with paralysis have earned him the respect and adulation of his colleagues. My good friend for many years—decades, actually—Angel Pardo, president of Spinal Cord Living-Assistance Development, said the following:

Mr. Gwynn is passionate about his work, and works hard to help others. Despite being quadriplegic and a partial arm amputee, he often works 7 days a week.

Thank you, Angel.

Mr. Speaker, the work that Darrell Gwynn and Angel Pardo do every day on behalf of individuals afflicted by this condition is very important. There are an estimated 12,000 new cases of spinal cord injury and paralysis each year. Over 36 percent are a result of car accidents.

I know from the many personal stories from my constituents and friends just how devastating these injuries can be. The toll is often not exclusively physical. The emotional and financial tolls can be substantial, both on the victims and their families.

The provision of a power wheelchair can return confidence, freedom, and independence to a victim. This life-changing piece of equipment, however, comes at the considerable cost of approximately \$25,000 a chair, and that is where the Darrell Gwynn Foundation comes in. They are committed to improving the victims' quality of life by

providing each with a power wheelchair.

I encourage all members of our south Florida community to attend the Darrell Gwynn Foundation event on Friday, May 9, at Casa Larios Restaurant in Miami.

Congratulations, Darrell and Angel. May you continue to help so many afflicted individuals.

OPTIMISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak of the optimism of this Nation and of her people. Frankly, we do live in the greatest Nation in the world. Sometimes we are questioned when we say that, but I say it proudly and with a spirit of humbleness. I know that because on faraway shores and lands there are men and women who wear the uniform proudly.

This morning, in our own House of Representatives, we held a reception for participants of the Wounded Warriors program. These individuals are in a number of Members' offices. Many of us look forward to that opportunity, and they continue to serve.

So I know as President Obama rises tonight to speak to the Nation, he will have a sense of optimism, which I will enjoy and support. He will note, however, that as we are optimistic, we must provide that optimism and economic opportunity for all of our brothers and sisters, citizens and persons, in the United States of America.

It is well known that we have made great strides. We no longer have the horrific mortgage collapse, though we are still working with homeowners. We don't have the debacle on Wall Street because, as Democrats, we worked hard to fix that problem, as Wall Street continues to thrive. Of course, we have taken ourselves out of the doldrums of a deep depression—or recession—in 2008 and 2009 with a powerful stimulus package which today, in Houston, Texas, has seen the retrofit of the Mickey Leland Federal Building. With \$90 million, they put people to work fixing a building where citizens come for services.

That is the American way of investing, and not handouts, as has been described by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. When are we going to recognize that the investment in human resources is really the answer?

Thank you, Mr. President, for understanding that.

Theodore Roosevelt said:

The man of great wealth owes a peculiar obligation to the State, because he derives special advantage from the mere existence of government.

That is true. Wealth inequality must be fixed, and it must be fixed now. In the U.S., income inequality has been rising steadily over the past four decades, reaching levels not seen since the late 1920s.

The President has signed an executive order, which I congratulate him on, understanding that you cannot live on less than \$10 an hour. It needs to be more. That is investing in the American way. That is generating the jobs so that individuals can then spend their dollars and then more jobs are created.

So tonight I don't want there to be a retrenching. I don't want us to be overwhelmed with this myth of debt and deficit so much so that we cannot invest in the education of our children and we can't fix the horrible situation of individuals not having access to higher education.

Who in their right mind would continue to allow those who are chronically unemployed and need unemployment insurance to suffer, as they are doing? Who would allow four out of five beneficiaries who have at least one adult that they are taking care of, children that they are taking care of, or multiple adults, who would allow 50 percent of those who have a college education and 36 percent who have a high school education and are not able to get jobs, and not extend the unemployment benefits on an emergency basis? Who would allow the over 9 in 10 that live in households with a total income under \$75,000 that need this extension of unemployment benefits so they can pay their rent or mortgage, who would allow such a crisis?

We are doing it right here, and we should be optimistic.

I have introduced legislation to extend unemployment for a whole year. It is an emergency. Then I introduced H.R. 3888, which indicates that those who are on unemployment benefits can get training to redirect their career with a stipend—their unemployment benefits do not cease—so that they can come back to what they want—the very stories that I listened to as I went to career recovery and resources fairs.

Mr. Speaker, tonight, I will be optimistic. I will be optimistic for Maggie, a 25-year-old Army veteran who has to get food stamps. She makes \$10 an hour, 6 days a week, in order to save for paramedic training. She is the very example of someone that we can provide that training for so she can invest in the community, even though she tried nursing but did not have the money to finish. Or, maybe I can speak of Ms. Aguilar, who lives in my State of Texas, which refuses to expand Medicaid under the Affordable Care Act.

Where is the optimism, Mr. Speaker?

So tonight, Mr. President, you do what is necessary for the optimism of this Nation. It is the greatest Nation in the world. We will stand with you as you invest in human resources, create jobs, provide unemployment extension, and raise the minimum wage to cure wealth inequality.

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of an important week for my community, but also for our Nation as a whole.

This is the 40th annual Catholic Schools Week, and it is a time to recognize the importance of parochial education on the fabric of our community and our country. This year's theme truly encapsulates the critical mission of Catholic schools: Communities of Faith, Knowledge, and Service. These are important things to teach our children.

Yesterday, I was happy to be able to stop by St. Mark's School in historic Bristol, Bucks County, and meet with schoolchildren there. St. Mark's School has been providing a top-rate education for Bucks County families for over 125 years, and, like all Catholic schools, their connection to their community is deep and vital.

Parents are involved at the school. They were there at the school when I arrived, running a book fair for the students. The teachers sacrifice greatly for the children, as do the families make sacrifices to send their children to St. Mark's and to other Catholic schools throughout our country.

As a Catholic school graduate, the husband of a Catholic school teacher, and a parent also, I understand how important it is to draw attention to the academic, the faith development, and the community service excellence performed year-round in Catholic schools.

Mr. Speaker, there are few things more important to a parent than the success of our children in and out of the classroom. One of the most important decisions a parent makes is the school that will educate their children.

National Catholic Schools Week is a time to recognize the importance of school choice for families looking to increase access to opportunity and the American Dream for future generations, and also to say thank you to the parishes and schools that serve our children this week and every week.

HONORING FALLEN TOLEDO FIREFIGHTERS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, tonight, the President will deliver his State of the Union address to the Nation. Our Nation is great because of the patriotism, strength, and self-sacrifice of our people.

In that spirit, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give honor to two fallen Toledo firefighters, Stephen Machcinski and James Dickman.

Mr. Machcinski is survived by his parents, sister, and brother. Mr. Dickman is survived by his wife, 3-year-old daughter, 1-month-old son, and parents.

Our thoughts and prayers are with the families of these brave men. These

heroes responded to a two-story apartment building fire where people were reported inside. Toledo Mayor Michael Collins said it best:

The average person would run in the opposite direction than they do, but that is their profession.

As we all go about our busy lives every day, we often fail to recognize that we likely owe our way of life to someone else because of their sacrifice. Firefighters, police officers, and other emergency and law enforcement personnel put their lives on the line for us every single day. We should all take a moment every now and then to say thank you to these extraordinary citizens.

Our hearts go out to the families who lost such brave and generous loved ones. May they be comforted with the knowledge that Stephen and James died in a noble profession founded to protect and serve our people and our Republic. They accomplished their mission for our city. We are forever indebted to them, and are flying flags over this Capitol today in their memory.

CALLING FOR AN END TO VIOLENCE IN UKRAINE

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I want to reference as well this morning the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which reads:

Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.

Sixty-five years after the ratification of this most important document, police in Ukraine continue to brutally fend off protesters and journalists, who have been demonstrating for over 2 months in the bitter cold for their human rights and democratic freedoms. We know there have been countless injuries, and now, sadly, there have been five deaths.

Kiev, a beautiful and historic city, now resembles a war zone, covered with ash and burning fires. The situation in Ukraine grows more dire everyday, and we in Congress have the responsibility to stand with Ukraine's freedom marchers.

I call on our fellow Members to support the passage of H. Res. 447, which supports the democratic aspirations of the people of Ukraine and calls for condemnation of the regime's undemocratic practices. We implore President Yanukovich and the opposition leaders to advance the cause of freedom for all the people of Ukraine.

Last evening, Ukraine's parliament rightly repealed its early passage of the anti-free assembly laws, and its prime minister resigned. These are hopeful signs to calm the unrest.

As we gather this evening to learn about the state of our own Union, let us not forget the state of our trusted allies around the world. I ask President Obama to please draw attention to the economic and political crisis in Ukraine here tonight.

No more blood should be shed in Ukraine. The world community looks to Ukraine to live up to the magnifi-

cent nation she can be, linking East and West, North and South. Her potential is unlimited.

Ukraine's people, who have suffered so much, not just currently, but over the last century, are owed their most deserved day in the sun. History's clock is ticking. May God be with them.

□ 1030

MASSACHUSETTS SNAP RECIPIENTS WILL BE HARMED BY FARM BILL HEAT AND EAT CUTS

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will be voting on a 950-page-plus bill that no one has read. This is a bill, the farm bill, which was first made available to us late last evening.

To make matters even worse, Mr. Speaker, we are told that we will only have 1 hour of debate on this bill, and we are not even to have a rule on the bill. We are going to have a rule that incorporates the farm bill with an abortion bill. What they have to do with one another, I have no idea.

But it is clear what is going on here, and that is that the leadership of this House does not want anyone to know what is in that bill. One of the things that is in that bill, which I find reprehensible, is an \$8.6 billion cut in the SNAP program.

The SNAP program exists to make sure that people in this country do not go hungry. On November 1, last November 1, a cut of \$11 billion went into effect. The recovery moneys ran out. Congress did not renew them, so everybody on SNAP, all 47 million people, received a cut.

Food prices didn't go down. The economy hasn't gotten much better, but their food benefit went down. And their benefit is, on average, about \$1.40 a meal per day. So those who think that this is some sort of generous benefit have no idea what they are talking about.

So we cut their benefit; and they are now ending up spending more time at food banks and food pantries, looking for ways to put food on their table so that their kids don't go hungry; and we bring a farm bill to the floor that cuts that program by another \$8.6 billion.

Now, supporters of the farm bill say, well, really it could have been a lot worse. You should just be happy it is \$8.6 billion. You should declare victory.

Well, those people who are going to be adversely impacted by that \$8.6 billion cut don't feel a lot of victory.

Yes, it is targeted. It is targeted at those individuals who are on this so-called "Heat and Eat" program. These are poor people who get a little bump up in their benefit to put food on their table, mostly elderly people, mostly disabled people.

So we are going to go tell them that they are going to get significantly less

a month in a food benefit, but the good news for them is there will be some that won't be adversely impacted. They should take some satisfaction in that.

We talk about numbers all the time. We talk about statistics. Let me read to you a couple of real life examples.

William, an elderly man from Salem, Massachusetts, currently receives \$181 a month in SNAP. He lives in senior housing, where heat and utilities are included, but the rent exceeds 35 percent of his \$802 a month supplemental Social Security income.

His SNAP benefit of \$181 a month is based on the Heat and Eat option. He incurs other health-related expenses not covered by Medicaid, but he has had significant difficulty producing the detailed verification required by the State.

His current SNAP would be significantly reduced by more than \$80 a month if he lost this Heat and Eat option.

Pamela, a severely disabled woman from Northborough, Massachusetts, currently receives \$115 a month as SNAP benefits. She gets \$1,007 in monthly Social Security disability benefits. In addition to other medical conditions, she is a diabetic and requires a special diet to meet her daily nutritional needs.

While she lives in public housing, she must pay for her own appliances and maintenance fees, including her air conditioning unit, essential to her health. She does not have a car, but uses her limited income for private transportation to medical appointments, grocery shopping and pharmacy trips, as she is not near any public transportation.

With the loss of the Heat and Eat SNAP option, her SNAP benefit will be reduced by \$100 a month, so from \$115 to the minimum of \$15 a month, significantly impacting her ability to maintain her special diet.

Let me say to my colleagues here, the cut that went into effect last November will cost the average family of three about \$30 a month in benefits. Those who will be impacted by the cuts of this Heat and Eat program will lose an additional \$80 to \$90 a month. So their reduction in their monthly benefit for food should be between \$120 and \$130 a month.

Where are they going to find the food?

Who is going to make up the difference?

My colleagues on the Republican side say, well, they can go beg to the States; the States ought to do more; or if the States say no, go to the churches or the synagogues or the mosques. Maybe they will do more.

The bottom line is, if any of my colleagues took the time to go back to their districts and visit their food banks, they would realize they are at capacity. Food banks can't give out any more.

So I would urge my colleagues, vote against this farm bill. Do not make hunger worse in America.

NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, for the past 40 years, my work in this House has been guided by my firm belief that every child, regardless of his or her ZIP code, deserves access to a quality education that will prepare them for future success; and every parent deserves to know that their child's school is helping their son or daughter achieve his or her full potential.

That is why, under No Child Left Behind, we demanded the accountability include transparency on school performance. We share the collective responsibility, at all levels of government, to make good on the promise of high-quality education for all students. Unfortunately, we all know that not every school is living up to that promise.

When any school fails its students, it is our responsibility, not only to give those students a high-quality public school option, but to also improve the low-performing schools. It is simple: no child should be stuck in a failing school.

This week is National School Choice Week. Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and their strategists have embraced the so-called "school choice" as a part of their rebranding effort to appear more caring.

Politico reported just last week that the Republican strategists have been counseling the Republicans that talking about helping poor minority children softens the Republican image. Talking about it, not doing something about it.

Conservative advocacy groups have declared in planning documents that it is an excellent media opportunity to focus on kids and the future. It is a media opportunity to focus on children, not to do something about it.

This new effort even has a warm and fuzzy name, the Growth and Opportunity Project. This is political posturing at its worst, and it does nothing to provide actual choice for our Nation's students.

The cornerstone of true school choice is the principle that every child has the right to attend a great school. Not only should the students have high-quality options, but we need to demand that low-performing schools improve, and support that improvement.

Without quality schools to pick from, families face an empty choice. Yet that is all the Republican majority has offered Americans so far.

Neither school choice nor quality of schools was on their agenda when they voted for the Republican rewrite of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. That bill abandoned our responsibility to ensure that every child has access to a high-quality education. It undercut Federal support for schools.

The majority leader pledged that Republicans remain vigilant in protecting

and promoting school choice; yet their bill removed the school choice mechanisms that were already in current law. And their bill failed to require that schools in districts improve when they are failing to effectively educate students.

With the Republicans' Elementary and Secondary Education bill, along with sequestration, the majority turned its back on the Nation's most vulnerable students. They took money away from America's poorest schools, and they took money away from America's poorest students.

The very people that the majority's school choice media opportunity pretends to support are the same ones that are hurt by the majority's actual votes in this Chamber. Not a media conversation, not the posturing to appear to soften the image, but the actual votes taken in this Chamber harm the very children that they now say they want to support with this media opportunity to soften their image.

It was the Democratic Elementary and Secondary Education bill that held schools accountable for improvement and demanded that children be afforded new education opportunities when stuck in a failing school.

School choice should not be an empty promise. It should not be a political tag line that frees my colleagues from taking responsibility for our Nation's education system.

Mr. Speaker, if you want meaningful school choice, you must demand schools be held accountable for equitably serving all students, and you must provide the support that the schools need to provide that quality education.

Without that accountability for school quality, what choices would parents really have when their schools are failing?

An option between two low-performing schools? Not a good option.

An option between low-performing neighborhood schools and figuring out how to get your child across town to a different school, providing the transportation, and still hold down the job, that is not a fair option.

What we know, Mr. Speaker, is that if you ask parents all across America, they will tell you that their first choice in school choice is to have a neighborhood school that is high-performing; have a neighborhood school that meets the demands of that family and those children to get a first-class education; not to drive across town; not to spend time putting their kids in transit or putting their kids in harm's way trying to walk to that better school.

Fix the neighborhood schools; and if you don't, then provide that child the alternative to go to another school, as we did in current law, not as we do in the media release.

I challenge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to go beyond the rhetoric and posturing and sit down with me and others to make real, sustainable improvements in public education for all students.

Poor and minority kids are not a media opportunity. These are real children who deserve an equal shot at a bright future.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MRS.
ADELFA CALLEJO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mrs. Adelfa Callejo, a well-respected civil rights leader and attorney in Texas.

Mrs. Callejo was 90 years old when she passed last week. She developed into her role as an advocate for justice at an early age. As the oldest daughter of a father who did not speak English, Mrs. Callejo often had to serve as an intermediary in the defense of her family against intimidation from Federal immigration agents or unfair treatment in schools targeted at Mexican American immigrants.

As the first Hispanic woman to graduate from law school at Southern Methodist University, her background and education have not gone unnoticed. Mrs. Callejo emerged as a prominent civil rights attorney in Texas, battling questionable city council redistricting in the late 1980s, and staunchly opposing illegal immigration policies in Farmers Branch, among other prominent legal battles, that have helped to shape our State.

Mrs. Callejo was known best for her forceful advocacy and fiery personality. She overcame tremendous adversity as a female and as a Hispanic, although nothing would deter her from becoming a powerful financial and social force in Texas.

She once said: Only through education will we make the world a better place than we found it. She lived true to these words and worked with the Dallas Independent School District to ensure a better education was offered to a more diverse range of students; and for that, she was honored by a school being named for her in the Dallas Independent School District.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Callejo was an inspirational character who offered her talent and her resources to those who were less fortunate. While she had an incredible presence in Dallas, her reputation as “the Godmother” extended far beyond the city limits.

While her passing comes as a great loss to many, we may continue to look to her life for an inspiration. I am proud to call her my friend and supporter.

Mr. Speaker, we have lost a warrior.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, a gunman walked into a

mall in Columbia, Maryland, and opened fire, killing two people before taking his own life. Prior to the mall shooting, we saw six school shootings take place nationwide in just 10 days.

Countless other Americans are terrorized each day on streets that have become shooting galleries where kids aren't safe to walk to school or go to the corner store or sit on their front porches. And yet we do nothing.

Time and time again, despite the headlines and the bloodshed and the pleas from the parents of the victims to act, Congress has failed to pass commonsense gun reforms that would save thousands of American lives, including background checks, which are supported by 90 percent of Americans.

□ 1045

Somehow, in the years between Columbine and Newtown, we have developed a collective indifference to the killings. After each shooting, we are in disbelief; but then we shrug and move on, dismissing the mass shootings as isolated incidents and ignoring the everyday shootings altogether.

Sadly, a callus has formed where our compassion should be. Or is it that the gun lobby's agenda has taken the place of our country's conscience?

I am at a loss because I truly do not understand how we can continue to ignore the public health epidemic that is gun violence in America. What will it take? How many more must die? How many parents must weep before we do the right thing?

Make no mistake, gun violence is robbing us of a generation. It is a slow-motion plague that is killing our kids one day at a time.

In the Chicagoland area, gun violence has claimed some of our best and our brightest, like 15-year-old Hadiya Pendleton, who was shot and killed a year ago this week while standing in a park with friends. You may remember, she was killed a week after performing for President Obama's inauguration.

She was certainly one of my district's shining stars. But she was, by far, not the only one. There were many Hadiyas, young people with promise and potential who were felled by gun violence. They had family and friends who loved them, communities who mourned them, and they are:

Eva Casara, 17; Tyrone Lawson, 17; Maurice Knowles, 16; Darnell Williams, 17; Abdullah Trull, 16; Leonard Anderson, 17; Jaleel Pearson, 18; Malcolm Whitney, 16; Fearro Denard, 18; Tyshon Anderson, 18; Tyrone Hart, 18; Ashaya Miller, 15; Equiel Velasquez, 17; Christopher Lattin, Jr., 15; Rey Donantas, 14; Victor Vegas, 15; Tyrone Lawson, 17; Antonio Fenner, 16; Frances Colon, 18; Jorge Valdez-Benitez, 18; Oscar Marquez, 17; Jonyla Watkins, 6 months; Arrell Monegan, 16; Victor Damian, 15; Clifton Barney, 17; Miguel Delaluz, 17; Leetema Daniels, 17; Fearro Denard, 18; Patrick Sykes, 15; Dionte Maxwell, 18; Miguel Villegas, 15; April McDaniel, 18; Fernando Mondragon, 18; Kevin Rivera,

16; Ricardo Herrera, 17; and Alexander Lagunas, 18.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here in honor of their memories, asking my colleagues to get serious about gun reform and to pass legislation to help them stem the tide of shootings in this country. I hope one day never to have to add another name to that list.

RECOGNIZING BART OFFICER
TOMMY SMITH

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, there is no person more worthy of respect and tribute than he or she who lays down their own life while working to protect others. Today it is with great sadness that I wish to honor Bay Area Rapid Transit Sergeant Thomas Smith, whose end of watch came too early when he was tragically killed on January 21 of this year.

Sergeant Smith, known as Tommy to his family and friends, is from a law enforcement family that knows all too well the daily risks of wearing a badge and serving the community as a police officer. Sergeant Smith's wife, Kellie, also works as a police officer, as do his two brothers, Ed and Pat, and also his brother-in-law Todd. So aware were Sergeant Smith and his family of the personal danger they faced in their jobs that they had a rule of what they would say to each other whenever they would leave each other's company: Never say good-bye. You only tell each other, “Be safe.”

But Sergeant Smith is not a hero because of how he died; he is a hero because of how he lived. On the job, Sergeant Smith worked honorably every day—not just the day that we lost him—to protect our community.

Sergeant Smith cared most about his family, and nothing else was even a close second, as his own lieutenant described earlier last week. Sergeant Smith took every opportunity to spend time with whom he called his “girls”—his wife, Kellie, and their 6-year-old daughter, Summer.

May we always remember Sergeant Smith and how he lived so honorably for us. And may Sergeant Smith now watch over us from above, as he always did on Earth, to make sure that all of us can be safe.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 50 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

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

The people's House prepares to welcome the President of the United States this day, as well as the other governmental, judicial, and military leadership of our Nation. The world watches as America's great experiment in civilian self-government is in high relief.

May all who populate these hallways this day be possessed of goodwill and a shared commitment to guarantee the freedoms and responsibilities inspired by the soaring rhetoric and subsequent actions of our American ancestors.

May all that is said and done in this Chamber today redound to the benefit of our Nation and glory of Your holy name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HIGGINS 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 75. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1901. An act to authorize the President to extend the term of the nuclear energy agreement with the Republic of Korea until March 19, 2016.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

THIS IS AMERICA, NOT BURGER KING

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the State of the Union is tonight, but the President has already said that he would ignore Congress if he doesn't have his way. He is going to rule by pen and phone: the pen to write down laws and executive orders, bypassing Congress; the phone to call lower-level operatives I suppose, like the EPA, the IRS, NSA, and impose new rules and, thus, again, bypassing Congress.

Mr. Speaker, nowhere in the Constitution is the phrase "executive order." It is not in this Constitution. This is not an imperial kingdom where the ruler makes his own rules as he goes along.

We all learned in ninth-grade civics that Congress makes the law, and the President can approve or disapprove it. It is in the Constitution.

Rather than rule by pen and phone, the President should be bound by the law and rule by the Constitution and by his oath, but the Constitution seems to be a mere suggestion to this administration.

Madam Speaker, this is America; it is not Burger King. The President cannot always have it his way.

And that's just the way it is.

THE SO-CALLED NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

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

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, H.R. 7, the so-called No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, is as deceitful as it is dangerous. We already ensure that tax dollars don't fund abortions and have ever since the Hyde Amendment was introduced in 1976.

This new effort is an attempt to create restrictions far beyond the scope of current law, interfering with how women use their own private dollars, on their own private insurance, for health coverage.

This is just the latest Republican assault in their ongoing war on women. It is why I felt it was so important to

introduce the Women's Health Protection Act. My bill would put a stop to the unprecedented attack on abortion we have seen at the State level over the last few years. It would ensure that every woman has access to the medical care she is entitled to.

Decisions about pregnancies are deeply personal and difficult, and they belong to the woman and the doctor she trusts, period.

THE STATE OF OUR NATION'S FOREIGN POLICY

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

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Speaker, when the President delivers his State of the Union address tonight, it will be important to note what he won't say about the state of our Nation's foreign policy. This is because, on President Obama's watch, America has been notably absent from the world stage.

His foreign policy has taken America away from a role of global leadership to a shuffled retreat. Madam Speaker, successful foreign policy is defined by your friends trusting you and your enemies fearing you. Chances are the President will only touch momentarily on the Iranian nuclear deal tonight and for good reason. It has gathered strong bipartisan opposition, and the regime in Tehran has flaunted the deal as a legitimization of their shadowy nuclear program.

Madam Speaker, those who seek freedom and democracy look now more than ever to America for leadership. Chances are you won't hear much about that from the President tonight.

ROBERT MOSES PARKWAY FUNDING

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, today the New York Power Authority took an important step toward righting a historic wrong by providing funding to remove the Robert Moses Parkway in Niagara Falls. Niagara Falls is a national treasure, drawing millions of visitors each year.

However, with the construction of the Robert Moses Parkway in the 1960s, the New York Power Authority created both economic and physical barriers to Niagara Falls in arguably the greatest waterfront in the world.

For Niagara Falls, it is not about tearing something down; it is about building something up. Removal of the parkway is a critical step in giving this city the waterfront it deserves and unleashing the limitless economic potential that comes with it.

The New York Power Authority did the right thing, and the future of Niagara Falls will be better because of it.

STATE OF THE UNION PREVIEW

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, this evening, I am glad to hear the President will deliver the State of the Union address focused on optimism.

Optimism requires he changes his disastrous policies destroying jobs, as revealed by the record number of food stamp recipients. Each higher food stamp report uncovers job destruction. Governor Scott Walker of Wisconsin has proven jobs are created by citizens keeping their own money. It is not the government's money. Dangerous deficits are unsustainable.

The President needs to repeal and replace the ObamaCare train wreck which destroys jobs. He should uncover the tragedy of the Benghazi murders and promote peace through strength to prevent further attacks. Reducing the military threatens American families with expanded terrorist safe havens. The IRS targeting of citizens should really be investigated. The NSA should be restricted and not spy on all Americans. The Department of Justice and FBI eavesdropping on media should be stopped, with reprimands for malfeasance.

The President can restore optimism if he and his advisers change course. Americans have seen the overreach of Big Government. Now we should work together for limited government and expanded freedom.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

WORKING FOR ALL OF AMERICA

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, the President is going to address this House and this country with great enthusiasm about the work that he has done with his Cabinet, Democratic Members of Congress, and others who have worked with him to make America better.

He will be able to report that 3 million Americans have enrolled in the Affordable Care Act, giving suffering Americans with preexisting conditions the opportunity for good health care. He will be able to acknowledge that people like Mrs. Aguilar would be better off if States like Texas would have expanded the Medicare coverage. Her children are covered, but she is not. We are committed to working to make sure that that happens.

He will be able to say that he stands on the side of extending the unemployment for working Americans—those who have worked and now are unemployed, and yes, he will be able to say that it is important that we invest in the infrastructure.

It is important to note that America is great, as we watch our soldiers in foreign lands wearing the uniform with pride.

We must invest in the American people. Food stamps, which are now given mostly to working Americans, are an investment, and the President can be optimistic and work for all of America.

NO TAXPAYER FUNDS FOR ABORTION

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, last week, amid frigid temperatures, hundreds of thousands of Americans marched in our Nation's Capital in support of the unborn and the value of life. Today, it is our turn.

It is our turn to stand for life by supporting H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. This bill would ban the use of taxpayer dollars to fund abortions once and for all. The last thing pro-life taxpayers should be required to do is subsidize unethical practices. It is their money, and you better believe I will fight for them to have a say in how it is spent.

Enough is enough.

Madam Speaker, today, this isn't just what Republicans want. According to multiple polls, the majority of Americans oppose the use of Federal funding for abortions. This is what the American people want, and it is time folks in Washington listened. Remember, we work for them.

Let's stand for life. It is the right and just thing to do.

UKRAINE

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, today, Ukraine faces a pivotal moment in its history. The Ukrainian people are making their demand for freedom and economic growth loud and clear, protesting President Yanukovich's refusal to sign accords with the European Union. Ukrainian police forces have met protesters with intimidation, and the escalating violence has resulted in the death of protesters. The use of excessive force to silence peaceful voices undermines the country's democratic future.

The United States and Ukraine share an ideal of democracy in which citizens may live free of oppression and may elect their own leaders. When those leaders break their promises, it is even more important that citizens can freely express their discontent.

We all must closely watch the negotiations between the current administration and the opposition. The United States should continue to stand with the Ukrainian people in their desire for economic growth and a free republic.

NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK

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

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, let me begin by reminding the House that the gentleman that spoke before me on this side of the aisle, Mr. SAM JOHNSON from Texas, is a real American hero, and let us not forget that.

This week is recognized as National School Choice Week, a week dedicated to bringing awareness to a very simple idea: let's put parents in charge of their children's education.

School choice means giving every child the opportunity to learn at the place that best meets their needs, not one they are relegated to because of where they may live or what district they are assigned to.

For decades now, where our children learn has been decided by arbitrary government rules that could never understand the needs of each individual child or family. When kids fail to make the grade, the solution has been to throw more money and government regulation into the mix, but the end results cannot be clearer.

This top-down, government-knows-best system has failed to serve the very people it seeks to help, and support from parents and teachers for initiatives like Common Core continues to crumble.

Be it a charter school, private school, home school, or local public school, the fact of the matter is parents know what works best for their child, not Washington. We owe it to our children to help them reach their full potential.

I strongly believe that every child, regardless of background or school district, should have the opportunity to learn at the school that best meets their needs. Let's work together for a brighter future for our children.

□ 1215

EVERYONE WHO WORKS HARD AND PLAYS BY THE RULES DESERVES A CHANCE AT SUCCESS

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, tonight, the President will address a key American principle, that everyone who works hard and plays by the rules deserves a chance at success. We certainly expect our kids to work hard in school and play by the rules in hopes that they will have strong futures that include a shot at the American Dream.

No matter what side of the aisle we are on, we can all agree that what we want is the best for our kids and, in some cases, our grandkids. But what kind of future are we giving them if they have to start behind kids in other countries where access to pre-K is widespread?

Kids who are part of a quality pre-K program are more likely to graduate high school, to earn higher pay, and live more productive lives.

In looking for common ground, we should learn from the recent spending deal which showed bipartisan support for boosting early education. Let's not let tonight be a wasted opportunity to give our kids the strong start that they desire.

FEDERAL REGULATION

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

Mr. MULLIN. Madam Speaker, I would like to call attention to recent remarks made by Department of the Interior Secretary Sally Jewell. Regarding document requests submitted by the Natural Resources Committee, the Secretary gave excuses as to why it was inconvenient for her agency to comply with these requests and allow Congress to fulfill its duty in providing oversight to Federal agencies.

I serve on the Natural Resources Committee, and the document requests submitted concerned Federal regulations burdening this Nation. The Secretary noted that going through these documents was a waste of time and money for her agency.

Yet Congress is charged with keeping an agency like the Department of the Interior accountable because we are all, in turn, held accountable to the American taxpayer. We want answers to these regulation questions.

A battle is being waged in our country between an increasingly overbearing government and an increasingly burdened country of entrepreneurs. The struggle between regulation and innovation has tied the hands of many job creators.

The Federal Government must stop putting people out of business through regulation and help get our country back to work.

NO TAXPAYER FUNDS FOR ABORTION ACT

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Madam Speaker, instead of talking about jobs, or the economy, or the unemployed who have lost their benefits because of our inaction, we are here talking about legislation that strips women of their fundamental right to make their own medical decisions.

If H.R. 7 passes, millions of women who work for small businesses, or who will be buying insurance on the exchanges, will lose access to comprehensive health care.

H.R. 7 is a radical bill that places restrictions on how women can spend their private dollars to purchase their private insurance. It would also make

the Hyde amendment permanent, which will cause detrimental and devastating effects to all women, especially low-income women.

We must stand by women and vote "no" on H.R. 7.

THE CONGRESSIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE CAUCUS

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

Mr. MESSER. Madam Speaker, no child in America should be forced to go to a school where they won't have a meaningful chance to learn. That is why school choice matters.

School choice is about the freedom of parents to choose the best educational environment for their child to succeed. For some, that means open enrollment. For others, that means a public charter school. Some may prefer a magnet school or a private school or even a virtual school. Others may want to home school their children.

Whatever the choice, National School Choice Week is about celebrating those choices and recognizing that applying market-based principles and technology to education can enhance student achievement and lead to better results.

That is why I am creating the Congressional School Choice Caucus, which will be dedicated to expanding educational freedom and promoting policies that increase high-quality education options for all children.

I urge my colleagues to join us and empower parents with a choice so their kids have a chance for success.

AN UNPRECEDENTED ASSAULT ON WOMEN'S HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, today, this House will consider H.R. 7, which is an unprecedented assault on women's health care.

This law would mean that millions of American women who would like to purchase their health insurance with their own money cannot purchase comprehensive health insurance, insurance which is their legal right because this House of Representatives and, Madam Speaker, I would note, a House of Representatives, particularly on the majority side, that is dominated by men, tell them they cannot do so.

What is even more cynical, however, is that those who are promoting this and have said this know that it will not become law. It is a messaging bill.

It is intended to send a message to whom?

And just what is that message?

So while we are debating that, the House is not taking up unemployment insurance extension, which is not a messaging bill. It is heat in the home, it is keeping the lights on, it is paying

the mortgage, it is putting food on the table for the children of the people in those homes.

That is not a messaging bill. That is the work that we were sent here to do.

GROWING CONCERNS ABOUT THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(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. Madam Speaker, when we needed bipartisan action to lower costs and improve health care, Congress passed the Affordable Care Act on a party-line vote.

Given the growing number of failures that have been revealed since the law's implementation began, it is time for Congress to work together to address the unworkable provisions for the good of the American people.

Fortunately, opposition to the ACA's flawed policy is moving beyond party labels. Last year, the Democratic-led Senate voted 79-20 to repeal the law's medical device tax. Since then, more and more Members of Congress recognize there are bigger problems.

Earlier in January, despite the Obama administration's vocal opposition to the efforts to boost consumer protections under the law, a veto-proof majority of Republicans and Democrats in the House voted to pass H.R. 3811, which would help secure personal information on the online exchanges.

Madam Speaker, the American people deserve bipartisan solutions.

NO TAXPAYER FUNDS FOR ABORTION ACT

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

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, here we go again. Instead of working with President Obama and Democrats to create jobs, economic opportunities, and fight poverty, extreme Tea Party Republicans are at it again, attacking women's health care and reproductive rights. Yes, it is another battle in the war on women.

Instead of working together to extend unemployment benefits, here we are today debating another dangerous and divisive attempt to strip away the rights of women.

Madam Speaker, Congress currently imposes unfair limitations on insurance coverage of abortion and, through the Hyde amendment, that is a fact, even though I personally think we should get rid of all these restrictions.

Yet this bill, H.R. 7, creates an unprecedented interference in the lives of women and their families by restricting coverage for women's health in private insurance plans.

It specifically attacks low-income women in the District of Columbia by permanently, mind you, permanently prohibiting the District from spending

its purely local funds on abortions for low-income women.

How many of you would want the Federal Government to restrict your funding in your local districts for any health care benefits for women?

It codifies the harmful Helms amendment. Enough is enough.

NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank Messrs. SMITH and LIPINSKI for introducing H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, a crucial bill that will help us save so many innocent lives. As pro-life Members of Congress, we have a commitment to fight on behalf of those who have no voice and to take the necessary steps to advance legislation on the floor.

The vast majority of Americans do not want their tax dollars to be used to pay for abortions. This bill would establish a permanent prohibition on taxpayer subsidies for abortions.

For many years, the Hyde amendment and other Federal prohibitions on public funding for abortion have been enacted as appropriation riders, but they are not permanent. We need to get rid of this patchwork approach and enact H.R. 7 to ensure that Federal funds are not used to pay for abortions.

I will continue to work with like-minded Members of Congress to promote H.R. 7 and all pro-life legislation because I understand that we have a responsibility to protect the innocent unborn.

ASSAULT ON WOMEN'S HEALTH CARE

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I found her. Forty years ago I found my friend, Flora, bleeding, near death. She was a victim of an illegal abortion, forced to turn to a back-alley practitioner. She survived, but many like her did not.

Today, my Republican colleagues are, once again, trying to take us back to those days with a new, radical bill to deny our mothers, our daughters, our sisters the right to obtain a safe and legal abortion.

I have a better idea. Madam Speaker, let's pass the Women's Health Protection Act that will allow all women, no matter where they live in this country, access to the tools and information that they need to make their own private health care decisions.

Madam Speaker, we cannot—we will not—go back.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF DAVIE COUNTY DEPUTY SHERIFF CHRISTOPHER FLEMING

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize Davie County Deputy Sheriff Christopher Fleming, injured last week while attempting to apprehend a violent suspected home invader.

When deputies initially attempted to arrest the suspect, he fled to a nearby home and held two juveniles hostage at gunpoint for over an hour. After the hostages were released, Deputy Fleming, along with three other members of the sheriff's office, entered the home in order to apprehend the suspect.

The suspect opened fire, hitting Deputy Fleming in the shoulder. Deputy Fleming's canine partner, Gorky, a Russian shepherd and 5-year veteran of the force, was also shot in the incident and died last Thursday.

Madam Speaker, I am happy to report the suspect is in custody, and Deputy Fleming is in good condition and expected to make a full recovery.

This incident is a reminder of the risks taken by those who work to keep our communities safe. We must not take their sacrifices for granted.

PROTECTING ACCESS TO REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH CARE

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

Ms. KUSTER. Madam Speaker, today, the House will, once again, vote to restrict access to our reproductive health care. H.R. 7 would callously deny coverage to comprehensive health care for millions of women across America.

When women are denied the freedom to make their own personal health care decisions, their economic opportunities are diminished as well. Instead of denying tax credits to women and small businesses seeking affordable health coverage, Congress needs to work together to empower women and increase opportunity.

We should start by passing the Paycheck Fairness Act so every woman deserves and receives equal pay for equal work. This week marks the fifth anniversary of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act being signed into law. Enactment of this law was a landmark achievement in the fight against gender discrimination, but there is so much work to do.

Madam Speaker, Congress needs to get to work for women, not against women.

□ 1230

OBAMA ADMINISTRATION STATISTICS

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

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Tonight, President Obama will give another speech on the state of the American Union, and here are a few facts you likely won't hear him report to the American people. After 1,834 days as President, here are the results:

6.5 million more Americans in poverty; \$6.6 trillion in massive new debt on our children and grandchildren; 13 million more Americans on food stamps; 5 million Americans and counting have lost their health insurance because of ObamaCare; and 24.2 million Americans are still looking for a full-time job in the Obama economy.

Mr. President, I can only hope that you will recognize and that you honestly will admit and that tonight you will apologize for the damage your policies have inflicted on our Nation, on the American people, and on the American Dream.

WOMEN SHOULD MAKE THEIR OWN HEALTH CARE DECISIONS

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

Mr. BARBER. Madam Speaker, as the husband of an incredible woman who has guided and advised me for 46 years and the father of two strong and accomplished young women and the grandfather of three granddaughters, I stand with all women today.

I stand in support of every woman's right to be able to choose what is best for her and her family. And I stand ready to protect and preserve the ability of every woman to make her own health care decisions with her doctor and without the interference of politicians in Washington. And I stand in opposition to H.R. 7, which would restrict the rights of women and their access to care.

I urge my colleagues, every one, to stand with me.

A WOMAN'S RIGHT TO CHOOSE

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

Ms. TITUS. Like those who have spoken so eloquently before me, I stand in strong opposition to H.R. 7. This legislation would drastically undermine a woman's constitutional right to choose and could effectively eliminate access to safe, legal reproductive care for low-income women across the country. It would also hurt our small businesses by raising taxes on those who offer their employees comprehensive health insurance.

Republicans have repeatedly demonstrated a lack of understanding about basic women's health care, and this bill is just one more example of their continuing attack on women's rights.

H.R. 7 is a step backward. It is nothing more than a distraction from the critical work we should be doing to

pass immigration reform, strengthen our economy, and create jobs. We apparently have no time to vote on unemployment benefits for our neighbors but plenty of time to take away a woman's right to choose.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this harmful and unconstitutional legislation.

UNEMPLOYMENT

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Speaker, many who are unemployed through no fault of their own remember December 28. That was when the unemployment insurance was not extended and Congress failed them. 1.3 million Americans were without any support as of that day. In 6 months, that number will grow to 1.9 million—72,000 a week, or one person every 8 seconds.

The real problem that we face is really the lack of job opportunities. Madam Speaker, we must bring the President's proposal for job creation to the floor. Remember, you have to be actively seeking work before you can receive unemployment insurance. Do you see the problem? There are no efforts to create jobs, and there is no bill there to protect those who are unemployed through no fault of their own.

This is the highest long-term unemployment this country has seen since World War II. People need government to recognize this problem, and we have failed. We need to go back and know why unemployment insurance was created in the first place. We need to be that compassionate country again.

NO TAXPAYER FUNDING OF ABORTION ACT

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, for years, the other side of the aisle has been trying to get between a woman and her doctor. Now they are trying to come between a woman and her health insurance company. They want to open a new front in the war on women, and this one cruelly focuses on poor women.

The law of the land is already clear: no Federal funding for abortions. But with H.R. 7, which will be on the floor today, even private insurance plans could be restricted from covering abortion if you get a government subsidy. So if you are a low-income woman who needs help affording health care insurance, this bill is aimed squarely at you.

Rather than tackling the real the problems of economic growth and job creation, the other side of the aisle seems obsessed with curbing a woman's reproductive rights. They may not want to call this a war on women, but I would point out to my colleagues that women—and only women—are the

casualties of this multifaceted assault on a woman's right to choose and reproductive rights.

40TH ANNUAL NATIONAL CATHOLIC SCHOOLS WEEK

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, as a proud graduate of St. Symphorosa Grammar School and St. Ignatius College Prep, and as a strong supporter of Catholic education, I rise today to recognize the outstanding contributions Catholic schools have made to our Nation.

Next week is the 40th annual National Catholic Schools Week, and I have introduced H. Res. 461, along with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), to honor the work done by parents, teachers, administrators, and parishioners for the more than 2 million children at over 6,600 Catholic schools in America. This year's theme, "Catholic Schools: Communities of Faith, Knowledge, and Service," highlights the values that are the centerpiece of a Catholic school education.

Later on this week, I will be visiting several schools, including St. Rene in Chicago, St. Francis Xavier in La Grange, the SS. Cyril and Methodius in Lemont, and St. Catherine's of Alexandria in Oak Lawn.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Catholic schools across our Nation for the outstanding education they provide to so many Americans.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION AND ABORTION INSURANCE FULL DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2014, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2642, FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 465 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 465

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7) to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-33 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member

of the Committee on the Judiciary, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the conference report to its adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate; and (2) one motion to recommit if applicable.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I raise a point of order against House Resolution 465 because the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. The resolution—in waiving all points of order against consideration of both H.R. 7, the anti-abortion bill, and the conference report on H.R. 2642, the farm bill—waives section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act, thereby causing a violation of section 426(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). The gentleman from Massachusetts makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, first of all, let me just say that it is outrageous, absolutely outrageous, that the Republican leadership has combined a major piece of antiabortion legislation with the farm bill conference report into one single rule, restricting our ability to debate both of these important issues.

There is an \$8.6 billion cut to SNAP in this conference report, a cut that will only affect poor families, primarily the elderly and the disabled. Besides being cruel and heartless, this cut is also an unfunded mandate. If States, cities, or towns want to prevent hunger from getting worse, they will have to spend more money out of their own budgets.

Now, I know my Republican friends are in a big hurry to go off to their issues retreat at some luxurious resort, but maybe we could have found another hour somewhere.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to serve on the Agriculture Committee. I was honored to serve on the conference committee for the farm bill. I want to thank Chairman LUCAS and Ranking

Member PETERSON and all of my colleagues for their hard work.

I want a farm bill. I want to support the farm bill conference. But from the beginning of this process, I made my position very clear that I will not vote for a farm bill that makes hunger worse in America. And this farm bill fails that basic test. If this bill passes, hundreds of thousands of vulnerable Americans will have less to eat, period.

Now, some people will say, well, an \$8 billion cut in SNAP is better than what the House Republicans wanted to do. That is a strange argument, Madam Speaker. It is like saying thank goodness the burglar only took the silver, because he could have taken the jewelry, too.

The fact of the matter is that any cut to SNAP will be piled on top of the cut that already went into effect last fall. And any cut to SNAP will result in more Americans going hungry. And any cut in SNAP will increase the financial burdens on State and local governments.

There are those, Madam Speaker, who claim that the Heat and Eat program is some sort of a loophole. It isn't. It is a policy decision. It is a way for States to help some of our neighbors who are struggling through very difficult times. But even if this is a loophole, I ask my friends, of all the loopholes in Federal law, of all of the special interest giveaways, this is the one you are going to target? This is the one that is in your crosshairs, a program that helps poor people get enough food to eat? My goodness.

There are those who say that States and local governments or food banks or food pantries should pick up the slack. Have any of those people actually ever been to a food bank? Have they ever talked to a director of a food pantry? Because they are already at capacity, Madam Speaker. They can't meet the needs of the clients that they already have.

My Republican friends have made their priorities very clear. They want to dismantle the social safety net. They want to get the Federal Government out of the business of helping people get enough to eat.

But I also want to say that I am disappointed, Madam Speaker, in the people in my own party, here in the Congress and in the White House, who are going along with this.

Tonight, the President of the United States will stand in this Chamber and deliver the State of the Union; and when he talks about income inequality and helping people get into the middle class, all of us Democrats—and I hope some Republicans—will stand up and cheer. But before that happens, we have an opportunity to put our votes where our cheers are; we have a chance to match our actions with our rhetoric. And the way to do that is to vote “no” on this conference report.

□ 1245

So I say to my fellow Democrats, if cutting SNAP or other programs that

help poor people is the price of admission to get anything done, any piece of major legislation passed, then we have strayed very, very far from our principles. Madam Speaker, again, I want to remind my colleagues that this is an unfunded mandate because there will be an increased burden on States, cities and towns to deal with this issue of hunger.

By the way, Madam Speaker, when people are hungry, when kids are hungry, they don't learn in school. When people are hungry, they end up going to the emergency room more often. When children are hungry, when they get a common cold, they end up staying in the hospital for a period of time. That all costs us a great deal in terms of not only Federal money but State and local money. So, in my opinion, this is an unfunded mandate, and this is a burden on the States.

Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the remaining time to the gentleness from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I thank him for his dedication and his passion on this issue that people in the United States of America should not go hungry.

I rise in support of my colleague's point of order. This farm bill contains cuts to the food stamp program that will transfer the responsibility to States and cities to provide food to their families. May I remind the Members of this body that food stamps—our Nation's most important anti-hunger program—was just cut 2 months ago in November—in November.

Because of the recent expiration of the Recovery Act provisions, food stamps have already been cut by \$5 billion for next year and \$11 billion is the cut over 3 years. What does it mean? It means that a family of four lost \$36—or 16 meals—a month in support. That is already the difference between health and hunger.

Now the savage cuts in this farm bill would push Americans already living on the edge that much closer to the brink. Because of the \$8.5 billion in cuts here, 850,000 households—translates into 1.7 million Americans—will lose an average of \$90 a month or 66 more meals a month. Low-income seniors, working poor with families, individuals with disabilities and veterans would be particularly impacted by these cruel cuts.

Perhaps some Members have forgotten. That is because we eat well. That is because we eat well every day. Members have forgotten hunger is an abomination. We are talking about men and women experiencing real physical trauma, children who cannot concentrate in school because all they can think about is food, and seniors are forced to decide in what has been a

polar vortex, a virulent winter season, whether or not they will go hungry or be cold.

This is a problem all across the land. In my Connecticut district, nearly one in seven households are not sure they can afford enough food to feed their families. In Mississippi, 24.5 percent suffer food hardship. In West Virginia and Kentucky, 22 percent. In Ohio, nearly 20 percent, and in California, just over 19 percent.

The continued existence of hunger in America is a disgrace. That is why in the past there has been a strong tradition of bipartisanship on fighting hunger and supporting nutrition. This farm bill flies in the face of that tradition. It takes food from the poor to pay for crop subsidies for the rich.

Food stamps have one of the lowest error rates of any government program. It is a powerful and positive impact on economic growth because they get resources into the hands of families who are going to spend them right away. The research shows that for every \$5 of Federal food stamp benefits, it generates nearly twice that in economic activity.

Children's Health Watch, those researchers found that after collecting 14 years of data on over 20,000 low-income families that when families experienced a loss or reduction in food stamp benefits, they are more likely to be food insecure, to be in poor health, and their children experience intensified developmental delays relative to their peers.

Most importantly, food stamps are the right thing to do. It is the job of a good government to help vulnerable families to get back on their feet, and cutting food stamps will cause more hunger and health problems for Americans. In the words of Harry Truman:

Nothing is more important in our national life than the welfare of our children, and proper nourishment comes first in attaining this welfare.

This bill—this bill—flies in the face of that. It will cut \$8.5 billion. You couple that with the cuts that have already been made in the economic recovery program, and that is almost \$20 billion in a cut to the food stamp program. Some of my colleagues will say, well, we only did 8½ billion in the farm bill. Let me just tell you: it may come from two sources, but the constituency is the same.

Who are we as a nation? Where are our values? If we can provide crop subsidies for the richest farmers in this Nation and tell them that they can make \$900,000 a year before they will not be able to get a subsidy, or 26 individuals who get a premium subsidy for crop insurance of at least \$1 million a year—those folks are eating, they are high on the hog, they got three squares a day. When we provide \$1.40—it is \$1.40 per meal for food stamp beneficiaries—the people at the top end don't have an income cap. They don't have any asset test, and that is not true for food stamp recipients. We prescribe who can

receive them. There are income limitations and asset limitations. Who are we as a nation? What are we about? Let's not take food out of the mouths of families and their children.

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

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, the question before the House is should the House now consider H. Res. 465. This point of order, Madam Speaker, is a dilatory tactic. I will remind the gentleman that each bill under this rule will be separately considered and debatable on the House floor.

Madam Speaker, in order to allow the House to continue its scheduled business for the day, I urge Members to vote "yes" on the question of consideration of the resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I raise a point of order against House Resolution 465 under clause 9(c) of rule XXI because the resolution contains a waiver of all points of order against H.R. 7, the abortion bill, and the conference report on H.R. 2642, the farm bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes a point of order that the resolution violates clause 9(c) of rule XXI.

Under clause 9(c) of rule XXI, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration.

Following that debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as follows: "Will the House now consider the resolution?"

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the conference report on the farm bill was made public at around 7:30 last night. With nearly 1,000 pages dumped on us at the last minute, we know that no one has had a chance to read the entire thing. I'm a conferee, and even I had an extra few hours to try to digest this monstrosity of a bill, but who knows what is in this bill? That is why I'm raising this earmarks point of order.

As I said earlier, Madam Speaker, one of the things that is most troubling to me and a number of my colleagues, again, is this attack on poor people and is this attack on SNAP, a program that does nothing more than provide food to people.

Madam Speaker, I would like to include for the RECORD a letter that was

addressed to Congress from the mayors of Baton Rouge, Boston, Dallas, the District of Columbia, Gary, Hartford, Ithaca, Los Angeles, Madison, Memphis, New York, Providence, Raleigh, Sacramento, Salt Lake City, San Diego, San Francisco, Seattle and Tucson urging us in both the House and the Senate to reject these SNAP cuts. These mayors have made it very clear that it would have an adverse impact on the people that they represent. They have stressed in this letter the importance of SNAP to help people to be able to put food on the table for their children.

I also would like to reference a statement from the Food Research and Action Center, otherwise known as FRAC. They are urging us to vote against this conference committee report if these SNAP cuts remain in the bill. They have said that SNAP is essential to the nutrition, the health and the well-being of 47 million Americans each month, but every participant suffered a significant cut in benefits beginning last November 1.

As the gentlelady from Connecticut made mention of, on November 1, an \$11 billion cut in SNAP went into effect. All 47 million beneficiaries received a cut. Food prices didn't go down, but their benefit went down, and now we are going to pile on. There are some who say, well, it doesn't affect all 47 million. It is only going to be about 1 million or so people that will be adversely impacted, but those people that will be adversely impacted stand a great deal to lose. The November 1 cut for the average family of three resulted in a \$31 a month benefit cut. You add this on top of it, and it is another \$30 to \$90. So that family of three will receive about \$120 to \$130 less per month.

What are they going to do? Even before these cuts went into effect, they were going to food banks, they were going to charities looking for help because their benefit was so meager to begin with. What are they supposed to do? I think in this House of Representatives, I don't care what your political party or ideology is, it should never, ever, ever be acceptable that anybody in this country—the United States of America, the richest country in the history of the world—should go hungry.

The fact that we are moving forward with the farm bill—a deal that contains this \$8.6 billion in cuts—I think is outrageous. I'm all for a deal. I want a farm bill. I'm willing to swallow a lot of things in this bill that I don't like, but the price of doing that should not be to increase hunger and poverty in this country, and that is what this bill does.

We talk about deals. Behind these deals are real people. They are our neighbors. They are in every community. There is not a congressional district in our country that is hunger free. These people are everywhere. We have an obligation to not turn our backs on them. SNAP is one of the most efficiently run Federal programs with one of the lowest error rates.

This is important. SNAP in and of itself is not going to solve the problem of hunger or poverty. The bottom line is by cutting it the way we are doing, we are making things worse for people. I stood on the floor today, and I read the descriptions of individuals in Massachusetts who, if this farm bill passes, will see a significant cut in their benefit, and their question to me is, what do I do? Where do I go? Tell me how to put food on the table for my kids. Tell me how I'm going to survive.

We should not be making the lives of people who are suffering more miserable. That is not our job.

I will also insert for the RECORD the entire Food Research and Action Center statement.

Madam Speaker, in Massachusetts alone there will be 125,000 SNAP households that could suffer up to a \$70 to \$80 a month cut in SNAP benefit if this farm bill goes through as it is. There is no reason in the world that we should be cutting this program. This is not an ATM machine to pay for big farm subsidies. This is not an ATM machine to make up for the fraud, the waste and the abuse in the crop insurance program.

Again, I will repeat to my colleagues, tonight we are going to hear the President talk about income inequality, and my criticism here, it is a bipartisan criticism. I'm critical of the Republicans for the cruel cuts that were proposed in the original farm bill—up to \$40 billion—and I'm frustrated that there are people in my own party, including in this White House, who don't believe this is worth a fight. Well, this is worth a fight. If this is not worth a fight, I don't know what the hell we are here for. If making sure people in this country don't go hungry is not a priority, then I don't know what we are doing here.

We can explain this away, we can rationalize it and justify it. I have heard all the talking points. My favorite is that nobody will actually lose their benefit.

□ 1300

What that neglects to tell you is that your benefit will be cut down to almost nothing. Yes, they will still get a little benefit, but it might be \$15 a month instead of \$115 a month. I mean, is that the best we can do, on both sides of the aisle? This never used to be a partisan issue. This never used to be a polarizing issue, and now all of a sudden it has become one. Again, I plea with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, let's come together and get a farm bill done, but not at this price.

And I urge the White House to stand up and fight alongside of us on this. They should be taking a greater leadership role on this. It is not enough to just talk about income inequality; you have to fight for it, too.

MAYORS OF BATON ROUGE, BOSTON, DALLAS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, GARY, HARTFORD, ITHACA, LOS ANGELES, MADISON, MEMPHIS, NEW YORK, PROVIDENCE, RALEIGH, SACRAMENTO, SALT LAKE CITY, SAN DIEGO, SAN FRANCISCO, SEATTLE, AND TUCSON,

January 27, 2014.

Hon. DEBBIE STABENOW,
Chair, Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. FRANK D. LUCAS,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. THAD COCHRAN,
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. COLIN PETERSON,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Agriculture, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN STABENOW, RANKING MEMBER COCHRAN, CHAIRMAN LUCAS, AND RANKING MEMBER PETERSON: As mayors of major cities across the United States, we write to express our serious concerns about provisions under discussion in the Farm Bill reauthorization conference that could make it much more difficult for millions of Americans to put food on their tables. These provisions include billions of dollars in cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). We urge you to work to remove these cuts to a program that provides essential food support to low-income families and individuals across the country.

SNAP provides food support for approximately 47 million Americans, more than half of whom are children and seniors. As mayors, every day we see the importance of SNAP benefits and how they have helped millions of Americans to feed their families during an extended period of economic uncertainty and high unemployment. Although the economy is showing signs of recovery, unemployment rates are still above pre-recession levels and we are still faced with rates above the national average in many cities across the country.

In addition, since every dollar in SNAP benefits generates up to \$1.80 in local economic activity, cuts will also have a negative impact on our urban economies.

At this critical juncture in our recovery, we urge you eliminate changes to the SNAP program that will reduce a support as basic as food to so many struggling Americans and could undermine our local economies.

Sincerely,

Ralph Becker, Mayor, Salt Lake City;
Karen Freeman-Wilson, Mayor, City of Gary;
Todd Gloria, Interim Mayor, City of San Diego;
Melvin L. "Kip" Holden, Mayor, City of Baton Rouge;
Edwin M. Lee, Mayor, City of San Francisco;
Bill de Blasio, Mayor, City of New York;
Eric Garcetti, Mayor, City of Los Angeles;
Vincent Gray, Mayor, District of Columbia;
Kevin Johnson, Mayor, City of Sacramento;
Nancy McFarlane, Mayor, City of Raleigh;
Ed Murray, Mayor, City of Seattle;
Mike Rawlings, Mayor, City of Dallas;
Pedro E. Segarra, Mayor, City of Hartford;
Angel Taveras, Mayor, City of Providence;
A C Wharton, Jr., Mayor, City of Memphis;
Svante L. Myrick, Mayor, City of Ithaca;
Jonathan Rothschild, Mayor, City of Tucson;
Paul R. Soglin, Mayor, City of Madison;
Martin J. Walsh, Mayor, City of Boston.

From: On Behalf of Food Research and Action Center

Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2014

To: Ellen Teller

Subject: FRAC Statement on the Farm Bill
[From FRAC, Food Research and Action Center, Jan. 28, 2014]

SNAP CUTS IN FARM BILL WILL LEAD TO LESS FOOD FOR VULNERABLE PEOPLE

WASHINGTON, DC.—The Farm Bill moving from conference committee to the floor of the House and Senate will cut SNAP benefits to an estimated 850,000 households by an average of \$90/month. The Food Research and Action Center is encouraging members to vote "No" on the bill because of the pain this provision will cause for so many of the most vulnerable members of our society, making monthly food allotments fall even further short of what is needed.

SNAP is essential to the nutrition, health and well-being of 47 million Americans each month. But every participant suffered a significant cut in benefits beginning last November 1st. Demand at emergency food providers around the country has skyrocketed. Now the Farm Bill, if passed, will considerably worsen the already bad situation for nearly a million households.

The SNAP cuts in the conference bill amount to \$8.6 billion over 10 years. The bill has modest boosts in nutrition supports in respects (e.g. for The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP), for "double bucks" farmers' market programs, for improved SNAP education and training programs, for Healthy Food Financing). These are small positive steps but are far from commensurate to the SNAP damage in the bill.

We appreciate that key conferees and other Senators and House members spoke and acted to reject the far larger harmful cuts proposed by the House. But FRAC believes the \$8.6 billion SNAP cut is deeply harmful.

This cut has been opposed by major newspapers, anti-poverty and anti-hunger groups and food banks across the country. It is inconsistent with polls showing voters—across party, age and other demographics—reject food stamp cuts. It is inconsistent with the President's proposals to improve, not harm, SNAP benefits. In a bitter irony, the bill goes to the floor almost exactly a year after an expert Institute of Medicine committee found that SNAP benefits are already inadequate for most families to purchase an adequate, healthy diet; and it comes in the same month that researchers issued a new study showing that low-income people have increased hypoglycemia-related hospital admissions late in the month because they run out of food. The SNAP cuts will be a blow to health and nutrition, and to the government's long-term fiscal well-being as well.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I am proud once again to join my colleague. I, too, want a farm bill. In fact, I had the honor of helping to negotiate the 2008 farm bill, the nutrition portion of it, where we maintained that historic coalition between the safety net for agriculture and the safety net for nutrition.

I think it is almost unbelievable that we got a thousand-page bill, and I just want to say to the American public here that they should ask Members of Congress whether or not they have read the bill. We went over and over

this with regard to the health care bill. Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle kept asking us if we have read the bill. No one has really read this bill. There were four people who negotiated this work. There could well be significant earmarks in this effort.

Let me point out the reverse Robin Hood legislation here. It steals food from the poor to help pay for handouts to wealthy agribusiness. Let me just give a couple of examples. In violation of the congressional rule that provisions passed by both bodies should not be changed, the conference, four people, more than doubled the annual primary payments from \$50,000 to \$125,000, or \$250,000 a couple. They reopened the loophole that was closed in the House and in the Senate that allows wealthy farmers to collect far more than the nominal payment limit: \$50,000. They raised it to \$125,000 for an individual; to a couple, \$250,000. House and Senate on a bipartisan basis closed the loophole.

This allows payments to be collected by multiple people on the farm. What we have today is eight people can collect a \$125,000 payment, leading to a million-dollar subsidy for a farm. Seven of those eight people never have to put their foot on the farm. It is called padding the payroll. "Farmers," they don't have to undergo any income means testing to receive a subsidy.

The Durbin-Coburn amendment in the Senate would reduce the level of Federal premium support for crop insurance participants with an adjusted gross income of \$750,000. The conference report—four people—determined that they would make that cap at \$900,000. Again, the wealthiest people in the Nation.

Let me tell you about crop insurance. I don't know that the American public knows that the Federal Government, you, Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer, you pick up 60 percent of the cost of that crop insurance. That doesn't include administrative fees. There are 26 individuals today who get at least a million dollars in premium subsidy. We can't find out who they are. They could be Members of Congress, because they are protected: 26 individuals. We have almost 50 million people who are on the food stamp program, 16 million of whom are children. And there is no fraud and abuse in this program, the way there is in the crop insurance program; and yet we want to take food out of the mouths of families and children in this Nation. It is the wrong thing to do. This bill should be rejected.

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

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

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

Ms. FOXX. The question before the House is, Should the House now consider H. Res. 465? This point of order,

Madam Speaker, is a dilatory tactic. None of the provisions contained in the underlying measures meet the definition of an earmark under the rule.

The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary certified that H.R. 7 contains no congressional earmarks by including the following earmark statement in the report accompanying this bill, which was filed on January 23, 2014:

In accordance with clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, H.R. 7 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(e), 9(f) or 9(g) of rule XXI.

The following was included in the Joint Explanatory Statement for the farm bill:

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, neither this conference report nor the accompanying joint statement of managers contains any congressional earmarks, congressionally directed spending items, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits, as defined in such rules.

I also remind the gentleman that this conference agreement is a bipartisan and bicameral measure. Nine of the 10 Democrat conferees from the Agriculture Committee have signed the conference report. The conference report was made available to all Members and the public yesterday, in full compliance of the 3-day availability rule.

In order to allow the House to continue its scheduled business for the day, Madam Speaker, I urge Members to vote "yes" on the question of consideration of the resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. House Resolution 465 provides for a closed rule allowing for consideration of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, and provides for separate consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2642,

the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013, under a standard conference report rule.

Madam Speaker, since 1976, the Hyde amendment—which prohibits the Federal funding of abortions—has been included in relevant appropriations bills. Each year it has been consistently renewed and supported by congressional majorities and Presidents of both parties.

NARAL, an abortion advocacy group, has suggested that prohibiting public funds for abortion reduces abortion rates by roughly 50 percent. That means that half of the women who would have otherwise had a publicly funded abortion end up carrying their babies to term.

In 1993, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that the Hyde amendment prevented as many as 675,000 abortions every single year. This means that millions of Americans are alive today because of the Hyde amendment. After 38 years, it is time for this life-saving amendment to become permanent law.

When Barack Obama was elected in 2008, a myriad of long-established laws, including the Hyde amendment, created a mostly uniform policy that Federal programs did not pay for abortion or subsidize health plans that included coverage of abortion, with only narrow exceptions.

Unfortunately, ObamaCare destroyed that longstanding policy, bypassing the Hyde amendment restriction and paving the way for publicly funded abortions. The President's health care law authorized massive public subsidies to assist millions of Americans to purchase private health plans that will cover abortion on demand. In other words, hard-earned taxpayer dollars are now being used to pay for elective abortions. This is simply unacceptable.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 7 will codify the principles of the Hyde amendment on a permanent, government-wide basis, which means it will apply longstanding Federal health programs such as Medicaid, SCHIP, and Federal Employees Health Benefits, as well as to new programs created by ObamaCare. H.R. 7 prohibits the use of Federal funds for abortions. It does so by prohibiting all Federal funding for abortion; prohibiting Federal subsidies for ACA health care plans that include coverage for abortion; prohibiting the use of Federal facilities for abortion; and prohibiting Federal employees from performing abortions.

This bill applies to the Federal funding of abortions, except in cases of rape, incest, or when the life of the mother is in danger. This commonsense measure, which restores a longstanding bipartisan agreement, protects the unborn and prevents taxpayers from being forced to fund thousands of abortions. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote for life by voting in favor of this rule and H.R. 7.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman yielding

me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume. I will attach extraneous material to this part of my speech since we only have 30 minutes on two legislative matters.

Madam Speaker, at a time when millions are struggling to find work, the majority has decided that their top priority, one of the first 10 bills of the session that they number, is to continue the decades-long assault on a woman's constitutionally protected right to choose.

Before I go any further, let me be clear: this bill is a hoax. Federal taxpayer dollars are not spent on abortion. This has been true for more than three decades. Under the Hyde amendment, the use of Federal dollars to pay for abortions is flatly prohibited except in the case of rape or incest or when the life of the mother is in danger.

Thus, despite what the majority may claim, H.R. 7 is not a solution to a problem but a poorly, thinly veiled attempt to chip away at ObamaCare and women's reproductive rights, another battle in the war against women.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 7 is a reflection of a majority out of touch with the American people and struggling to understand fundamental truths about reproductive health. And we really mean struggle.

This extreme legislation was originally sponsored by a man, originated from a subcommittee composed of 13 men, and was passed out of the Judiciary Committee with the votes of 21 Republican men. This has been the problem for a long time—men in blue suits and red ties determining what women can and should do when it comes to their own health.

One such Republican man has declared that "wife is to voluntarily submit" to her husband in a book that he recently wrote. Another has declared, and this is a new one, this is not the one from the last election, "the incidents of rape resulting in pregnancy are very low." In other words, Madam Speaker, the men who are making these decisions simply don't know what they are talking about.

Meanwhile, a Republican man on the Judiciary Committee recently said that today's legislation is good for reducing the unemployment numbers because:

Having new children brought into the world is not harmful to job creation. It very much promotes job creation for care and services and so on that need to be provided for a lot of people to raise children.

Unfortunately, the hypocrisy of that statement is it comes from a majority that staunchly opposes increasing any funding for pre-K education or paid sick leave for working parents, and the same majority cutting nutritional benefits for the working poor under the farm bill that we will consider tomorrow. Such a hypocritical and mean-spirited agenda reminds me of another quote from former Congressman Barney Frank who once famously said that

the anti-choice legislators “believe that life begins at conception but ends at birth.” In other words, once it is born, they don’t want to have anything to do with it. In looking at the majority’s legislative priorities, it is almost impossible to disagree.

Madam Speaker, a new poll shows that 64 percent of Americans agree that “decisions on abortion should be made by a woman and her doctor.” The government should never have gotten into the business of being between the woman and her doctor, or anyone else she wants to consult. Only 24 percent say “government has a right and obligation to pass restrictions on abortion.” Perhaps that is why the majority is passing H.R. 7 on the same day as the State of the Union, because we know it is not going anywhere. We know that the Senate will not take this up; and if by some strange set of events it should pass the Senate, which it won’t, the President would never sign it.

□ 1315

But anyway, we bring it up on the same day of the State of the Union, rushing it through Congress to make some kind of point to some people somewhere before they leave on a weekend retreat and making one rule to consider two drastically different bills even though we would have had plenty of time to have had two rules here.

Included under today’s rule is the conference report on the farm bill, a major piece of legislation that impacts all aspects of the economy. Surely it deserves a full and open debate before its final passage.

Instead, the majority is proposing another closed and House rule-breaking process because we have not had time to read it. This will also be their 100th closed rule since taking control in 2011, and allowing just an hour of general debate for each bill and 15 minutes basically on the rule on our side of the House.

If one wonders at the lack of productivity from this Congress, just look at the closed and partisan legislative process pursued by the majority and you will quickly understand.

Madam Speaker, with all of the major issues facing our country, attacking women’s health care shows just how extreme—and extremely out of touch—the Washington Republicans are because the Republicans at home don’t feel that way.

We should be passing legislation to create jobs, to grow our economy and to level the playing field for working women, not taking the country backwards with bills that attack women’s rights.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on today’s rule and the underlying legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, for more than three decades, the so-called Hyde Amendment has flat-

ly banned the use of Federal dollars to pay for abortions except in cases of rape or incest or when the life of the mother is endangered. In part, the Hyde Amendment reads, “None of the funds appropriated in this Act, and none of the funds in any trust fund to which funds are appropriated in this Act, shall be expended for health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion.”

Despite the Majority’s claims to the contrary, today’s legislation goes far beyond the definitive language of the Hyde Amendment in an attempt to restrict a woman’s reproductive health options under private insurance plans and her ability to spend private dollars on a constitutionally protected right to reproductive health care.

At the heart of this legislative attack is the extremely broad and vague language included in today’s bill that redefines the definition of “federal funding.” Under this legislation, the definition of Federal funding would be expanded to include the benefit of a tax expenditure. While this terminology may seem complex, its consequences are quite simple.

If this bill becomes law, a woman purchasing health insurance that includes abortion coverage will be denied a premium tax credit that helps make coverage affordable in the first place. Facing such a circumstance, she would be financially incentivized to buy a cheaper health insurance plan that does not include abortion services. As more women give up health insurance plans with abortion coverage, health insurance companies will stop offering such plans. Very quickly, it will become both prohibitively expensive and difficult to purchase abortion coverage in a health insurance plan.

In so doing, this bill takes particular aim at the reproductive rights of poor women. Women who are struggling to get by rely almost exclusively upon insurance premium subsidies to reduce the cost of health care while more affluent women can often access additional benefits such as Flexible Spending Accounts to reduce their health care costs. While insurance premium subsidies are eliminated under today’s bill Flexible Spending Accounts are left untouched.

We should not be restricting either of these tax benefits that serve America’s women, but it is particularly immoral for the Majority to be targeting the most vulnerable women among us.

Sadly, targeting the reproductive health care of poor women is nothing new for the Republican Party. As far back as the 1970’s Henry Hyde infamously stated “I would certainly like to prevent, if I could legally, anybody having an abortion: a rich woman, a middle class woman, or a poor woman. Unfortunately, the only vehicle available is the [Medicaid] bill,” he continued—which as we know only affects low-income women and families.

In addition to taking a tax benefit away from those struggling to get by, today’s bill would raise taxes on small businesses in another attempt to make force small businesses to drop insurance coverage. Under this legislation, small businesses that offer health insurance plans that include abortion coverage would be ineligible for the Small Business Tax Credit. Currently, 87 percent of all employer-sponsored insurance plans include coverage for abortion, and the Small Business Tax Credit can be worth 35–50% of the cost of a small business’ premiums. Taking away this tax

credit would be a major tax INCREASE on small businesses for simply keeping the same insurance coverage that they already have.

In short, today’s legislation is an attempt to rewrite our Nation’s laws so that it is financially impossible for a woman to access a private health insurance plan that provides abortion coverage. And it is yet another attack on women’s rights from a Majority that seems to be struggling to understand the most fundamental aspects of an issue important to America’s women.

Indeed, when it comes to the issue of reproductive rights, one member of the Majority has declared that “the incidence of rape resulting in pregnancy are very low.” Another member of the Majority has declared that today’s legislation is good for reducing unemployment, because “having new children brought into the world is not harmful to job creation. It very much promotes job creation for all the care and services and so on that need to be provided by a lot of people to raise children.”

Quotes such as these make it clear how such extreme—and extremely misguided—legislation has made it to the floor today. They also remind us why it is so important that the Majority allows an open and transparent legislative process so that such dangerous legislation never sees the light of day.

Unfortunately, it is under a closed legislative process that variations of this legislation have been introduced and pushed through the House of Representatives in recent years. Repeatedly, the Majority has written similar legislation and included provisions that attempted to redefine rape. The Majority, who just weeks ago decried the role of the IRS in Obamacare, has even introduced a variation of this legislation that empowered the IRS to audit any woman who has had an abortion. This in no way should be the responsibility of the IRS and any attempt to impose the IRS in a woman’s medical decisions is nothing but an attack on her constitutionally protected rights.

Once again, it is under a closed legislative process—and an abandonment of regular order—that we find ourselves here today considering yet another misguided attempt to restrict women’s rights.

In fact, while today’s legislation bears the same name, it is not the same bill that was reported out of the Judiciary Committee earlier this month.

Instead, it is an original Rules Committee print that was first made available less than a week ago and includes significant legislative changes, such as the addition of text from two bills that have never received any committee debate, review or mark-up.

Furthermore, the Majority is asking that we consider this new bill under another closed rule. If we do, it will be the 100th closed rule for a Majority that just concluded the most closed session in history.

Madam Speaker, it comes as little surprise that bad legislative process has produced another bad bill.

Over and over again, the Majority has shown no interest in opening up the legislative process and coming to the table to work on commonsense legislation with members from the other side of the aisle. My Democratic colleagues and I believe that we should be voting on bills to create jobs, grow our economy and level the playing field for working women—but we will never be able to do so until the Majority allows us to truly participate in the legislative process.

Finally, I would be remiss if I failed to mention the farm bill conference report that is also brought to the floor by this resolution. Having only received the 900-plus page bill last night Members have had little chance to read the bill. In fact, as my friend Mr. MCGOVERN has noted, even conferees who supposedly negotiated this deal were not given a chance to read it!

But the one policy I know is included in the conference report is a massive, \$8.6 billion cut in SNAP, formerly known as “food stamps.” Families receiving SNAP benefits already saw a cut in their monthly food budgets of approximately \$30 less than three months ago. For some families, this will mean an additional cut of up to \$90—a devastating blow for a low-income household.

In closing, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote “no” on today’s rule, so that we can get to work on real solutions for the American people and put an end to the Majority’s dangerous attacks on a woman’s constitutionally protected right to choose, as well as their disregard for the plight of the poor and those searching for work.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding. I want to thank VIRGINIA FOXX for her extraordinary leadership on behalf of the weakest and the most vulnerable among us.

Madam Speaker, because abortion dismembers, decapitates, or chemically poisons an unborn child to death, Americans have consistently demanded that public funds not pay for abortion.

I would note parenthetically—and we just saw this last week—since 1973, some 56 million babies, unborn babies, have been killed by abortion, a number, a death toll that equates with the entire population of England.

Madam Speaker, a huge majority—well over 60 percent according to the most polls—show that women and men in this country don’t want to be complicit in abortion by subsidizing it. A December 2009 Quinnipiac poll found that 72 percent opposed allowing abortion to be paid for by public funds under health care reform.

Another poll asked: If the choice were up to you, would you want your own insurance policy to include abortion? Sixty-nine percent of women said no.

Madam Speaker, this is because an ever-growing number of people recognize that abortion isn’t health care; it kills babies and it hurts women.

We live in an age of ultrasound imaging: the ultimate window to the womb and the child who resides there. We are in the midst of a fetal health revolution, an explosion of benign life-affirming interventions designed to diagnose, treat, and cure the precious lives of these youngest patients. Abortion is the antithesis of health care.

H.R. 7 will help save lives and it will reduce abortions. The Judiciary Committee report accompanying H.R. 7 notes that the high demand has saved over 1 million children, and the number

is probably far larger because one in four women who would have had procured an abortion don’t go through with it if public funding isn’t available.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 7 seeks to accomplish three goals:

One, make the Hyde amendment and other current abortion funding prohibitions permanent;

Two, ensure that the Affordable Care Act faithfully conforms with the Hyde amendment, as promised by the President;

And three, provide full disclosure, transparency, and the prominent display of the extent to which any health care insurance plan on the exchange funds abortion.

Madam Speaker, in the runup to passage of the Affordable Care Act, America was repeatedly assured by President Obama himself, including in a speech to a joint session of Congress in September of 2009, that: “Under our plan, no Federal dollars will be used to fund abortion.”

On March 24, 2010, President Obama issued an executive order that said the Affordable Care Act “maintains current Hyde amendment restrictions governing abortion policy and extends those restrictions to newly created health insurance exchanges.” Nothing could have been clearer. That seemed to be ironclad.

As far as my colleagues will recall, the Hyde amendment has two principles: it not only prohibits direct funding for abortion, but also bans funding for insurance plans that include abortion, except in cases of rape, incest, or to save the life of the mother.

We now know that the Hyde amendment principles have not been extended to the newly created health insurance exchanges. H.R. 7 seeks to correct that.

Under the Affordable Care Act, Madam Speaker, massive amounts of public funds in the form of tax credits are today paying for, and will soon pay for, insurance plans that include elective abortion. That violates the Hyde amendment and that violates the President’s solemn promise.

As we all know, the new law is poised to give billions of dollars—they call them tax credits—directly to insurance companies on behalf of people who purchase health insurance. The Congressional Budget Office counts the cost of these so-called tax credits under the ACA as either direct spending or revenue reductions. Direct spending involves funds taken from where? The Treasury, to subsidize health insurance coverage. According to the CBO, the ACA premium assistance credits will cost the Federal Government \$796 billion over 10 years.

Absent repeal or reform of the law, taxpayers will then be forced to foot the bill for abortion. Again, an overwhelming percentage of the people have consistently polled they don’t want to be complicit in the taking of human life.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous

consent request to the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman KILDEE.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD in support of extending unemployment insurance for 1.6 million Americans instead of this radical Republican assault on women’s health care rights.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentlelady from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD in support of extending the unemployment insurance benefits for 1.6 million Americans instead of what is a radical Republican assault, a continuous assault, on women’s health care rights.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, Congresswoman CLARK.

(Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD in support of extending unemployment insurance for 1.6 million Americans instead of this radical Republican assault on women’s health care rights.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, Congresswoman TSONGAS.

(Ms. TSONGAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TSONGAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD in support of extending unemployment insurance for 1.6 million Americans instead of this radical Republican assault on women’s health care rights.

Madam Speaker, I want to share emails from just three of the many people I hear from each week who have been personally affected by House Republicans’ decision to block a vote on extending unemployment insurance.

Katie from Chelmsford: “I was laid off in April and have looked for a job since then—with no luck—In spite of the news reports about the economy and how great the job market is, we all know that is not true. I know so many folks still looking for jobs in MA—all well educated, well qualified good people! . . . I truly hope unemployment benefits are extended.”

Clark from Westford: “I am writing you regarding the stopping of the Federal Emergency Unemployment Compensation program. I am a married father of 2 children in local area colleges living in Westford, MA and rely on this emergency money to survive. I have

been able to work 8 months this year over 3 jobs but all were temporary positions that did not lead to full-time employment. The economy is not yet hot enough to create enough full-time jobs and without this money our family will not make it. Please find the money to pay for extending this program as it is saving our lives . . . literally!"

Doreen from Lowell: "I'm a single mom of a great 14 year old daughter who is an honor student! (Very proud.) In May of 2013 I was laid off after 23 wonderful years of employment with the same company. This has been a life changing time for [my daughter] and myself, however we have taken the change with nothing less than a positive attitude. We have made sacrifices such as canceling our cable and Internet as well as making cuts from cell phone service to more frugal grocery shopping.

"I found out today that after 6 months of unemployment it has ended! I received a letter just two months ago that I would be extended until May of 2014, however because of Federal budget cuts this is not happening. I've been looking and applying for jobs faithfully on a weekly basis with no luck. Nothing comes close to what I was making before, I have a mortgage by myself as a single mom . . .

"I've been proud of myself for this accomplishment and being a positive strong role model has always been important to me for my daughter. I don't understand how an extension can just be cancelled like that! My daughter and I are now just our small savings account away from being homeless and that's a shame. I can only hope that someone in Congress is listening to us hard working people and will step up and do something about this. It upsets me to think after 23 years of service I can't lean on my government for support. I don't expect to be on unemployment for long but unfortunately 6 months wasn't enough, it's still tough out there! I really appreciate you taking the time to read this email and please, please, please be my voice and make them hear me."

I urge my colleagues to pass an extension now and help hardworking people throughout our nation avoid economic disaster.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from California, Congressman TAKANO.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD in support of extending unemployment insurance for 1.6 million Americans instead of this radical Republican assault on women's health care rights.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from New Mexico, Congresswoman LUJAN GRISHAM.

(Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, I also seek unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD in support of extending unemployment insurance

for 1.6 million Americans, including nearly 7,500 New Mexico job seekers, instead of this radical Republican assault on women's health care rights.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman JOHNSON.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will first make a statement.

The Member asking to insert remarks may include a simple declaration of sentiment toward the question under debate, but should not embellish the request with extended oratory.

The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD in support of extending unemployment insurance for 1.6 million Americans instead of this radical Republican assault on women's health care rights. H.R. 7 is enumerated appropriately because it reflects the priorities of this Congress.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

For what purpose does the gentlewoman from North Carolina seek recognition?

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the Chair to reiterate her statement made just a few minutes ago about the extent of the remarks that may be made.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Connecticut, Congresswoman ESTY.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from New York will be charged due to the embellishment of the gentleman from Georgia.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized.

(Ms. ESTY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ESTY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD in support of extending unemployment insurance for 1.6 million Americans instead of this radical Republican assault on women's health care rights.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Texas, Congressman AL GREEN.

(Mr. AL GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD in support of extending unemployment insurance for 1.6 million Americans instead of this radical Republican assault on women's health care rights.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from California, Congresswoman LEE.

(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD in support of extending unemployment insurance for 1.6 million Americans instead of this radical Republican assault on women's health care rights.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Rhode Island, Congressman CICILLINE.

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD in support of extending unemployment insurance for 1.6 million Americans instead of this radical Republican assault on women's health care.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Texas, Congresswoman JACKSON LEE.

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD in support of extending unemployment insurance for 1.6 million Americans instead of this radical Republican assault on women's health care rights.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Maryland, Congressman VAN HOLLEN.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD in support of extending unemployment insurance for 1.6 million Americans instead of this radical Republican assault on women's health care rights.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from New York, Congressman ELIOT ENGEL.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD in support of extending unemployment insurance for 1.6 million Americans. We really have to have compassion for people. People are starving. We need to help them. That is what Congress should be all about.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of embellishment by the gentleman from New York will be charged to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Florida, Congressman ALCEE HASTINGS.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to

insert my statement into the RECORD in support of extending unemployment insurance for 1.6 million Americans instead of this radical Republican assault on women's health care rights.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1330

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Thank you to the gentledady from North Carolina.

Madam Speaker, we stand in this Hall, and many times it is spoken of the history that goes on here and of the things that have been done, and often it echos through time—the Speakers, the Presidents, the others who have spoken here. Today, I think, as we talk about this, there is an echo that should be coming forth, spoken in the Chamber that was spoken by this, our administration and our President, who said, One more misunderstanding I want to clear up. Adding, No Federal dollars will be used to fund abortions, and conscience laws will remain in place.

To me, that still echos in this Chamber.

I rise today as a cosponsor of the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act. I rise in strong support of the bill and the underlying rule. I share the belief of many taxpayers, which is that life is a gift worthy of our protection, not something to be snuffed out when deemed inconvenient or challenging. I rise in support of this bill on behalf of those who do not yet have a voice—the yet to be born daughters and sons of our Nation.

For me, this issue is very personal. When my wife was pregnant with our first child, we learned that our daughter, Jordan, was affected with spina bifida. When we were dealing with the struggle and were excited about her birth, we were shocked when people came to us after hearing of Jordan's diagnosis and said we have a choice about whether to keep our child. We knew that Jordan was a gift from God and that there was a plan and purpose for her life. We believe of that fact more strongly than ever today, and we cannot imagine life without Jordan.

I know my family is not alone. Many folks have welcomed children in the midst of difficult circumstances, not because it was easy but because it was right, for when we deny the humanity of the unborn, we betray our own. Every member of civil society has a sacred responsibility to protect the lives of children.

Today, we have the opportunity to affirm the responsibility by passing the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act. This bill helps ensure that taxpayer dollars are directed to care that preserves and improves lives, not to a procedure that guarantees death. On behalf of the millions of Americans

who object to abortion on demand, I urge this body to prevent taxpayer dollars from funding such abortions.

As has been said, life matters, and promises matter, and echoes of this Chamber matter as well, especially when spoken by the President.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule and give the House a vote on a bill, written by Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. LEVIN, to extend emergency unemployment benefits paid for with savings from the farm bill that, it seems, this House will pass today.

To discuss his bill, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, let me express very personally why we are asking for a “no” on the previous question.

Unemployment insurance has lifted 11 million people from poverty since 2008. It kept 2.5 million people from poverty in 2012. So, for so many people in this country today, there is a personal emergency. Since the end of this program, December 28, they have been facing bills to pay—utility bills, house payment bills, rental bills, money for gas to keep looking for work. These are hardworking Americans who are facing the winds of poverty.

One of them today is with me for the State of the Union—Josie Maisano, from Michigan. She will tell you, as others will today at a press conference, that there is an emergency. There is an emergency for them. Extending UI is a moral American imperative. It is also a national economic benefit.

The Speaker asked for an offset. We are proposing one. So let us today have the chance to bring to the floor a bill to extend unemployment insurance for 1.6 million Americans, growing 72,000 every week.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. It is a good bill, an important bill, that takes critical steps to protect the lives of the innocent unborn and the conscience rights of millions of Americans. Before discussing the bill, I think it is important to recall some important history that was discussed previously.

On Saturday, March 20, 2010, the President of the United States announced a so-called “agreement” on his Affordable Care Act. In part, because of this agreement supposedly protecting Americans' conscience rights, ObamaCare narrowly passed and was signed into law.

Madam Speaker, the so-called “Stupak agreement” was a charade—it did not protect our conscience rights; it did not stop the Federal funding of

abortion. In fact, it did the very opposite. It was hidden behind a veil of secrecy and accounting gimmicks, and because of this charade, we are here today.

H.R. 7 is very simple. It does exactly what the administration hoped we would believe they were doing in the Stupak agreement, and it answers the fundamental question: How do we protect the moral beliefs of a majority of Americans on the wrenching issue of taking the lives of the innocent unborn? The answer is clear: We should not force people to pay for what they do not believe in. We should stop Federal bureaucrats from using Americans' hard-earned tax dollars to pay for abortions, and we should allow Americans to exercise their God-given rights of conscience.

The American people are opposed to using taxpayer dollars to pay for the taking of innocent human life. We know this from the thousands of constituents who contact each of our offices. We know this from the hundreds and thousands of Americans who descended upon this Capitol and State capitals across the Nation in March for Lives just last week, and we know this from the 90-plus lawsuits that have been filed by organizations on religious liberty grounds, like the Little Sisters of the Poor, Wheaton College, Hobby Lobby, and Conestoga Wood. The list goes on and on.

We know this in our hearts. It is simply wrong to force people to pay for abortions—something that violates their consciences, their fundamental beliefs and religious liberties.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD).

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD in support of extending unemployment insurance benefits for the 1.6 million Americans instead of this radical Republican assault on women's health care rights in our great country.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my friend.

Madam Speaker, what we are seeing here is an abuse of process. We have one rule governing a bill that is an assault on women's health care rights, combined with the same rule for a 900-page farm bill that was filed at 7:30 last night. I know a lot of people around here claim to be speed readers, but we are supposed to have a vote on the farm bill on Wednesday. Some people may decide to vote for it, and some people may decide to vote against it.

What we are asking, Madam Speaker, is that we should all agree that this

House—Republicans and Democrats alike—should have a chance to vote on a bill that says we will take the savings from cutting back on agriculture subsidies and use those savings to pay for an extension of emergency unemployment insurance for over 1.5 million Americans who lost their jobs through no fault of their own and are out there looking for work every day in an economy where there are still three people looking for every one job. That is what we are asking for, Madam Speaker, with respect to defeating the previous question and letting us have a vote.

Now, the Speaker has said repeatedly over the last couple of weeks that he would be open to extending unemployment insurance if we would find a way to pay for it. We have a way to pay for it. Mr. LEVIN and I went to the Rules Committee and said, Okay. Let's let the whole House vote today after the farm bill passes, if it does pass on Wednesday, and say, Let's use those savings for this important purpose. They said no. They didn't want this House to have that right. So now each of us—Republicans and Democrats alike—will have the opportunity to vote to decide whether this body can decide to spend the savings from cutting ag subsidies to help 1.5 million people in their districts and around the country who are struggling right now.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my friend.

By the way, it doesn't just help those struggling families. The Congressional Budget Office says it helps all of us—it helps the small businesses and merchants in our communities—because, if those struggling families can't pay the rent or the mortgage or go out and buy groceries, who does it hurt? It also hurts the local merchants and small businesses.

So, Madam Speaker, for goodness sakes, if people want to vote against the idea of using the savings from cutting the ag subsidies to help 1.3 million Americans—if you want to vote “no”—go for it, but for goodness sakes, let the people's House have that vote. Let the people's House decide whether we want to help 1.3 million Americans. I hope this will weigh heavily on the conscience of the House.

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I remind my friends on the other side of the aisle and every American watching at home that normal unemployment benefits remain in effect for all Americans in need. What has expired is the additional emergency unemployment compensation that goes above and beyond the normal compensation. This emergency compensation was put in place during the economic downturn and was always intended to be temporary. In fact, we have been told that the recession is over and that it has been over for a

long time. Republicans want to help create jobs, and we call on the Senate to act on the bills we have sent them, and we will do just that.

Madam Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, Dr. ROE.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, as an OB/GYN physician who has delivered close to 5,000 babies, I strongly support the sanctity of life and, therefore, H.R. 7.

Since 1976, Congress has prevented taxpayer funding for abortion. Unfortunately, this door was reopened with the passage of the Affordable Care Act. This misguided law, in addition to causing incredible harm to our health care system, has potentially put taxpayers on the hook for funding the termination of innocent life. That is why H.R. 7 is so important. It explicitly states that taxpayer dollars should not be used to fund abortions.

I am not here today making a point. I am here on this floor as a physician, trying to save lives. Abortion is not a business our government should be involved in. As legislators, we carry the responsibility and privilege to protect those who do not have a voice. We must make our laws consistent with our science and ensure full legal protections to those who are waiting to be born. This starts with legislation like H.R. 7.

One of our government's core functions is to protect the most innocent among us, and I will do my best to ensure that government fulfills its duty. I will always fight for the right to life because it is my belief that we are unique creations of God, who knows us and loves us even before we are born.

I urge my colleagues to support this important rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, let me give myself just a half a second to say that, again, we hear how important it is until a child is born, but if it is unemployed later, it is not going to get to eat as long as we have this majority.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and to the underlying legislation.

Forty-one years ago, the Supreme Court recognized that women have the right to make their own decisions about their reproductive health. Yet, once again, this House is choosing to senselessly attack women's rights.

This bill would restrict a woman's right to make personal medical decisions by bullying small businesses to either drop comprehensive health coverage for their female employees or lose tax credits. Furthermore, it places restrictions on women using private funds to buy private insurance for their most personal medical decisions. This bill is nothing more than an unprecedented, mean-spirited attempt to shame women out of being in control of their own health.

We can and must do better, which is why I urge my colleagues to oppose

this effort to restrict health care for women.

□ 1345

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, it is unfortunate that our colleagues are doing all that they can to portray this bill as an attack on women's rights. It is not that at all. I appreciate all of my colleagues who have spoken so eloquently on our side of the aisle about what this bill truly is.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. NUNNELEE).

Mr. NUNNELEE. I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding.

Today, I rise in support of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, which will make policies like the Hyde amendment permanent and government-wide, and remove funding for insurance plans that include abortions from the Affordable Care Act.

Just last week, we marked the 41st anniversary of the Roe decision, and we memorialized the 56 million children whose lives have been sacrificed for that decision.

I am a proud defender of life. I represent a State that stands strongly for life. I understand that the very first inalienable right in our Declaration of Independence is the right to life. But I also acknowledge that there is wide disagreement on that subject throughout our Nation and throughout this House. I recognize there is wide debate on when life may begin.

Surely, we can agree that there should be no taxpayer dollars used to fund abortion procedures. There should be no taxpayer forced to pay for health care through ObamaCare that funds abortion against his or her will.

That is why I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 7, and I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the final bill.

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

Ms. LEE of California. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Currently, Congress imposes unfair limitations on insurance coverage of abortions through the Hyde amendment for low-income women, which should be, quite frankly, repealed. Today, Republicans are asking us to go even further—to create an unprecedented interference in the lives of women and their families by restricting coverage for women's health in private insurance plans.

Instead of working together to extend unemployment benefits for the more than 1.3 million unemployed Americans, here we are debating another dangerous and divisive attempt to strip away the rights of women, instead of creating economic opportunity and jobs. Here you go again, attacking women's health care, not to mention that this bill singles out an attack on low-income women in the District of Columbia by permanently prohibiting the District from spending its own locally raised funds on abortions for low-income women. You would not want us

to restrict anything in your districts where privately raised local funds are used.

This is just another battle in the war on women. It has got to stop. We must stop these attacks on women's health.

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

I will say it again. We are not attacking women's health care with this rule and this legislation.

H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, codifies many long-standing pro-life protections that have been passed under both Republican- and Democrat-controlled Congresses.

The majority of taxpayers oppose Federal funding for abortion, as demonstrated in poll after poll. A recent Marist poll showed that 58 percent of respondents oppose or strongly oppose using any taxpayer dollars for abortions.

During the ObamaCare debate, a 2010 Zogby/O'Leary poll found that 76 percent of Americans said that Federal funds should never pay for an abortion or should pay only to save the life of the mother.

A January 2010 Quinnipiac University poll showed 67 percent of respondents opposed Federal funding of abortion.

An April 2011 CNN poll showed that 61 percent of respondents opposed public funding for abortion.

A November 2009 Washington Post poll showed 61 percent of respondents opposed government subsidies for health insurance that includes abortion.

A September 2009 International Communications Research poll showed that 67 percent of respondents opposed any measure that would "require people to pay for abortion coverage with their Federal taxes."

Madam Speaker, it is clear. The American people do not want the government spending their hard-earned tax dollars to destroy innocent human life. Period.

Like most taxpayers, employers also prefer plans that preclude abortion coverage. According to the insurance industry's trade association:

Most insurers offer plans that include abortion coverage, but most employers choose not to offer it as a part of their benefits package.

Even Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI has voted numerous times to prohibit taxpayer funding for abortion in the District of Columbia. President Obama voted against taxpayer funding of abortion in the District of Columbia twice when he was in the Senate, and since being elected President he has signed appropriations legislation into law that prohibits this funding.

As you can see, Madam Speaker, opposition to taxpayer funding for abortion is bipartisan, bicameral, and supported by a majority of the American people. It is time to restore the status quo on government funding of abortion and make this widely supported policy permanent across the Federal Government. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and H.R. 7.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, first, let me just point out that despite what the gentlelady from North Carolina just said, both President Obama and his administration, as well as Leader PELOSI, strongly oppose H.R. 7.

I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. Despite the misleading title, this bill is not about Federal funding for abortions. It is about intervening in women's personal health care decisions.

Forty-one years ago, the Supreme Court confirmed in *Roe v. Wade* a constitutional right for women to keep our decisions about our body between us and our doctors. Yet here we are, more than four decades later, confronted with another draconian bill that encroaches on that right.

Since 1976, the Hyde amendment has prohibited the use of Federal dollars for abortions. The Affordable Care Act is compliant with the Hyde amendment. The Affordable Care Act is law. The bill before us is nothing more than a deceitful attempt to place further restrictions on women's access to health care services.

Unfortunately, these kinds of baseless attacks on women's reproductive rights continue to be led by Republican men. It is clear that the all-male Republican members on the House Judiciary Committee who approved this bill would rather focus their time and American taxpayer dollars on restricting a woman's right to make her own medical decisions rather than confront our Nation's most pressing problems.

You would think that Republicans would realize we have a few more things to focus on that are a higher priority than whether or not women can make their own health care decisions. These men do not represent or reflect the voices of women in America. That is why as a mother, a lawmaker, and as a woman, I stand before you today to say: No more.

We should oppose H.R. 7.

We have worked too hard to secure freedom and independence for women in this country; and

We have come too far to let our nation inch back to the dark ages when barriers stood between women and their Constitutional rights.

When I think about the kind of world I want my daughters to live in, it's one where they have access to comprehensive, affordable, and safe health care services.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand up for women by voting "no" on H.R. 7.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the author of H.R. 7.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentlelady for yielding and for her extraordinary leadership.

Madam Speaker, let me again convey to my colleagues the fact that H.R. 7 seeks to make the Hyde amendment and other current abortion funding prohibitions permanent.

Just a couple of weeks ago, as part of the omnibus bill, Members on both sides of the aisle voted to renew the pro-life riders for another year. Title I of H.R. 7 are those separate riders made permanent. That is all it is.

Secondly, it ensures that the Affordable Care Act faithfully conforms to the Hyde amendment, as promised by the President of the United States.

As the previous speaker just said, she believes it comports with the Hyde amendment. It doesn't.

The Hyde amendment is made up of two parts, I remind my colleagues: direct funding for abortion and no funds to any insurance policy, any coverage, any plan that includes abortion.

It couldn't be simpler. It is right there in the Hyde amendment. It has been there year in and year out.

I would note, parenthetically, that I authored the ban on funding for abortions in the Federal Employees Health Benefit program. We mirrored the language of the Hyde amendment so that today every single insurance plan in the FEHB does not include abortion, except in cases of rape, incest, or life of the mother, just like the Hyde amendment.

Let me also say to my colleagues that we need transparency. There is a galling lack of transparency in ObamaCare on a myriad of fronts, including whether or not a plan includes abortion.

In my own State of New Jersey, we tried and tried and took hours upon hours and finally found out that of the 31 plans offered in the State, 14 plans subsidized abortion on demand. Yet none of the plans—not one—makes this information available to the consumers shopping online.

Ditto for State after State. You can't find out. When you make those phone calls, you get conflicting feedback from the person on the other side, who himself or herself doesn't know either. Every single ObamaCare plan in Connecticut and Rhode Island includes abortion on demand. Every single one. You may be happy with that, but we see that as the taking of human life.

I remind my colleagues, look at what abortion does to the unborn child. The baby is either dismembered, chemically poisoned, or decapitated. The methods are horrific, and we live in a culture of denial that does not want to look at the method.

It also is highly injurious of women, especially on the intermediate and long-term basis, as relates to psychological health.

Let me also say to my colleagues as well: Do you want to know what ObamaCare is doing? Just look at our own plan. Look at the DC Health Link, our own portable health insurance. Of the 112 plans that you and I and our staff can obtain, 103 of those plans are

subsidized by Federal dollars, completely in violation of the Hyde amendment—and my amendment, frankly. Only nine plans are pro-life. And 103 of those plans that you and I can buy pay for abortion on demand.

Just look at the facts.

The rhetoric that is so attacking of our side on the issue—I believe in talking about the issue and not attacking my friends and colleagues, and I do count so many as close personal friends, but when it comes to this issue, we need to talk about victims. I work with a lot of women. I know a lot of women who are post-abortive. They are in need of help and reconciliation. Abortion is the abandonment of women and also the destruction of a child.

ObamaCare has not lived up to its promise. H.R. 7 gets it to the point where it does so.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 7, which effectively bans insurance coverage for family planning and allows the government to step between a woman and her doctor even when there are risks of serious medical complications.

Madam Speaker, the women of America are watching. Dictating women's personal health care decisions should not be on the table today.

What should be on the table?

How about the many policies that ensure the economic success of women, such as pay equity, paid sick leave, and raising the minimum wage? How about making sure that millions of American job seekers have the vital safety net that unemployment insurance provides and allows them to put food on the table? How about instead of dictating women's health care decisions, we focus on making child care and education more accessible and affordable?

This bill does not move us forward. It moves us backward and inserts the government into the most personal decisions a woman and a family can make.

I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 7.

□ 1400

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), who was not able to testify before those 12 men.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I appreciate the opportunity to speak, particularly since I was denied the courtesy of speaking on this bill, which targets my own district.

Madam Speaker, the only thing worse than targeting the reproductive health of the Nation's women is reaching beyond that to do even greater damage to the women of a local jurisdiction—to permanently keep the Dis-

trict of Columbia from spending its own local funds on abortion services for poor women, as 17 States do. Among them are Alaska, Arizona, and Montana, hardly bastions of liberalism.

Mind you, such spending is already barred in the annual D.C. appropriations bill. Yet H.R. 7 strips—imagine this—strips the District of Columbia of its very identity for purposes of abortion by deeming the District of Columbia government to be part of the Federal Government. What an indignity.

Republicans captured the majority in the name of local control and devolving Federal power to the States and localities. Today, you turn your own principles on their heads to snatch power from a local jurisdiction. We will insist that Republicans practice what they preach.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this offensive and overreaching legislation. It endangers women's health and well-being and attempts to effectively ban working women's access to a legal medical procedure.

With a budget passed, and the President delivering the State of the Union tonight, this body has an important opportunity to turn the page and start acting in a bipartisan manner to address the Nation's real problem.

We should be working together to create jobs, encourage economic growth, and ensure steady and rising wages. Instead, this House majority has once again succumbed to their worst ideological impulses at the expense of women's health. Once again, for almost the 50th time now, they are trying to undermine the Affordable Care Act.

The bill claims to end taxpayer funding for abortion. Everyone in this room knows there is no taxpayer funding for abortion, per the Hyde amendment which is enacted every year.

What this bill does is prevents millions of women working for small businesses from using their own private funds to purchase coverage for services from private insurance. It aims to end any private coverage of these services by private insurance companies. Women cannot get the comprehensive coverage that they need in the insurance marketplace.

The same old, same old from this House Republican majority. Oppose this ideological legislation.

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

Madam Speaker, the passage of H.R. 7 will be welcome news for the majority of Americans who do not want their tax dollars paying for the grisly business of abortion. This bill, which is co-sponsored by 165 House Members and a quarter of the Senate, will make exist-

ing policies like the Hyde amendment permanent and will rid ObamaCare of its massive expansion of public funding for abortion insurance plans.

The President repeatedly assured Americans that ObamaCare would “maintain current Hyde amendment restrictions governing abortion policy and extend those restrictions to newly created health insurance exchanges.” That promise didn't pan out, like so many other promises he made. It now joins, “If you like your plan, you can keep it” in President Obama's panoply of broken promises.

Madam Speaker, last week hundreds of thousands of Americans came to Washington, D.C., braved the cold, and marched for life. Participants hailed from all 50 States, various religions, and all different walks of life. The one thing they had in common was a shared dedication to protecting the unborn.

The March for Life gives a voice to the voiceless and sends a powerful message to Representatives of the people assembled here in Congress. It is heartening that so many Americans of different backgrounds are willing to take a stand for life.

This is not a partisan issue, and this is not a partisan bill. H.R. 7 reflects the bipartisan, bicameral agreement that our government should not be in the business of subsidizing abortions. This is not a radical idea, Madam Speaker. It is a commonsense proposal that codifies a longstanding practice. Therefore, I again urge my colleagues to vote for this rule and H.R. 7.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democrat leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I commend her for her longstanding and strong support and respect for women, for their judgment, for the size and timing of their families, for when women succeed, America succeeds. And Congresswoman Ranking Member SLAUGHTER has been a great proponent of that.

Today, the President will stand at the rostrum of the House to report on the State of the Union. On a day when we should join him in laying out a vision of opportunity and optimism for our country, Republicans are voting to limit women's health care decisions.

They are hiding the provisions of this legislation by what they have described as longstanding tradition and accepted policy that there will be no Federal funding for abortions and, indeed, there isn't. It is spelled out every time we have a bill that addresses this in appropriation, which they have stated very clearly and they have said that, in a bipartisan way, we have supported.

So why are we wasting time coming to the floor today to take up something that, as they have conceded, is the accepted policy of the House and of the Congress of the United States?

Why?

We are doing it because they are using it as a front for legislation that is very harmful to reproductive health of women, very disrespectful of women's judgment and, again, a waste of time on the floor of the House, a waste of time when, instead of disrespecting women, we should be mindful and address the needs of 1.5 million and a growing number of Americans who have lost their unemployment insurance through no fault of their own, hardworking Americans who play by the rules and work hard.

The work-hard ethic is alive and well in America; but in this economic time, some people have lost their jobs through no fault of their own.

Over time, we have always respected the system that we had, paid these benefits—but not now.

So today, instead of going down this path to nowhere—they know this legislation is going nowhere, that is to say, the underlying damage that they are doing to women's health in their legislation, it is going nowhere.

Instead, we should defeat this rule, vote against the previous question, follow the lead of distinguished Ranking Member SLAUGHTER on the committee, our distinguished Ranking Member VAN HOLLEN of the Budget Committee, vote this rule down, enable us to bring up a bill that will use the savings from the subsidy cuts in the farm bill in order to pay for unemployment insurance benefits.

I, myself, do not think that they should be paid for because it is an emergency and, by and large, those emergencies have never had an offset.

But if the Republicans want an offset, here is an offset, one that is going to be voted into law tomorrow in the House of Representatives. We can use it today to extend these benefits.

Why don't we use the time that we have to meet the needs of the American people, to honor their priorities, to make their future better, instead of dragging us into the past?

So I ask, again, our colleagues to vote against the bill so that we can take up a bill in support of extending unemployment insurance for 1.6 million Americans instead of this radical Republican assault on women's health care rights.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, our leader is right. Our message today should be to be able to help the chronically and unemployed individuals who have worked and are now in need of an extension of the unemployment benefits.

Instead, today, as we pass H.R. 7, we will be making a blatant attack on equal protection of the law, and that disappoints me because I know my good friends believe in the Constitution on the other side of the aisle. And the

Hyde amendment, and I had the privilege of serving with Chairman Hyde for a number of years on the Judiciary Committee, clearly is the law.

But what this bill has done is gone even further. It has disenfranchised, from their civil liberties, the people of the District of Columbia, and completely abolished home rule, to the extent of women's health. And if it was a State, the question would be whether or not it was appropriate under the 10th Amendment.

Then it has disincentivized small businesses, for you have disqualified them from getting a tax incentive or a tax credit because they are not allowed to provide for their employees.

This bill should be put to the side, and we should pass legislation to ensure that the unemployed have unemployment insurance. That is what is right about America, and we should do the right thing.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule for H.R. 7, the so-called "No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act," and the underlying bill.

I oppose this bill because it is unnecessary, puts the lives of women at risk, interferes with women's constitutionally guaranteed right of privacy, and diverts our attention from the real problems facing the American people.

Instead of resuming their War on Women, our colleagues across the aisle should be working with Democrats to extend unemployment insurance to the 1.9 million Americans whose benefits have been terminated and to raise the minimum wage to \$10.10 per hour so that people who work hard and play by the rules do not have to raise their families in poverty.

A far better use of our time would be to provide help to long-term unemployed jobhunters by bringing to the floor and passing H.R. 3888, the "New Chance for a New Start in Life Act," a bill I introduced that would provide compensated skills training for the jobs of tomorrow to the long-term unemployed.

Last year I opposed this irresponsible and reckless legislation when it was brought to the floor. I opposed this bill when it was considered in the Judiciary Committee earlier this month. I opposed this bill yesterday when it was being considered by the Rules Committee.

Madam Speaker, the version of H.R. 7 before us is only a little less bad than the bill reported by the Judiciary Committee.

Dropped are the tax provisions that would prevent an individual from deducting any abortion expenses as a tax-eligible medical expense or using pre-tax flex health or health savings accounts for abortion expenses.

But the other draconian provisions of this terrible bill remain intact:

1. Prohibits federal funds from being used for any health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion. (Thus making permanent existing federal policies.)

2. Prohibits the inclusion of abortion in any health care service furnished by a federal or District of Columbia health care facility or by any physician or other individual employed by the federal government or the District.

3. Applies such prohibitions to District of Columbia funds.

4. Prohibits individuals from receiving a refundable federal tax credit, or any cost-sharing

reductions, for purchasing a qualified health plan that includes coverage for abortions.

5. Prohibits small employers from receiving the small-employer health insurance credit provided by the health care law if the health plans or benefits that are purchased provide abortion coverage.

Taken together, these provisions have the effect, and possibly the intent, of arbitrarily infringing women's reproductive freedoms and poses a nationwide threat to the health and wellbeing of American women and a direct challenge to the Supreme Court's ruling in *Roe v. Wade*.

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

Women like Danielle Deaver, who was 22 weeks pregnant when her water broke. Tests showed that Danielle had suffered anhydramnios, a premature rupture of the membranes before the fetus has achieved viability.

This condition meant that the fetus likely would be born with a shortening of muscle tissue that results in the inability to move limbs. In addition, Danielle's fetus likely would suffer deformities to the face and head, and the lungs were unlikely to develop beyond the 22-week point. There was less than a 10% chance that, if born, Danielle's baby would be able to breathe on its own and only a 2% chance the baby would be able to eat on its own.

H.R. 7 hurts women like Vikki Stella, a diabetic, who discovered months into her pregnancy that the fetus she was carrying suffered from several major anomalies and had no chance of survival. Because of Vikki's diabetes, her doctor determined that induced labor and Caesarian section were both riskier procedures for Vikki than an abortion.

Every pregnancy is different. No politician knows, or has the right to assume he knows, what is best for a woman and her family. These are decisions that properly must be left to women to make, in consultation with their partners, doctors, and their God.

H.R. 7 lacks the necessary exceptions to protect the health and life of the mother.

H.R. 7 is an unconstitutional infringement on the right to privacy, as interpreted by the Supreme Court in a long line of cases going back to *Griswold v. Connecticut* in 1965 and *Roe v. Wade* decided in 1973.

In *Roe v. Wade*, the Court held that a State could prohibit a woman from exercising her right to terminate a pregnancy in order to protect her health prior to viability.

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

Supreme Court precedents make it clear that neither Congress nor a state legislature can declare any one element—"be it weeks of gestation or fetal weight or any other single factor—as the determinant" of viability. *Colautti v. Franklin*, 439 U.S. 379, 388–89 (1979).

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

This right of privacy was hard won and must be preserved inviolate. The bill before us

threatens this hard won right for women and must be defeated.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY).

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition today to the rule. I offered an amendment to H.R. 7 which was not made in order by the Rules Committee. In fact, not a single amendment was made in order.

The majority continues to tell us about their commitment to open debate and regular order. Yet we continue to govern under closed rule.

I am disappointed by the majority's broken promises. I am also opposed to the underlying bill, which is an attack on women and an attack on their families. It limits a woman's constitutionally protected right to choose.

It denies affordable health care, particularly to low-income women. It disproportionately hurts individuals who are counting on Federal assistance to get health care coverage for themselves and their families.

Instead of bringing up bills that undermine a woman's constitutional rights, why can't we just focus on legislation that creates jobs and helps struggling families?

Madam Speaker, today, let us just put an end to these attacks on women's rights. Indeed, we can do this.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady.

Now, instead of taking up critical issues, we are here today considering a radical bill that failed several years ago. It has been resurrected by the majority so that they can continue their war on women and their vendetta against the Affordable Care Act.

It is a deceptively named bill. It is not about unauthorized use of taxpayer dollars. The purpose of this legislation is to make the Federal Government interfere with a woman's decision to use her private dollars for legal health services.

□ 1415

It will restrict women's access to safe reproductive health; and because it would rule out standard insurance policies now available to women, it will leave even more women without health care coverage.

So instead of taking up an ideological, mean-spirited lost cause, let's turn our attention to helping women get comprehensive health care, excellent health care for themselves and their families. Let's help women get excellent affordable child care, help women get pay equity and fairness. Vote "no" on this rule.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, from renewing unemployment insurance for more than 1.6 million Americans to growing our economy and rebuilding our middle class, there is an urgent need for Congress to pass legislation that will help the American people. So I urge my colleagues to reject today's rule so that we can finally get to work, I hope, on real solutions to the problems that face our Nation, not wasting more time with another attack on women's constitutionally protected reproductive rights.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to give the House a vote on the bill written by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) to extend emergency unemployment benefits, paid for with the savings from the farm bill that, it seems, this House will pass today or tomorrow.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, the only thing I really need to say, other than the absolute requirements here, is that we have had a great demonstration in this rule debate on what is going on here.

H.R. 7, written by men, discussed before a subcommittee of 12 men and then voted on by the main committee, composed mostly of men, who carried the debate, was brought here today; and yet, with the exception of the manager of the bill, not a single woman on the other side came to speak on this bill.

On our side, we had diversity. We had women. We had men getting up and talking about actually complying with the Constitution. And on the other side, we had, once again, men telling women what they are allowed to do.

We are so far past that. When we finally got the right to vote, we said, Let's put all this behind us, certainly in the House of Representatives, the people's House. Can't you understand the difference here in the people's House, that the people represent the diversity of the faces of America, and all the men over there who seem to have devoted their lives to making sure that women do what they expect them to do and what they are told to do and trying to pass laws to require that. I think it was one of the most telling debates that I have ever seen, and I hope that it will not go unnoticed by the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I am going to say it again, this bill is not an attack on women or an attack on women's rights.

I think it is wonderful that we had so many men here today speaking on behalf of the unborn. Life is the most fundamental of all rights, Madam Speaker. It is sacred and God-given. But millions of babies have been robbed of that right in this, the freest country in the world. This is a tragedy beyond words and a betrayal of what we, as a Nation, stand for.

Before liberty, equality, free speech, freedom of conscience, and the pursuit of happiness and justice for all, there has to be life. And yet, for millions of aborted infants, many pain-capable and many discriminated against because of gender or disability, life is exactly what they have been denied. And an affront to life for some is an affront to life for every one of us. That is the message we want to get across today.

One day, we hope it will be different. We hope life will cease to be valued on a sliding scale. We hope the era of elective abortions, ushered in by an unelected Court, would be closed and collectively deemed one of the darkest chapters in American history. But until that day, it remains a solemn duty for all of us to stand up for life.

Regardless of the length of this journey, we will continue to speak for those who cannot. And we will continue to pray to the One who can change the hearts of those in desperation and those in power who equally hold the lives of the innocent in their hands.

Madam Speaker, the commonsense measure before us restores an important longstanding bipartisan agreement that protects the unborn and prevents taxpayers from being forced to finance thousands of elective abortions. It reflects the will of the American people and is the product of what has historically been a bipartisan, bicameral consensus in Congress. Therefore, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule and H.R. 7.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 465 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

Sec. 3. Immediately upon adoption of the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3936), the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2014. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the

bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 3 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon re-

jection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 465, if ordered, and approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 194, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]

YEAS—222

Aderholt	Duffy	Johnson (OH)
Amash	Duncan (SC)	Johnson, Sam
Bachmann	Duncan (TN)	Jordan
Bachus	Ellmers	Joyce
Barletta	Farenthold	Kelly (PA)
Barr	Fincher	King (IA)
Barton	Fitzpatrick	King (NY)
Benishek	Fleischmann	Kingston
Bentivolio	Fleming	Kinzinger (IL)
Bilirakis	Flores	Kline
Bishop (UT)	Forbes	Labrador
Black	Fortenberry	LaMalfa
Blackburn	Foxx	Lamborn
Boustany	Franks (AZ)	Lance
Brady (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Lankford
Bridenstine	Gardner	Latham
Brooks (AL)	Garrett	Latta
Brooks (IN)	Gerlach	LoBiondo
Broun (GA)	Gibbs	Long
Buchanan	Gibson	Lucas
Bucshon	Gingrey (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Burgess	Gohmert	Lummis
Byrne	Goodlatte	Marchant
Calvert	Gosar	Marino
Camp	Gowdy	Massie
Cantor	Granger	McAllister
Capito	Graves (GA)	McCarthy (CA)
Carter	Graves (MO)	McCaul
Cassidy	Griffin (AR)	McClintock
Chabot	Griffith (VA)	McHenry
Chaffetz	Grimm	McKeon
Coble	Guthrie	McKinley
Coffman	Hall	McMorris
Cole	Hanna	Rodgers
Collins (GA)	Harper	Meadows
Collins (NY)	Harris	Meehan
Conaway	Hartzler	Messer
Cook	Hastings (WA)	Mica
Cotton	Heck (NV)	Miller (MI)
Cramer	Hensarling	Miller, Gary
Crawford	Herrera Beutler	Mullin
Crenshaw	Holding	Mulvaney
Culberson	Hudson	Murphy (PA)
Daines	Huelskamp	Neugebauer
Davis, Rodney	Huizenga (MI)	Noem
Denham	Hultgren	Nugent
Dent	Hunter	Nunes
DeSantis	Hurt	Nunnelee
DesJarlais	Issa	Olson
Diaz-Balart	Jenkins	Palazzo

Paulsen	Rothfus	Thornberry
Pearce	Royce	Tiberi
Perry	Ryan (WI)	Turner
Petri	Salmon	Upton
Pittenger	Sanford	Valadao
Poe (TX)	Scalise	Wagner
Pompeo	Schock	Walberg
Posey	Schweikert	Walden
Price (GA)	Scott, Austin	Walorski
Reed	Sensenbrenner	Weber (TX)
Reichert	Sessions	Webster (FL)
Renacci	Shimkus	Wenstrup
Ribble	Shuster	Whitfield
Rice (SC)	Simpson	Williams
Rigell	Smith (MO)	Wilson (SC)
Roby	Smith (NE)	Wittman
Roe (TN)	Smith (NJ)	Wolf
Rogers (AL)	Smith (TX)	Womack
Rogers (KY)	Southerland	Woodall
Rohrabacher	Stewart	Yoder
Rokita	Stivers	Yoho
Rooney	Stockman	Young (AK)
Ros-Lehtinen	Stutzman	Young (IN)
Roskam	Terry	
Ross	Thompson (PA)	

NAYS—194

Andrews	Green, Al	Negrete McLeod
Barber	Green, Gene	Nolan
Barrow (GA)	Grijalva	O'Rourke
Bass	Gutiérrez	Owens
Beatty	Hahn	Pallone
Becerra	Hanabusa	Pascrell
Bera (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (GA)	Heck (WA)	Payne
Bishop (NY)	Higgins	Pelosi
Bonamici	Himes	Perlmutter
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Peters (CA)
Bralley (IA)	Holt	Peters (MI)
Brown (FL)	Honda	Peterson
Brownley (CA)	Horsford	Pingree (ME)
Bustos	Hoyer	Pocan
Butterfield	Huffman	Polis
Capps	Israel	Price (NC)
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Rahall
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Rangel
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Cartwright	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Keating	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Chu	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Cicilline	Kildee	T.
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Clyburn	Kuster	Schneider
Cohen	Langevin	Schrader
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Scott, David
Costa	Levin	Serrano
Courtney	Lewis	Sewell (AL)
Crowley	Lipinski	Shea-Porter
Cuellar	Loeb	Sherman
Cummings	Loeb	Sinema
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Sires
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lowey	Smith (WA)
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Speier
Delaney	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Takano
DelBene	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
Deutch	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	Maffei	Tierney
Doggett	Maloney,	Titus
Doyle	Carolyn	Tonko
Duckworth	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
Edwards	Matheson	Van Hollen
Ellison	Matsui	Vargas
Engel	McCollum	Veasey
Enyart	McDermott	Vela
Eshoo	McGovern	Velázquez
Esty	McIntyre	Vislosky
Farr	McNerney	Walz
Fattah	Meeks	Wasserman
Foster	Meng	Schultz
Frankel (FL)	Michaud	Waters
Fudge	Miller, George	Waxman
Gabbard	Moore	Welch
Gallego	Moran	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Murphy (FL)	Yarmuth
Garcia	Nadler	
Grayson	Napolitano	
	Neal	

NOT VOTING—15

Amodei	Clay	Miller (FL)
Blumenauer	Jones	Pitts
Campbell	McCarthy (NY)	Rogers (MI)

Runyan Rush Tipton
Ruppersberger Sanchez, Loretta Westmoreland

□ 1452

Messrs. PASCARELL and CASTRO of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 192, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 27]
YEAS—224

Aderholt	Gibbs	McMorris
Amash	Gibson	Rodgers
Bachus	Gingrey (GA)	Meadows
Barletta	Gohmert	Meehan
Barr	Goodlatte	Messer
Barton	Gosar	Mica
Benishek	Gowdy	Miller (MI)
Bentivolio	Granger	Miller, Gary
Bilirakis	Graves (GA)	Mullin
Bishop (UT)	Graves (MO)	Mulvaney
Black	Griffin (AR)	Murphy (PA)
Blackburn	Griffith (VA)	Neugebauer
Boustany	Grimm	Noem
Brady (TX)	Guthrie	Nugent
Bridenstine	Hall	Nunes
Brooks (AL)	Hanna	Nunnelee
Brooks (IN)	Harper	Olson
Broun (GA)	Harris	Palazzo
Buchanan	Hartzler	Paulsen
Buechosh	Hastings (WA)	Pearce
Burgess	Heck (NV)	Perry
Byrne	Hensarling	Petri
Calvert	Herrera Beutler	Pittenger
Camp	Holding	Pitts
Cantor	Hudson	Poe (TX)
Capito	Huelskamp	Pompeo
Carter	Huizenga (MI)	Posey
Cassidy	Hultgren	Price (GA)
Chabot	Hunter	Reed
Chaffetz	Hurt	Reichert
Coble	Issa	Renacci
Coffman	Jenkins	Ribble
Cole	Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)
Collins (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Rigell
Collins (NY)	Jordan	Roby
Conaway	Joyce	Roe (TN)
Cook	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (AL)
Cotton	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)
Cramer	King (NY)	Rohrabacher
Crawford	Kingston	Rokita
Crenshaw	Kinzing (IL)	Rooney
Culberson	Kline	Ros-Lehtinen
Daines	Labrador	Roskam
Davis, Rodney	LaMalfa	Ross
Denham	Lamborn	Rothfus
Dent	Lance	Royce
DeSantis	Lankford	Ryan (WI)
DesJarlais	Latham	Salmon
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Sanford
Duffy	Lipinski	Scalise
Duncan (SC)	LoBiondo	Schock
Duncan (TN)	Long	Schweikert
Ellmers	Lucas	Scott, Austin
Farenthold	Luetkemeyer	Sensenbrenner
Fincher	Lummis	Sessions
Fitzpatrick	Marchant	Shimkus
Fleischmann	Marino	Shuster
Fleming	Massie	Simpson
Flores	McAllister	Smith (MO)
Forbes	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (NE)
Fortenberry	McCaul	Smith (NJ)
Fox	McClintock	Smith (TX)
Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Southerland
Frelinghuysen	McIntyre	Stewart
Gardner	McKeon	Stivers
Garrett	McKinley	Stockman
Gerlach		Stutzman

Terry Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Ciilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia

Amodei
Bachmann
Blumenauer
Campbell
Clay
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Rogers (MI)
Runyan

Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

NAYS—192

Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Loewenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

NOT VOTING—15

Ruppersberger
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Tipton
Westmoreland

□ 1502

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on

agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 260, nays 142, answered “present” 3, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 28]
YEAS—260

Aderholt	Gallego	Michaud
Bachmann	Garrett	Miller (MI)
Barber	Gerlach	Miller, Gary
Barletta	Gibbs	Moran
Barrow (GA)	Gingrey (GA)	Mullin
Beatty	Goodlatte	Murphy (FL)
Becerra	Gosar	Murphy (PA)
Bera (CA)	Gowdy	Nadler
Bilirakis	Granger	Napolitano
Bishop (GA)	Graves (GA)	Noem
Bishop (UT)	Grayson	Nunes
Black	Griffith (VA)	Nunnelee
Blackburn	Grimm	O’Rourke
Bonamici	Guthrie	Olson
Boustany	Hahn	Pascarell
Bridenstine	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Brooks (AL)	Harper	Perlmutter
Brooks (IN)	Harris	Petri
Brown (FL)	Hastings (FL)	Pingree (ME)
Brownley (CA)	Hastings (WA)	Polis
Buchanan	Heck (WA)	Pompeo
Bustos	Hensarling	Posey
Butterfield	Higgins	Price (NC)
Byrne	Himes	Quigley
Calvert	Hinojosa	Rangel
Camp	Holt	Reichert
Cantor	Horsford	Ribble
Capito	Huelskamp	Rice (SC)
Capps	Huffman	Roby
Carney	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Carson (IN)	Hurt	Rogers (KY)
Carter	Issa	Rohrabacher
Cartwright	Jackson Lee	Rokita
Cassidy	Johnson (GA)	Rooney
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Roskam
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Chu	Kaptur	Rothfus
Ciilline	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Royce
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Ruiz
Cleaver	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Coble	King (NY)	Salmon
Cole	Kingston	Sanford
Collins (NY)	Kline	Scalise
Conaway	Kuster	Schiff
Conyers	LaMalfa	Schneider
Cook	Lamborn	Schock
Cooper	Langevin	Schwartz
Cramer	Lankford	Schweikert
Crawford	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Crenshaw	Latham	Scott, Austin
Culberson	Latta	Scott, David
Daines	Lipinski	Sensenbrenner
Davis (CA)	Loebsack	Serrano
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Sessions
DeGette	Long	Sewell (AL)
Delaney	Lowenthal	Shea-Porter
DeLauro	Lucas	Sherman
DelBene	Luetkemeyer	Shimkus
Dent	Lujan Grisham	Shuster
DesJarlais	(NM)	Simpson
Deutch	Luján, Ben Ray	Sinema
Diaz-Balart	(NM)	Smith (NE)
Dingell	Maloney,	Smith (NJ)
Doggett	Carolyn	Smith (TX)
Doyle	Marino	Smith (WA)
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Southerland
Duncan (TN)	McAllister	Speier
Ellison	McCarthy (CA)	Stewart
Enyart	McCaul	Stutzman
Eshoo	McClintock	Swalwell (CA)
Esty	McHenry	Takano
Farr	McIntyre	Thornberry
Fincher	McKeon	Tierney
Fleischmann	McKinley	Tonko
Fleming	McMorris	Tsongas
Fortenberry	Rodgers	Turner
Foster	McNerney	Van Hollen
Frankel (FL)	Meadows	Vargas
Franks (AZ)	Meeks	Velázquez
Frelinghuysen	Meng	Wagner
Gabbard	Messer	Walden
	Mica	Walorski

Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch

Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf

Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (IN)

NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION AND ABORTION INSURANCE FULL DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2014

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 465, I call up the bill (H.R. 7) to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions, 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 465, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-33 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 7

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act of 2014”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—PROHIBITING FEDERALLY FUNDED ABORTIONS

Sec. 101. Prohibiting taxpayer funded abortions.

Sec. 102. Amendment to table of chapters.

TITLE II—APPLICATION UNDER THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Sec. 201. Clarifying application of prohibition to premium credits and cost-sharing reductions under ACA.

Sec. 202. Revision of notice requirements regarding disclosure of extent of health plan coverage of abortion and abortion premium surcharges.

TITLE I—PROHIBITING FEDERALLY FUNDED ABORTIONS

SEC. 101. PROHIBITING TAXPAYER FUNDED ABORTIONS.

Title 1, United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following new chapter:

“CHAPTER 4—PROHIBITING TAXPAYER FUNDED ABORTIONS

“301. Prohibition on funding for abortions.

“302. Prohibition on funding for health benefits plans that cover abortion.

“303. Limitation on Federal facilities and employees.

“304. Construction relating to separate coverage.

“305. Construction relating to the use of non-Federal funds for health coverage.

“306. Non-preemption of other Federal laws.

“307. Construction relating to complications arising from abortion.

“308. Treatment of abortions related to rape, incest, or preserving the life of the mother.

“309. Application to District of Columbia.

“§301. Prohibition on funding for abortions

“No funds authorized or appropriated by Federal law, and none of the funds in any trust fund to which funds are authorized or appropriated by Federal law, shall be expended for any abortion.

“§302. Prohibition on funding for health benefits plans that cover abortion

“None of the funds authorized or appropriated by Federal law, and none of the funds in any trust fund to which funds are authorized or appropriated by Federal law, shall be ex-

pended for health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion.

“§303. Limitation on Federal facilities and employees

“No health care service furnished—

“(1) by or in a health care facility owned or operated by the Federal Government; or

“(2) by any physician or other individual employed by the Federal Government to provide health care services within the scope of the physician’s or individual’s employment, may include abortion.

“§304. Construction relating to separate coverage

“Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as prohibiting any individual, entity, or State or locality from purchasing separate abortion coverage or health benefits coverage that includes abortion so long as such coverage is paid for entirely using only funds not authorized or appropriated by Federal law and such coverage shall not be purchased using matching funds required for a federally subsidized program, including a State’s or locality’s contribution of Medicaid matching funds.

“§305. Construction relating to the use of non-Federal funds for health coverage

“Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as restricting the ability of any non-Federal health benefits coverage provider from offering abortion coverage, or the ability of a State or locality to contract separately with such a provider for such coverage, so long as only funds not authorized or appropriated by Federal law are used and such coverage shall not be purchased using matching funds required for a federally subsidized program, including a State’s or locality’s contribution of Medicaid matching funds.

“§306. Non-preemption of other Federal laws

“Nothing in this chapter shall repeal, amend, or have any effect on any other Federal law to the extent such law imposes any limitation on the use of funds for abortion or for health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion, beyond the limitations set forth in this chapter.

“§307. Construction relating to complications arising from abortion

“Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to apply to the treatment of any infection, injury, disease, or disorder that has been caused by or exacerbated by the performance of an abortion. This rule of construction shall be applicable without regard to whether the abortion was performed in accord with Federal or State law, and without regard to whether funding for the abortion is permissible under section 308.

“§308. Treatment of abortions related to rape, incest, or preserving the life of the mother

“The limitations established in sections 301, 302, and 303 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.

“§309. Application to District of Columbia

“In this chapter:

“(1) Any reference to funds appropriated by Federal law shall be treated as including any amounts within the budget of the District of Columbia that have been approved by Act of Congress pursuant to section 446 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (or any applicable successor Federal law).

“(2) The term ‘Federal Government’ includes the government of the District of Columbia.”

SEC. 102. AMENDMENT TO TABLE OF CHAPTERS.

The table of chapters for title 1, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

NAYS—142

Amash
Andrews
Bachus
Barr
Barton
Bass
Benishkek
Bentivolio
Bishop (NY)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Capuano
Cárdenas
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Connolly
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Crowley
Cummins
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
DeSantis
Duckworth
Duffy
Edwards
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Forbes
Foxy
Fudge
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Graves (MO)
Green, Al

Palazzo
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Renacci
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Stivers
Stockman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Walberg
Waters
Weber (TX)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—3

Gohmert
Grijalva
Payne

NOT VOTING—26

Amodei
Blumenauer
Brady (TX)
Campbell
Clay
Engel
Gardner
Jones
Labrador
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
Meehan
Miller (FL)
Neugebauer
Nugent
Owens
Pocan
Rogers (MI)
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schradler
Tipton
Titus
Westmoreland

1509

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1094

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN) be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1094.

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

There was no objection.

“4. Prohibiting taxpayer funded abortions 301”.

TITLE II—APPLICATION UNDER THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

SEC. 201. CLARIFYING APPLICATION OF PROHIBITION TO PREMIUM CREDITS AND COST-SHARING REDUCTIONS UNDER ACA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) DISALLOWANCE OF REFUNDABLE CREDIT AND COST-SHARING REDUCTIONS FOR COVERAGE UNDER QUALIFIED HEALTH PLAN WHICH PROVIDES COVERAGE FOR ABORTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 36B(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “or any health plan that includes coverage for abortions (other than any abortion or treatment described in section 307 or 308 of title 1, United States Code)”.

(B) OPTION TO PURCHASE OR OFFER SEPARATE COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Paragraph (3) of section 36B(c) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) SEPARATE ABORTION COVERAGE OR PLAN ALLOWED.—

“(i) OPTION TO PURCHASE SEPARATE COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed as prohibiting any individual from purchasing separate coverage for abortions described in such subparagraph, or a health plan that includes such abortions, so long as no credit is allowed under this section with respect to the premiums for such coverage or plan.

“(ii) OPTION TO OFFER COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall restrict any non-Federal health insurance issuer offering a health plan from offering separate coverage for abortions described in such subparagraph, or a plan that includes such abortions, so long as premiums for such separate coverage or plan are not paid for with any amount attributable to the credit allowed under this section (or the amount of any advance payment of the credit under section 1412 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act).”.

(2) DISALLOWANCE OF SMALL EMPLOYER HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSE CREDIT FOR PLAN WHICH INCLUDES COVERAGE FOR ABORTION.—Subsection (h) of section 45R of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking “Any term” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any term”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) EXCLUSION OF HEALTH PLANS INCLUDING COVERAGE FOR ABORTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified health plan’ does not include any health plan that includes coverage for abortions (other than any abortion or treatment described in section 307 or 308 of title 1, United States Code).

“(B) SEPARATE ABORTION COVERAGE OR PLAN ALLOWED.—

“(i) OPTION TO PURCHASE SEPARATE COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed as prohibiting any employer from purchasing for its employees separate coverage for abortions described in such subparagraph, or a health plan that includes such abortions, so long as no credit is allowed under this section with respect to the employer contributions for such coverage or plan.

“(ii) OPTION TO OFFER COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall restrict any non-Federal health insurance issuer offering a health plan from offering separate coverage for abortions described in such subparagraph, or a plan that includes such abortions, so long as such separate coverage or plan is not paid for with any employer contribution eligible for the credit allowed under this section.”.

(3) CONFORMING ACA AMENDMENTS.—Section 1303(b) of Public Law 111-148 (42 U.S.C. 18023(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (2);

(B) by striking paragraph (3), as amended by section 202(a); and

(C) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (2).

(b) APPLICATION TO MULTI-STATE PLANS.—Paragraph (6) of section 1334(a) of Public Law 111-148 (42 U.S.C. 18054(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(6) COVERAGE CONSISTENT WITH FEDERAL ABORTION POLICY.—In entering into contracts under this subsection, the Director shall ensure that no multi-State qualified health plan offered in an Exchange provides health benefits coverage for which the expenditure of Federal funds is prohibited under chapter 4 of title 1, United States Code.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 2014, but only with respect to plan years beginning after such date, and the amendment made by subsection (b) shall apply to plan years beginning after such date.

SEC. 202. REVISION OF NOTICE REQUIREMENTS REGARDING DISCLOSURE OF EXTENT OF HEALTH PLAN COVERAGE OF ABORTION AND ABORTION PREMIUM SURCHARGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 1303(b) of Public Law 111-148 (42 U.S.C. 18023(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) RULES RELATING TO NOTICE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The extent of coverage (if any) of services described in paragraph (1)(B)(i) or (1)(B)(ii) by a qualified health plan shall be disclosed to enrollees at the time of enrollment in the plan and shall be prominently displayed in any marketing or advertising materials, comparison tools, or summary of benefits and coverage explanation made available with respect to such plan by the issuer of the plan, by an Exchange, or by the Secretary, including information made available through an Internet portal or Exchange under sections 1311(c)(5) and 1311(d)(4)(C).

“(B) SEPARATE DISCLOSURE OF ABORTION SURCHARGES.—In the case of a qualified health plan that includes the services described in paragraph (1)(B)(i) and where the premium for the plan is disclosed, including in any marketing or advertising materials or any other information referred to in subparagraph (A), the surcharge described in paragraph (2)(B)(i)(II) that is attributable to such services shall also be disclosed and identified separately.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to materials, tools, or other information made available more than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable 1 hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the gentleman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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. 7.

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

There was no objection.

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

I come in support of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act.

This legislation is written with the same simple principle that has been supported on a bipartisan basis for decades. No taxpayer dollars should be spent on abortions and abortion coverage. H.R. 7 establishes a permanent Governmentwide prohibition on taxpayer subsidies for abortion.

This bill is all the more necessary because of the President’s health care law and its attack on this long-standing protection of taxpayer dollars. For example, the health care law’s premium subsidies can be used to purchase coverage on exchanges that include coverage of abortion.

The ACA breaks with the tradition of the Hyde Amendment, which has ensured that Federal dollars do not subsidize plans that cover abortion.

□ 1515

The bill before us would simply codify the Hyde amendment language so it applies across the Federal Government.

Consumers should also have the right to know whether the plans they are selecting on an exchange include abortion coverage. While the ACA included some notification provisions, many of our constituents are simply unable to find out whether a plan is paying for abortions. In fact, this inability to find out whether exchange plans provide abortion coverage seems to extend to the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

In October of last year, Secretary Sebelius committed in testimony before the Energy and Commerce Committee to provide the Congress and the American people a full list of exchange plans providing abortion coverage. She was asked again to provide this list in December. Yet we are still waiting as the days tick by. We do not have this list.

The self-appointed most transparent administration in history is simply either unwilling or unable to comply with this request. This is why we have added provisions of the Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act. This would ensure Americans have the right to know whether plans on the exchange are providing abortion coverage. This bill is about protecting taxpayer dollars and protecting life. It also ensures we have at least some transparency under the President’s health care law.

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

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

I rise to speak in opposition to H.R. 7.

H.R. 7 is not based on fact. The Affordable Care Act does not secretly funnel taxpayer dollars to fund abortions, and it is not based on the real

experiences of American women and families. They want to make their own personal health care decisions in consultation with their doctors and their spiritual advisors, not with their Congressmen.

Instead, this bill would squarely put the government, namely the IRS, in the exam room by effectively raising the taxes of those who choose an insurance plan that happens to cover abortion services. That includes hard-working men, women, and families who would be penalized, and it would burden small businesses, making each one second-guess its current insurance plan. It would make them change their coverage if they want to keep their health insurance coverage affordable. Simply put, H.R. 7 would dictate what individuals can do with their own private dollars.

Instead of this cynical attack on women's personal decisionmaking, we should be empowering our Nation's families by focusing on the economy, by strengthening the middle class, and by helping parents provide the best for their kids. It is really time to stop reverting back to the culture wars and to start trusting our Nation's women, our Nation's families and small businesses to make their own personal health care decisions.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. Madam Speaker, we were told over and over again: if you like your health insurance plan, you can keep it. We all found out that that wasn't true. I will never forget on the day that ObamaCare passed—I was here in this Chamber—we were promised by the President of the United States that, not only would the taxpayers of this country not be forced to pay for other people's abortions, but that abortion would not be a part of ObamaCare. We know today that isn't true. Abortion is a part of ObamaCare.

What is worse is that no matter how anyone feels about that issue there is pretty strong agreement that no one should be forced to violate one's conscience and pay for other people's abortions and be forced to do that, but that is the way it is. H.R. 7 makes President Obama's promise stand up and ring true, and it is this: that no taxpayer-funded money ever goes to pay for someone else's abortion.

Couldn't we unite on this principle? This is important.

Mrs. CAPPs. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank you for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, existing law very clearly states no taxpayers' money can fund abortions—that is already the law—with the exception of rape, incest, or to save a woman's life. The Repub-

licans are coming in and saying we have got to make sure that no taxpayer's money is going to be used to pay for any insurance that might provide abortions.

The law—the Affordable Care Act—provides that, if you get an insurance policy on the exchange, you can choose a policy that does not provide abortion coverage, but if you choose a policy that has abortion coverage, that portion of the policy must be paid by the purchaser, not the government.

So this is, in fact, like all we do around here, which is propaganda. It is politics. The Republicans try to make people believe that taxpayers' dollars are being used to pay for abortions. It is not true. This bill is bad in substance. It is an unfortunate bill that tries to interfere with the ability of people to buy with their own money a policy that may cover abortion services, which is a legal medical service.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS), who is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you to my distinguished colleague.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, of which I am a proud cosponsor. I am here today for those who cannot speak for themselves.

The premise of this legislation is nothing new. It simply continues the longstanding prohibition of using taxpayer dollars to pay for abortions. Regardless of whether you are pro-life or not, most Americans recognize that it is unfair to force every American in this country to subsidize abortion. This is, however, exactly what ObamaCare does. It has allowed taxpayer subsidies for health care plans that cover elective abortions. H.R. 7 is as much about protecting the taxpayer as it is about protecting the unborn.

I urge my colleagues to make the fair choice and to vote "yes" on this bill.

Mrs. CAPPs. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), who is the ranking member of the Health Subcommittee of Energy and Commerce.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 7. This legislation does nothing but impede women's access to health care in this country and turns the clock back on reproductive rights by 38 years.

The bill's sponsors claim it will prevent taxpayer dollars from paying for abortions. However, we already know that Federal funds do not go to abortions except in the limited cases of rape, incest, or to save the mother's life. This bill does not simply codify the Hyde amendment. That is bogus. What this bill does is prohibit millions of American families from using their own money to buy health plans that include abortion coverage.

Madam Speaker, spending time attacking women's health shows just how

far out of touch Republicans in Washington are. Instead of focusing on the economy and job creation, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would rather focus on legislation that puts access to reproductive health care in danger and undermines a woman's right to choose.

On December 28, unemployment insurance expired for Americans still struggling to find work. Meanwhile, Democrats have a bill that would raise the minimum wage to \$10.10 an hour, generating economic activity, creating jobs, and growing the middle class. These should be the priorities of the House of Representatives, not this phony bill before us. This legislation is an unprecedented, radical assault on women's health care. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN), who has been such an advocate on our life issues.

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the gentlelady for yielding and for her hard work on this very important issue.

Madam Speaker, I am humbled to join my pro-life colleagues here on the House floor and, more importantly, the millions of pro-life Americans across the country.

Although this debate is often clouded by empty euphemisms like "choice," we cannot forget the human element at the heart of this issue. This isn't about abstract concepts. This is about babies, the most vulnerable members of our society. At the same time, we must show compassion and offer help to those struggling through what seems like an impossible circumstance; and, as civilized people, we ought to prevent taxpayer dollars from subsidizing the senseless destruction of innocent lives once and for all. After all, we are a Nation founded to protect life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Today, we have an opportunity to do exactly that with commonsense legislation. Millions of pro-life Americans don't want their tax dollars used to subsidize abortions.

I urge my colleagues to support the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Mrs. CAPPs. Madam Speaker, I am now very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), a real champion for women's issues.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, this so-called "No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act" has got to be the most deceptively named bill of this Congress.

Here are the facts:

There is no taxpayer funding for abortion. The Affordable Care Act does not change that. Let me say that again. There is no taxpayer funding for abortion. The Affordable Care Act does not change that.

The ACA contains a hard-fought compromise that guarantees that the tax credits made available through the exchanges are segregated out for plans that cover certain women's health benefits. This bill is an attempt to undo

that compromise. It effectively bans the coverage of important women's health services in the new health insurance exchanges. It restricts the way that women can use their own private dollars to purchase private insurance. It says small businesses cannot get tax credits if they choose to use their private dollars to purchase private insurance that covers important women's benefits.

It goes far, far beyond the Hyde amendment, which prohibits taxpayer funding for most abortions in the annual appropriations bills. It also, for the first time, puts the Hyde amendment into law, and it says women in the District of Columbia will not have the same right to access health services as women in other States throughout this country.

This bill would not only restrict comprehensive health care for women; it would also undermine a woman's right to make her own health care decisions under her insurance policy with her own money. Vote "no."

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. I thank my colleague from Tennessee for her leadership on this particular issue.

For far too long, Madam Speaker, I was silent on this particular issue. Some 22 years ago, as we were expecting our first child—my wife was pregnant—I began to talk to her about this particular thing. There my son was kicking in his mother's womb, and as we started to see this, I realized very profoundly that not only was it life but that it responded. My son was responding to my voice and to my touch, and as we saw that, I realized that I had been silent for far too long.

Regardless of where you are on this particular issue, we must say something today—the many of us who find this just appalling that it is even legal today—in allowing taxpayer dollars to be spent. This is something on which we must stand together. So, for those who can't speak for themselves, I stand here today, and I urge my colleagues to support this particular legislation.

Mrs. CAPPs. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

□ 1530

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to be absolutely obsessed with taking away a woman's right to make her own personal health decisions with her own money.

Today, we could be extending unemployment benefits to 1.6 million Americans. Instead, we are considering legislation that would discriminate against a woman's right with her own money to pick an insurance policy. We could be raising the minimum wage instead of effectively banning abortion coverage in the ACA market, even though not a penny of Federal dollars will go

to do that. We could be passing the Healthy Families Act to provide paid sick leave, instead of erecting more barriers to women's ability to protect their health, and yes, including access to safe and legal abortions.

We should be defeating this legislation for three reasons:

First, because women and their doctors—not politicians—should make their health care decisions;

Secondly, because we should not be undermining access to comprehensive insurance coverage of women's health insurance paid by the insured woman, not the government;

Third, because we have more pressing priorities to address.

It is time that we moved on to things that matter to the American people and not continue this relentless war on women's rights.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I think it is important to realize over 60 percent of the American people agree with us on this issue. You can look at survey after survey. They do not want taxpayers funds used for abortion.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY), joining us in this fight to make certain that we preserve taxpayer funds, a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee for her leadership on this.

I have been intrigued at the latest rhetoric on the so-called "war on women." I am intrigued because at some point pro-abortion activists stopped using the word "abortion." Instead of using the "A" word, they use terms like "women's health" or "reproductive rights." It is a clever word game designed to disguise the truth and build artificial support. After all, who would be against the health of women? Who would oppose anyone's right to reproduce? But what about the baby's health? What about the unborn child's "right" to life?

They don't call it abortion anymore because people understand what abortion is. It is the taking of a life. It is death where life once existed. It is cruel and tragic, and there is no place in the Federal budget for funding it.

Mrs. CAPPs. I am now pleased to yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank my colleague for yielding time.

Madam Speaker, here at the start of the new year, when Americans are facing so many challenges in their lives, the Republicans are taking us off on this cruel tangent. We should be debating how to boost wages across this country, how to better educate our children, and how to ensure that everyone has a chance and an opportunity to be successful in their lives and secure in their futures, but yet again, a handful of mostly older, mostly male politicians here in Washington, D.C., believe that the priority for us is to interfere in the personal lives of women. They

want to intrude in the personal, private health care decisions of women and their families. They think they know best. But how can they?

I trust women and their families to make their own decisions, not the politicians here in Washington, D.C. Republicans in Congress should respect our right to privacy. Politicians shouldn't be allowed to direct treatments and oversee diagnoses from Washington, and they shouldn't unnecessarily restrict a woman's health insurance coverage and the comprehensive policy that she has paid for.

This Republican bill is an unprecedented, radical assault on a woman's right to make her own health and health insurance decisions. It interferes with the relationship between a patient and doctor.

Thankfully, this bill is not going anywhere after the vote today, but it does provide evidence of what Republicans in the House believe is the top priority for America.

Is it jobs? No. Is it boosting wages? No. Is it improving our schools and higher ed? No.

The Republicans' top priority today is to interfere in the personal lives and health decisions of women across our country.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPs. May I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 1 minute remaining, and the gentlewoman from Tennessee has 2 minutes remaining.

Mrs. CAPPs. Madam Speaker, H.R. 7 is not about taxpayer funding. It is about what women, families, and small businesses can do with their own money, their own private dollars, and it is about keeping Congress and the IRS out of the doctor's office.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to start trusting America's women to make their own decisions.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this dangerous bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

What an interesting debate we have and what a difference we have in philosophies as we approach the work of this Nation.

I have found it quite curious, as we have some who say we should be talking about how we live better lives and jobs and futures. You know what, Madam Speaker? As we talk today, what our focus is on is making certain that these precious unborn children do have that right to life, to liberty, to the pursuit of happiness. Yes, indeed.

Today, let me just clear up the record for the legislation before us where we talk about no taxpayer funding of abortion. I want to read from the legislation itself, Madam Speaker.

Section 304 in title I:

Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as prohibiting any individual, entity, or

State or locality from purchasing separate abortion coverage or health benefits coverage that includes abortion so long as such coverage is paid for entirely using only funds not authorized or appropriated by Federal law.

Reading directly from the bill and then going to section 306:

Nothing in this chapter shall repeal, amend, or have any effect on any other Federal law to the extent such law imposes any limitation on the use of funds for abortion or for health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion, beyond the limitations set forth in this chapter.

So, Madam Speaker, may I lay the fears aside of my colleagues. This is an issue that 60 percent of the American people agree with us on. It is an action that they think is important to take; that it is important for taxpayers to have the assurance from their government that we are not going to have taxpayer funds used for abortion.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

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

(Ms. JENKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, I am proud to stand before the House today in support of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. I supported this legislation last Congress because the message I have consistently received from my constituents is that they do not want their taxpayers dollars funding abortions. Period.

It is time to put this issue to rest once and for all. The majority of Americans, regardless of where they stand on the larger issue, do not want their taxpayer dollars paying for abortions, but for too long, we have had a patchwork of provisions when it comes to Federal funding, which has created potential loopholes and confusion. H.R. 7 solidifies the longstanding provisions of the Hyde amendment, which are especially needed when it comes to the Affordable Health Care Act.

Madam Speaker, I don't have time to stand here and list all of the problems with the President's health care law, but one of these problems can be fixed through the passage of this bipartisan bill, which simply states that taxpayer dollars will not pay for abortions.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

When I go home to talk to my constituents back home in Queens and the portions of the Bronx that I represent, there are a lot of issues that they bring up to me. They want to see unemployment insurance restored. They want to see jobs created. They want to see our economy strengthened. They want to see investments in infrastructure and building our communities.

But not once has anyone ever said, Forget all about that. They have never

said to me, Please raise my taxes if Uncle Sam objects to the health care plan I have picked for me, my family, or my business.

Yes, that's exactly what this bill does. It raises taxes on individuals, families, and small businesses.

I offered an amendment that would block this bill from taking effect if it would raise taxes, but the Republican majority, with yet another closed rule, refused to make that amendment in order. Why?

Because they knew that if that amendment were to become a part of this bill, it would kill this bill. Because no matter how you slice it, this Republican bill will raise taxes on hard-working Americans. Small businesses will pay more taxes because if their employee health plan covers abortion or reproductive care, the business will be denied the small business tax credit. No one denies that.

Families will pay more in taxes when they lose any tax credits they received to purchase a health insurance plan if the plan that works best for them happens to include abortion coverage. That is right. Families will have to give up on choosing their own plan.

Stripping these health care tax credits will have the same effect as if we denied or stripped out similar tax credits like the child tax credit or the higher education tax credit.

If this isn't a tax increase, I don't know what is.

This bill interferes with personal choice and decisions.

I find it ironic that my Republican colleagues claim to support ensuring Americans can pick a private health plan that suits their individual needs until the plan they pick covers legal services they find personally objectionable. I find it ironic that my Republican colleagues oppose every suggested tax increase out there until it is one that abnegates their social agenda.

There is no question this is a serious issue and it deserves serious consideration. Yet on an issue as important as access to comprehensive health care coverage—and with such severe tax implications—it is outrageous that this bill was not first considered by the Ways and Means Committee. The reason for that is Republicans are rushing this new bill forward. Not because they are looking to make good policy, but because they are looking to make good political friends—good political friends who support a very narrow political agenda.

I just wish the real issues that we need to be working on like extending unemployment insurance for 1.6 million Americans would get as much attention as all these made-up issues.

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

□ 1545

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume simply to note that, according to the staff of the Joint Committee on

Taxation, the bill would have negligible effects on tax revenues.

Similarly, the CBO estimates that any effects on direct spending would be negligible for each year and over the 10-year budget window.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the author of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend for her leadership and her very eloquent remarks.

My friend from New York talked about a narrow agenda and a narrow perspective. More than 60 percent of every poll, in the case of one poll, 69 percent of all women in the United States of America say they do not want their funds being used to subsidize abortion on demand.

Let me remind my colleagues that this legislation accomplishes three goals:

One, it makes the Hyde amendment and other current abortion funding prohibitions permanent. We just reauthorized all of those riders just a few weeks ago. This just makes them permanent;

Ensures that the Affordable Care Act faithfully conforms to the Hyde amendment, as promised by the President of the United States;

And provides full disclosure, transparency, and prominent display that is absolutely lacking right now of the extent to which any health insurance plan on the exchange funds abortion.

Madam Speaker, the President of the United States stood about 10 feet from where I am standing right now back in September of 2009 and told a joint session of Congress:

Under our plan, no Federal dollars will be used to fund abortion.

The executive order that was issued in March of 2010 said, and I quote, that the Affordable Care Act "maintains current Hyde amendment restrictions governing abortion policy and extends those restrictions to newly created health insurance exchanges."

Madam Speaker, that is simply not true. It is absolutely not true. As my colleagues know, the Hyde amendment has two parts. It prohibits direct funding for abortion, and it bans funding to any insurance coverage, any insurance plan that includes abortion, except in the cases of rape, incest, or to save the life of the mother.

Earlier speakers have said not a penny will go to pay for abortion. Yet under the Affordable Care Act, massive amounts of public funds—what are they if they are not public? They are public funds coming out of the U.S. Treasury in the forms of tax credits. That is the word used.

\$796 billion in direct spending, over 10 years, according to CBO, will pay for insurance plans, many, perhaps most of which will include elective abortions, abortion on demand.

Madam Speaker, that massively violates the Hyde amendment. You can't have it both ways. You can't say you

are for the Hyde amendment and you are comporting with the Hyde amendment when you violate it in such a way.

Let me also point out to my colleagues that there are many States where pro-life individuals and constituents will have no opportunity to buy a plan that is pro-life on the exchanges. That includes Connecticut and Rhode Island. Every plan is abortion-on-demand, so their premium dollars, your tax dollars and mine, will be combining to buy plans that provide for abortion-on-demand.

In 2014, Madam Speaker, we have learned so much about the magnificent life of an unborn child. Increasingly, we have also learned about the deleterious effects that abortions have on women, psychologically, the children born subsequently to them and, of course, to other aspects of their physical health.

Please support H.R. 7.

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, may I ask how much time we have.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 6 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Kansas has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, when you are not limited by the facts, you can say almost anything out on this floor; and we are hearing that today because, in the grand tradition of the anti-choice terminology, the title of this bill is an absolute farce.

Taxpayers do not currently fund abortions, and this legislation would do nothing more than make it difficult for private businesses to provide adequate health care for their workers, restrict how our Nation's Capital conducts its affairs, and generally block poor women from accessing safe and legal abortions.

In 1963, I was an intern in Buffalo, New York, before the Hyde amendment, before all the business and abortions were illegal. I stood there on the general medicine ward with two women, one with eight children, one with 12 children, who had gotten septic abortions done in a back alley, and they died.

They left eight and 12 children in that situation. Now, they did that because they didn't have access to clean abortions. They had made a choice. They can make a choice.

If we say women can't make a choice, that is very simple. We will just tell women what to do, which is really what this bill is all about.

The Republicans want to tell women what to do. Stay out of our lives, get the government out of our lives. No, in every area except women's health.

Now, the truth of the matter is not tax credits or health coverage. The heart of this debate is a simple question about does women's health count?

Do women deserve comprehensive health care?

Or are they some kind of submissive person who hangs around the house and we tell them what to do?

Are their health care needs real?

And does 51 percent of our population deserve control over their own health decisions?

Or are they special exceptions who need to be taken care of because they can't decide for themselves?

Do they have a right to make health decisions for themselves?

Does Congress have a right to stigmatize a safe, legal procedure?

Imagine if we were standing up here debating whether or not private business would be allowed to help employees get coverage for prostate cancer or erectile dysfunction drugs or vasectomies. Suppose we were to pass a law and say you can't pay for that kind of stuff?

Imagine if we told men that they would lose their deserved tax credits in the exchange if they purchased insurance that covered their health needs as they decide them?

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

Mr. CROWLEY. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Women's health care is health care. It is not Congress' job to stigmatize legal medical procedures and punish women who use them. It is also not Congress' job to tell Washington, D.C., what to do or to stop people from having their options.

This bill is insulting to women, and the Republicans are asking for it in the next election. If anybody votes for you, it is because they haven't paid attention to what you are doing out here today. You are insulting every woman in this country. She can't make her own decision about her health care.

I urge you to vote "no."

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, this is appalling that we are even at this point in talking about this providing health care for women. I am really shocked. If we are not providing the best possible medical help for expectant mothers and their unborn child, that is not the issue.

This country has always been the champion of life around the world, protecting human rights. We have always showed up at every single encounter, whenever people were being treated in a way that we thought was not right.

We worry about Syria and the fact that they are losing their citizens, that Assad is killing their citizens. Yet, since 1973, we have aborted 56 million unborn children, 56 million unborn children.

And today we are having a discussion on H.R. 7, where the only thing the American taxpayers are saying, we know, by law, a woman can make that

choice, but we also know that taxpayers don't want to fund it.

It is appalling that we have to have this type of a discussion in the United States of America when you know how we feel in our hearts and in our souls. You know how people feel about this.

I want you to think about those 56 million unborn children who could have made a huge difference in this world. It is absolutely appalling to sit in this great room where so many great debates over the protection of human rights and freedom and liberty have taken place and to be having this discussion.

This has nothing to do with us cutting back on women's health care. It has to do with taxpayers not wanting to fund an abortion. This is what we are talking about.

Please—and as the gentleman just said—is it about the next election? Really?

Have we reduced ourselves to only winning elections and not winning on behalf of people's rights?

These are human rights. I appreciate the time to come to speak.

Madam Speaker, I have got to tell you, this is one of the most disturbing things that we face in the country today, and I want our people to think about this: 56 million children have been aborted.

If we can't wake up and smell the roses on this, then shame on us.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, there is no tax money being used for abortions. That has been true since Henry Hyde served here with us.

What this bill does is not address that issue. It really is intended to eliminate abortion coverage in private insurance plans.

Our witness, Professor Wood, testified in the Judiciary Committee that eliminating the tax benefit, essentially raising taxes if a small business offers a broad insurance plan that includes abortion, will result in dropping that portion of the coverage. So this is really an extreme measure.

I understand that not everyone believes that women should make this choice. If you are opposed to abortion, don't have an abortion. But don't put the Federal Government in charge of the decisions that are properly and legally made by women, along with their husbands and families.

This is an extreme agenda. It is wrong, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, throughout history, there has often been great intensity surrounding the debates over protecting the innocent lives of those who, through no fault of their own, find themselves obscured in the shadows of humanity.

It encourages me greatly that in nearly all of those cases the collective

conscience was finally moved in favor of the victims. The same thing is beginning to happen in this debate related to innocent, unborn children.

No matter how the left has tried to obscure the true issue, we are finally beginning to ask ourselves the real question: Does abortion take the life of a child?

And we are finally beginning to realize, as a human family, Madam Speaker, that it does. Ultrasound technology demonstrates to all reasonable observers both the humanity of the victim and the inhumanity of what is being done to them.

And we are finally beginning to realize, as Americans, that 56 million lost little lives and their blood staining the foundations of this Nation is enough.

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, we are prepared to close, if the gentlelady has any additional speakers before she closes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Kansas has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, I don't see any additional speakers, so we will be prepared to close.

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady.

The gentlelady from Kansas, my good friend, who I respect greatly, said the overall tax effect is negligible. I would ask, negligible to whom?

If you are that person who can't get a needed tax credit, it is not negligible to you. It is very real.

Part of what is so troubling about this bill is it is not only how much further it goes than current existing law, but how much further this kind of thinking could go.

What other restrictions on medical procedures are next, as my friend from Washington said? If your procedure involves stem cells, prenatal care for teen mothers?

Could hospitals lose funding for training doctors in necessary procedures that this majority may deem troubling?

The question is, where does it end?

How many other ways can the majority use our laws to punish hardworking Americans?

□ 1600

Can they take away your student loans because your teacher wants you to read "Catcher in the Rye"? Can they limit your tax benefits for buying a house in the wrong neighborhood? The slope is steep and slippery. Vote "no" on this wrongheaded bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, we are not interested in raising taxes. This bill does not do that. We are simply ensuring that hardworking Americans who pay taxes and oppose abortion don't see their taxpayer dollars going to fund abortion.

We have had legislation similar to this bill in place for over three decades. This legislation is not a new idea. The

majority of Americans have long held that taxpayers should not be forced to foot the bill for abortion practices that they do not believe in.

I would ask everyone to support passage of H.R. 7, Madam Speaker, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I consume.

However stark Americans' differences of opinions can be on the matter of abortion, generally, there has long been bipartisan agreement that Federal taxpayer funds should not be used to destroy innocent life. The Hyde amendment, named for its chief sponsor, former House Judiciary Chairman Henry Hyde, has prohibited the Federal funding of abortion since 1976, when it passed a House and Senate that was composed overwhelmingly of Democratic Members.

It has been renewed each appropriations cycle with few changes for over 35 years, supported by Congress' control by both parties and Presidents from both parties. It is probably the most bipartisan, pro-life proposal, sustained over a longer period of time than any other.

Just last week, a Marist landline and cell phone poll of over 2,000 adults found that 58 percent of those surveyed oppose or strongly oppose using any taxpayer dollars for abortions. It is time the Hyde amendment was codified in the United States Code.

H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, sponsored by CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey, would do just that. It would codify the two core principles of the Hyde amendment throughout the operations of the Federal Government, namely, a ban on Federal funding for abortions and a ban on use of Federal funds for health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion.

During the time the Hyde amendment has been in place, probably millions and millions of innocent children and their mothers have been spared the horrors of abortion. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the Hyde amendment has led to as many as 675,000 fewer abortions each year. Let that sink in for a few precious moments.

The policy we will be discussing today has likely given America the gift of millions more children and, consequently, millions more mothers and millions more fathers, millions more lifetimes and trillions more loving gestures and other human gifts in all their diverse forms. What a stunningly wondrous legacy.

I encourage my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Ladies and gentlemen, H.R. 7 is not about the regulation of Federal funds.

Through the Hyde amendment, Congress already prevents funding of abortion and has done so for more than 30 years. Nothing in the Affordable Care Act changes this fact.

H.R. 7 is not needed to prevent the Federal funding of abortion, nor does it merely codify existing law as has been falsely asserted by those proponents. As a matter of fact, the bill on the floor today contains numerous new provisions adopted after the Judiciary Committee marked up and reported the bill.

This version of the bill has never been examined, debated, or amended by any committee of the House, yet my colleagues in the majority refuse to allow their colleagues any opportunity to amend this harmful bill today. This bill is far too significant and its impact on women is far too harmful to foreclose meaningful debate on an amendment as my colleagues in the majority have done.

This measure represents yet another assault on women's health care and constitutionally protected rights and should be rejected.

I reserve the balance of my time.

I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 7, the so-called "No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act."

This bill is just another ill-conceived attempt to push a divisive social agenda instead of focusing on what Americans care most about: creating jobs and improving our Nation's economy.

Plain and simple, H.R. 7 is not about the regulation of federal funds, but yet again another attack on women's health and their constitutionally-protected rights.

Sponsors of H.R. 7 want you to believe that the bill merely codifies existing law, but this is false.

For more than 30 years, the current law has prohibited federal funding for abortion. There is absolutely no risk that the public fisc will be raided to pay for abortion services, even under the Affordable Care Act.

The goal of H.R. 7 is to nullify the decisions of women and small business employers who choose insurance coverage that includes abortion coverage paid for with purely private, non-federal funds.

Through its novel tax penalty provisions, H.R. 7 departs radically from existing law, taking away women's existing health care and placing their health and lives at risk.

H.R. 7 eradicates the authority of the District of Columbia to make decisions about how locally raised funds are used for the healthcare of women.

When Delegate Holmes-Norton sought to address the Judiciary Committee about the bill's overreach, her request was denied by the Majority in utter disrespect for her and the District.

Women deserve a meaningful examination of their constitutionally-protected private health care decisions, not the frivolous and reckless process the Majority has undertaken on this bill before us today.

This bill was rushed through the Judiciary Committee, and was discharged from two other committees of jurisdiction—leaving no opportunity for their Members to seriously consider this legislation.

What the Majority has brought to the floor today contains numerous new provisions, has never been examined, debated, or amended by any Committee of the House.

The fact that the Minority is foreclosed from offering any amendments today is yet further proof that this legislation is simply intended to be yet another polemic attack on women, against our deliberative legislative process, and an attack against the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Why are these latest changes being demanded? Who is pushing this drastic course?

I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this egregious bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank Congressman CHRIS SMITH for his leadership in protecting the rights of the unborn.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of life. I believe in the sanctity of life, that life begins at conception, and that life is truly our greatest gift. I also recognize that abortion can be a very divisive issue. However, there is an area where most Americans agree and where elected officials can come together, and that is on the Federal funding of abortion.

Recent polling and information confirms what we have always known, that the majority of Americans do not want their hard-earned tax dollars going to pay for abortions. And Congress has consistently worked together over the years by attaching the Hyde amendment to appropriations bills to prevent taxpayer funds from going towards abortions.

Today the House will vote on a bill that I am proud to cosponsor and support, H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. This bill does exactly what the name implies: it permanently ensures that no taxpayer dollars go to pay for abortions or abortion coverage. This bill codifies the Hyde amendment as well as addresses taxpayer funding that, unfortunately, the Hyde amendment does not cover.

For example, ObamaCare expressly allows funding for plans that include abortions through taxpayer subsidies. During the health care debate, the President assured the American people that no Federal dollars would be used to fund abortions under ObamaCare. Yet this was just one more in a long line of inaccurate statements on ObamaCare by the President and his administration.

The No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act not only prevents taxpayer funding for abortion under ObamaCare, but it also requires transparency to ensure consumers are fully informed about which plans on the exchanges contain abortion coverage and surcharges.

Madam Speaker, throughout my life, I have worked hard to draw attention to the pro-life movement. I do it with love and compassion. I live for the day

when abortion is not just illegal, but it is unthinkable.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, today we consider H.R. 7, the misleadingly named No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion bill. Congress, unfortunately, already prohibits Federal funding of abortion. This bill does not simply codify existing law. Rather, it modifies and extends current funding restrictions in the Hyde amendment and, for the first time ever, uses the Tax Code to penalize the use of private funds to purchase insurance that covers abortion. It denies small businesses the tax credits they are entitled to under the Affordable Care Act if they offer their employees health insurance, if that health insurance covers abortion. It similarly denies income-eligible women and families the tax credits that they are entitled to under the Affordable Care Act if they use their own money to purchase insurance, if that insurance covers abortion.

The claim here is that a tax credit equals Federal funding. This is a completely new principle, asserted for the first and only time in this context. If we adopt this new theory—that granting tax relief is Federal funding—then how can tax relief for churches, synagogues, and religious-affiliated schools not be considered Federal funding in violation of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment? We should all be very careful about establishing this new principle.

H.R. 7 is not a codification of existing law, nor is it just another attempt to enact the approach taken in the Stupak-Pitts amendment to the House-passed Affordable Care Act. H.R. 7 is a radical departure from current tax treatment of medical expenses and insurance coverage; and it is not justifiable, nor is it necessary, unfortunately, to prevent Federal funding of abortion.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote “no” on this bill.

Today the House will consider H.R. 7—a bill that embraces the completely fictitious claim that legislation is needed to prevent federal funding of abortion services.

Congress already prohibits federal funding of abortion and has done so for more than thirty years. Many of us disagree with that decision. But regardless, there is no need for this bill, at least not to prevent federal funding of abortion.

Nor is the bill simply an effort to codify existing law. H.R. 7 modifies and extends current funding restrictions in the Hyde Amendment that are limited in time and scope, without any effort to determine how such a sweeping and permanent expansion would impact American women and their families.

If this were all, that would be reason enough to oppose it, but H.R. 7 actually goes much further. For the first time ever, anti-choice lawmakers are using the Federal tax code to penalize the purchase of insurance that covers abortion in certain circumstances. These penalties would apply when women and busi-

nesses use their own money—let me repeat that, their own money, not Federal funds—to purchase insurance that covers abortion.

In particular, H.R. 7 penalizes income-eligible women by denying them the tax credits that they are entitled to under the Affordable Care Act if they use their own money to purchase insurance that covers abortion. It similarly denies small businesses the tax credits that they are entitled to under the Affordable Care Act if the insurance they offer their employees includes abortion coverage.

The claim here is that a tax credit equals Federal funding. This is a completely new principle, asserted for the first and only time in this context. If we adopt this new theory—that granting tax relief is Federal funding—then how can tax relief for churches not be considered Federal funding in violation of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment? I am sure that many churches, synagogues, other houses of worship, and religiously-affiliated schools would be alarmed to discover this.

We all should be very careful about establishing this new principle.

Some additional tax penalties were in the bill when it was considered by the House Judiciary Committee. Those were removed and we now have new provisions that have never been considered by any Committee.

We have no idea who made these changes or why they were made. But they demonstrate the fiction and hypocrisy that underlies this bill.

This bill, unlike the version considered in the Judiciary Committee, no longer denies women who pay for abortion out-of-pocket the ability to claim those expenses as deductible medical expenses. And this version no longer taxes women when they use money they have set aside in flexible savings accounts or health savings accounts for abortion services. We welcome the removal of those tax penalty provisions, but these changes are not nearly enough.

This version, unlike the bill considered by House Judiciary, also adds a notice requirement that requires insurance companies to provide a false notice to policyholders that they will be forced to pay a so-called “abortion surcharge” if they are in a plan that covers abortion.

Existing law already requires plans to disclose to consumers whether a policy includes abortion. No further notice is necessary. And there is no surcharge for this coverage, as the new notice provision falsely suggests. The Affordable Care Act requires participating insurance plans to segregate monies for abortion services from all other funds, a measure my anti-choice colleagues insisted was necessary to prevent Federal funding of abortion. The segregation of a private dollar contribution of at least \$1 a month is not a surcharge at all but merely a segregation of the premium. The new notice provision requires insurance companies to mislead consumers into mistakenly believing that they are paying a separate, additional charge for coverage of abortion and that they would pay a lesser premium for insurance that does not cover abortion.

The harms caused by this bill are compounded by the fact that we are being forced to consider it under a closed rule, with no opportunity for amendment.

The potential impact of this bill on the rights of individuals to spend their own funds to purchase comprehensive insurance that cover all of their health care needs (including the potential of an unplanned pregnancy) is significant.

Members should have been given the chance to consider amendments and debate the impact of this bill—and, in particular, its untested tax provisions—before taking an up or down vote on the whole package. This bill is too important, the impact on the rights of all Americans to spend their own money in ways see fit too great, simply to close the door to any debate.

I urge all my colleagues to vote no on this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for his leadership on this, and I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for sponsoring this bill.

Whether you are pro-choice or pro-life, I think we can all agree on this: it is wrong to spend hard-earned tax dollars to pay for abortions. Yet that is the policy of this administration through ObamaCare and what today's bill reverses. This commonsense provision ensures tax dollars are used wisely and government policy does not violate Americans' basic rights.

H.R. 7 brings a stop to government-subsidized abortion created through ObamaCare, creates transparency by ensuring citizens have the information they need regarding their insurance policy and whether it pays for abortion or not, and, ultimately, lessens the number of lives ended through abortion. This legislation is important for the future of our country and forces our government to no longer be complicit in taking the lives of millions of innocent babies.

We now live in a country that is trending pro-life, and a CNN poll shows that 61 percent of respondents oppose public funding for abortion. Forcing Americans to pay for services that they find morally unconscionable is wrong.

The pro-choice Alan Guttmacher Institute demonstrates that when tax dollars are used, abortions increase by 25 percent. Conversely, by ensuring tax dollars are not used for abortions, we can not only save hard-earned tax dollars, but we can save lives, and that is a policy we can all live with.

I ask my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 7.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), a distinguished Judiciary Committee member.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

H.R. 7 is a dangerous bill, and it is an attack on women's health, particularly women who get subsidies based on their ability to purchase insurance under ObamaCare. This bill is also emblematic of a Republican Party that is utterly and completely out of touch with Americans.

□ 1615

Americans want to grow this economy. They want jobs. The response of the Republicans, however, is more anti-gay, anti-woman legislation. They have even referred to this as a job-creating bill. Not one job will be created by the bill. Why don't we focus on getting Americans back to work instead of doing everything we can to restrict women's health care choices? Let's focus on helping the 1.3 million Americans whose unemployment benefits lapsed a month ago today.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. At this time, Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time to me, and I thank Mr. SMITH for bringing this very important legislation here to the House.

I rise today in support of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act—commonsense, bipartisan legislation that will protect American taxpayers from footing the bill for this barbaric practice of abortion, in turn helping to protect women's health and unborn life.

Now, despite the legislation's bipartisan support, we have heard more than a few mischaracterizations of this bill from our colleagues across the aisle, and as a woman, I reject these false attacks. This legislation is not about taking away anyone's choice. It is about giving choice to the nearly two-thirds of Americans who don't want their hard-earned tax dollars funding the destruction of innocent life.

Madam Speaker, as a nurse for over 40 years, I have seen countless births. I have seen the joy in a mother's eyes as she holds her newborn for the first time, and I have also seen a young woman lose her life to abortion.

Those experiences informed my belief that all life—born and unborn, mother and child—is a precious gift, and I hope to see the day that this truth is reflected in our Nation's laws. Until then, we can, at least, protect the values and conscience of millions of American taxpayers by passing this legislation.

I look forward to voting "yes" on the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, new year, new Congress, but the same old political tricks. H.R. 7, the so-called No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, will not do anything further to stop tax dollars from funding abortions because

tax dollars are already restricted from funding abortion and have been ever since the Hyde amendment was introduced in 1976.

As one of the five female members on the Judiciary Committee, I strongly oppose this bill that will undermine women from using their own private funds to buy their own private insurance for health coverage. This is a ploy to drive out abortion coverage in the private market. Millions of women who purchase health insurance in the private market will lose access to comprehensive health insurance.

It is time to end these games once and for all. Decisions about a woman's reproductive health belong between that woman and the doctor she trusts, not with politicians who would interfere with a woman's private decision.

I urge a "no" vote on this bill.

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

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to oppose this sweeping anti-choice bill which would deny premium tax credits to income-eligible women and their families if the insurance they obtain under the Affordable Care Act covers abortion—except in cases of rape, incest and when a woman's life is in danger.

What experts in the health care industry predict, and as one of the witnesses at this month's Judiciary hearing testified, is that the burdensome regulatory requirements contained in this bill would have a chilling effect and lead to insurers dropping abortion coverage from their plans.

While this bill provides a narrow exception if a woman's life is in danger, unfortunately, it would not allow any exceptions to protect a woman's health, even in circumstances where she needs an abortion to prevent severe, permanent damage to her health.

Each patient is different, and legislators cannot know the circumstances of every pregnancy. They should not interfere in personal, private medical decisions that should be made between a woman, her family and her doctor. I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 7.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, let me thank the gentleman who has served on this committee of opportunity, equality and justice for his entire career, among other committees, in the United States Congress. Let me thank the manager and chairman of the Judiciary Committee, as well.

We do not come to the floor in argument about each other's conscience. We respect the belief of others and the conscience of others and the integrity of the decision made by those who choose to stand for their positions. As a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, I only stand here on the basis

of equal protection under the law and the applying of the Constitution to every single person, which includes a woman's access to health care.

What H.R. 7 does beyond the Hyde amendment, which has been law and in law and adhered to for decades, one, that I would be reminded of the eloquence of Chairman Hyde, who would be on the floor discussing the continuation of his position.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. That is very kind, sir.

If, for example, you have pretax money for health care or a health savings account, you are taken care of, but if you live in the District of Columbia and you want to use local funds, you are left along the highway of unequalness. If you are in the United States military, you are left along the highway of unequalness. If, for example, you have been the victim of sexual assault that results in a situation that requires access to health care, you are left alone. Federal employees, you are left alone. Poor, you are left alone.

The bill that we have was just submitted to the Rules Committee. It was not before the House Judiciary Committee. We don't know what is in it.

So, Madam Speaker, I do not rise against a person's conscience. I rise and hold the Constitution in my hand, and that is that we have a right to privacy, and we have a right to use local or your own funds, and in this bill, all of that has been denied. I ask the question: Can we pass this legislation and deny Americans equal protection under the law?

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation which is an assault on women; and ask that my colleagues also vote against H.R. 7, The No Taxpayer Funding For Abortion Act.

What we have before us in H.R. 7 is a dangerous and misleading bill which has one goal—eliminating abortion coverage in all of the insurance markets. And it is the reincarnation of H.R. 3 which was a featured bill in the last Congress.

And although some terrible things were in the bill have been removed—this bill is still an attack on women.

Let me be clear, if H.R. 7 were to become law, all women could either lose insurance coverage that includes abortion or be stigmatized while seeking such comprehensive insurance.

Mr. Speaker, I offered an amendment in the Rules Committee last night along with ALL of the women on the Judiciary Committee, which was summarily rejected as were all of the other amendments to this bill.

Our amendment would have corrected a shortcoming in the bill, which only considers a woman's health when she is faced with death.

I would like to thank all four women on the Judiciary Committee, KAREN BASS, JUDY CHU, SUSAN DELBENE, and ZOE LOFGREN who co-sponsored this important amendment.

Every year, 10–15 million women suffer severe or long-lasting damage to their health during pregnancy.

This Congress should not be in business of interfering with a woman's health nor should we ever single out women who choose not to endure a long-lasting health defect or disease due to a pregnancy.

Without this amendment, this Congress would submit millions of women to face serious and long-lasting health issues.

Our amendment reflects the 1978 version of the Hyde Amendment by incorporating an exemption for severe and long-lasting damage to a woman's health in continuing a pregnancy.

This amendment is supported by the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists.

Women must receive the best health care and disease prevention and have access to all medically appropriate legal medical procedures.

And Mr. Speaker it must be stated over and over that this is purely partisan and divisive legislation which:

1. Unduly burdens a woman's right to terminate a pregnancy and thus puts their lives at risk;
2. Does not contain exceptions for the health of the mother;
3. Unfairly targets the District of Columbia; and
4. Infringes upon women's right to privacy, which is guaranteed and protected by the U.S. Constitution.

The bill poses a nationwide threat to the health and wellbeing of American women and a direct challenge to the Supreme Court's ruling in *Roe v. Wade*.

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

Women like Danielle Deaver, who was 22 weeks pregnant when her water broke. Tests showed that Danielle had suffered anhydramnios, a premature rupture of the membranes before the fetus has achieved viability.

This condition meant that the fetus likely would be born with a shortening of muscle tissue that results in the inability to move limbs. In addition, Danielle's fetus likely would suffer deformities to the face and head, and the lungs were unlikely to develop beyond the 22-week point. There was less than a 10 percent chance that, if born, Danielle's baby would be able to breathe on its own and only a 2 percent chance the baby would be able to eat on its own.

H.R. 7 hurts women like Vikki Stella, a diabetic, who discovered months into her pregnancy that the fetus she was carrying suffered from several major anomalies and had no chance of survival. Because of Vikki's diabetes, her doctor determined that induced labor and Caesarian section were both riskier procedures for Vikki than an abortion.

Every pregnancy is different. No politician knows, or has the right to assume he knows, what is best for a woman and her family. These are decisions that properly must be left to women to make, in consultation with their partners, doctors, and their God.

H.R. lacks the necessary exceptions to protect the health and life of the mother.

H.R. 7 is an unconstitutional infringement on the right to privacy, as interpreted by the Supreme Court in a long line of cases going back to *Griswold v. Connecticut* in 1965 and *Roe v. Wade* decided in 1973.

In *Roe v. Wade*, the Court held that a state could prohibit a woman from exercising her right to terminate a pregnancy in order to protect her health prior to viability.

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

Supreme Court precedents make it clear that neither Congress nor a state legislature can declare any one element—"be it weeks of gestation or fetal weight or any other single factor—as the determinant" of viability. *Colautti v. Franklin*, 439 U.S. 379, 388–89 (1979).

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

This right of privacy was hard won and must be preserved inviolate. And again, our amendment would have helped to preserve this hard won right for women.

Let's not turn back the hands of time Mr. Speaker—vote "no" on H.R. 7.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Speaker, no child is unwanted. Let me repeat that. No child is unwanted. There are millions of American couples today that are waiting to give these unborn children a home—a loving home. I don't know all the circumstances, but I do know that a lot of the unborn are little girls and little boys. I don't know about my colleagues, but I believe that God has a plan for each of those unborn children, and I don't believe that that plan includes terminating their life.

Now, that may not be a popular thing to say. But can't we focus on the unborn and the fact that there are millions of families out there, many of them childless, that would love to have these little girls and boys in their home?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield briefly to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a list of those opposing H.R. 7 into the RECORD.

ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSING H.R. 7, THE "NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT"

Advocates for Youth; American Association of University Women (AAUW); American Civil Liberties Union; American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists; American Public Health Association; American Society for Reproductive Medicine; Asian & Pacific Islander American Health Forum; Association of Reproductive Health Professionals (ARHP); Black Women's Health Imperative, Catholics for Choice; Center for Reproductive Rights; Choice USA.

Feminist Majority; Guttmacher Institute; Hadassah, The Women's Zionist Organization

of America, Inc; Jewish Women International; Joint Action Committee for Political Affairs; Methodist Federation for Social Action; NARAL Pro-Choice America; National Abortion Federation; National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum (NAPAWF); National Center for Lesbian Rights; National Council of Jewish Women; National Family Planning and Reproductive Health Association; National Health Law Program; National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health.

National Organization for Women; National Partnership for Women & Families; National Women's Health Network; National Women's Law Center; People For the American Way; Physicians for Reproductive Health; Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Population Connection Action Fund; Population Institute; Raising Women's Voices for the Health Care We Need; Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice.

Religious Institute; Reproductive Health Technologies Project; Sexuality Information and Education Council of the U.S. (SIECUS); South Carolina Small Business Chamber of Commerce; Third Way; Unitarian Universalist Association; Unitarian Universalist Women's Federation; United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to yield the remainder of the time to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, there has been a lot said today about taxpayer money being used for abortion. I think it is important to note that that does not occur in America today. That decision was made a number of decades ago recognizing that taxpayer funds will not be used. So what are we doing here? What we are doing is making sure that abortion can't be offered in the private insurance market. That is what we are doing here.

It was said earlier that the CBO had indicated there would be a minimal impact from the tax increase on small businesses if a broad insurance plan was offered that included abortion. The reason for that is that it is anticipated that all of those small businesses will avoid the tax increase and drop the abortion coverage. So that is why there would not be a large impact, but there will be a large impact on women because, although there are exceptions for the life of the mother, there is no exception for the health of the mother, something that is required by the Constitution and our Supreme Court. In those cases, this can be a very expensive proposition.

I will just tell you an example of a person whom I know, Vicki, who, unfortunately, her much-wanted child, all of this child's brains formed outside of the cranium. There was no question this wanted child was not going to survive more than a minute or 2. Unfortunately for Vicki, without an abortion, the expectation was that her uterus would be destroyed and she would not be able to have other children—not that she would die, but that she would not be able to have other children that she and her husband wanted to have.

It is very expensive to get some of these procedures when your health is

at risk. So, yes, we will not have increases on small businesses because they will drop these coverages, but the women of America are going to be told by this government, yes, we know better than you do. We are going to decide for you.

Vote "no" on this very wrongheaded bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would say that the evidence is overwhelming that the American people do not support using taxpayer funds for abortion, and the evidence is very strong that that should not be allowed under ObamaCare, either, and it is also very strong that individuals have the opportunity with their own private funds to purchase a policy that provides for abortion. It might be a separate policy from the policy that provides their health insurance. It would be probably not very expensive. That is their choice. That is their conscience. That is not what the American people expect to see done with their taxpayer dollars.

In fact, as one of our committee witnesses pointed out, a majority of the public opposes government funding for abortion. Women oppose funding by a few percentage points more than men, and those who are poor and would presumably be those most likely to seek government funding for abortion oppose it more than those who are more affluent.

The bill before us today is supported by all segments of American society, and it should be supported by this House, as well. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. Let's pass it through the House.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 7, the "No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act." This legislation codifies the longstanding, bipartisan Hyde amendment, which prevents taxpayer funds from being used for abortion-related costs.

The legislation before us today imposes restrictions with respect to two ObamaCare-related tax benefits: the Exchange subsidies and the small business health insurance credit.

These two provisions were included in a broader bill passed in the 112th Congress. The legislation is necessary because the Democrats' health care law included a massive expansion of the IRS's authority and funneled taxpayer funds for various costs and procedures, including abortions.

This legislation will prevent the use of taxpayer funding for abortions—reflecting the spirit and the intent of the Hyde amendment.

However, I want to be clear about what the legislation would not do.

It would not affect either the ability of an individual to pay for an abortion (or for abortion coverage) through private funds, or the ability of an entity to provide separate abortion coverage.

It would not apply to abortions in cases of rape, incest or life-threatening physical condition of the mother.

It would not apply to treatment of injury, infection or other health problems resulting from an abortion.

Simply put, this bill is about making sure taxpayer funds are not used to pay for abortions and does not affect the use of private funds. As such, this legislation takes the necessary steps to codify the Hyde amendment in the tax code so that it appropriately reflects changes that have occurred as a result of ObamaCare.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 7, another thinly veiled attempt to limit American women from being able to access comprehensive health care.

It may be a new year, but 2014 clearly has not inspired new beginnings for the Majority leadership in this House of Representatives. Last year, under Republican leadership, we did not take up immigration reform, we did not overhaul No Child Left Behind, and we did not vote on legislation to create jobs, or help those who have been struggling to find work. In fact, Congress's failure to extend unemployment benefit left millions of Americans, including 90,000 New Jerseyans, without their benefits.

But instead of taking on these critical issues, we are here today considering a radical bill that failed in 2011, but has been resurrected by the Majority so they continue to pursue their war on women and their vendetta against the Affordable Care Act.

This deceptively named "No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act" is not about unauthorized use of taxpayer dollars. The purpose of this legislation is to permit the federal government to interfere with a woman's decision to use private dollars on legal health services. This dangerous legislation would jeopardize the availability of safe reproductive health care services for all American women. In addition to intentionally interfering with women's access to health services, this bill would result in higher taxes for small businesses, and permanently bar military service women, civil servants, D.C. residents, and low-income women from abortion coverage.

For 2014, I propose a New Year's resolution for this Congress. Let's cease the tired partisan ploys, and work together on legislation that expands—not limits—Americans' access to quality health care coverage. Let's work together to craft legislation that accelerates job growth, and let's work together to ensure that Americans get their unemployment benefits.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, thank you for bringing this critical bill to the floor today. I'd also like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. SMITH, for authoring this legislation.

Coming on the heels of the 41st anniversary of Roe v. Wade, this bill signifies our staunch support of life and the importance of preventing taxpayers' funds from being used to pay for abortion.

For years, our government has had an uneven approach to federal funding of abortions. This bill would create a single, unified policy across all federal agencies. U.S. taxpayer funds are not to be used to pay for abortions whether it be funding for elective abortion coverage through any program funded through the annual Labor, Health and Human Services Appropriations Act; funding for health plans that include elective abortion coverage for Federal employees; congressionally appropriated funds for abortion in the District of Columbia; or funding through the Peace Corps or

federal prisons or federal immigration detention centers to pay for elective abortion.

The No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act will do just what the title says. It will ban the use of federal funds for abortion or health plans that cover abortion. H.R. 7 prohibits abortions at facilities owned or operated by the federal government, and prevents federal employees from performing abortions within the scope of their employment.

The founding fathers strongly believed that human beings are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which is the right to life, and therefore the right to life of each human being should be preserved and protected by every human being in the society and by the society as a whole. It is our duty as Members of Congress to protect those who cannot speak for themselves.

Mr. TERRY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 7—the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Our Founding Fathers, when writing the Declaration of Independence, listed three rights that this Congress has an obligation to protect, the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

I believe strongly that life begins at conception and thus it's our obligation to protect the right to life, especially for the most defenseless.

It's unconscionable to me that some would even consider using Federal dollars to perform these heinous acts against the unborn. Unfortunately, there are some who would like this practice to continue even though a majority of Americans don't believe that taxpayer funds should be used to abort a baby.

The bill that we're debating today prohibits taxpayer-funded abortions but leaves exceptions for rape, incest and the life of the mother. This legislation also holds the President's health care law to the same standard by making sure those receiving assistance to participate in the newly formed health care exchanges aren't able to receive abortion on demand.

Like many parents, I will never forget when I first heard my child's heart beat. It was a sign of a healthy, living child of God. It was a defining moment for me as a father knowing that my wife and I were bringing and responsible for another human being.

I strongly urge the House to pass this bill because we cannot and shouldn't accept abortion on demand with taxpayer dollars.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Longstanding federal policy explicitly prohibits the use of federal funds for abortions, except for certain narrow circumstances of rape, incest, or severe health complications that threaten the life of the mother. The Affordable Care Act (ACA) maintains this ban and a federal appeals court confirmed that no federal dollars may be used to pay for abortion services under the law.

Far more sweeping in scope than the title implies, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act goes well beyond codifying the Hyde amendment and protecting public funds. This bill intrudes on women's reproductive autonomy and access to health care, manipulates the tax code to put additional financial burdens on many women and small businesses, and unnecessarily restricts the private insurance choices available to consumers today.

The House of Representatives should be spending our time working to improve access

to health care for all Americans, instead of deceptive legislation that interferes with a woman's ability to make personal, private medical decisions.

□ 1630

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 465, 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. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Ms. MOORE. Yes, Madam Speaker, I am opposed to the bill.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. MOORE moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

TITLE III—RULE OF CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 301. PROTECTING THE MEDICAL PRIVACY OF WOMEN, INCLUDING VICTIMS OF RAPE AND INCEST.

Nothing in title I, section 201(b), or section 202 of this Act shall be construed to authorize any party to violate, directly or indirectly, the medical privacy of any woman, including the victims of rape or incest, with respect to her choice of or use of comprehensive health insurance coverage.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, the motion to recommit is very simple, as the Clerk stated. It will ensure that nothing in this bill shall be construed to authorize any party to violate the medical privacy of any woman, including the victims of rape or incest with respect to her choice of or use of comprehensive health insurance.

Here we are today, Madam Speaker, on the day of the State of the Union when long-term unemployment insurance has lapsed, debating a recycled bill that attacks women's health care. This is truly an out-of-touch moment for the majority.

The legislation under consideration today fundamentally lacks compassion. Women's health advocates have expressed strong concerns about its impact on women's right to privacy when it comes to their medical care and decisions. This bill could have damaging effects on women who have been raped

and victimized by incest, who suffer from debilitating illnesses like the one that the gentlewoman from California described, Vicky, who want nothing more than their right to make their own personal health care decisions with their own private insurance.

I have heard people continuously say that this is a recodification of the Hyde amendment. We all abide by the Hyde amendment. This bill seeks to strip women of their rights to have insurance even in the private insurance market. That is why I invite my colleagues to join me in passing this motion to recommit today, to ensure that we do not unintentionally eviscerate protections that are fundamental to women's health and liberty.

We are greatly concerned about this legislation, that it would force women in private health insurance to have to "justify" their need for a full range of reproductive health care services even if their life is in danger or if they have been the victim of sexual assault or incest. This legislation, again, could remove the option for a health insurance company to choose to offer comprehensive women's health services.

Many of us remember, some of us on a very personal level, the egregious history of this issue. Many of us remember the shame and stigma that women—victims—faced, and still face when they come forward to seek services. Depending on how this bill is implemented, a woman could be required to provide extensive documentation to save her own life or even prove to her insurance company that she was assaulted. What will happen? Will she have to go to court, Madam Speaker? Will there be an IRS audit?

Madam Speaker, there are just so many unanswered questions, and the answers could have meaningful consequences for women across our entire country.

What kind of proof would a woman need to exercise options for health care? Who gets to determine whether or not a woman's sexual assault was a legitimate rape? What kind of intensively private information would be required to establish this proof? Who in the insurance company or other entity would be equipped to make a ruling on the validity laid out in the bill?

Oh, we remember our history as women, of humiliation and public degradation that forced victims of rape or incest to stay in the shadows rather than to get the health care they need and deserve, or to seek justice against their attacker.

This motion to recommit simply makes sure that we uphold our history of protecting the confidentiality and medical privacy of women, upholding women's constitutional right to health care, particularly those who are victims of terrible crimes. I urge my colleagues to adopt this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my point of order and rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I find it so interesting that we have an MTR when just 2 weeks ago we brought to this floor a bill that Chairman PITTS brought from Energy and Commerce that addressed the privacy issues and concerns of all Americans that have had to go to the healthcare.gov site. I would remind my colleagues that there were 67 Members of their caucus that crossed the aisle and voted with us. Privacy is an important issue, and we are concerned about that issue for all Americans.

I would also remind my colleagues who have inquired about the possibility of an IRS audit that we have seen many of those come out of this administration. I would remind them when they say we are remembering our history as women that we all stand and we remember that the first guarantee, the first right is the right to life. We have a responsibility as Members of the people's House to make certain we do the will of the people, and over 60 percent of all Americans say do not use my money. All money we have is taxpayer money, and do not use it to fund abortions. This is what we are doing.

I would remind all of my colleagues in the House that the bill that is before us today upholds and follows a long-standing principle that the American people and Members from both sides of the aisle have supported for decades, that is, that taxpayer dollars should not be spent on abortions and abortion coverage except in the instance of rape, incest, and life of the mother.

The vast majority of my colleagues, Democrat colleagues, voted for this same principle in last month's appropriations bill; yet this simple fact seems to be eluding most of them who have come to the floor today. I would encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this motion to recommit and to vote for H.R. 7 and the underlying legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 192, nays 221, answered "present" 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 29]

YEAS—192

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia

Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsock
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

NAYS—221

Aderholt
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter

Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick

Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley

McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus

Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Lipinski
NOT VOTING—17

Amodei
Blumenauer
Campbell
Chaffetz
Clay
Frelinghuysen
Hinojosa
Jones
LaMalfa
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Runyan

□ 1704

Messrs. REED, BENTIVOLIO, DesJARLAIS, MURPHY of Pennsylvania, GOHMERT, RYAN of Wisconsin, and MESSER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. CAPPs, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. WATERS, Messrs. GARAMENDI, HUFFMAN, Mses. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, SCHAKOWSKY, Messrs. MCINTYRE, RAHALL, and THOMPSON of Mississippi changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 29, I was unexpectedly detained and just missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

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.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 188, answered “present” 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]
YEAS—227

Aderholt	Graves (GA)	Paulsen
Amash	Graves (MO)	Pearce
Bachmann	Griffin (AR)	Perry
Bachus	Griffith (VA)	Peterson
Barletta	Grimm	Pittenger
Barr	Guthrie	Pitts
Barton	Hall	Poe (TX)
Benishek	Harper	Pompeo
Bentivolio	Harris	Posey
Bilirakis	Hartzer	Price (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Rahall
Black	Heck (NV)	Reed
Blackburn	Hensarling	Reichert
Boustany	Herrera Beutler	Renacci
Brady (TX)	Holding	Ribble
Bridenstine	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp	Rigell
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Buchanan	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Bucshon	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Burgess	Hurt	Rogers (KY)
Byrne	Issa	Rogers (MI)
Calvert	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Camp	Johnson (OH)	Rokita
Cantor	Johnson, Sam	Rooney
Capito	Jordan	Ros-Lehtinen
Carter	Joyce	Roskam
Cassidy	Kelly (PA)	Ross
Chabot	King (IA)	Rothfus
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Royce
Coble	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)	Salmon
Cole	Klme	Sanford
Collins (GA)	Labrador	Scalise
Collins (NY)	LaMalfa	Schock
Conaway	Lamborn	Schweikert
Cook	Lance	Scott, Austin
Cotton	Lankford	Sensenbrenner
Cramer	Latham	Sessions
Crawford	Latta	Shimkus
Crenshaw	Lipinski	Shuster
Cuellar	LoBiondo	Simpson
Culberson	Long	Smith (MO)
Daines	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Denham	Lummis	Smith (TX)
Dent	Marchant	Southerland
DeSantis	Marino	Stewart
DesJarlais	Massie	Stivers
Diaz-Balart	Matheson	Stockman
Duffy	McAllister	Stutzman
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Duncan (TN)	McCaul	Thompson (PA)
Ellmers	McClintock	Thornberry
Farenthold	McHenry	Tiberi
Fincher	McIntyre	Turner
Fitzpatrick	McKeon	Upton
Fleischmann	McKinley	Valadao
Fleming	McMorris	Wagner
Flores	Rodgers	Walberg
Forbes	Meadows	Walden
Fortenberry	Meehan	Walorski
Fox	Messer	Weber (TX)
Franks (AZ)	Mica	Webster (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)	Wenstrup
Gardner	Miller, Gary	Whitfield
Garrett	Mullin	Williams
Gerlach	Mulvaney	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Gibson	Neugebauer	Wolf
Gingrey (GA)	Noem	Womack
Gohmert	Nugent	Woodall
Goodlatte	Nunes	Yoder
Gosar	Nunnelee	Yoho
Gowdy	Olson	Young (AK)
Granger	Palazzo	Young (IN)

NAYS—188

Andrews	Brownley (CA)	Clark (MA)
Barber	Bustos	Clarke (NY)
Barrow (GA)	Butterfield	Cleaver
Bass	Capps	Clyburn
Beatty	Capuano	Cohen
Becerra	Cardenas	Connolly
Bera (CA)	Carney	Conyers
Bishop (GA)	Carson (IN)	Cooper
Bishop (NY)	Cartwright	Costa
Bonamici	Castor (FL)	Courtney
Brady (PA)	Castro (TX)	Crowley
Braley (IA)	Chu	Cummings
Brown (FL)	Ciilline	Davis (CA)

Davis, Danny	Kildee	Pocan
DeFazio	Kilmer	Polis
DeGette	Kind	Price (NC)
Delaney	Kirkpatrick	Quigley
DeLauro	Kuster	Rangel
DelBene	Langevin	Richmond
Deutch	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Ruiz
Doggett	Lee (CA)	Ryan (OH)
Doyle	Levin	Sánchez, Linda T.
Duckworth	Lewis	Sarbanes
Edwards	Loebsock	Schakowsky
Ellison	Lofgren	Schiff
Engel	Lowenthal	Schneider
Enyart	Lowe	Schrader
Eshoo	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Schwartz
Esty	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Scott (VA)
Farr	Lynch	Scott, David
Fattah	Maffei	Serrano
Foster	Maloney, Carolyn	Sewell (AL)
Frankel (FL)	Maloney, Sean	Shea-Porter
Fudge	Matsui	Sherman
Gabbard	McCollum	Sinema
Gallego	McDermott	Sires
Garamendi	McGovern	Slaughter
Garcia	McNerney	Smith (WA)
Grayson	Meeke	Speier
Green, Al	Meng	Swalwell (CA)
Green, Gene	Michaud	Takano
Grijalva	Miller, George	Thompson (CA)
Griñalva	Moore	Thompson (MS)
Gutiérrez	Moran	Tierney
Hahn	Murphy (FL)	Titus
Hanabusa	Nadler	Tonko
Hanna	Napolitano	Tsongas
Hastings (FL)	Neal	Van Hollen
Heck (WA)	Negrete McLeod	Vargas
Higgins	Nolan	Veasey
Himes	O'Rourke	Vela
Holt	Owens	Velázquez
Honda	Pallone	Vislosky
Horsford	Pascrell	Walz
Hoyer	Pastor (AZ)	Wasserman
Huffman	Payne	Schultz
Israel	Pelosi	Waters
Jackson Lee	Perlmutter	Waxman
Jeffries	Peters (CA)	Welch
Johnson (GA)	Peters (MI)	Wilson (FL)
Johnson, E. B.	Pingree (ME)	Yarmuth
Kaptur		
Keating		
Kelly (IL)		
Kennedy		

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Broun (GA)

NOT VOTING—15

Amodei	Jones	Ruppersberger
Blumenauer	McCarthy (NY)	Rush
Campbell	Miller (FL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Petri	Tipton
Hinojosa	Runyan	Westmoreland

□ 1712

Ms. SINEMA changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 30 I was not able to vote because I was home recovering from knee surgery and pneumonia. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, due to being unavoidably detained, I missed the following rollcall votes: No. 26, No. 27, No. 28, No. 29, and No. 30 on January 28, 2014 (today).

If present, I would have voted: rollcall vote No. 26—H. Res. 465, On Ordering the Previous Question, “aye;” rollcall vote No. 27—H. Res. 465, On Agreeing to the Resolution, “aye;” rollcall vote No. 28—On Approving the Journal, “nay;” rollcall vote No. 29—H.R. 7, On Motion to Recommit, “nay;” rollcall vote No. 30—H.R. 7, No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, On Passage, “aye.”

SUPPORT FOR UNITED STATES-REPUBLIC OF KOREA CIVIL NUCLEAR COOPERATION ACT

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table the bill (S. 1901) to authorize the President to extend the term of the nuclear energy agreement with the Republic of Korea until March 19, 2016, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1901

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 “Support for United States-Republic of Korea Civil Nuclear Cooperation Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In the 60th year of the alliance, the relationship between the United States and the Republic of Korea could not be stronger. It is based on mutual sacrifice, mutual respect, shared interests, and shared responsibility to promote peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region and throughout the world.

(2) North Korea’s nuclear weapons programs, including uranium enrichment and plutonium reprocessing technologies, undermine security on the Korean Peninsula. The United States and the Republic of Korea have a shared interest in preventing further proliferation, including through the implementation of the 2005 Joint Statement of the Six-Party Talks.

(3) Both the United States and Republic of Korea have a shared objective in strengthening the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, done at London, Moscow, and Washington July 1, 1968, and a political and a commercial interest in working collaboratively to address challenges to their respective peaceful civil nuclear programs.

(4) The nuclear energy agreement referred to in section 3 is scheduled to expire on March 19, 2014. In order to maintain healthy and uninterrupted cooperation in this area between the two countries while a new agreement is being negotiated, Congress should authorize the President to extend the duration of the current agreement until March 19, 2016.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF NUCLEAR ENERGY AGREEMENT WITH THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA.

Notwithstanding section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153), the President is authorized to take such actions as may be required to extend the term of the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, done at Washington November 24, 1972 (24 UST 775; TIAS 7583), and amended on May 15, 1974 (25 UST 1102; TIAS 7842), to a date that is not later than March 19, 2016.

SEC. 4. REPORT TO CONGRESS ON PROGRESS OF NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND REPUBLIC OF KOREA.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter until a new Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea Concerning

Civil Uses of Nuclear Energy is submitted to Congress, the President shall provide to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report on the progress of negotiations on a new civil nuclear cooperation agreement.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 28, 2014.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, H-232, United States Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to Section 4(b) of House Resolution 5, 113th Congress, I am pleased to appoint the following members to the House Democracy Partnership:

The Honorable David E. Price of North Carolina

The Honorable Lois Capps of California

The Honorable Sam Farr of California

The Honorable Keith Ellison of Minnesota

The Honorable Lucille Roybal-Allard of California

The Honorable Susan Davis of California

The Honorable Gwen Moore of Wisconsin

The Honorable Jim McDermott of Washington

The Honorable Dina Titus of Nevada

Thank you for your attention to these appointments.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

□ 1715

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After consultation among the Speaker and the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent, the Chair announces that, when the two Houses meet tonight in joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those immediately to his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House. Due to the large attendance that is antici-

pated, the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly enforced. Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor. The cooperation of all Members is requested.

The practice of purporting to reserve seats prior to the joint session by placement of placards or personal items will not be allowed. Chamber Security may remove these items from the seats. Members may reserve their seats only by physical presence following the security sweep of the Chamber.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 8:35 p.m. for the purpose of receiving in joint session the President of the United States.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2041

JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS PURSUANT TO HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 75 TO RE- CEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 8 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms, Ms. Kathleen Joyce, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The joint session will come to order.

The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR);

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY);

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN);

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD);

The gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS);

The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI);

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER);

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN);

The gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL); and

The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of

that body, appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort the President of the United States into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID);
The Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN);

The Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER);

The Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY);

The Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET);

The Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW);

The Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH);

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL);

The Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN);

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE);

The Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT); and

The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO).

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, Ambassador Hersey Kyota of the Republic of Palau.

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for him.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 9 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m., the Sergeant at Arms, the Honorable Paul D. Irving, announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the high privilege and the distinct honor of presenting to you the President of the United States.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Members of Congress, my fellow Americans:

Today in America, a teacher spent extra time with a student who needed it, and did her part to lift America's graduation rate to its highest levels in more than three decades.

An entrepreneur flipped on the lights in her tech startup, and did her part to

add to the more than 8 million new jobs our businesses have created over the past 4 years.

An autoworker fine-tuned some of the best, most fuel-efficient cars in the world, and did his part to help America wean itself off foreign oil.

A farmer prepared for the spring after the strongest 5-year stretch of farm exports in our history. A rural doctor gave a young child the first prescription to treat asthma that his mother could afford. A man took the bus home from the graveyard shift, bone-tired but dreaming big dreams for his son. And in tight-knit communities all across America, fathers and mothers will tuck in their kids, put an arm around their spouse, remember fallen comrades, and give thanks for being home from a war that, after 12 long years, is finally coming to an end.

Tonight, this Chamber speaks with one voice to the people we represent: it is you, our citizens, who make the state of our Union strong.

Here are the results of your efforts: the lowest unemployment rate in over 5 years. A rebounding housing market. A manufacturing sector that's adding jobs for the first time since the 1990s. More oil produced at home than we buy from the rest of the world—the first time that's happened in nearly 20 years. Our deficits—cut by more than half. And for the first time in over a decade, business leaders around the world have declared that China is no longer the world's number one place to invest; America is.

That's why I believe this can be a breakthrough year for America. After 5 years of grit and determined effort, the United States is better positioned for the 21st century than any other nation on Earth.

The question for everyone in this Chamber, running through every decision we make this year, is whether we are going to help or hinder this progress. For several years now, this town has been consumed by a rancorous argument over the proper size of the Federal Government. It's an important debate—one that dates back to our very founding. But when that debate prevents us from carrying out even the most basic functions of our democracy—when our differences shut down government or threaten the full faith and credit of the United States—then we are not doing right by the American people.

As President, I am committed to making Washington work better and rebuilding the trust of the people who sent us here. And I believe most of you are too.

Last month, thanks to the work of Democrats and Republicans, Congress finally produced a budget that undoes some of last year's severe cuts to priorities like education. Nobody got everything they wanted, and we can still do more to invest in this country's future while bringing down our deficit in a balanced way, but the budget compromise should leave us freer to focus

on creating new jobs, not creating new crises.

In the coming months, let's see where else we can make progress together. Let's make this a year of action. That is what most Americans want—for all of us in this Chamber to focus on their lives, their hopes, their aspirations; and what I believe unites the people of this Nation, regardless of race or region or party, young or old, rich or poor, is the simple, profound belief in opportunity for all—the notion that, if you work hard and take responsibility, you can get ahead in America.

Let's face it. That belief has suffered some serious blows. Over more than three decades, even before the Great Recession hit, massive shifts in technology and global competition had eliminated a lot of good, middle class jobs and weakened the economic foundations that families depend on.

Today, after 4 years of economic growth, corporate profits and stock prices have rarely been higher, and those at the top have never done better, but average wages have barely budged. Inequality has deepened. Upward mobility has stalled. The cold, hard fact is that, even in the midst of recovery, too many Americans are working more than ever just to get by, let alone to get ahead, and too many still aren't working at all.

So our job is to reverse these trends. It won't happen right away, and we won't agree on everything; but what I offer tonight is a set of concrete, practical proposals to speed up growth, strengthen the middle class, and build new ladders of opportunity into the middle class. Some require congressional action, and I am eager to work with all of you; but America does not stand still, and neither will I, so wherever and whenever I can take steps without legislation to expand opportunity for more American families, that is what I am going to do.

As usual, our First Lady sets a good example. Michelle's Let's Move partnership with schools, businesses, and local leaders has helped bring down childhood obesity rates for the first time in 30 years, and that is an achievement that will improve lives and reduce health care costs for decades to come. The Joining Forces alliance that Michelle and Jill Biden launched has already encouraged employers to hire or train nearly 400,000 veterans and military spouses. Taking a page from that playbook, the White House just organized a College Opportunity Summit where already 150 universities, businesses, and nonprofits have made concrete commitments to reduce inequality and access to higher education and to help every hard-working kid go to college and succeed when they get to campus. Across the country, we are partnering with mayors, Governors, and State legislatures on issues from homelessness to marriage equality.

The point is there are millions of Americans outside of Washington who

are tired of stale political arguments and are moving this country forward. They believe and I believe that, here in America, our success should depend not on accident of birth but the strength of our work ethic and the scope of our dreams. That is what drew our forebears here. It is how the daughter of a factory worker is CEO of America's largest automaker, how the son of a barkeeper is Speaker of the House, how the son of a single mom can be President of the greatest Nation on Earth.

Now, opportunity is who we are, and the defining project of our generation must be to restore that promise.

We know where to start: the best measure of opportunity is access to a good job. With the economy picking up speed, companies say they intend to hire more people this year, and over half of big manufacturers say they are thinking of in-sourcing jobs from abroad.

So let's make that decision easier for more companies. Both Democrats and Republicans have argued that our Tax Code is riddled with wasteful, complicated loopholes that punish businesses investing here and reward companies that keep profits abroad. Let's flip that equation. Let's work together to close those loopholes, end those incentives to ship jobs overseas, and lower tax rates for businesses that create jobs right here at home.

Moreover, we can take the money we save with this transition to tax reform to create jobs rebuilding our roads, upgrading our ports, unblocking our commutes because, in today's global economy, first-class jobs gravitate to first-class infrastructure. We will need Congress to protect more than 3 million jobs by finishing transportation and waterways bills this summer—that can happen—but I will act on my own to slash bureaucracy and streamline the permitting process for key projects so we can get more construction workers on the job as fast as possible.

We also have the chance right now to beat other countries in the race for the next wave of high-tech manufacturing jobs. My administration has launched two hubs for high-tech manufacturing—in Raleigh, North Carolina, and in Youngstown, Ohio—where we have connected businesses to research universities that can help America lead the world in advanced technologies. Tonight, I am announcing we will launch six more this year. Bipartisan bills in both Houses could double the number of these hubs and the jobs they create. So get those bills to my desk. Put more Americans back to work.

Let's do more to help the entrepreneurs and small business owners who create most new jobs in America. Over the past 5 years, my administration has made more loans to small business owners than any other, and when 98 percent of our exporters are small businesses, new trade partnerships with Europe and the Asia-Pacific will help them create even more jobs. We need to work together on tools like

bipartisan trade promotion authority to protect our workers, protect our environment, and open new markets to new goods stamped “Made in the USA.” Listen, China and Europe aren’t standing on the sidelines, and neither should we.

We know that the Nation that goes “all in” on innovation today will own the global economy tomorrow. This is an edge America cannot surrender. Federally funded research helped lead to the ideas and inventions behind Google and smartphones, and that is why Congress should undo the damage done by last year’s cuts to basic research—so we can unleash the next great American discovery. There are entire industries to be built based on vaccines that stay ahead of drug-resistant bacteria or paper-thin material that is stronger than steel, and let’s pass a patent reform bill that allows our businesses to stay focused on innovation, not costly and needless litigation.

Now, one of the biggest factors in bringing more jobs back is our commitment to American energy. The all-of-the-above energy strategy I announced a few years ago is working, and today, America is closer to energy independence than we have been in decades.

One of the reasons why is natural gas. If extracted safely, it is the bridge fuel that can power our economy with less of the carbon pollution that causes climate change. Businesses plan to invest almost \$100 billion in new factories that use natural gas. I will cut red tape to help States get those factories built and put folks to work, and this Congress can help by putting people to work building fueling stations that shift more cars and trucks from foreign oil to American natural gas.

Meanwhile, my administration will keep working with the industry to sustain production and job growth while strengthening protection of our air, our water, and our communities. And while we are at it, I will use my authority to protect more of our pristine Federal lands for future generations.

It is not just oil and natural gas production that’s booming. We are becoming a global leader in solar, too. Every 4 minutes, another American home or business goes solar, every panel pounded into place by a worker whose job cannot be outsourced. Let’s continue that progress with a smarter tax policy that stops giving \$4 billion a year to fossil fuel industries that don’t need it so that we can invest more in fuels of the future that do.

And even as we have increased energy production, we have partnered with businesses, builders, and local communities to reduce the energy we consume. When we rescued our automakers, for example, we worked with them to set higher fuel-efficiency standards for our cars. In the coming months, I will build on that success by setting new standards for our trucks so we can keep driving down oil imports and what we pay at the pump.

Taken together, our energy policy is creating jobs and leading to a cleaner, safer planet. Over the past 8 years, the United States has reduced our total carbon pollution more than any other nation on Earth. But we have to act with more urgency because a changing climate is already harming Western communities struggling with drought and coastal cities dealing with floods. That’s why I directed my administration to work with States, utilities, and others to set new standards on the amount of carbon pollution our power plants are allowed to dump into the air.

The shift to a cleaner energy economy won’t happen overnight, and it will require some tough choices along the way. But the debate is settled. Climate change is a fact. And when our children’s children look us in the eye and ask if we did all we could to leave them a safer, more stable world, with new sources of energy, I want us to be able to say, yes, we did.

Finally, if we are serious about economic growth, it is time to heed the call of business leaders, labor leaders, faith leaders, and law enforcement and fix our broken immigration system. Republicans and Democrats in the Senate have acted. I know that Members of both parties in the House want to do the same.

Independent economists say immigration reform will grow our economy and shrink our deficit by almost \$1 trillion in the next two decades. And for good reason. When people come here to fulfill their dreams—to study, invent, and contribute to our culture—they make our country a more attractive place for businesses to locate and create jobs for everybody. So let’s get immigration reform done this year. Let’s get it done. It’s time.

The ideas I have outlined so far can speed up growth and create more jobs. But in this rapidly changing economy, we have to make sure that every American has the skills to fill those jobs.

The good news is, we know how to do it. Two years ago, as the auto industry came roaring back, Andra Rush opened up a manufacturing firm in Detroit. She knew that Ford needed parts for the best-selling truck in America, and she knew how to make those parts. She just needed the workforce.

So she dialed up what we call an American Job Center—places where folks can walk in to get the help or training they need to find a new job, or a better job. She was flooded with new workers. And today, Detroit Manufacturing Systems has more than 700 employees.

What Andra and her employees experienced is how it should be for every employer—and every job seeker. So tonight, I have asked Vice President BIDEN to lead an across-the-board reform of America’s training programs to make sure they have one mission: train Americans with the skills employers need and match them to good jobs that need to be filled right now. That means

more on-the-job training and apprenticeships that set a young worker on a trajectory for life. It means connecting companies to community colleges that can help design training to fill their specific needs. And if Congress wants to help, you can concentrate funding on proven programs that connect more ready-to-work Americans with ready-to-be-filled jobs.

I am also convinced we can help Americans return to the workforce faster by reforming unemployment insurance so that it is more effective in today’s economy. But first, this Congress needs to restore the unemployment insurance you just let expire for 1.6 million people.

Let me tell you why.

Misty DeMars is a mother of two young boys. She had been steadily employed since she was a teenager. She put herself through college. She had never collected unemployment benefits—but she had been paying taxes.

In May, she and her husband used their life savings to buy their first home. A week later, budget cuts claimed the job she loved. Last month, when their unemployment insurance was cut off, she sat down and wrote me a letter—the kind I get every day.

“We are the face of the unemployment crisis,” she wrote. “I am not dependent on the government . . . Our country depends on people like us who build careers, contribute to society . . . care about our neighbors . . . I am confident that in time I will find a job . . . I will pay my taxes, and we will raise our children in their own home in the community we love. Please give us this chance.”

Congress, give these hardworking, responsible Americans that chance. Give them that chance. Give them the chance. They need our help right now, but more important, this country needs them in the game. That’s why I’ve been asking CEOs to give more long-term unemployed workers a fair shot at new jobs, a new chance to support their families. And, in fact, this week many will come to the White House to make that commitment real. Tonight, I ask every business leader in America to join us and do the same, because we are stronger when America fields a full team.

Of course, it’s not enough to train today’s workforce. We also have to prepare tomorrow’s workforce by guaranteeing every child access to a world-class education.

Estiven Rodriguez couldn’t speak a word of English when he moved to New York City at age 9. But last month, thanks to the support of great teachers and an innovative tutoring program, he led a march of his classmates through a crowd of cheering parents and neighbors from their high school to the post office where they mailed off their college applications. And this son of a factory worker just found out he’s going to college this fall.

Five years ago, we set out to change the odds for all our kids. We worked

with lenders to reform student loans; and, today, more young people are earning college degrees than ever before. Race to the Top, with the help of Governors from both parties, has helped States raise expectations and performance. Teachers and principals in schools from Tennessee to Washington, D.C., are making big strides in preparing students with the skills for the new economy, problem-solving, critical thinking, science, technology, engineering, math.

Now, some of this change is hard. It requires everything from more challenging curriculums and more demanding parents to better support for teachers and new ways to measure how well our kids think, not how well they can fill in a bubble on a test. But it is worth it, and it is working.

The problem is, we're still not reaching enough kids, and we're not reaching them in time, and that has to change.

Research shows that one of the best investments we can make in a child's life is high-quality early education. Last year, I asked this Congress to help States make high-quality pre-K available to every 4-year-old; and as a parent, as well as the President, I repeat that request tonight. But in the meantime, 30 States have raised pre-K funding on their own. They know we can't wait. So just as we worked with States to reform our schools, this year we'll invest in new partnerships with States and communities across the country in a race to the top for our youngest children. And as Congress decides what it's going to do, I'm going to pull together a coalition of elected officials, business leaders, and philanthropists willing to help more kids access the high-quality pre-K that they need. It is right for America. We need to get this done.

Last year, I also pledged to connect 99 percent of our students to high-speed broadband over the next 4 years. Tonight, I can announce that, with the support of the FCC and companies like Apple, Microsoft, Sprint, and Verizon, we've got a down payment to start connecting more than 15,000 schools and 20 million students over the next 2 years, without adding a dime to the deficit.

We're working to redesign high schools and partner them with colleges and employers that offer the real-world education and hands-on training that can lead directly to a job and career. We're shaking up our system of higher education to give parents more information and colleges more incentives to offer better value, so that no middle class kid is priced out of a college education. We're offering millions the opportunity to cap their monthly student loan payments to 10 percent of their income, and I want to work with Congress to see how we can help even more Americans who feel trapped by student loan debt. And I'm reaching out to some of America's leading foundations and corporations on a new initiative to help more young men of color facing especially tough odds to stay on track and reach their full potential.

The bottom line is, Michelle and I want every child to have the same chance this country gave us; but we know our opportunity agenda won't be complete, and too many young people entering the workforce today will see the American Dream as an empty promise, unless we also do more to make sure our economy honors the dignity of work, and hard work pays off for every single American.

Now, today, women make up about half our workforce; but they still make 77 cents for every dollar a man earns. That is wrong and, in 2014, it's an embarrassment. Women deserve equal pay for equal work. She deserves to have a baby without sacrificing her job. A mother deserves a day off to care for a sick child or a sick parent without running into hardship. And you know what? A father does too. It is time to do away with workplace policies that belong in a "Mad Men" episode. This year, let's all come together, Congress, the White House, businesses from Wall Street to Main Street, to give every woman the opportunity she deserves, because I believe when women succeed, America succeeds.

Now, women hold a majority of lower-wage jobs, but they're not the only ones stifled by stagnant wages. Americans understand that some people will earn more money than others, and we don't resent those who, by virtue of their efforts, achieve incredible success. That's what America's all about. But Americans overwhelmingly agree that no one who works full-time should ever have to raise a family in poverty.

In the year since I asked this Congress to raise the minimum wage, five States have passed laws to raise theirs. Many businesses have done it on their own. Nick Chute is here today with his boss, John Sorrano. John's an owner of Punch Pizza in Minneapolis, and Nick helps make the dough. Only now, he makes more of it. John just gave his employees a raise, to 10 bucks an hour, and that's a decision that has eased their financial stress and boosted their morale.

Tonight, I ask more of America's business leaders to follow John's lead. Do what you can to raise your employees' wages. It's good for the economy. It's good for America.

To every mayor, Governor, State legislator in America, I say, you don't have to wait for Congress to act. Americans will support you if you take this on. And as the Chief Executive, I intend to lead by example. Profitable corporations like Costco see higher wages as the smart way to boost productivity and reduce turnover. We should too.

In the coming weeks, I will issue an executive order requiring Federal contractors to pay their federally funded employees a fair wage of at least \$10.10 an hour—because if you cook our troops' meals or wash their dishes, you should not have to live in poverty.

Of course, to reach millions more, Congress does need to get onboard.

Today, the Federal minimum wage is worth about 20 percent less than it was when Ronald Reagan first stood here. TOM HARKIN and GEORGE MILLER have a bill to fix that by lifting the minimum wage to \$10.10. It is easy to remember—10, 10. This will help families. It will give businesses customers with more money to spend. It does not involve any new bureaucratic program. So join the rest of the country. Say "yes." Give America a raise. Give them a raise.

There are other steps we can take to help families make ends meet, and few are more effective at reducing inequality and helping families pull themselves up through hard work than the earned income tax credit. Right now, it helps about half of all parents at some point. Think about that. It helps about half of all parents in America at some point in their lives. But I agree with Republicans like Senator RUBIO that it doesn't do enough for single workers who don't have kids. So let's work together to strengthen the credit, reward work, and help more Americans get ahead.

Let's do more to help Americans save for retirement. Today, most workers don't have a pension. A Social Security check often isn't enough on its own. And while the stock market has doubled over the last 5 years, that doesn't help folks who don't have 401(k)s.

That is why tomorrow, I will direct the Treasury to create a new way for working Americans to start their own retirement savings: MyRA. It is a new savings bond that encourages folks to build a nest egg. MyRA guarantees a decent return with no risk of losing what you put in. And if this Congress wants to help, work with me to fix an upside-down Tax Code that gives big tax breaks to help the wealthy save but does little to nothing for middle class Americans.

Offer every American access to an automatic IRA on the job so they can save at work, just like everybody in this Chamber can. And since the most important investment many families make is their home, send me legislation that protects taxpayers from footing the bill for a housing crisis ever again and keeps the dream of homeownership alive for future generations.

One last point on financial security. For decades, few things exposed hard-working families to economic hardship more than a broken health care system. And in case you haven't heard, we are in the process of fixing that.

A preexisting condition used to mean that someone like Amanda Shelley, a physician assistant and single mom from Arizona, couldn't get health insurance. But on January 1, she got covered. On January 3, she felt a sharp pain. On January 6, she had emergency surgery. Just 1 week earlier, Amanda said, that surgery would have meant bankruptcy. That is what health insurance reform is all about, the peace of mind that, if misfortune strikes, you don't have to lose everything.

Already, because of the Affordable Care Act, more than 3 million Americans under age 26 have gained coverage under their parents' plans. More than 9 million Americans have signed up for private health insurance or Medicaid coverage—9 million.

And here is another number: zero. Because of this law, no American—none, zero—can ever again be dropped or denied coverage for a preexisting condition like asthma or back pain or cancer. No woman can ever be charged more just because she is a woman. And we did all this while adding years to Medicare's finances, keeping Medicare premiums flat, and lowering prescription costs for millions of seniors.

Now, I do not expect to convince my Republican friends on the merits of this law, but I know that the American people are not interested in refighting old battles. So, again, if you have specific plans to cut costs, cover more people, and increase choice, tell America what you would do differently. Let's see if the numbers add up. But let's not have another 40-something votes to repeal a law that is already helping millions of Americans like Amanda. The first 40 were plenty. We all owe it to the American people to say what we are for, not just what we are against.

And if you want to know the real impact this law is having, just talk to Governor Steve Beshear of Kentucky who is here tonight. Now, Kentucky is not the most liberal part of the country. That is not where I got my highest vote totals. But he is like a man possessed when it comes to covering his Commonwealth's families. "They are our neighbors and our friends," he said. "They are people we shop and go to church with, farmers out on the tractors, grocery clerks. They are people who go to work every morning praying they don't get sick. No one deserves to live that way."

Steve's right. And that's why, tonight, I ask every American who knows someone without health insurance to help them get covered by March 31. Help them get covered. Moms, get on your kids to sign up. Kids, call your mom and walk her through the application. It will give her some peace of mind—plus, she'll appreciate hearing from you.

After all, that's the spirit that has always moved this Nation forward. It's the spirit of citizenship, the recognition that through hard work and responsibility we can pursue our individual dreams but still come together as one American family to make sure the next generation can pursue its dreams as well.

Citizenship means standing up for everyone's right to vote. Last year, part of the Voting Rights Act was weakened, but conservative Republicans and liberal Democrats are working together to strengthen it. And the bipartisan commission I appointed, chaired by my campaign lawyer and Governor Romney's campaign lawyer, came to-

gether and has offered reforms so that no one has to wait for more than a half hour to vote. Let's support these efforts. It should be the power of our vote, not the size of our bank account, that drives our democracy.

Citizenship means standing up for the lives that gun violence steals from us each day. I have seen the courage of parents, students, pastors, and police officers all over this country who say "we are not afraid," and I intend to keep trying, with or without Congress, to help stop more tragedies from visiting innocent Americans in our movie theaters, in our shopping malls, or schools like Sandy Hook.

Citizenship demands a sense of common purpose, participation in the hard work of self-government, an obligation to serve our communities. And I know this Chamber agrees that few Americans give more to their country than our diplomats and the men and women of the United States Armed Forces.

Tonight, because of the extraordinary troops and civilians who risk and lay down their lives to keep us free, the United States is more secure. When I took office, nearly 180,000 Americans were serving in Iraq and Afghanistan. Today, all our troops are out of Iraq. More than 60,000 of our troops have already come home from Afghanistan. With Afghan forces now in the lead for their own security, our troops have moved to a support role. Together with our allies, we will complete our mission there by the end of this year, and America's longest war will finally be over.

After 2014, we will support a unified Afghanistan as it takes responsibility for its own future. If the Afghan Government signs a security agreement that we have negotiated, a small force of Americans could remain in Afghanistan with NATO allies to carry out two narrow missions: training and assisting Afghan forces, and counterterrorism operations to pursue any remnants of al Qaeda. For while our relationship with Afghanistan will change, one thing will not: our resolve that terrorists do not launch attacks against our country.

The fact is that danger remains. While we have put al Qaeda's core leadership on a path to defeat, the threat has evolved as al Qaeda affiliates and other extremists take root in different parts of the world. In Yemen, Somalia, Iraq, and Mali, we have to keep working with partners to disrupt and disable those networks. In Syria, we'll support the opposition that rejects the agenda of terrorist networks. Here at home, we'll keep strengthening our defenses and combat new threats like cyberattacks. And as we reform our defense budget, we'll have to keep faith with our men and women in uniform and invest in the capabilities they need to succeed in future missions.

We have to remain vigilant. But I strongly believe our leadership and our security cannot depend on our out-standing military alone. As Com-

mander in Chief, I have used force when needed to protect the American people, and I will never hesitate to do so as long as I hold this office. But I will not send our troops into harm's way unless it is truly necessary, nor will I allow our sons and daughters to be mired in open-ended conflicts. We must fight the battles that need to be fought, not those that terrorists prefer from us—large-scale deployments that drain our strength and may ultimately feed extremism.

So, even as we actively and aggressively pursue terrorist networks—through more targeted efforts and by building the capacity of our foreign partners—America must move off a permanent war footing. That's why I have imposed prudent limits on the use of drones, for we will not be safer if people abroad believe we strike within their countries without regard for the consequence. That's why, working with this Congress, I will reform our surveillance programs, because the vital work of our intelligence community depends on public confidence, here and abroad, that the privacy of ordinary people is not being violated.

And with the Afghan war ending, this needs to be the year Congress lifts the remaining restrictions on detainee transfers and we close the prison at Guantanamo Bay—because we counter terrorism not just through intelligence and military actions but by remaining true to our constitutional ideals and setting an example for the rest of the world.

You see, in a world of complex threats, our security and our leadership depends on all elements of our power, including strong and principled diplomacy. American diplomacy has rallied more than 50 countries to prevent nuclear materials from falling into the wrong hands and allowed us to reduce our own reliance on Cold War stockpiles. American diplomacy, backed by the threat of force, is why Syria's chemical weapons are being eliminated, and we will continue to work with the international community to usher in the future the Syrian people deserve—a future free of dictatorship, terror, and fear.

As we speak, American diplomacy is supporting Israelis and Palestinians as they engage in the difficult but necessary talks to end the conflict there; to achieve dignity and an independent state for Palestinians, and lasting peace and security for the State of Israel—a Jewish State that knows America will always be at their side.

And it is American diplomacy, backed by pressure, that has halted the progress of Iran's nuclear program—and rolled back parts of that program—for the very first time in a decade. As we gather here tonight, Iran has begun to eliminate its stockpile of higher levels of enriched uranium. It is not installing advanced centrifuges. Unprecedented inspections help the world verify, every day, that Iran is not building a bomb. And with our allies

and partners, we are engaged in negotiations to see if we can peacefully achieve a goal we all share: preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

These negotiations will be difficult. They may not succeed. We are clear-eyed about Iran's support for terrorist organizations like Hezbollah, which threaten our allies, and we are clear about the mistrust between our nations, mistrust that cannot be wished away. But these negotiations don't rely on trust; any long-term deal we agree to must be based on verifiable action that convinces us and the international community that Iran is not building a nuclear bomb. If John F. Kennedy and Ronald Reagan could negotiate with the Soviet Union, then surely a strong and confident America can negotiate with less powerful adversaries today.

The sanctions that we put in place helped make this opportunity possible. But let me be clear: if this Congress sends me a new sanctions bill now that threatens to derail these talks, I will veto it. For the sake of our national security, we must give diplomacy a chance to succeed. If Iran's leaders do not seize this opportunity, then I will be the first to call for more sanctions and stand ready to exercise all options to make sure Iran does not build a nuclear weapon. But if Iran's leaders do seize the chance—and we will know soon enough—then Iran could take an important step to rejoin the community of nations, and we will have resolved one of the leading security challenges of our time without the risks of war.

Finally, let's remember that our leadership is defined not just by our defense against threats, but by the enormous opportunities to do good and promote understanding around the globe—to forge greater cooperation, to expand new markets, to free people from fear and want. And no one is better positioned to take advantage of those opportunities than America.

Our alliance with Europe remains the strongest the world has ever known. From Tunisia to Burma, we are supporting those who are willing to do the hard work of building democracy. In Ukraine, we stand for the principle that all people have the right to express themselves freely and peacefully and have a say in their country's future. Across Africa, we are bringing together businesses and governments to double access to electricity and help end extreme poverty. In the Americas, we are building new ties of commerce, but we are also expanding cultural and educational exchanges among young people. And we will continue to focus on the Asia-Pacific, where we support our allies, shape a future of greater security and prosperity, and extend a hand to those devastated by disaster—as we did in the Philippines, when our marines and civilians rushed to aid those battered by a typhoon, and who were greeted with words like, "We will never forget your kindness," and, "God bless America."

We do these things because they help promote our long-term security, and we do them because we believe in the inherent dignity and equality of every human being, regardless of race or religion, creed or sexual orientation. And next week, the world will see one expression of that commitment when Team USA marches the red, white, and blue into the Olympic Stadium and brings home the gold.

My fellow Americans, no other country in the world does what we do. On every issue, the world turns to us, not simply because of the size of our economy or our military might—but because of the ideals we stand for and the burdens we bear to advance them.

No one knows this better than those who serve in uniform. As this time of war draws to a close, a new generation of heroes returns to civilian life. We will keep slashing that backlog so our veterans receive the benefits they have earned and our wounded warriors receive the health care—including the mental health care—that they need. We will keep working to help all of our veterans translate their skills and leadership into jobs here at home, and we will all continue to join forces to honor and support our remarkable military families.

Let me tell you about one of those families I have come to know.

I first met Cory Remsburg, a proud Army Ranger, at Omaha Beach on the 65th anniversary of D-day. Along with some of his fellow Rangers, he walked me through the program. He was a strong, impressive young man with an easy manner. He was sharp as a tack. We joked around and took pictures, and I told him to stay in touch.

A few months later, on his 10th deployment, Cory was nearly killed by a massive roadside bomb in Afghanistan. His comrades found him in a canal, face down, under water, shrapnel in his brain.

For months, he lay in a coma. The next time I met him, in the hospital, he couldn't speak; he could barely move. Over the years, he has endured dozens of surgeries and procedures and hours of grueling rehab every day.

Even now, Cory is still blind in one eye. He still struggles on his left side. But slowly, steadily, with the support of caregivers like his dad, Craig, and the community around him, Cory has grown stronger. Day by day, he has learned to speak again and stand again and walk again—and he is working toward the day when he can serve his country again.

"My recovery has not been easy," he says. "Nothing in life that's worth anything is easy."

Cory is here tonight; and like the Army he loves, like the America he serves, Sergeant First Class Cory Remsburg never gives up, and he does not quit.

My fellow Americans, men and women like Cory remind us that America has never come easy. Our freedom, our democracy, has never been easy.

Sometimes we stumble; we make mistakes; we get frustrated or discouraged. But for more than 200 years, we have put those things aside and placed our collective shoulder to the wheel of progress—to create and build and expand the possibilities of individual achievement; to free other nations from tyranny and fear; to promote justice and fairness and equality under the law, so that the words set to paper by our Founders are made real for every citizen. The America we want for our kids—a rising America where honest work is plentiful and communities are strong; where prosperity is widely shared and opportunity for all lets us go as far as our dreams and toil will take us—none of it is easy.

But if we work together, if we summon what is best in us, the way Cory summoned what was best in him, with our feet planted firmly in today but our eyes cast towards tomorrow, I know it is within our reach.

Believe it.

God bless you, and God bless the United States of America.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

At 10 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m., the President of the United States, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet; the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court; the Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 10 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m., the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WESTMORELAND (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of medical reasons.

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for January 27 through January 29 on account of attending to family acute medical care and hospitalization.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 29, 2014, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4578. A letter from the Director, Naval Reactors, Department of Defense, transmitting a report entitled, "Environmental Monitoring and Disposal of Radioactive Wastes From U.S. Naval Nuclear-Powered Ships and Their Support Facilities"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4579. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting a proposal regarding the decision by the United States Court of Appeals in National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners v. United States Department of Energy (Nos. 11-1066 and 11-1068; D.C. Cir. 2013); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4580. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a Report to Congress on the Evaluation of the Medicaid Emergency Psychiatric Demonstration; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4581. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Rural Call Completion [WC Docket No.: 13-39] received January 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4582. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting Periodic Report on the National Emergency Caused by the Lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979 for February 26, 2013–August 25, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4583. A letter from the Chair, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Inspector General and the semiannual management report for the period ending September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4584. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a semiannual management report to the Congress for the period April 1, 2013 to September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4585. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting a report entitled "Preserving the Integrity of the Federal Merit Systems: Understanding and Addressing Perceptions of Favoritism", pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1204(a)(3); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4586. A letter from the Clerk, Court of Appeals, transmitting an opinion of the United States Court of Appeals regarding Katherine Elizabeth Barnet, docket no. 13-612; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4587. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "2013 Status of the Nation's Highways, Bridges and Transit: Conditions and Performance"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4588. A letter from the Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Loan Guaranty: Minimum Property and Construction Requirements (RIN: 2900-

AO67) received January 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

4589. A letter from the Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — VA Compensation Service and Pension and Fiduciary Service Nomenclature Changes (RIN: 2900-AO64) received January 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

4590. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Import Restrictions Imposed on Certain Archaeological and Ecclesiastical Ethnological Material from Bulgaria [CBP Dec. 14-01] (RIN: 1515-AD95) received January 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4591. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Prevailing State Assumed Interest Rates (Rev. Rule. 2014-4) received January 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4592. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Current Refundings of Recovery Zone Facility Bonds [Notice 2014-9] received January 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4593. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Sales-Based Royalties and Vendor Allowances [TD: 9652] (RIN: 1545-BI57) received January 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4594. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Computation of, and Rules Relating to, Medical Loss Ratio [TD 9651] (RIN: 1545-BL05) received January 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4595. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Exclusion from Income of Payments to Care Providers from Medicaid Waiver Programs [Notice 2014-7] received January 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4596. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Bond Premium Carryforward [TD 9653] (RIN: 1545-BL28) received January 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 3936. A bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 3937. A bill to evaluate and report on the feasibility and effectiveness of using natural gas as a fuel source in long haul trucks; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 3938. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to designate natural gas fueling corridors in the United States for long haul truck traffic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 3939. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to jumpstart the sluggish economy, finance critical infrastructure investments, fight income inequality and create jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 3940. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to weight limitations for natural gas vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3941. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the deduction for mortgage insurance premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3942. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the deduction of state and local general sales taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3943. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the above-the-line deduction for qualified tuition and related expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3944. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year tax-free distributions from individual retirement plans for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3945. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the business research credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3946. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the employer wage credit for employees who are active duty members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3947. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the work opportunity tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3948. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the 15-year straight-line cost recovery for qualified leasehold improvements, qualified restaurant buildings and improvements, and qualified retail improvements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3949. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the enhanced charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3950. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the credit for energy-efficient existing homes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3951. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the credit for energy-efficient new homes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3952. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the credits for energy-efficient appliances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3953. A bill to amend title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act concerning the notice requirements regarding the extent of health plan coverage of abortion; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 3954. A bill to provide for systemic research, surveillance, treatment, prevention, awareness, development of rules of play, standards, and dissemination of information with respect to sports-related and other concussions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, 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 Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 3955. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to establish a pilot program through the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to provide older individuals with training in computer literacy, advanced computer operations, and resume writing; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 3956. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to authorize the Small Business Administrator to make grants for economic growth, business retention and business recruitment to economically underserved communities; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. MEEKS (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MENG, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIMM, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. TONKO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. REED, Mr. MAFFEI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. HIGGINS):

H.R. 3957. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 218-10 Merrick Boulevard in Springfield Gardens, New York, as the "Cynthia Jenkins Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 3936.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 3937.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8
". . . to regulate commerce . . . among the several States . . ."

". . . to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers . . ."

This legislation seeks to promote the use of natural gas in the trucking industry, a vital mode of transporting goods across the country. The use of such a cheap, domestic source of energy will be beneficial to both businesses and consumers. Therefore, it will affect the commerce of the U.S. in a positive way.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 3938.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8
". . . to regulate commerce . . . among the several States . . ."

". . . to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers . . ."

This legislation seeks to promote the use of natural gas in the trucking industry, a vital mode of transporting goods across the country. The use of such a cheap, domestic source of energy will be beneficial to both businesses and consumers. Therefore, it will affect the commerce of the U.S. in a positive way.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 3939.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 and the 16th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 3940.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8
". . . to regulate commerce . . . among the several States . . ."

". . . to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers . . ."

This legislation seeks to promote the use of natural gas in the trucking industry, a vital mode of transporting goods across the country. The use of such a cheap, domestic source of energy will be beneficial to both businesses and consumers. Therefore, it will affect the commerce of the U.S. in a positive way.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3941.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3942.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3943.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3944.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3945.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3946.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3947.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3948.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3949.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3950.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3951.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3952.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3953.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 3954.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and within the Indian Tribes, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 3955.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 3956.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 3957.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7
Congress shall have the power to establish Post Offices and post roads.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

- H.R. 351: Mr. CONAWAY.
- H.R. 366: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. SHIMKUS.
- H.R. 422: Mr. KING of Iowa.
- H.R. 425: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
- H.R. 435: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
- H.R. 436: Mr. MCHENRY.
- H.R. 455: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
- H.R. 543: Mr. FINCHER.
- H.R. 562: Mr. HINOJOSA.
- H.R. 610: Mr. REED.
- H.R. 611: Mr. REED.
- H.R. 628: Mr. LEWIS, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. VEASEY.
- H.R. 645: Mr. QUIGLEY.
- H.R. 713: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
- H.R. 719: Mr. GRIMM.
- H.R. 792: Mr. COTTON.
- H.R. 809: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
- H.R. 831: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. COOPER.
- H.R. 921: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
- H.R. 924: Mr. MEEKS.
- H.R. 938: Mr. BYRNE.
- H.R. 962: Mr. CAPUANO.
- H.R. 1010: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mr. COOPER.
- H.R. 1015: Mr. VARGAS.
- H.R. 1078: Mr. SCHOCK.
- H.R. 1089: Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 1091: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
- H.R. 1129: Mr. BARROW of Georgia.
- H.R. 1130: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
- H.R. 1146: Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 1148: Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 1209: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
- H.R. 1213: Mr. HONDA.
- H.R. 1254: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
- H.R. 1280: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. FLORES.
- H.R. 1281: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
- H.R. 1339: Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 1507: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. COFFMAN.
- H.R. 1515: Mr. CRENSHAW.
- H.R. 1528: Mr. COBLE.
- H.R. 1666: Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 1690: Ms. TITUS.
- H.R. 1701: Mr. CRAWFORD.
- H.R. 1726: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. RAHALL.
- H.R. 1732: Mr. BARROW of Georgia and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
- H.R. 1750: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. LANKFORD.
- H.R. 1755: Mr. GRIMM.
- H.R. 1812: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
- H.R. 1830: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
- H.R. 1852: Ms. DELBENE.
- H.R. 1869: Mr. GARCIA.
- H.R. 1918: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. NUNES, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. JONES.
- H.R. 2029: Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 2037: Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 2058: Mr. LOEBSACK.

- H.R. 2123: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
- H.R. 2203: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
- H.R. 2220: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
- H.R. 2235: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
- H.R. 2509: Mr. HONDA and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
- H.R. 2548: Mr. PERRY.
- H.R. 2616: Mr. LIPINSKI.
- H.R. 2643: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. BARBER.
- H.R. 2647: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.
- H.R. 2663: Ms. ESTY and Ms. DEGETTE.
- H.R. 2710: Mr. STEWART.
- H.R. 2737: Mr. NEAL.
- H.R. 2801: Mr. POMPEO and Mr. NOLAN.
- H.R. 2892: Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 2907: Ms. KUSTER.
- H.R. 2990: Mr. ENYART, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
- H.R. 3015: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
- H.R. 3077: Mr. COTTON, Mr. PEARCE, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
- H.R. 3303: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
- H.R. 3306: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
- H.R. 3318: Mr. QUIGLEY.
- H.R. 3322: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 3344: Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 3361: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. GARRETT.
- H.R. 3367: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
- H.R. 3370: Mr. KIND.
- H.R. 3395: Mrs. ELLMERS.
- H.R. 3461: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
- H.R. 3485: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
- H.R. 3489: Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 3493: Mr. DENHAM.
- H.R. 3505: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. RUNYAN.
- H.R. 3508: Mr. KIND.
- H.R. 3530: Mr. ROSKAM.
- H.R. 3578: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
- H.R. 3590: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana and Mr. NUNNELEE.
- H.R. 3600: Mrs. ELLMERS.
- H.R. 3635: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, and Mr. NUNNELEE.
- H.R. 3649: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. TAKANO.
- H.R. 3658: Mr. WOLF.
- H.R. 3685: Mrs. ROBY and Mr. NUNNELEE.
- H.R. 3689: Mr. LONG, Mr. JONES, Mr. WEST-MORELAND, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
- H.R. 3718: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
- H.R. 3726: Mr. VARGAS.
- H.R. 3734: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
- H.R. 3738: Mr. LANGEVIN.
- H.R. 3740: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
- H.R. 3741: Ms. NORTON and Ms. SHEA-POR-TER.
- H.R. 3792: Mr. FLORES.
- H.R. 3810: Mr. VARGAS.
- H.R. 3824: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
- H.R. 3825: Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 3854: Mr. BARLETTA.
- H.R. 3855: Mr. HOLT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

- H.R. 3857: Mr. LANCE.
- H.R. 3864: Mr. TIBERI.
- H.R. 3865: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CARTER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 3867: Mr. POCAN, Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. PIERLUISI.
- H.R. 3876: Mr. LEWIS.
- H.R. 3878: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. FARR, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
- H.R. 3899: Mr. HONDA, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
- H.R. 3914: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FARR, and Ms. EDWARDS.
- H.R. 3921: Ms. TITUS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. VARGAS, and Ms. LEE of California.
- H.R. 3930: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. STEWART, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. WALZ, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DENT, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. HUNTER.
- H.R. 3931: Mr. MARINO and Mr. PERRY.
- H. J. Res. 34: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
- H. Con. Res. 52: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
- H. Con. Res. 78: Mr. VARGAS and Mr. SERRANO.
- H. Res. 109: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and Mr. CAPUANO.
- H. Res. 190: Mr. NEAL.
- H. Res. 302: Mr. TERRY and Mr. VISCLOSKY.
- H. Res. 387: Mr. PITTENGER.
- H. Res. 442: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. DAINES, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
- H. Res. 447: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HIMES, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

- H.R. 1094: Mr. PAULSEN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

68. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Washington Township, Long Valley, New Jersey, relative to Resolution No. R-166-13 urging the Congress to invest additional federal dollars in maintaining the highways and improving the transportation infrastructure in the State of New Jersey; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.