Since then 10 more red states—Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, North Dakota, and Oklahoma—have enacted similar bans. None of these laws has an adequate health exception. Only one provides an exception for cases of rape or incest.

H.R. 1797 seeks to take the misguided and mean-spirited policy of these states and make it the law of the land. In so doing, the bill poses a nationwide threat to the health and wellbeing of American women and a direct challenge to the Supreme Court's ruling in Roe v. Wade.

Madam Speaker, one of the most detestable aspects of this bill is that it would curb access to care for women in the most desperate of circumstances. It is these women who receive the 1.5 percent of abortions that occur after 20 weeks.

Women like Danielle Deaver, who was 22 weeks pregnant when her water broke. Tests showed that Danielle had suffered anhydramnios, a premature rupture of the membranes before the fetus has achieved viability. This condition meant that the fetus likely would be born with a shortening of muscle tissue that results in the inability to move limbs.

In addition, Danielle's fetus likely would suffer deformities to the face and head, and the lungs were unlikely to develop beyond the 22-week point. There was less than a 10% chance that, if born, Danielle's baby would be able to breathe on its own and only a 2% chance the baby would be able to eat on its own. Danielle and her husband decided to terminate the pregnancy but could not because of the Nebraska ban. Danielle had no recourse but to endure the pain and suffering that followed. Eight days later, Danielle gave birth to a daughter, Elizabeth, who died 15 minutes later.

H.R. 1797 hurts women like Vikki Stella, a diabetic, who discovered months into her pregnancy that the fetus she was carrying suffered from several major anomalies and had no chance of survival. Because of Vikki's diabetes, her doctor determined that induced labor and Caesarian section were both riskier procedures for Vikki than an abortion. Because Vikki was able to terminate the pregnancy, she was protected from the immediate and serious medical risks to her health and her ability to have children in the future was preserved.

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

That is why the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the nation's leading medical experts on women's health, strongly opposes 20-week bans, citing the threat these laws pose to women's health.

Madam Speaker, I also strongly oppose H.R. 1797 because it lacks the necessary exceptions to protect the health and life of the mother. In fact, the majority Republicans rejected an amendment offered by our colleague, Congressman NADLER, which would have added a ''health of the mother'' exception to the bill.

During the markup of H.R. 1797 in the Judiciary Committee, Republicans even rejected an amendment I offered that would have provided a limited exception in cases where ''the pregnancy could result in severe and long-lasting damage to a woman's health, including lung disease, heart disease, or diabetes.''

Imagine, Madam Speaker, an amendment permitting an exception in the case where a woman risked heart or lung disease was rejected by Judiciary Republicans as too lenient and compassionate toward women.

I offered my amendment again to the Rules Committee but again, Committee Republicans refused to make it in order.

Madam Speaker, it is an additional measure of just how incredibly bad this bill is that when it was introduced and considered in the Judiciary Committee, it did not even include an exception for rape or incest.

Madam Speaker, this may come as news to some in this body, but each year approximately 25,000 women in the United States become pregnant as a result of rape. And about a third (30%) of these rapes involved women under age 18.

Madam Speaker, last and most important, I oppose H.R. 1797 because it is an unconstitutional infringement on the right to privacy, as interpreted by the Supreme Court in a long line of cases going back to Griswold v. Connecticut in 1965 and Roe v. Wade decided in 1973. In Roe v. Wade, the Court held that a state could prohibit a woman from exercising her right to terminate a pregnancy in order to protect her health prior to viability. While many factors go into determining fetal viability, the consensus of the medical community is that viability is acknowledged as not occurring prior to 24 weeks gestation.

By prohibiting nearly all abortions beginning at ''the probable post-fertilization age'' of 20 weeks, H.R. 1797 violates this clear and long standing constitutional rule.

In striking down Texas's pre-viability abortion prohibitions, the Supreme Court stated in Roe v. Wade:

> With respect to the State's important and legitimate interest in potential life, the ''compelling'' point is at viability. This is so because the fetus then presumably has the capability of meaningful life outside the mother's womb. State regulation protective of fetal life after viability thus has both logical and biological justification. If the State is interested in protecting fetal life after viability, it may go as far as to proscribe abortion during that period, except when it is necessary to preserve the life or health of the mother.

Supreme Court precedents make it clear that neither Congress nor a state legislature can declare any one element—''be it weeks of gestation or fetal weight or any other single factor—as the determinant'' of viability. *Colautti* v. *Franklin, 439 U.S. 379, 388–89 (1979).* Nor can the government restrict a woman's autonomy by arbitrarily setting the number of weeks gestation so low as to effectively prohibit access to abortion services as is the case with the bill before us.

If this bill ever were to become law, it would not survive a constitutional challenge even to its facial validity. A similar 20-week provision enacted by the Utah legislature was struck down years ago as unconstitutional by the United States Court of Appeals for the 10th Circuit because it ''unduly burden[ed] a woman's right to choose to abort a nonviable fetus.'' *Jane L.* v. *Bangerter, 102 F.3d 1112, 1118 (10th Cir. 1996).* And just last month, the Ninth Circuit struck down a 20 week ban on the ground that the U.S. Supreme Court has been ''unalterably clear'' that ''a woman has a constitutional right to choose to terminate her pregnancy before the fetus is viable.'' *Isaacson* v. *Horne*, __F.3d__, No. 12–16670, 2013 WL 2160171, at *1 (9th Cir. May 21, 2013).

Madam Speaker, the constitutionally protected right to privacy encompasses the right of women to choose to terminate a pregnancy before viability, and even later where continuing to term poses a threat to her health and safety. This right of privacy was hard won and must be preserved inviolate. For this reason, I offered an amendment before the Rules Committee that would ensure that the legislation before us is not to be interpreted to abridge this right. The Jackson Lee Amendment #2 provided:

> SEC. 4. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION. Nothing in this Act shall be construed or interpreted to limit the right of privacy guaranteed and protected by the United States Constitution as interpreted by the United States Supreme Court in the cases of *Griswold* v. *Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 479 (1965); *Eisenstadt* v. *Baird*, 405 U.S. 438 (1972), and *Roe* v. *Wade*, 410 U.S.113 (1973).

Regrettably, the Rules Committee did not make this amendment in order. Unregrettably, I strongly oppose H.R. 1797 and urge all members to join me in voting against this unwise measure that put the lives and health of women at risk.

FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. MICHAEL G. GRIMM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1947) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes:

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Chair, I rise today to express my sincere thanks to Chairman FRANK LUCAS for his acceptance of the amendment to the Farm Bill that I offered with my colleagues from New York Reps. CHRIS GIBSON and TIM BISHOP. Our amendment would require the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a study and no later than 180 days after enactment report back to the relevant committees in the House and Senate an analysis of energy use in USDA facilities, a list of energy audits that have been conducted at USDA facilities, a list of energy efficiency projects that have been conducted at USDA facilities and a list of energy savings projects that could be achieved with additional mechanical insulation at USDA facilities.

Thermal Insulation for piping, equipment, and other mechanical devices, known as mechanical insulation, is a proven energy efficiency and emission reduction technology that will reduce costs, save energy, and improve personnel safety. It is also important to point out that 95 percent of all mechanical insulation products used in the United States are manufactured in the United States.

As you are well aware, buildings are responsible for 40 percent of the United States energy demand and emissions, which makes efficiency gains in this area crucial if we are to markedly reduce America's energy consumption. To give you a sense of the impact mechanical insulation can have on our country, the National Insulation Association estimates that implementing a comprehensive mechanical insulation maintenance program in the commercial and industrial market segments would lead to annual energy savings of 1.22 quads of primary energy or $3.8 billion and returns on investment ranging from 25–100 percent.

We, as Members of Congress, should be taking a leading role in ensuring energy efficiency is a priority in our country. What better way to lead than to look in our federal buildings at the ways we utilize, or unfortunately, the ways we all too often do not utilize and maintain a low cost, high impact American product that is proven to save energy and money.

By passing this amendment we are asking the Department of Agriculture to help lead the way for others to follow by reducing its energy cost and emissions with the increased use of a proven technology, simply known as mechanical insulation.

CONGRATULATING JULIUS CIACCIA

HON. DAVID P. JOYCE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2013

Mr. JOYCE, Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate Mr. Julius Ciaccia, Executive Director of Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District on his election as the new President of the National Association of Clean Water Agencies, NACWA.

Mr. Ciaccia is an accomplished leader and committed environmental steward who plays a prominent role in the water industry, exemplifying what it means to be a public servant. He is ideally suited to serve as President of one of the Nation's leading proponents of responsible policies that advance clean water. Mr. Ciaccia has served the people of the Cleveland area for decades, and in his new role, will continue to ensure that Ohio's, and the Nation's clean water agencies continue to improve to protect public health and the environment.

Mr. Ciaccia began his career in public utilities in 1977 when he was appointed as Assistant Director of the Public Utilities Department for the City of Cleveland. In 1979 he took on the temporary role of Commissioner of Cleveland Water until 1981 when he assumed the role of Deputy Commissioner of Cleveland Water and was eventually appointed Commissioner in 1988.

During the 25 years in the Division of Water, Mr. Ciaccia oversaw the management of over $1 billion worth of capital improvement projects and maintained the Division of Water's very favorable financial position. He was appointed Director of the city's Department of Public Utilities in 2004 and began his current role at the Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District in November 2007.

In his current role at the District, he oversees all aspects of managing one of the nation's largest wastewater management utilities. Under his leadership, the District has received two awards from the Commission on Economic Inclusion including a 2009 award for Supplier Diversity which highlights the success of one of Mr. Ciaccia's initiatives to craft and implement a supplier inclusion program; and a 2012 award for Senior Management Inclusion, recognizing diversity of Senior Staff.

As the District's Executive Director, Mr. Ciaccia was also responsible for a recently entered consent order for a long term control plan to significantly reduce combined sewer overflows, as well as the successful development and implementation of a new Regional Stormwater Management Program. Additionally, one of Mr. Ciaccia's many accomplishments as Executive Director has been the transformation of the District's culture to one of transparency and ethical financial practices.

As member of NACWA's Board of Directors, Mr. Ciaccia has served as the Secretary, Treasurer, and Vice President. Mr. Ciaccia has selflessly shared his time, passion, energy and ideas to carry out the objectives of the Clean Water Act.

It is my sincere pleasure to congratulate Julius Ciaccia on becoming President of NACWA. I am certain his actions will ensure continued water quality progress for the Cleveland area, the State of Ohio and the Nation.

FEDEAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. FRANK D. LUCAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (HR. 1947) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes:

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chair, I am aware of the concern that some of the 1890's are having difficulty meeting the matching requirement under the McIntire-Stennis Cooperative Forestry Program. There has been considerable discussion regarding matching fund policies in our research, extension and education programs. This legislation contains several reforms reflective of those discussions and beneficial to the entirety of the land-grant community.

I appreciate the gentleman's willingness to allow us the opportunity to work through this issue with USDA and the 1890's Council of Presidents to craft a workable policy under McIntire-Stennis. You have my commitment that we will resolve this issue favorably and will certainly look to the language contained in the Senate legislation as the basis for these discussions.

HONORING DR. MELODY SMITH

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Dr. Melody Smith of Saint Joseph, Missouri. Melody is active in the community and has been chosen to receive the YWCA Women of Excellence Woman in the Workplace Award.

Melody has been the Superintendent of the Saint Joseph School District since 2006. Under Melody's leadership the Saint Joseph School District has earned the Missouri Distinction in Performance rating six times. Melody is also credited with bringing State recognition to Saint Joseph for excellence in Early Childhood Education. As Superintendent, Melody has been a true leader and mentor encouraging teachers to pursue national board certification and to work toward postgraduate degrees.

During her tenure in that position she developed the PACT program to give the people of the school district a voice in guiding the educational future of the community. Thanks to those efforts, Saint Joseph will be enjoying two new schools in the very near future. If asked she will simply say that she has viewed the job of Superintendent as an opportunity to serve. With all of these accomplishments, one distinction will always remain for Melody; that she was the first woman to serve as Superintendent for the Saint Joseph School District.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in recognizing Dr. Melody Smith. She has made an amazing impact on countless individuals in the St. Joseph community. I am honored to represent her in the United States Congress.

AGAINST THE NAME OF THE NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE'S WASHINGTON FOOTBALL FRANCHISE

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2013

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the name of the National Football League's Washington, D.C. franchise, the ''Redskins,'' which I will refer to as the ''R-word.'' In particular, I want to recognize the national media coverage of this very important and sensitive issue. While the media has no doubt contributed to the alleged normalcy of the ''R-word'' among NFL fans, it must be acknowledged that the tide of public opinion—as recently evidenced through well-known media outlets—is changing.

Mr. Jarrett Bell, an NFL columnist for USA Today, penned an article stating that the Washington franchise ''[has] a history of bigotry.'' In Mr. Bell's words: ''[Dan Snyder] has an opportunity to make a bold statement in the name of social progress by discarding the racially offensive nickname of his team—and he won't budge an inch. Shame on him.'' Mr. Bell continues: ''Changing the franchise's nickname would be the next step after the monumental gesture of implementing the Rooney Rule a decade ago, and another show of corporate leadership that might inspire teams in other sports that trivialize Native Americans with their nicknames to break tradition.''

Mr. Michael Wilbon and Mr. Tony Kornheiser, sports columnists for the Washington Post and co-hosts of ESPN's ''Pardon the Interruption,'' recently ran a segment on the controversy over the ''R-word.'' Mr. Wilbon stated: ''I don't have any faith in the NFL. But