

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 gentlelady 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 famously 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 prohibition 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 gentle lady 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 gentle lady 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 gentlelady 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	Fox	Lamborn
Boustany	Franks (AZ)	Lance
Brady (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Lankford
Bridenstine	Gardner	Latham
Brooks (AL)	Garrett	Latta
Brooks (IN)	Gerlach	LoBiondo
Brown (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
Pearce	Royce
Perry	Ryan (WI)
Petri	Salmon
Pittenger	Sanford
Poe (TX)	Scalise
Pompeo	Schock
Posey	Schweikert
Price (GA)	Scott, Austin
Reed	Sensenbrenner
Reichert	Sessions
Renacci	Shimkus
Ribble	Shuster
Rice (SC)	Simpson
Rigell	Smith (MO)
Roby	Smith (NE)
Roe (TN)	Smith (NJ)
Rogers (AL)	Smith (TX)
Rogers (KY)	Southerland
Rohrabacher	Stewart
Rokita	Stivers
Rooney	Stockman
Ros-Lehtinen	Stutzman
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	Pascarell
Bera (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (GA)	Heck (WA)	Payne
Bishop (NY)	Higgins	Pelosi
Bonamici	Himes	Perlmutter
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Peters (CA)
Braley (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
Ciçilline	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	Loebsock	Sherman
Cummings	Lofgren	Sinema
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Sires
Davis, Danny	Lowe	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lujan Grisham	Smith (WA)
DeGette	(NM)	Speier
Delaney	Lujan, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
DeLauro	(NM)	Takano
DelBene	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
Deutch	Maffei	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	Maloney,	
Doggett	Carolyn	
Doyle	Maloney, Sean	
Duckworth	Matheson	
Edwards	Matsui	
Ellison	McCollum	
Engel	McDermott	
Enyart	McGovern	
Eshoo	McIntyre	
Esty	McNerney	
Farr	Meeks	
Fattah	Meng	
Foster	Michaud	
Frankel (FL)	Miller, George	
Fudge	Moore	
Gabbard	Moran	
Gallego	Murphy (FL)	
Garamendi	Nadler	
Garcia	Napolitano	
Grayson	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. PASCRELL 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
Bucshon	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	Kinzinger (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
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
Deutsch
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

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
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
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

Jones
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Rogers (MI)
Runyan

Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

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
Schradner
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

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	Pascrell
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
Cicilline	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
Cuellar	Latta	Scott, David
Culberson	Lipinski	Sensenbrenner
Daines	Loeb sack	Serrano
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Sessions
Davis, Danny	Long	Sewell (AL)
DeGette	Lowenthal	Shea-Porter
Delaney	Lucas	Sherman
DeLauro	Luetkemeyer	Shimkus
DelBene	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Shuster
Dent	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Simpson
DesJarlais	Maloney, Carolyn	Sinema
Deutch	Marino	Smith (NE)
Diaz-Balart	Massie	Smith (NJ)
Dingell	McAllister	Smith (TX)
Doggett	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (WA)
Doyle	McCaul	Southerland
Duncan (SC)	McClintock	Speier
Duncan (TN)	McHenry	Stewart
Ellison	McIntyre	Stutzman
Enyart	McKeon	Swalwell (CA)
Eshoo	McKinley	Takano
Esty	McMorris	Thornberry
Farr	Rodgers	Tierney
Fincher	Fortenberry	Tonko
Fleischmann	Foster	Tsongas
Fleming	Frankel (FL)	Turner
Flores	Franks (AZ)	Van Hollen
Forbes	Frelinghuysen	Vargas
Fortenberry	Gabbard	Velázquez
Fox		Wagner
Franks (AZ)		Walden
Frelinghuysen		Walorski
Gardner		
Garrett		
Gerlach		

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on