

Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch

Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf

Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (IN)

NAYS—142

Amash
Andrews
Bachus
Barr
Barton
Bass
Benishke
Bentivolio
Bishop (NY)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Capuano
Cárdenas
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Connolly
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
DeSantis
Duckworth
Duffy
Edwards
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Forbes
Foxy
Fudge
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Graves (MO)
Green, Al

Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Gutiérrez
Hall
Hanna
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Israel
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Lance
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Matheson
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan

Palazzo
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Renacci
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Stivers
Stockman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Walberg
Waters
Weber (TX)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Gohmert Grijalva Payne

NOT VOTING—26

Amodei
Blumenauer
Brady (TX)
Campbell
Clay
Engel
Gardner
Jones
Labrador
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
Meehan
Miller (FL)
Neugebauer
Nugent
Owens
Pocan
Rogers (MI)
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schradler
Tipton
Titus
Westmoreland

□ 1509

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1094

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN) be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1094.

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

There was no objection.

NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION AND ABORTION INSURANCE FULL DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2014

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 465, I call up the bill (H.R. 7) to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 465, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-33 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 7

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the “No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act of 2014”.

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—PROHIBITING FEDERALLY FUNDED ABORTIONS

Sec. 101. Prohibiting taxpayer funded abortions.

Sec. 102. Amendment to table of chapters.

TITLE II—APPLICATION UNDER THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Sec. 201. Clarifying application of prohibition to premium credits and cost-sharing reductions under ACA.

Sec. 202. Revision of notice requirements regarding disclosure of extent of health plan coverage of abortion and abortion premium surcharges.

TITLE I—PROHIBITING FEDERALLY FUNDED ABORTIONS

SEC. 101. PROHIBITING TAXPAYER FUNDED ABORTIONS.

Title 1, United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following new chapter:

“CHAPTER 4—PROHIBITING TAXPAYER FUNDED ABORTIONS

“301. Prohibition on funding for abortions.

“302. Prohibition on funding for health benefits plans that cover abortion.

“303. Limitation on Federal facilities and employees.

“304. Construction relating to separate coverage.

“305. Construction relating to the use of non-Federal funds for health coverage.

“306. Non-preemption of other Federal laws.

“307. Construction relating to complications arising from abortion.

“308. Treatment of abortions related to rape, incest, or preserving the life of the mother.

“309. Application to District of Columbia.

“§301. Prohibition on funding for abortions

“No funds authorized or appropriated by Federal law, and none of the funds in any trust fund to which funds are authorized or appropriated by Federal law, shall be expended for any abortion.

“§302. Prohibition on funding for health benefits plans that cover abortion

“None of the funds authorized or appropriated by Federal law, and none of the funds in any trust fund to which funds are authorized or appropriated by Federal law, shall be ex-

pendent for health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion.

“§303. Limitation on Federal facilities and employees

“No health care service furnished—

“(1) by or in a health care facility owned or operated by the Federal Government; or

“(2) by any physician or other individual employed by the Federal Government to provide health care services within the scope of the physician’s or individual’s employment, may include abortion.

“§304. Construction relating to separate coverage

“Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as prohibiting any individual, entity, or State or locality from purchasing separate abortion coverage or health benefits coverage that includes abortion so long as such coverage is paid for entirely using only funds not authorized or appropriated by Federal law and such coverage shall not be purchased using matching funds required for a federally subsidized program, including a State’s or locality’s contribution of Medicaid matching funds.

“§305. Construction relating to the use of non-Federal funds for health coverage

“Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as restricting the ability of any non-Federal health benefits coverage provider from offering abortion coverage, or the ability of a State or locality to contract separately with such a provider for such coverage, so long as only funds not authorized or appropriated by Federal law are used and such coverage shall not be purchased using matching funds required for a federally subsidized program, including a State’s or locality’s contribution of Medicaid matching funds.

“§306. Non-preemption of other Federal laws

“Nothing in this chapter shall repeal, amend, or have any effect on any other Federal law to the extent such law imposes any limitation on the use of funds for abortion or for health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion, beyond the limitations set forth in this chapter.

“§307. Construction relating to complications arising from abortion

“Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to apply to the treatment of any infection, injury, disease, or disorder that has been caused by or exacerbated by the performance of an abortion. This rule of construction shall be applicable without regard to whether the abortion was performed in accord with Federal or State law, and without regard to whether funding for the abortion is permissible under section 308.

“§308. Treatment of abortions related to rape, incest, or preserving the life of the mother

“The limitations established in sections 301, 302, and 303 shall not apply to an abortion—

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

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

“§309. Application to District of Columbia

“In this chapter:

“(1) Any reference to funds appropriated by Federal law shall be treated as including any amounts within the budget of the District of Columbia that have been approved by Act of Congress pursuant to section 446 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (or any applicable successor Federal law).

“(2) The term ‘Federal Government’ includes the government of the District of Columbia.”.

SEC. 102. AMENDMENT TO TABLE OF CHAPTERS.

The table of chapters for title 1, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“4. Prohibiting taxpayer funded abortions 301”.

TITLE II—APPLICATION UNDER THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

SEC. 201. CLARIFYING APPLICATION OF PROHIBITION TO PREMIUM CREDITS AND COST-SHARING REDUCTIONS UNDER ACA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) DISALLOWANCE OF REFUNDABLE CREDIT AND COST-SHARING REDUCTIONS FOR COVERAGE UNDER QUALIFIED HEALTH PLAN WHICH PROVIDES COVERAGE FOR ABORTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 36B(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “or any health plan that includes coverage for abortions (other than any abortion or treatment described in section 307 or 308 of title 1, United States Code)”.

(B) OPTION TO PURCHASE OR OFFER SEPARATE COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Paragraph (3) of section 36B(c) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) SEPARATE ABORTION COVERAGE OR PLAN ALLOWED.—

“(i) OPTION TO PURCHASE SEPARATE COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed as prohibiting any individual from purchasing separate coverage for abortions described in such subparagraph, or a health plan that includes such abortions, so long as no credit is allowed under this section with respect to the premiums for such coverage or plan.

“(ii) OPTION TO OFFER COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall restrict any non-Federal health insurance issuer offering a health plan from offering separate coverage for abortions described in such subparagraph, or a plan that includes such abortions, so long as premiums for such separate coverage or plan are not paid for with any amount attributable to the credit allowed under this section (or the amount of any advance payment of the credit under section 1412 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act).”.

(2) DISALLOWANCE OF SMALL EMPLOYER HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSE CREDIT FOR PLAN WHICH INCLUDES COVERAGE FOR ABORTION.—Subsection (h) of section 45R of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking “Any term” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any term”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) EXCLUSION OF HEALTH PLANS INCLUDING COVERAGE FOR ABORTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified health plan’ does not include any health plan that includes coverage for abortions (other than any abortion or treatment described in section 307 or 308 of title 1, United States Code).

“(B) SEPARATE ABORTION COVERAGE OR PLAN ALLOWED.—

“(i) OPTION TO PURCHASE SEPARATE COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed as prohibiting any employer from purchasing for its employees separate coverage for abortions described in such subparagraph, or a health plan that includes such abortions, so long as no credit is allowed under this section with respect to the employer contributions for such coverage or plan.

“(ii) OPTION TO OFFER COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall restrict any non-Federal health insurance issuer offering a health plan from offering separate coverage for abortions described in such subparagraph, or a plan that includes such abortions, so long as such separate coverage or plan is not paid for with any employer contribution eligible for the credit allowed under this section.”.

(3) CONFORMING ACA AMENDMENTS.—Section 1303(b) of Public Law 111-148 (42 U.S.C. 18023(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (2);

(B) by striking paragraph (3), as amended by section 202(a); and

(C) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (2).

(b) APPLICATION TO MULTI-STATE PLANS.—Paragraph (6) of section 1334(a) of Public Law 111-148 (42 U.S.C. 18054(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(6) COVERAGE CONSISTENT WITH FEDERAL ABORTION POLICY.—In entering into contracts under this subsection, the Director shall ensure that no multi-State qualified health plan offered in an Exchange provides health benefits coverage for which the expenditure of Federal funds is prohibited under chapter 4 of title 1, United States Code.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 2014, but only with respect to plan years beginning after such date, and the amendment made by subsection (b) shall apply to plan years beginning after such date.

SEC. 202. REVISION OF NOTICE REQUIREMENTS REGARDING DISCLOSURE OF EXTENT OF HEALTH PLAN COVERAGE OF ABORTION AND ABORTION PREMIUM SURCHARGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 1303(b) of Public Law 111-148 (42 U.S.C. 18023(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) RULES RELATING TO NOTICE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The extent of coverage (if any) of services described in paragraph (1)(B)(i) or (1)(B)(ii) by a qualified health plan shall be disclosed to enrollees at the time of enrollment in the plan and shall be prominently displayed in any marketing or advertising materials, comparison tools, or summary of benefits and coverage explanation made available with respect to such plan by the issuer of the plan, by an Exchange, or by the Secretary, including information made available through an Internet portal or Exchange under sections 1311(c)(5) and 1311(d)(4)(C).

“(B) SEPARATE DISCLOSURE OF ABORTION SURCHARGES.—In the case of a qualified health plan that includes the services described in paragraph (1)(B)(i) and where the premium for the plan is disclosed, including in any marketing or advertising materials or any other information referred to in subparagraph (A), the surcharge described in paragraph (2)(B)(i)(II) that is attributable to such services shall also be disclosed and identified separately.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to materials, tools, or other information made available more than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable 1 hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 7.

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

There was no objection.

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

I come in support of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act.

This legislation is written with the same simple principle that has been supported on a bipartisan basis for decades. No taxpayer dollars should be spent on abortions and abortion coverage. H.R. 7 establishes a permanent Governmentwide prohibition on taxpayer subsidies for abortion.

This bill is all the more necessary because of the President's health care law and its attack on this long-standing protection of taxpayer dollars. For example, the health care law's premium subsidies can be used to purchase coverage on exchanges that include coverage of abortion.

The ACA breaks with the tradition of the Hyde Amendment, which has ensured that Federal dollars do not subsidize plans that cover abortion.

□ 1515

The bill before us would simply codify the Hyde amendment language so it applies across the Federal Government.

Consumers should also have the right to know whether the plans they are selecting on an exchange include abortion coverage. While the ACA included some notification provisions, many of our constituents are simply unable to find out whether a plan is paying for abortions. In fact, this inability to find out whether exchange plans provide abortion coverage seems to extend to the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

In October of last year, Secretary Sebelius committed in testimony before the Energy and Commerce Committee to provide the Congress and the American people a full list of exchange plans providing abortion coverage. She was asked again to provide this list in December. Yet we are still waiting as the days tick by. We do not have this list.

The self-appointed most transparent administration in history is simply either unwilling or unable to comply with this request. This is why we have added provisions of the Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act. This would ensure Americans have the right to know whether plans on the exchange are providing abortion coverage. This bill is about protecting taxpayer dollars and protecting life. It also ensures we have at least some transparency under the President's health care law.

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

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

I rise to speak in opposition to H.R. 7.

H.R. 7 is not based on fact. The Affordable Care Act does not secretly funnel taxpayer dollars to fund abortions, and it is not based on the real

experiences of American women and families. They want to make their own personal health care decisions in consultation with their doctors and their spiritual advisors, not with their Congressmen.

Instead, this bill would squarely put the government, namely the IRS, in the exam room by effectively raising the taxes of those who choose an insurance plan that happens to cover abortion services. That includes hard-working men, women, and families who would be penalized, and it would burden small businesses, making each one second-guess its current insurance plan. It would make them change their coverage if they want to keep their health insurance coverage affordable. Simply put, H.R. 7 would dictate what individuals can do with their own private dollars.

Instead of this cynical attack on women's personal decisionmaking, we should be empowering our Nation's families by focusing on the economy, by strengthening the middle class, and by helping parents provide the best for their kids. It is really time to stop reverting back to the culture wars and to start trusting our Nation's women, our Nation's families and small businesses to make their own personal health care decisions.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. Madam Speaker, we were told over and over again: if you like your health insurance plan, you can keep it. We all found out that that wasn't true. I will never forget on the day that ObamaCare passed—I was here in this Chamber—we were promised by the President of the United States that, not only would the taxpayers of this country not be forced to pay for other people's abortions, but that abortion would not be a part of ObamaCare. We know today that isn't true. Abortion is a part of ObamaCare.

What is worse is that no matter how anyone feels about that issue there is pretty strong agreement that no one should be forced to violate one's conscience and pay for other people's abortions and be forced to do that, but that is the way it is. H.R. 7 makes President Obama's promise stand up and ring true, and it is this: that no taxpayer-funded money ever goes to pay for someone else's abortion.

Couldn't we unite on this principle? This is important.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank you for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, existing law very clearly states no taxpayers' money can fund abortions—that is already the law—with the exception of rape, incest, or to save a woman's life. The Repub-

licans are coming in and saying we have got to make sure that no taxpayer's money is going to be used to pay for any insurance that might provide abortions.

The law—the Affordable Care Act—provides that, if you get an insurance policy on the exchange, you can choose a policy that does not provide abortion coverage, but if you choose a policy that has abortion coverage, that portion of the policy must be paid by the purchaser, not the government.

So this is, in fact, like all we do around here, which is propaganda. It is politics. The Republicans try to make people believe that taxpayers' dollars are being used to pay for abortions. It is not true. This bill is bad in substance. It is an unfortunate bill that tries to interfere with the ability of people to buy with their own money a policy that may cover abortion services, which is a legal medical service.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS), who is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you to my distinguished colleague.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, of which I am a proud cosponsor. I am here today for those who cannot speak for themselves.

The premise of this legislation is nothing new. It simply continues the longstanding prohibition of using taxpayer dollars to pay for abortions. Regardless of whether you are pro-life or not, most Americans recognize that it is unfair to force every American in this country to subsidize abortion. This is, however, exactly what ObamaCare does. It has allowed taxpayer subsidies for health care plans that cover elective abortions. H.R. 7 is as much about protecting the taxpayer as it is about protecting the unborn.

I urge my colleagues to make the fair choice and to vote "yes" on this bill.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), who is the ranking member of the Health Subcommittee of Energy and Commerce.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 7. This legislation does nothing but impede women's access to health care in this country and turns the clock back on reproductive rights by 38 years.

The bill's sponsors claim it will prevent taxpayer dollars from paying for abortions. However, we already know that Federal funds do not go to abortions except in the limited cases of rape, incest, or to save the mother's life. This bill does not simply codify the Hyde amendment. That is bogus. What this bill does is prohibit millions of American families from using their own money to buy health plans that include abortion coverage.

Madam Speaker, spending time attacking women's health shows just how

far out of touch Republicans in Washington are. Instead of focusing on the economy and job creation, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would rather focus on legislation that puts access to reproductive health care in danger and undermines a woman's right to choose.

On December 28, unemployment insurance expired for Americans still struggling to find work. Meanwhile, Democrats have a bill that would raise the minimum wage to \$10.10 an hour, generating economic activity, creating jobs, and growing the middle class. These should be the priorities of the House of Representatives, not this phony bill before us. This legislation is an unprecedented, radical assault on women's health care. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN), who has been such an advocate on our life issues.

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the gentlelady for yielding and for her hard work on this very important issue.

Madam Speaker, I am humbled to join my pro-life colleagues here on the House floor and, more importantly, the millions of pro-life Americans across the country.

Although this debate is often clouded by empty euphemisms like "choice," we cannot forget the human element at the heart of this issue. This isn't about abstract concepts. This is about babies, the most vulnerable members of our society. At the same time, we must show compassion and offer help to those struggling through what seems like an impossible circumstance; and, as civilized people, we ought to prevent taxpayer dollars from subsidizing the senseless destruction of innocent lives once and for all. After all, we are a Nation founded to protect life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Today, we have an opportunity to do exactly that with commonsense legislation. Millions of pro-life Americans don't want their tax dollars used to subsidize abortions.

I urge my colleagues to support the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I am now very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), a real champion for women's issues.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, this so-called "No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act" has got to be the most deceptively named bill of this Congress.

Here are the facts:

There is no taxpayer funding for abortion. The Affordable Care Act does not change that. Let me say that again. There is no taxpayer funding for abortion. The Affordable Care Act does not change that.

The ACA contains a hard-fought compromise that guarantees that the tax credits made available through the exchanges are segregated out for plans that cover certain women's health benefits. This bill is an attempt to undo

that compromise. It effectively bans the coverage of important women's health services in the new health insurance exchanges. It restricts the way that women can use their own private dollars to purchase private insurance. It says small businesses cannot get tax credits if they choose to use their private dollars to purchase private insurance that covers important women's benefits.

It goes far, far beyond the Hyde amendment, which prohibits taxpayer funding for most abortions in the annual appropriations bills. It also, for the first time, puts the Hyde amendment into law, and it says women in the District of Columbia will not have the same right to access health services as women in other States throughout this country.

This bill would not only restrict comprehensive health care for women; it would also undermine a woman's right to make her own health care decisions under her insurance policy with her own money. Vote "no."

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. I thank my colleague from Tennessee for her leadership on this particular issue.

For far too long, Madam Speaker, I was silent on this particular issue. Some 22 years ago, as we were expecting our first child—my wife was pregnant—I began to talk to her about this particular thing. There my son was kicking in his mother's womb, and as we started to see this, I realized very profoundly that not only was it life but that it responded. My son was responding to my voice and to my touch, and as we saw that, I realized that I had been silent for far too long.

Regardless of where you are on this particular issue, we must say something today—the many of us who find this just appalling that it is even legal today—in allowing taxpayer dollars to be spent. This is something on which we must stand together. So, for those who can't speak for themselves, I stand here today, and I urge my colleagues to support this particular legislation.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

□ 1530

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to be absolutely obsessed with taking away a woman's right to make her own personal health decisions with her own money.

Today, we could be extending unemployment benefits to 1.6 million Americans. Instead, we are considering legislation that would discriminate against a woman's right with her own money to pick an insurance policy. We could be raising the minimum wage instead of effectively banning abortion coverage in the ACA market, even though not a penny of Federal dollars will go

to do that. We could be passing the Healthy Families Act to provide paid sick leave, instead of erecting more barriers to women's ability to protect their health, and yes, including access to safe and legal abortions.

We should be defeating this legislation for three reasons:

First, because women and their doctors—not politicians—should make their health care decisions;

Secondly, because we should not be undermining access to comprehensive insurance coverage of women's health insurance paid by the insured woman, not the government;

Third, because we have more pressing priorities to address.

It is time that we moved on to things that matter to the American people and not continue this relentless war on women's rights.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I think it is important to realize over 60 percent of the American people agree with us on this issue. You can look at survey after survey. They do not want taxpayers funds used for abortion.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY), joining us in this fight to make certain that we preserve taxpayer funds, a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee for her leadership on this.

I have been intrigued at the latest rhetoric on the so-called "war on women." I am intrigued because at some point pro-abortion activists stopped using the word "abortion." Instead of using the "A" word, they use terms like "women's health" or "reproductive rights." It is a clever word game designed to disguise the truth and build artificial support. After all, who would be against the health of women? Who would oppose anyone's right to reproduce? But what about the baby's health? What about the unborn child's "right" to life?

They don't call it abortion anymore because people understand what abortion is. It is the taking of a life. It is death where life once existed. It is cruel and tragic, and there is no place in the Federal budget for funding it.

Mrs. CAPPS. I am now pleased to yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank my colleague for yielding time.

Madam Speaker, here at the start of the new year, when Americans are facing so many challenges in their lives, the Republicans are taking us off on this cruel tangent. We should be debating how to boost wages across this country, how to better educate our children, and how to ensure that everyone has a chance and an opportunity to be successful in their lives and secure in their futures, but yet again, a handful of mostly older, mostly male politicians here in Washington, D.C., believe that the priority for us is to interfere in the personal lives of women. They

want to intrude in the personal, private health care decisions of women and their families. They think they know best. But how can they?

I trust women and their families to make their own decisions, not the politicians here in Washington, D.C. Republicans in Congress should respect our right to privacy. Politicians shouldn't be allowed to direct treatments and oversee diagnoses from Washington, and they shouldn't unnecessarily restrict a woman's health insurance coverage and the comprehensive policy that she has paid for.

This Republican bill is an unprecedented, radical assault on a woman's right to make her own health and health insurance decisions. It interferes with the relationship between a patient and doctor.

Thankfully, this bill is not going anywhere after the vote today, but it does provide evidence of what Republicans in the House believe is the top priority for America.

Is it jobs? No. Is it boosting wages? No. Is it improving our schools and higher ed? No.

The Republicans' top priority today is to interfere in the personal lives and health decisions of women across our country.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. May I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 1 minute remaining, and the gentlewoman from Tennessee has 2 minutes remaining.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, H.R. 7 is not about taxpayer funding. It is about what women, families, and small businesses can do with their own money, their own private dollars, and it is about keeping Congress and the IRS out of the doctor's office.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to start trusting America's women to make their own decisions.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this dangerous bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

What an interesting debate we have and what a difference we have in philosophies as we approach the work of this Nation.

I have found it quite curious, as we have some who say we should be talking about how we live better lives and jobs and futures. You know what, Madam Speaker? As we talk today, what our focus is on is making certain that these precious unborn children do have that right to life, to liberty, to the pursuit of happiness. Yes, indeed.

Today, let me just clear up the record for the legislation before us where we talk about no taxpayer funding of abortion. I want to read from the legislation itself, Madam Speaker.

Section 304 in title I:

Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as prohibiting any individual, entity, or

State or locality from purchasing separate abortion coverage or health benefits coverage that includes abortion so long as such coverage is paid for entirely using only funds not authorized or appropriated by Federal law.

Reading directly from the bill and then going to section 306:

Nothing in this chapter shall repeal, amend, or have any effect on any other Federal law to the extent such law imposes any limitation on the use of funds for abortion or for health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion, beyond the limitations set forth in this chapter.

So, Madam Speaker, may I lay the fears aside of my colleagues. This is an issue that 60 percent of the American people agree with us on. It is an action that they think is important to take; that it is important for taxpayers to have the assurance from their government that we are not going to have taxpayer funds used for abortion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

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

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

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, I am proud to stand before the House today in support of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. I supported this legislation last Congress because the message I have consistently received from my constituents is that they do not want their taxpayers dollars funding abortions. Period.

It is time to put this issue to rest once and for all. The majority of Americans, regardless of where they stand on the larger issue, do not want their taxpayer dollars paying for abortions, but for too long, we have had a patchwork of provisions when it comes to Federal funding, which has created potential loopholes and confusion. H.R. 7 solidifies the longstanding provisions of the Hyde amendment, which are especially needed when it comes to the Affordable Health Care Act.

Madam Speaker, I don't have time to stand here and list all of the problems with the President's health care law, but one of these problems can be fixed through the passage of this bipartisan bill, which simply states that taxpayer dollars will not pay for abortions.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

When I go home to talk to my constituents back home in Queens and the portions of the Bronx that I represent, there are a lot of issues that they bring up to me. They want to see unemployment insurance restored. They want to see jobs created. They want to see our economy strengthened. They want to see investments in infrastructure and building our communities.

But not once has anyone ever said, Forget all about that. They have never

said to me, Please raise my taxes if Uncle Sam objects to the health care plan I have picked for me, my family, or my business.

Yes, that's exactly what this bill does. It raises taxes on individuals, families, and small businesses.

I offered an amendment that would block this bill from taking effect if it would raise taxes, but the Republican majority, with yet another closed rule, refused to make that amendment in order. Why?

Because they knew that if that amendment were to become a part of this bill, it would kill this bill. Because no matter how you slice it, this Republican bill will raise taxes on hard-working Americans. Small businesses will pay more taxes because if their employee health plan covers abortion or reproductive care, the business will be denied the small business tax credit. No one denies that.

Families will pay more in taxes when they lose any tax credits they received to purchase a health insurance plan if the plan that works best for them happens to include abortion coverage. That is right. Families will have to give up on choosing their own plan.

Stripping these health care tax credits will have the same effect as if we denied or stripped out similar tax credits like the child tax credit or the higher education tax credit.

If this isn't a tax increase, I don't know what is.

This bill interferes with personal choice and decisions.

I find it ironic that my Republican colleagues claim to support ensuring Americans can pick a private health plan that suits their individual needs until the plan they pick covers legal services they find personally objectionable. I find it ironic that my Republican colleagues oppose every suggested tax increase out there until it is one that abnegates their social agenda.

There is no question this is a serious issue and it deserves serious consideration. Yet on an issue as important as access to comprehensive health care coverage—and with such severe tax implications—it is outrageous that this bill was not first considered by the Ways and Means Committee. The reason for that is Republicans are rushing this new bill forward. Not because they are looking to make good policy, but because they are looking to make good political friends—good political friends who support a very narrow political agenda.

I just wish the real issues that we need to be working on like extending unemployment insurance for 1.6 million Americans would get as much attention as all these made-up issues.

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

□ 1545

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume simply to note that, according to the staff of the Joint Committee on

Taxation, the bill would have negligible effects on tax revenues.

Similarly, the CBO estimates that any effects on direct spending would be negligible for each year and over the 10-year budget window.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the author of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend for her leadership and her very eloquent remarks.

My friend from New York talked about a narrow agenda and a narrow perspective. More than 60 percent of every poll, in the case of one poll, 69 percent of all women in the United States of America say they do not want their funds being used to subsidize abortion on demand.

Let me remind my colleagues that this legislation accomplishes three goals:

One, it makes the Hyde amendment and other current abortion funding prohibitions permanent. We just reauthorized all of those riders just a few weeks ago. This just makes them permanent;

Ensures that the Affordable Care Act faithfully conforms to the Hyde amendment, as promised by the President of the United States;

And provides full disclosure, transparency, and prominent display that is absolutely lacking right now of the extent to which any health insurance plan on the exchange funds abortion.

Madam Speaker, the President of the United States stood about 10 feet from where I am standing right now back in September of 2009 and told a joint session of Congress:

Under our plan, no Federal dollars will be used to fund abortion.

The executive order that was issued in March of 2010 said, and I quote, that the Affordable Care Act "maintains current Hyde amendment restrictions governing abortion policy and extends those restrictions to newly created health insurance exchanges."

Madam Speaker, that is simply not true. It is absolutely not true. As my colleagues know, the Hyde amendment has two parts. It prohibits direct funding for abortion, and it bans funding to any insurance coverage, any insurance plan that includes abortion, except in the cases of rape, incest, or to save the life of the mother.

Earlier speakers have said not a penny will go to pay for abortion. Yet under the Affordable Care Act, massive amounts of public funds—what are they if they are not public? They are public funds coming out of the U.S. Treasury in the forms of tax credits. That is the word used.

\$796 billion in direct spending, over 10 years, according to CBO, will pay for insurance plans, many, perhaps most of which will include elective abortions, abortion on demand.

Madam Speaker, that massively violates the Hyde amendment. You can't have it both ways. You can't say you

are for the Hyde amendment and you are comporting with the Hyde amendment when you violate it in such a way.

Let me also point out to my colleagues that there are many States where pro-life individuals and constituents will have no opportunity to buy a plan that is pro-life on the exchanges. That includes Connecticut and Rhode Island. Every plan is abortion-on-demand, so their premium dollars, your tax dollars and mine, will be combining to buy plans that provide for abortion-on-demand.

In 2014, Madam Speaker, we have learned so much about the magnificent life of an unborn child. Increasingly, we have also learned about the deleterious effects that abortions have on women, psychologically, the children born subsequently to them and, of course, to other aspects of their physical health.

Please support H.R. 7.

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, may I ask how much time we have.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 6 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Kansas has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, when you are not limited by the facts, you can say almost anything out on this floor; and we are hearing that today because, in the grand tradition of the anti-choice terminology, the title of this bill is an absolute farce.

Taxpayers do not currently fund abortions, and this legislation would do nothing more than make it difficult for private businesses to provide adequate health care for their workers, restrict how our Nation's Capital conducts its affairs, and generally block poor women from accessing safe and legal abortions.

In 1963, I was an intern in Buffalo, New York, before the Hyde amendment, before all the business and abortions were illegal. I stood there on the general medicine ward with two women, one with eight children, one with 12 children, who had gotten septic abortions done in a back alley, and they died.

They left eight and 12 children in that situation. Now, they did that because they didn't have access to clean abortions. They had made a choice. They can make a choice.

If we say women can't make a choice, that is very simple. We will just tell women what to do, which is really what this bill is all about.

The Republicans want to tell women what to do. Stay out of our lives, get the government out of our lives. No, in every area except women's health.

Now, the truth of the matter is not tax credits or health coverage. The heart of this debate is a simple question about does women's health count?

Do women deserve comprehensive health care?

Or are they some kind of submissive person who hangs around the house and we tell them what to do?

Are their health care needs real?

And does 51 percent of our population deserve control over their own health decisions?

Or are they special exceptions who need to be taken care of because they can't decide for themselves?

Do they have a right to make health decisions for themselves?

Does Congress have a right to stigmatize a safe, legal procedure?

Imagine if we were standing up here debating whether or not private business would be allowed to help employees get coverage for prostate cancer or erectile dysfunction drugs or vasectomies. Suppose we were to pass a law and say you can't pay for that kind of stuff?

Imagine if we told men that they would lose their deserved tax credits in the exchange if they purchased insurance that covered their health needs as they decide them?

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

Mr. CROWLEY. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Women's health care is health care. It is not Congress' job to stigmatize legal medical procedures and punish women who use them. It is also not Congress' job to tell Washington, D.C., what to do or to stop people from having their options.

This bill is insulting to women, and the Republicans are asking for it in the next election. If anybody votes for you, it is because they haven't paid attention to what you are doing out here today. You are insulting every woman in this country. She can't make her own decision about her health care.

I urge you to vote "no."

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, this is appalling that we are even at this point in talking about this providing health care for women. I am really shocked. If we are not providing the best possible medical help for expectant mothers and their unborn child, that is not the issue.

This country has always been the champion of life around the world, protecting human rights. We have always showed up at every single encounter, whenever people were being treated in a way that we thought was not right.

We worry about Syria and the fact that they are losing their citizens, that Assad is killing their citizens. Yet, since 1973, we have aborted 56 million unborn children, 56 million unborn children.

And today we are having a discussion on H.R. 7, where the only thing the American taxpayers are saying, we know, by law, a woman can make that

choice, but we also know that taxpayers don't want to fund it.

It is appalling that we have to have this type of a discussion in the United States of America when you know how we feel in our hearts and in our souls. You know how people feel about this.

I want you to think about those 56 million unborn children who could have made a huge difference in this world. It is absolutely appalling to sit in this great room where so many great debates over the protection of human rights and freedom and liberty have taken place and to be having this discussion.

This has nothing to do with us cutting back on women's health care. It has to do with taxpayers not wanting to fund an abortion. This is what we are talking about.

Please—and as the gentleman just said—is it about the next election? Really?

Have we reduced ourselves to only winning elections and not winning on behalf of people's rights?

These are human rights. I appreciate the time to come to speak.

Madam Speaker, I have got to tell you, this is one of the most disturbing things that we face in the country today, and I want our people to think about this: 56 million children have been aborted.

If we can't wake up and smell the roses on this, then shame on us.

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, there is no tax money being used for abortions. That has been true since Henry Hyde served here with us.

What this bill does is not address that issue. It really is intended to eliminate abortion coverage in private insurance plans.

Our witness, Professor Wood, testified in the Judiciary Committee that eliminating the tax benefit, essentially raising taxes if a small business offers a broad insurance plan that includes abortion, will result in dropping that portion of the coverage. So this is really an extreme measure.

I understand that not everyone believes that women should make this choice. If you are opposed to abortion, don't have an abortion. But don't put the Federal Government in charge of the decisions that are properly and legally made by women, along with their husbands and families.

This is an extreme agenda. It is wrong, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, throughout history, there has often been great intensity surrounding the debates over protecting the innocent lives of those who, through no fault of their own, find themselves obscured in the shadows of humanity.

It encourages me greatly that in nearly all of those cases the collective

conscience was finally moved in favor of the victims. The same thing is beginning to happen in this debate related to innocent, unborn children.

No matter how the left has tried to obscure the true issue, we are finally beginning to ask ourselves the real question: Does abortion take the life of a child?

And we are finally beginning to realize, as a human family, Madam Speaker, that it does. Ultrasound technology demonstrates to all reasonable observers both the humanity of the victim and the inhumanity of what is being done to them.

And we are finally beginning to realize, as Americans, that 56 million lost little lives and their blood staining the foundations of this Nation is enough.

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, we are prepared to close, if the gentlelady has any additional speakers before she closes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Kansas has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, I don't see any additional speakers, so we will be prepared to close.

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

The gentlelady from Kansas, my good friend, who I respect greatly, said the overall tax effect is negligible. I would ask, negligible to whom?

If you are that person who can't get a needed tax credit, it is not negligible to you. It is very real.

Part of what is so troubling about this bill is it is not only how much further it goes than current existing law, but how much further this kind of thinking could go.

What other restrictions on medical procedures are next, as my friend from Washington said? If your procedure involves stem cells, prenatal care for teen mothers?

Could hospitals lose funding for training doctors in necessary procedures that this majority may deem troubling?

The question is, where does it end?

How many other ways can the majority use our laws to punish hardworking Americans?

□ 1600

Can they take away your student loans because your teacher wants you to read "Catcher in the Rye"? Can they limit your tax benefits for buying a house in the wrong neighborhood? The slope is steep and slippery. Vote "no" on this wrongheaded bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, we are not interested in raising taxes. This bill does not do that. We are simply ensuring that hardworking Americans who pay taxes and oppose abortion don't see their taxpayer dollars going to fund abortion.

We have had legislation similar to this bill in place for over three decades. This legislation is not a new idea. The

majority of Americans have long held that taxpayers should not be forced to foot the bill for abortion practices that they do not believe in.

I would ask everyone to support passage of H.R. 7, Madam Speaker, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I consume.

However stark Americans' differences of opinions can be on the matter of abortion, generally, there has long been bipartisan agreement that Federal taxpayer funds should not be used to destroy innocent life. The Hyde amendment, named for its chief sponsor, former House Judiciary Chairman Henry Hyde, has prohibited the Federal funding of abortion since 1976, when it passed a House and Senate that was composed overwhelmingly of Democratic Members.

It has been renewed each appropriations cycle with few changes for over 35 years, supported by Congress' control by both parties and Presidents from both parties. It is probably the most bipartisan, pro-life proposal, sustained over a longer period of time than any other.

Just last week, a Marist landline and cell phone poll of over 2,000 adults found that 58 percent of those surveyed oppose or strongly oppose using any taxpayer dollars for abortions. It is time the Hyde amendment was codified in the United States Code.

H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, sponsored by CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey, would do just that. It would codify the two core principles of the Hyde amendment throughout the operations of the Federal Government, namely, a ban on Federal funding for abortions and a ban on use of Federal funds for health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion.

During the time the Hyde amendment has been in place, probably millions and millions of innocent children and their mothers have been spared the horrors of abortion. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the Hyde amendment has led to as many as 675,000 fewer abortions each year. Let that sink in for a few precious moments.

The policy we will be discussing today has likely given America the gift of millions more children and, consequently, millions more mothers and millions more fathers, millions more lifetimes and trillions more loving gestures and other human gifts in all their diverse forms. What a stunningly wondrous legacy.

I encourage my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Ladies and gentlemen, H.R. 7 is not about the regulation of Federal funds.

Through the Hyde amendment, Congress already prevents funding of abortion and has done so for more than 30 years. Nothing in the Affordable Care Act changes this fact.

H.R. 7 is not needed to prevent the Federal funding of abortion, nor does it merely codify existing law as has been falsely asserted by those proponents. As a matter of fact, the bill on the floor today contains numerous new provisions adopted after the Judiciary Committee marked up and reported the bill.

This version of the bill has never been examined, debated, or amended by any committee of the House, yet my colleagues in the majority refuse to allow their colleagues any opportunity to amend this harmful bill today. This bill is far too significant and its impact on women is far too harmful to foreclose meaningful debate on an amendment as my colleagues in the majority have done.

This measure represents yet another assault on women's health care and constitutionally protected rights and should be rejected.

I reserve the balance of my time.

I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 7, the so-called "No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act."

This bill is just another ill-conceived attempt to push a divisive social agenda instead of focusing on what Americans care most about: creating jobs and improving our Nation's economy.

Plain and simple, H.R. 7 is not about the regulation of federal funds, but yet again another attack on women's health and their constitutionally-protected rights.

Sponsors of H.R. 7 want you to believe that the bill merely codifies existing law, but this is false.

For more than 30 years, the current law has prohibited federal funding for abortion. There is absolutely no risk that the public fisc will be raided to pay for abortion services, even under the Affordable Care Act.

The goal of H.R. 7 is to nullify the decisions of women and small business employers who choose insurance coverage that includes abortion coverage paid for with purely private, non-federal funds.

Through its novel tax penalty provisions, H.R. 7 departs radically from existing law, taking away women's existing health care and placing their health and lives at risk.

H.R. 7 eradicates the authority of the District of Columbia to make decisions about how locally raised funds are used for the healthcare of women.

When Delegate Holmes-Norton sought to address the Judiciary Committee about the bill's overreach, her request was denied by the Majority in utter disrespect for her and the District.

Women deserve a meaningful examination of their constitutionally-protected private health care decisions, not the frivolous and reckless process the Majority has undertaken on this bill before us today.

This bill was rushed through the Judiciary Committee, and was discharged from two other committees of jurisdiction—leaving no opportunity for their Members to seriously consider this legislation.

What the Majority has brought to the floor today contains numerous new provisions, has never been examined, debated, or amended by any Committee of the House.

The fact that the Minority is foreclosed from offering any amendments today is yet further proof that this legislation is simply intended to be yet another polemic attack on women, against our deliberative legislative process, and an attack against the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Why are these latest changes being demanded? Who is pushing this drastic course?

I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this egregious bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank Congressman CHRIS SMITH for his leadership in protecting the rights of the unborn.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of life. I believe in the sanctity of life, that life begins at conception, and that life is truly our greatest gift. I also recognize that abortion can be a very divisive issue. However, there is an area where most Americans agree and where elected officials can come together, and that is on the Federal funding of abortion.

Recent polling and information confirms what we have always known, that the majority of Americans do not want their hard-earned tax dollars going to pay for abortions. And Congress has consistently worked together over the years by attaching the Hyde amendment to appropriations bills to prevent taxpayer funds from going towards abortions.

Today the House will vote on a bill that I am proud to cosponsor and support, H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. This bill does exactly what the name implies: it permanently ensures that no taxpayer dollars go to pay for abortions or abortion coverage. This bill codifies the Hyde amendment as well as addresses taxpayer funding that, unfortunately, the Hyde amendment does not cover.

For example, ObamaCare expressly allows funding for plans that include abortions through taxpayer subsidies. During the health care debate, the President assured the American people that no Federal dollars would be used to fund abortions under ObamaCare. Yet this was just one more in a long line of inaccurate statements on ObamaCare by the President and his administration.

The No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act not only prevents taxpayer funding for abortion under ObamaCare, but it also requires transparency to ensure consumers are fully informed about which plans on the exchanges contain abortion coverage and surcharges.

Madam Speaker, throughout my life, I have worked hard to draw attention to the pro-life movement. I do it with love and compassion. I live for the day

when abortion is not just illegal, but it is unthinkable.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, today we consider H.R. 7, the misleadingly named No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion bill. Congress, unfortunately, already prohibits Federal funding of abortion. This bill does not simply codify existing law. Rather, it modifies and extends current funding restrictions in the Hyde amendment and, for the first time ever, uses the Tax Code to penalize the use of private funds to purchase insurance that covers abortion. It denies small businesses the tax credits they are entitled to under the Affordable Care Act if they offer their employees health insurance, if that health insurance covers abortion. It similarly denies income-eligible women and families the tax credits that they are entitled to under the Affordable Care Act if they use their own money to purchase insurance, if that insurance covers abortion.

The claim here is that a tax credit equals Federal funding. This is a completely new principle, asserted for the first and only time in this context. If we adopt this new theory—that granting tax relief is Federal funding—then how can tax relief for churches, synagogues, and religious-affiliated schools not be considered Federal funding in violation of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment? We should all be very careful about establishing this new principle.

H.R. 7 is not a codification of existing law, nor is it just another attempt to enact the approach taken in the Stupak-Pitts amendment to the House-passed Affordable Care Act. H.R. 7 is a radical departure from current tax treatment of medical expenses and insurance coverage; and it is not justifiable, nor is it necessary, unfortunately, to prevent Federal funding of abortion.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote “no” on this bill.

Today the House will consider H.R. 7—a bill that embraces the completely fictitious claim that legislation is needed to prevent federal funding of abortion services.

Congress already prohibits federal funding of abortion and has done so for more than thirty years. Many of us disagree with that decision. But regardless, there is no need for this bill, at least not to prevent federal funding of abortion.

Nor is the bill simply an effort to codify existing law. H.R. 7 modifies and extends current funding restrictions in the Hyde Amendment that are limited in time and scope, without any effort to determine how such a sweeping and permanent expansion would impact American women and their families.

If this were all, that would be reason enough to oppose it, but H.R. 7 actually goes much further. For the first time ever, anti-choice lawmakers are using the Federal tax code to penalize the purchase of insurance that covers abortion in certain circumstances. These penalties would apply when women and busi-

nesses use their own money—let me repeat that, their own money, not Federal funds—to purchase insurance that covers abortion.

In particular, H.R. 7 penalizes income-eligible women by denying them the tax credits that they are entitled to under the Affordable Care Act if they use their own money to purchase insurance that covers abortion. It similarly denies small businesses the tax credits that they are entitled to under the Affordable Care Act if the insurance they offer their employees includes abortion coverage.

The claim here is that a tax credit equals Federal funding. This is a completely new principle, asserted for the first and only time in this context. If we adopt this new theory—that granting tax relief is Federal funding—then how can tax relief for churches not be considered Federal funding in violation of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment? I am sure that many churches, synagogues, other houses of worship, and religiously-affiliated schools would be alarmed to discover this.

We all should be very careful about establishing this new principle.

Some additional tax penalties were in the bill when it was considered by the House Judiciary Committee. Those were removed and we now have new provisions that have never been considered by any Committee.

We have no idea who made these changes or why they were made. But they demonstrate the fiction and hypocrisy that underlies this bill.

This bill, unlike the version considered in the Judiciary Committee, no longer denies women who pay for abortion out-of-pocket the ability to claim those expenses as deductible medical expenses. And this version no longer taxes women when they use money they have set aside in flexible savings accounts or health savings accounts for abortion services. We welcome the removal of those tax penalty provisions, but these changes are not nearly enough.

This version, unlike the bill considered by House Judiciary, also adds a notice requirement that requires insurance companies to provide a false notice to policyholders that they will be forced to pay a so-called “abortion surcharge” if they are in a plan that covers abortion.

Existing law already requires plans to disclose to consumers whether a policy includes abortion. No further notice is necessary. And there is no surcharge for this coverage, as the new notice provision falsely suggests. The Affordable Care Act requires participating insurance plans to segregate monies for abortion services from all other funds, a measure my anti-choice colleagues insisted was necessary to prevent Federal funding of abortion. The segregation of a private dollar contribution of at least \$1 a month is not a surcharge at all but merely a segregation of the premium. The new notice provision requires insurance companies to mislead consumers into mistakenly believing that they are paying a separate, additional charge for coverage of abortion and that they would pay a lesser premium for insurance that does not cover abortion.

The harms caused by this bill are compounded by the fact that we are being forced to consider it under a closed rule, with no opportunity for amendment.

The potential impact of this bill on the rights of individuals to spend their own funds to purchase comprehensive insurance that cover all of their health care needs (including the potential of an unplanned pregnancy) is significant.

Members should have been given the chance to consider amendments and debate the impact of this bill—and, in particular, its untested tax provisions—before taking an up or down vote on the whole package. This bill is too important, the impact on the rights of all Americans to spend their own money in ways see fit too great, simply to close the door to any debate.

I urge all my colleagues to vote no on this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for his leadership on this, and I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for sponsoring this bill.

Whether you are pro-choice or pro-life, I think we can all agree on this: it is wrong to spend hard-earned tax dollars to pay for abortions. Yet that is the policy of this administration through ObamaCare and what today's bill reverses. This commonsense provision ensures tax dollars are used wisely and government policy does not violate Americans' basic rights.

H.R. 7 brings a stop to government-subsidized abortion created through ObamaCare, creates transparency by ensuring citizens have the information they need regarding their insurance policy and whether it pays for abortion or not, and, ultimately, lessens the number of lives ended through abortion. This legislation is important for the future of our country and forces our government to no longer be complicit in taking the lives of millions of innocent babies.

We now live in a country that is trending pro-life, and a CNN poll shows that 61 percent of respondents oppose public funding for abortion. Forcing Americans to pay for services that they find morally unconscionable is wrong.

The pro-choice Alan Guttmacher Institute demonstrates that when tax dollars are used, abortions increase by 25 percent. Conversely, by ensuring tax dollars are not used for abortions, we can not only save hard-earned tax dollars, but we can save lives, and that is a policy we can all live with.

I ask my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 7.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), a distinguished Judiciary Committee member.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

H.R. 7 is a dangerous bill, and it is an attack on women's health, particularly women who get subsidies based on their ability to purchase insurance under ObamaCare. This bill is also emblematic of a Republican Party that is utterly and completely out of touch with Americans.

□ 1615

Americans want to grow this economy. They want jobs. The response of the Republicans, however, is more anti-gay, anti-woman legislation. They have even referred to this as a job-creating bill. Not one job will be created by the bill. Why don't we focus on getting Americans back to work instead of doing everything we can to restrict women's health care choices? Let's focus on helping the 1.3 million Americans whose unemployment benefits lapsed a month ago today.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. At this time, Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time to me, and I thank Mr. SMITH for bringing this very important legislation here to the House.

I rise today in support of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act—commonsense, bipartisan legislation that will protect American taxpayers from footing the bill for this barbaric practice of abortion, in turn helping to protect women's health and unborn life.

Now, despite the legislation's bipartisan support, we have heard more than a few mischaracterizations of this bill from our colleagues across the aisle, and as a woman, I reject these false attacks. This legislation is not about taking away anyone's choice. It is about giving choice to the nearly two-thirds of Americans who don't want their hard-earned tax dollars funding the destruction of innocent life.

Madam Speaker, as a nurse for over 40 years, I have seen countless births. I have seen the joy in a mother's eyes as she holds her newborn for the first time, and I have also seen a young woman lose her life to abortion.

Those experiences informed my belief that all life—born and unborn, mother and child—is a precious gift, and I hope to see the day that this truth is reflected in our Nation's laws. Until then, we can, at least, protect the values and conscience of millions of American taxpayers by passing this legislation.

I look forward to voting "yes" on the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, new year, new Congress, but the same old political tricks. H.R. 7, the so-called No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, will not do anything further to stop tax dollars from funding abortions because

tax dollars are already restricted from funding abortion and have been ever since the Hyde amendment was introduced in 1976.

As one of the five female members on the Judiciary Committee, I strongly oppose this bill that will undermine women from using their own private funds to buy their own private insurance for health coverage. This is a ploy to drive out abortion coverage in the private market. Millions of women who purchase health insurance in the private market will lose access to comprehensive health insurance.

It is time to end these games once and for all. Decisions about a woman's reproductive health belong between that woman and the doctor she trusts, not with politicians who would interfere with a woman's private decision.

I urge a "no" vote on this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to oppose this sweeping anti-choice bill which would deny premium tax credits to income-eligible women and their families if the insurance they obtain under the Affordable Care Act covers abortion—except in cases of rape, incest and when a woman's life is in danger.

What experts in the health care industry predict, and as one of the witnesses at this month's Judiciary hearing testified, is that the burdensome regulatory requirements contained in this bill would have a chilling effect and lead to insurers dropping abortion coverage from their plans.

While this bill provides a narrow exception if a woman's life is in danger, unfortunately, it would not allow any exceptions to protect a woman's health, even in circumstances where she needs an abortion to prevent severe, permanent damage to her health.

Each patient is different, and legislators cannot know the circumstances of every pregnancy. They should not interfere in personal, private medical decisions that should be made between a woman, her family and her doctor. I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 7.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, let me thank the gentleman who has served on this committee of opportunity, equality and justice for his entire career, among other committees, in the United States Congress. Let me thank the manager and chairman of the Judiciary Committee, as well.

We do not come to the floor in argument about each other's conscience. We respect the belief of others and the conscience of others and the integrity of the decision made by those who choose to stand for their positions. As a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, I only stand here on the basis

of equal protection under the law and the applying of the Constitution to every single person, which includes a woman's access to health care.

What H.R. 7 does beyond the Hyde amendment, which has been law and in law and adhered to for decades, one, that I would be reminded of the eloquence of Chairman Hyde, who would be on the floor discussing the continuation of his position.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. That is very kind, sir.

If, for example, you have pretax money for health care or a health savings account, you are taken care of, but if you live in the District of Columbia and you want to use local funds, you are left along the highway of unequalness. If you are in the United States military, you are left along the highway of unequalness. If, for example, you have been the victim of sexual assault that results in a situation that requires access to health care, you are left alone. Federal employees, you are left alone. Poor, you are left alone.

The bill that we have was just submitted to the Rules Committee. It was not before the House Judiciary Committee. We don't know what is in it.

So, Madam Speaker, I do not rise against a person's conscience. I rise and hold the Constitution in my hand, and that is that we have a right to privacy, and we have a right to use local or your own funds, and in this bill, all of that has been denied. I ask the question: Can we pass this legislation and deny Americans equal protection under the law?

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation which is an assault on women; and ask that my colleagues also vote against H.R. 7, The No Taxpayer Funding For Abortion Act.

What we have before us in H.R. 7 is a dangerous and misleading bill which has one goal—eliminating abortion coverage in all of the insurance markets. And it is the reincarnation of H.R. 3 which was a featured bill in the last Congress.

And although some terrible things were in the bill have been removed—this bill is still an attack on women.

Let me be clear, if H.R. 7 were to become law, all women could either lose insurance coverage that includes abortion or be stigmatized while seeking such comprehensive insurance.

Mr. Speaker, I offered an amendment in the Rules Committee last night along with ALL of the women on the Judiciary Committee, which was summarily rejected as were all of the other amendments to this bill.

Our amendment would have corrected a shortcoming in the bill, which only considers a woman's health when she is faced with death.

I would like to thank all four women on the Judiciary Committee, KAREN BASS, JUDY CHU, SUSAN DELBENE, and ZOE LOFGREN who cosponsored this important amendment.

Every year, 10–15 million women suffer severe or long-lasting damage to their health during pregnancy.

This Congress should not be in business of interfering with a woman's health nor should we ever single out women who choose not to endure a long-lasting health defect or disease due to a pregnancy.

Without this amendment, this Congress would submit millions of women to face serious and long-lasting health issues.

Our amendment reflects the 1978 version of the Hyde Amendment by incorporating an exemption for severe and long-lasting damage to a woman's health in continuing a pregnancy.

This amendment is supported by the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists.

Women must receive the best health care and disease prevention and have access to all medically appropriate legal medical procedures.

And Mr. Speaker it must be stated over and over that this is purely partisan and divisive legislation which:

1. Unduly burdens a woman's right to terminate a pregnancy and thus puts their lives at risk;

2. Does not contain exceptions for the health of the mother;

3. Unfairly targets the District of Columbia; and

4. Infringes upon women's right to privacy, which is guaranteed and protected by the U.S. Constitution.

The bill poses a nationwide threat to the health and wellbeing of American women and a direct challenge to the Supreme Court's ruling in *Roe v. Wade*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This right of privacy was hard won and must be preserved inviolate. And again, our amendment would have helped to preserve this hard won right for women.

Let's not turn back the hands of time Mr. Speaker—vote "no" on H.R. 7.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Speaker, no child is unwanted. Let me repeat that. No child is unwanted. There are millions of American couples today that are waiting to give these unborn children a home—a loving home. I don't know all the circumstances, but I do know that a lot of the unborn are little girls and little boys. I don't know about my colleagues, but I believe that God has a plan for each of those unborn children, and I don't believe that that plan includes terminating their life.

Now, that may not be a popular thing to say. But can't we focus on the unborn and the fact that there are millions of families out there, many of them childless, that would love to have these little girls and boys in their home?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield briefly to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a list of those opposing H.R. 7 into the RECORD.

ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSING H.R. 7, THE "NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT"

Advocates for Youth; American Association of University Women (AAUW); American Civil Liberties Union; American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists; American Public Health Association; American Society for Reproductive Medicine; Asian & Pacific Islander American Health Forum; Association of Reproductive Health Professionals (ARHP); Black Women's Health Imperative, Catholics for Choice; Center for Reproductive Rights; Choice USA; Feminist Majority; Guttmacher Institute; Hadassah, The Women's Zionist Organization

of America, Inc.; Jewish Women International; Joint Action Committee for Political Affairs; Methodist Federation for Social Action; NARAL Pro-Choice America; National Abortion Federation; National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum (NAPAWF); National Center for Lesbian Rights; National Council of Jewish Women; National Family Planning and Reproductive Health Association; National Health Law Program; National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health.

National Organization for Women; National Partnership for Women & Families; National Women's Health Network; National Women's Law Center; People For the American Way; Physicians for Reproductive Health; Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Population Connection Action Fund; Population Institute; Raising Women's Voices for the Health Care We Need; Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice.

Religious Institute; Reproductive Health Technologies Project; Sexuality Information and Education Council of the U.S. (SIECUS); South Carolina Small Business Chamber of Commerce; Third Way; Unitarian Universalist Association; Unitarian Universalist Women's Federation; United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to yield the remainder of the time to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, there has been a lot said today about taxpayer money being used for abortion. I think it is important to note that that does not occur in America today. That decision was made a number of decades ago recognizing that taxpayer funds will not be used. So what are we doing here? What we are doing is making sure that abortion can't be offered in the private insurance market. That is what we are doing here.

It was said earlier that the CBO had indicated there would be a minimal impact from the tax increase on small businesses if a broad insurance plan was offered that included abortion. The reason for that is that it is anticipated that all of those small businesses will avoid the tax increase and drop the abortion coverage. So that is why there would not be a large impact, but there will be a large impact on women because, although there are exceptions for the life of the mother, there is no exception for the health of the mother, something that is required by the Constitution and our Supreme Court. In those cases, this can be a very expensive proposition.

I will just tell you an example of a person whom I know, Vicki, who, unfortunately, her much-wanted child, all of this child's brains formed outside of the cranium. There was no question this wanted child was not going to survive more than a minute or 2. Unfortunately for Vicki, without an abortion, the expectation was that her uterus would be destroyed and she would not be able to have other children—not that she would die, but that she would not be able to have other children that she and her husband wanted to have.

It is very expensive to get some of these procedures when your health is

at risk. So, yes, we will not have increases on small businesses because they will drop these coverages, but the women of America are going to be told by this government, yes, we know better than you do. We are going to decide for you.

Vote “no” on this very wrongheaded bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would say that the evidence is overwhelming that the American people do not support using taxpayer funds for abortion, and the evidence is very strong that that should not be allowed under ObamaCare, either, and it is also very strong that individuals have the opportunity with their own private funds to purchase a policy that provides for abortion. It might be a separate policy from the policy that provides their health insurance. It would be probably not very expensive. That is their choice. That is their conscience. That is not what the American people expect to see done with their taxpayer dollars.

In fact, as one of our committee witnesses pointed out, a majority of the public opposes government funding for abortion. Women oppose funding by a few percentage points more than men, and those who are poor and would presumably be those most likely to seek government funding for abortion oppose it more than those who are more affluent.

The bill before us today is supported by all segments of American society, and it should be supported by this House, as well. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. Let's pass it through the House.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 7, the “No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.” This legislation codifies the longstanding, bipartisan Hyde amendment, which prevents taxpayer funds from being used for abortion-related costs.

The legislation before us today imposes restrictions with respect to two ObamaCare-related tax benefits: the Exchange subsidies and the small business health insurance credit.

These two provisions were included in a broader bill passed in the 112th Congress. The legislation is necessary because the Democrats' health care law included a massive expansion of the IRS's authority and funneled taxpayer funds for various costs and procedures, including abortions.

This legislation will prevent the use of taxpayer funding for abortions—reflecting the spirit and the intent of the Hyde amendment.

However, I want to be clear about what the legislation would not do.

It would not affect either the ability of an individual to pay for an abortion (or for abortion coverage) through private funds, or the ability of an entity to provide separate abortion coverage.

It would not apply to abortions in cases of rape, incest or life-threatening physical condition of the mother.

It would not apply to treatment of injury, infection or other health problems resulting from an abortion.

Simply put, this bill is about making sure taxpayer funds are not used to pay for abortions and does not affect the use of private funds. As such, this legislation takes the necessary steps to codify the Hyde amendment in the tax code so that it appropriately reflects changes that have occurred as a result of ObamaCare.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 7, another thinly veiled attempt to limit American women from being able to access comprehensive health care.

It may be a new year, but 2014 clearly has not inspired new beginnings for the Majority leadership in this House of Representatives. Last year, under Republican leadership, we did not take up immigration reform, we did not overhaul No Child Left Behind, and we did not vote on legislation to create jobs, or help those who have been struggling to find work. In fact, Congress's failure to extend unemployment benefit left millions of Americans, including 90,000 New Jerseyans, without their benefits.

But instead of taking on these critical issues, we are here today considering a radical bill that failed in 2011, but has been resurrected by the Majority so they continue to pursue their war on women and their vendetta against the Affordable Care Act.

This deceptively named “No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act” is not about unauthorized use of taxpayer dollars. The purpose of this legislation is to permit the federal government to interfere with a woman's decision to use private dollars on legal health services. This dangerous legislation would jeopardize the availability of safe reproductive health care services for all American women. In addition to intentionally interfering with women's access to health services, this bill would result in higher taxes for small businesses, and permanently bar military service women, civil servants, D.C. residents, and low-income women from abortion coverage.

For 2014, I propose a New Year's resolution for this Congress. Let's cease the tired partisan ploys, and work together on legislation that expands—not limits—Americans' access to quality health care coverage. Let's work together to craft legislation that accelerates job growth, and let's work together to ensure that Americans get their unemployment benefits.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, thank you for bringing this critical bill to the floor today. I'd also like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. SMITH, for authoring this legislation.

Coming on the heels of the 41st anniversary of Roe v. Wade, this bill signifies our staunch support of life and the importance of preventing taxpayers' funds from being used to pay for abortion.

For years, our government has had an uneven approach to federal funding of abortions. This bill would create a single, unified policy across all federal agencies. U.S. taxpayer funds are not to be used to pay for abortions whether it be funding for elective abortion coverage through any program funded through the annual Labor, Health and Human Services Appropriations Act; funding for health plans that include elective abortion coverage for Federal employees; congressionally appropriated funds for abortion in the District of Columbia; or funding through the Peace Corps or

federal prisons or federal immigration detention centers to pay for elective abortion.

The No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act will do just what the title says. It will ban the use of federal funds for abortion or health plans that cover abortion. H.R. 7 prohibits abortions at facilities owned or operated by the federal government, and prevents federal employees from performing abortions within the scope of their employment.

The founding fathers strongly believed that human beings are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which is the right to life, and therefore the right to life of each human being should be preserved and protected by every human being in the society and by the society as a whole. It is our duty as Members of Congress to protect those who cannot speak for themselves.

Mr. TERRY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 7—the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Our Founding Fathers, when writing the Declaration of Independence, listed three rights that this Congress has an obligation to protect, the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

I believe strongly that life begins at conception and thus it's our obligation to protect the right to life, especially for the most defenseless.

It's unconscionable to me that some would even consider using Federal dollars to perform these heinous acts against the unborn. Unfortunately, there are some who would like this practice to continue even though a majority of Americans don't believe that taxpayer funds should be used to abort a baby.

The bill that we're debating today prohibits taxpayer-funded abortions but leaves exceptions for rape, incest and the life of the mother. This legislation also holds the President's health care law to the same standard by making sure those receiving assistance to participate in the newly formed health care exchanges aren't able to receive abortion on demand.

Like many parents, I will never forget when I first heard my child's heart beat. It was a sign of a healthy, living child of God. It was a defining moment for me as a father knowing that my wife and I were bringing and responsible for another human being.

I strongly urge the House to pass this bill because we cannot and shouldn't accept abortion on demand with taxpayer dollars.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Longstanding federal policy explicitly prohibits the use of federal funds for abortions, except for certain narrow circumstances of rape, incest, or severe health complications that threaten the life of the mother. The Affordable Care Act (ACA) maintains this ban and a federal appeals court confirmed that no federal dollars may be used to pay for abortion services under the law.

Far more sweeping in scope than the title implies, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act goes well beyond codifying the Hyde amendment and protecting public funds. This bill intrudes on women's reproductive autonomy and access to health care, manipulates the tax code to put additional financial burdens on many women and small businesses, and unnecessarily restricts the private insurance choices available to consumers today.

The House of Representatives should be spending our time working to improve access

to health care for all Americans, instead of deceptive legislation that interferes with a woman's ability to make personal, private medical decisions.

□ 1630

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 465, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. MOORE. Yes, Madam Speaker, I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. MOORE moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

TITLE III—RULE OF CONSTRUCTION **SEC. 301. PROTECTING THE MEDICAL PRIVACY OF WOMEN, INCLUDING VICTIMS OF RAPE AND INCEST.**

Nothing in title I, section 201(b), or section 202 of this Act shall be construed to authorize any party to violate, directly or indirectly, the medical privacy of any woman, including the victims of rape or incest, with respect to her choice of or use of comprehensive health insurance coverage.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, the motion to recommit is very simple, as the Clerk stated. It will ensure that nothing in this bill shall be construed to authorize any party to violate the medical privacy of any woman, including the victims of rape or incest with respect to her choice of or use of comprehensive health insurance.

Here we are today, Madam Speaker, on the day of the State of the Union when long-term unemployment insurance has lapsed, debating a recycled bill that attacks women's health care. This is truly an out-of-touch moment for the majority.

The legislation under consideration today fundamentally lacks compassion. Women's health advocates have expressed strong concerns about its impact on women's right to privacy when it comes to their medical care and decisions. This bill could have damaging effects on women who have been raped

and victimized by incest, who suffer from debilitating illnesses like the one that the gentlewoman from California described, Vicky, who want nothing more than their right to make their own personal health care decisions with their own private insurance.

I have heard people continuously say that this is a recodification of the Hyde amendment. We all abide by the Hyde amendment. This bill seeks to strip women of their rights to have insurance even in the private insurance market. That is why I invite my colleagues to join me in passing this motion to recommit today, to ensure that we do not unintentionally eviscerate protections that are fundamental to women's health and liberty.

We are greatly concerned about this legislation, that it would force women in private health insurance to have to "justify" their need for a full range of reproductive health care services even if their life is in danger or if they have been the victim of sexual assault or incest. This legislation, again, could remove the option for a health insurance company to choose to offer comprehensive women's health services.

Many of us remember, some of us on a very personal level, the egregious history of this issue. Many of us remember the shame and stigma that women—victims—faced, and still face when they come forward to seek services. Depending on how this bill is implemented, a woman could be required to provide extensive documentation to save her own life or even prove to her insurance company that she was assaulted. What will happen? Will she have to go to court, Madam Speaker? Will there be an IRS audit?

Madam Speaker, there are just so many unanswered questions, and the answers could have meaningful consequences for women across our entire country.

What kind of proof would a woman need to exercise options for health care? Who gets to determine whether or not a woman's sexual assault was a legitimate rape? What kind of intensely private information would be required to establish this proof? Who in the insurance company or other entity would be equipped to make a ruling on the validity laid out in the bill?

Oh, we remember our history as women, of humiliation and public degradation that forced victims of rape or incest to stay in the shadows rather than to get the health care they need and deserve, or to seek justice against their attacker.

This motion to recommit simply makes sure that we uphold our history of protecting the confidentiality and medical privacy of women, upholding women's constitutional right to health care, particularly those who are victims of terrible crimes. I urge my colleagues to adopt this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my point of order and rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I find it so interesting that we have an MTR when just 2 weeks ago we brought to this floor a bill that Chairman PITTS brought from Energy and Commerce that addressed the privacy issues and concerns of all Americans that have had to go to the healthcare.gov site. I would remind my colleagues that there were 67 Members of their caucus that crossed the aisle and voted with us. Privacy is an important issue, and we are concerned about that issue for all Americans.

I would also remind my colleagues who have inquired about the possibility of an IRS audit that we have seen many of those come out of this administration. I would remind them when they say we are remembering our history as women that we all stand and we remember that the first guarantee, the first right is the right to life. We have a responsibility as Members of the people's House to make certain we do the will of the people, and over 60 percent of all Americans say do not use my money. All money we have is taxpayer money, and do not use it to fund abortions. This is what we are doing.

I would remind all of my colleagues in the House that the bill that is before us today upholds and follows a long-standing principle that the American people and Members from both sides of the aisle have supported for decades, that is, that taxpayer dollars should not be spent on abortions and abortion coverage except in the instance of rape, incest, and life of the mother.

The vast majority of my colleagues, Democrat colleagues, voted for this same principle in last month's appropriations bill; yet this simple fact seems to be eluding most of them who have come to the floor today. I would encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this motion to recommit and to vote for H.R. 7 and the underlying legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 192, nays 221, answered "present" 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 29]

YEAS—192

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia

NAYS—221

Aderholt
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishak
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter

Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Hondt
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
Loebbeck
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris

Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley

McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus

Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Lipinski

NOT VOTING—17

Amodei
Blumenauer
Campbell
Chaffetz
Clay
Frelinghuysen
Hinojosa
Jones
LaMalfa
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Runyan

□ 1704

Messrs. REED, BENTIVOLIO, DesJARLAIS, MURPHY of Pennsylvania, GOHMERT, RYAN of Wisconsin, and MESSER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. WATERS, Messrs. GARAMENDI, HUFFMAN, Mes. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, SCHAKOWSKY, Messrs. MCINTYRE, RAHALL, and THOMPSON of Mississippi changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 29, I was unexpectedly detained and just missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 188, answered “present” 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]
YEAS—227

Aderholt Graves (GA) Paulsen
Amash Graves (MO) Pearce
Bachmann Griffin (AR) Perry
Bachus Griffith (VA) Peterson
Barletta Grimm Pittenger
Barr Guthrie Pitts
Barton Hall Poe (TX)
Benishek Harper Pompeo
Bentivolio Harris Posey
Bilirakis Hartzler Price (GA)
Bishop (UT) Hastings (WA) Rahall
Black Heck (NV) Reed
Blackburn Hensarling Reichert
Boustany Herrera Beutler Renacci
Brady (TX) Holding Ribble
Bridenstine Hudson Rice (SC)
Brooks (AL) Huelskamp Rigell
Brooks (IN) Huizenga (MI) Roby
Buchanan Hultgren Roe (TN)
Bucshon Hunter Rogers (AL)
Burgess Hurt Rogers (KY)
Byrne Issa Rogers (MI)
Calvert Jenkins Rohrabacher
Camp Johnson (OH) Rokita
Cantor Johnson, Sam Rooney
Capito Jordan Ros-Lehtinen
Carter Joyce Roskam
Cassidy Kelly (PA) Ross
Chabot King (IA) Rothfus
Chaffetz King (NY) Royce
Coble Kingston Ryan (WI)
Coffman Kinzinger (IL) Salmon
Cole Kline Sanford
Collins (GA) Labrador Scalise
Collins (NY) LaMalfa Schock
Conaway Lamborn Schweikert
Cook Lance Scott, Austin
Cotton Lankford Sensenbrenner
Cramer Latham Sessions
Crawford Latta Shimkus
Crenshaw Lipinski Shuster
Cuellar LoBiondo Simpson
Culberson Long Smith (MO)
Daines Lucas Smith (NE)
Davis, Rodney Luetkemeyer Smith (NJ)
Denham Lummis Smith (TX)
Dent Marchant Southerland
DeSantis Marino Stivers
DesJarlais Massie Stockman
Diaz-Balart Matheson Stutzman
Duffy McAllister Terry
Duncan (SC) McCarthy (CA) Thompson (PA)
Duncan (TN) McCaul Thornberry
Ellmers McClintock Tiberi
Farenthold McHenry Turner
Fincher McIntyre Upton
Fitzpatrick McKeon Valadao
Fleischmann McKinley Valadao
Fleming McMorris Wagner
Flores Rodgers Walberg
Forbes Meadows Walden
Fortenberry Meehan Walorski
Foxy Messer Weber (TX)
Franks (AZ) Mica Webster (FL)
Frelinghuysen Miller (MI) Wenstrup
Gardner Miller, Gary Whitfield
Garrett Mullin Williams
Gerlach Mulvaney Wilson (SC)
Gibbs Murphy (PA) Wittman
Gibson Neugebauer Wolf
Gingrey (GA) Noem Womack
Gohmert Nugent Woodall
Goodlatte Nunes Yoder
Gosar Nunnelee Yoho
Gowdy Olson Young (AK)
Granger Palazzo Young (IN)

NAYS—188

Andrews Brownley (CA) Clark (MA)
Barber Bustos Clarke (NY)
Barrow (GA) Butterfield Cleaver
Bass Capps Clyburn
Beatty Capuano Cohen
Becerra Cardenas Connolly
Bera (CA) Carney Conyers
Bishop (GA) Carson (IN) Cooper
Bishop (NY) Cartwright Costa
Bonamici Castor (FL) Courtney
Brady (PA) Castro (TX) Crowley
Braley (IA) Chu Cummings
Brown (FL) Cicilline 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
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Broun (GA)

NOT VOTING—15

Amodei
Blumenauer
Campbell
Clay
Hinojosa
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Petri
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Tipton
Westmoreland

□ 1712

Ms. SINEMA changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 30 I was not able to vote because I was home recovering from knee surgery and pneumonia. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, due to being unavoidably detained, I missed the following rollcall votes: No. 26, No. 27, No. 28, No. 29, and No. 30 on January 28, 2014 (today).

If present, I would have voted: rollcall vote No. 26—H. Res. 465, On Ordering the Previous Question, “aye;” rollcall vote No. 27—H. Res. 465, On Agreeing to the Resolution, “aye;” rollcall vote No. 28—On Approving the Journal, “nay;” rollcall vote No. 29—H.R. 7, On Motion to Recommit, “nay;” rollcall vote No. 30—H.R. 7, No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, On Passage, “aye.”

SUPPORT FOR UNITED STATES-REPUBLIC OF KOREA CIVIL NUCLEAR COOPERATION ACT

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1901) to authorize the President to extend the term of the nuclear energy agreement with the Republic of Korea until March 19, 2016, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1901

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Support for United States-Republic of Korea Civil Nuclear Cooperation Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In the 60th year of the alliance, the relationship between the United States and the Republic of Korea could not be stronger. It is based on mutual sacrifice, mutual respect, shared interests, and shared responsibility to promote peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region and throughout the world.

(2) North Korea's nuclear weapons programs, including uranium enrichment and plutonium reprocessing technologies, undermine security on the Korean Peninsula. The United States and the Republic of Korea have a shared interest in preventing further proliferation, including through the implementation of the 2005 Joint Statement of the Six-Party Talks.

(3) Both the United States and Republic of Korea have a shared objective in strengthening the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, done at London, Moscow, and Washington July 1, 1968, and a political and a commercial interest in working collaboratively to address challenges to their respective peaceful civil nuclear programs.

(4) The nuclear energy agreement referred to in section 3 is scheduled to expire on March 19, 2014. In order to maintain healthy and uninterrupted cooperation in this area between the two countries while a new agreement is being negotiated, Congress should authorize the President to extend the duration of the current agreement until March 19, 2016.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF NUCLEAR ENERGY AGREEMENT WITH THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA.

Notwithstanding section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153), the President is authorized to take such actions as may be required to extend the term of the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, done at Washington November 24, 1972 (24 UST 775; TIAS 7583), and amended on May 15, 1974 (25 UST 1102; TIAS 7842), to a date that is not later than March 19, 2016.

SEC. 4. REPORT TO CONGRESS ON PROGRESS OF NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND REPUBLIC OF KOREA.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter until a new Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea Concerning