

compassion. To that end, H.R. 36 protects the unborn child from being aborted after 20 weeks of gestation.

Medical science tells us that the baby fights for survival in a second or third trimester abortion. He or she recoils in pain at the poison intended to stop their heart and the clamps used to dismember their tiny little body. We cannot deny this evidence. We must not look the other way.

While we show compassion to mothers who are facing difficult decisions, we must also protect the babies who are surely counted among the “least of these.” Who will be their voice? God forbid if we don’t speak out.

Martin Luther King, Jr., said:

“Our lives begin to end the day we become silent about things that matter.”

□ 1015

When this final page of human story is turned, what will we have done to embrace justice, to love mercy, and be a voice for those who have none?

The American people have grown weary of the rhetoric in D.C. Attention and being aware is good, but there comes a time when we have to move from the awareness stage to the action steps. Today is that time.

I urge my friends on both sides of this Chamber to break the silence, to stand up for life, and support H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

BUDGET CUTS FOR THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, MomsRising, a national grassroots organization of moms, delivered a petition signed by more than 25,000 moms from all across the country urging this Congress not to cut SNAP in the fiscal year 2016 budget.

Every Member of this House received the petition signed by moms in their districts. Today, that petition has grown to nearly 50,000 signatures, and it keeps on growing. This is just the latest petition from MomsRising urging Congress to prioritize children in the budget and protect SNAP from cuts and other structural changes.

I want to share one of the stories from a mom. Monique from Ohio writes:

I was raised to always work and so was my husband. We have tried to instill this in our daughter, even going so far as to work opposite shifts and have family babysit if there was an overlap. When my husband was laid off 2 years ago and then couldn’t find work, I tried my best to keep us floating on just my income, walking to work because I didn’t have the bus fare, often having \$20 or less after paying the bills to feed my family for a week.

I resisted getting on welfare, having been raised never to take a handout. My pastor

was the one who pointed out that I had already paid for that right through my taxes over several decades.

Since signing up for SNAP benefits, I can feed my family filling, nutritious meals again. Of course, my husband is still looking for work, and that will pick up the slack again if he gets work, and once he finds it, we will happily forego the benefits again. Until then, all I can say is thank God and the government for having a safety net in place.

Unfortunately, Monique’s story is not unique, but it shows that, without SNAP, her family would have been much worse off during these tough times.

One in five children in the United States experiences hunger. Without the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, that number would sadly be much higher. Already, nearly half of all SNAP participants are children under the age of 18—nearly half, Mr. Speaker.

This is despite the fact that SNAP households with children have high work rates. Families with children who are working continue to earn so little that they still qualify for SNAP, and they will struggle to put food on the table.

Mr. Speaker, we know that hunger can lead to a myriad of negative outcomes for children. From health problems and compromised immune systems, to poor nutrition, to an inability to concentrate and succeed in school, childhood hunger means kids suffer.

Despite these sobering statistics, the Republican budget resolutions passed by the House and Senate made draconian cuts to SNAP and other critical programs to help poor children and their families.

The budget conference report only makes these cuts worse. It builds upon the \$125 billion cut to SNAP in the House budget. To achieve a cut of that magnitude by block granting the program and capping its allotment means that States would be forced to cut benefits or cut eligible individuals and families off the program. There are simply no good choices. In short, it would make hunger worse in America, much worse.

Mr. Speaker, SNAP is one of the only remaining basic protections for the very poor. For many of the poorest Americans, SNAP is the only form of income assistance they receive. SNAP provides food benefits to low-income Americans at a very basic level. SNAP benefits are already too low. They average less than \$1.40 per person, per meal. We should not be balancing the Federal budget on the backs of the poor and working families. We should not be making childhood hunger worse in America.

I commend MomsRising for their leadership and for taking action to protect SNAP and ensure that all children have access to healthy, nutritious foods.

Later today, MomsRising will start a Twitterstorm under the #missionpossible to highlight how

building a strong economy for women, families, and the Nation is mission possible with policies to protect SNAP, promote healthy nutrition, guarantee paid sick days, require equal pay for equal work, and make child care more affordable. These are economic security priorities that boost our families and our economy.

As the old adage goes, “Mother knows best.” We should listen to our moms, especially as we gather only a few days after Mother’s Day. We should be strengthening families’ economic security, and we should be working to end hunger now, not making it worse.

PROTECTING THE UNBORN

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, for the sake of all those who founded this Nation and dreamed of what America could someday be and for the sake of all those since then who have died in darkness so America could walk in the light of freedom, it is so very important for those of us who are privileged to be Members of this Congress to pause from time to time and remind ourselves of why we are really all here.

Thomas Jefferson, whose words marked the beginning of this Nation said:

The care of human life and its happiness and not its destruction is the chief and only object of good government.

The phrase in the Fifth Amendment capsulizes our entire Constitution. It says:

No person shall be . . . deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

The 14th Amendment says:

No State shall . . . deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Mr. Speaker, protecting the lives of all Americans and their constitutional rights, especially those who cannot protect themselves, is why we are all here; yet today, Mr. Speaker, a great shadow looms over America because more than 18,000 very late-term abortions are occurring in America every year, placing the mothers at exponentially greater risk and subjecting their pain-capable unborn babies to torture and death without anesthesia or Federal protection of any kind in the land of the free and the home of the brave, and it is the greatest human rights atrocity in the United States today.

Almost every other civilized nation on this Earth, Mr. Speaker, protects pain-capable unborn babies at this age, and every credible poll of the American people shows that they are overwhelmingly in favor of protecting them; yet we have given these little babies less legal protection from unnecessary cruelty than the protection we have given farm animals under the Federal Humane Slaughter Act.

Mr. Speaker, it seems we are never quite so eloquent as when we decry the

crimes of past generations; yet we often become staggeringly blind when it comes to facing and rejecting the worst of atrocities in our own time. It is a heartbreaking thought.

I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the winds of change are indeed now beginning to blow and that the tide of blindness and blood is finally turning in America because today—today—we are poised to pass the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, no matter how it is shouted down or what distortions, deceptive what-ifs, distractions, diversions, gotchas, twisting of words, changing the subject, or blatant falsehoods the abortion industry hurls at this bill and its supporters, this bill is a deeply sincere effort, beginning at their sixth month of pregnancy, to protect both mothers and their little, pain-capable unborn babies from the atrocity of late-term abortion on demand. Ultimately, it is one all humane Americans can support if they truly understand it for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, this is a vote all of us will remember the rest of our lives, and it will be considered in the annals of history and, I believe, in the councils of eternity itself. It shouldn't be such a hard vote.

Protecting little, pain-capable unborn children and their mothers is not a Republican issue or a Democrat issue; it is a test of our basic humanity and who we are as a human family.

It is time to open our eyes and allow our consciences to catch up with our technology. It is time for the Members of the United States Congress to open our eyes and our souls, to remember that protecting those who cannot protect themselves is why we are all here.

It is time for all Americans, Mr. Speaker, to open our eyes and our hearts to the humanity of these little, pain-capable unborn children of God and the inhumanity of what is being done to them.

TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the President came to Oregon last week, and he has taken to insults and misstatements of fact in order to get his trade promotion authority bill done, the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

He said, "Number four, critics warn that parts of this deal would undermine American regulation, food safety, worker safety, even financial regulations. They are making this stuff up"—great applause from his audience. "This is not true. No trade agreement is going to force us to change our laws."

Well, the President has sort of a technical point there. He is a lawyer. They can't force us to change our laws. They can just make us pay to have them, and it has happened.

Mexican fishermen were paid by the U.S. Government to not kill dolphins because we had adopted a dolphin-safe label for tuna. We had to pay damages to Mexico because of their foregone profit because we wouldn't let them kill the dolphins.

Mexican trucks wanted to come into the U.S. Well, they don't meet our standards—kind of a problem, Mexican trucks rumbling around the U.S. with drivers that don't meet our standards, but they won a judgment under these same provisions.

Nope, he is right. They couldn't make us change the laws. They just imposed a whole range of punitive tariffs, politically targeted against people like me who had imposed the Mexican trucks, then-Speaker PELOSI, and others; and the U.S. relented.

Now, they didn't make us change our laws. We volunteered to do it after they imposed massive and unfair tariffs on Mexican goods.

But it works both ways. It has been great for America. There is a U.S. mining company that just won a judgment against Nova Scotia. They wanted to put a huge pit mine on the Bay of Fundy, destroy the fisheries' resource for their pit mine. They were denied. They won a judgment against the government of Nova Scotia and Canada.

Now, Nova Scotia and Canada don't have to change their laws. They can pay this country \$300 million of damages because they can't destroy the fishery with their pit mine.

Now, the President is a smart guy, went to Harvard, but I consulted a little bit higher and smarter authority. Last night, I was at a dinner with Joseph Stiglitz, Nobel Prize winning economist. He was on the Obama economic team when NAFTA was adopted.

He said we made a huge mistake. We did not understand that this ISDS was creating a regulatory taking in a special court available only to corporations. We didn't know that, and it opened the door on chapter 11 in NAFTA. He says Obama is opening the door all the way and putting full force behind those provisions in this legislation.

Bottom line, what he said? People will die. People will die because of this provision in the TPP. It is a huge win for the pharmaceutical industry. They get to wipe out the formularies in those countries, both developing and developed countries who are part of the TPP, which lowers drug prices. They will not be allowed under this agreement, and they can go to a secret tribunal to get damages if those countries won't revoke them.

It will wipe out access to generics in developing countries who are part of this agreement. That means AIDS drugs and other things that they can't afford, no longer generic—people will die.

□ 1030

Now, these are people overseas. Maybe we shouldn't care so much. I do.

But others might not; it is all about profits.

But ultimately, it is going to come home because a U.S.-based pharmaceutical company can open a subsidiary in any one of those countries, and it can go to a secret trade tribunal and it can challenge our reduced drug prices for veterans, which the pharmaceutical industry would really love to undo. That is billions of dollars of profits foregone every year because our veterans get the lowest price for drugs. Under this trade agreement, ultimately, that will be challenged, and in all probability, we will lose.

Now, the President is right: we won't have to repeal the law that gets the lowest-priced drugs for our veterans. We will just have to pay the pharmaceutical industry billions of dollars a year to continue to give our vets the drugs at a lower price so we can provide more care for more veterans.

This trade agreement, unfortunately, is what those of us who are critics say it is. It is built upon the faulty foundation of past trade agreements, including Korea.

The special trade representative to the President—also dissembling a little bit—comes to caucuses: "It is unbelievable. We have got 20,000 more cars into Korea last year. This thing is a success."

I said, "Oh, Mr. Ambassador, how many more Korean cars came in last year as a result of the agreement?"

"Oh, I don't have that number."

Well, of course he didn't have the number. Well, he knows the number. It is 461,000.

So we got 20,000 cars into Korea; they got 461,000 more into the U.S. That means a net loss of 441,000 cars. That is a heck of a lot of jobs lost in the auto industry.

This was a great day yesterday when the Senate slowed them down a little bit, and as the American people learn more, we will stop them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President of the United States.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, this week we celebrate National Police Week, when we recognize the service and sacrifice of the brave men and women who have lost their lives in the line of duty while serving to protect us.

National Police Week began in 1962, when President John F. Kennedy signed a proclamation designating May 15 as Peace Officers Memorial Day and the week in which that falls as Police Week.

The memorial service began in 1982 as a gathering in Senate Park of approximately 120 survivors and supporters of law enforcement. Decades later, National Police Week has grown