

box, the President continues to propose outdated, Washington-centered ideas that simply don't work.

The American people want Washington to stop interfering in their lives, and they don't need more one-size-fits-all Federal dictates. Republicans have a vision for the future, but President Obama appears to be mired in the past.

Last night, the President expressed a willingness to work with Republicans, and I hope that gesture is sincere. In the past, working together too often meant agreeing with whatever the President said. It is time for President Obama to live up to his rhetoric. House Republicans are eager to work together to increase opportunities for all Americans and empower people, not Washington.

A WOMAN'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO CHOOSE

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 36. This bill is a direct challenge to the Supreme Court's ruling 42 years ago in *Roe v. Wade*. It is a dangerous attack on a woman's constitutional right to choose.

The bill does not include an exception for the physical or emotional health of a woman. It fails to provide sufficient protections for victims of rape and incest, and it has only a very narrow exception when a woman's life is in danger.

In short, the bill significantly reduces the safe, legal options that women have and prevents doctors from providing the most medically appropriate care for their patients.

Republicans have repeatedly demonstrated a disregard for women's health care, and this bill is just one more example of their continuing attack on women's rights. It is a step backward for women's health and, quite simply, a distraction from the important work that we should be undertaking. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO MEMORY OF CAROL I. GLOVER

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an extraordinary woman and admired constituent, Carol Glover, who passed away on Monday, January 12, as a result of the tragic incident aboard Metro train 302.

Carol was a devoted mother who raised her two sons in Alexandria, Virginia. Many of her friends and family describe her as "the ultimate sports mom cheerleader" because she could often be found cheering on the sidelines of her sons' football, soccer, and bas-

ketball games. Carol was also the den mother for her sons' Cub Scouts troop and was said to treat all like her own children.

Carol had a successful 20-year career as a contractor for the Federal Government. She studied computer programming at Drexel University, where she graduated with honors, and she recently received the Employee of the Year honor. It is clear she was as diligent in her work as she was in raising her children.

Carol will be remembered as a woman of strong faith with a gentle demeanor and warm heart. At her funeral her mother said: "In life we all have a dark tunnel to go through. Stay on track, and you will see the light at the end of the tunnel." Her mother believed that Carol had found that light.

Carol leaves behind sons Anthony, who served in the Marines for 13 years, and Marcus, who works for a Christian nonprofit here in Washington, D.C.

Our thoughts and prayers go out to Carol's family, friends, and to all those whose lives were touched by this amazing woman.

WORKING TOGETHER

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

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it was an honor to attend the State of the Union Address last night for the first time, representing the Sixth Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

After listening to the President's speech, I hope that he will find common ground and work with Congress on a number of complex issues facing our Nation, including enacting job-creating policies for hardworking families, fixing our broken health care system, and reining in our out-of-control debt, and that is just to name a few.

But unfortunately, there were a number of veto threats and proposals which amount to more government overreach into the lives of hardworking taxpayers.

Americans are looking for Congress and the President to work together, not for the President to take a go-it-alone approach and repeatedly threaten use of veto power. We are not looking to grow our Federal government any further.

That said, I agree specifically with the President's desire for improving cybersecurity legislation and creating more economic opportunity for our Nation's veterans. I disagree with his approach on other matters discussed, specifically, certain tax reform measures that will ultimately amount to a trickle-down tax increase on middle class Americans.

I am confident we can find some common ground and adequately fund our Nation's transportation and infrastructure needs, and I look forward to doing that.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 39

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Nunnelee to rank immediately after Mr. Womack.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Garrett; Mr. Diaz-Balart; Mr. Cole; Mr. McClintock; Mrs. Black; Mr. Rokita; Mr. Woodall; Mrs. Blackburn; Mrs. Hartzler; Mr. Rice of South Carolina; Mr. Stutzman; Mr. Sanford; Mr. Schock; Mr. Womack; Mr. Brat; Mr. Blum; Mr. Mooney of West Virginia; Mr. Grothman; Mr. Palmer; Mr. Moolenaar; and Mr. Westerman.

Ms. FOXX (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 161, NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PERMITTING REFORM ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 36, PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 38 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 38

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 161) to provide for the timely consideration of all licenses, permits, and approvals required under Federal law with respect to the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of any natural gas pipeline projects. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 36) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage

without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

□ 1230

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

House Resolution 38 provides for a closed rule providing for consideration of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, and a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 161, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act.

The rule before us today, Mr. Speaker, provides for consideration of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. It is truly fitting that the House considers this legislation in the shadow of the 42nd anniversary of the *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton* decisions that gave Americans abortion on demand at any stage of pregnancy.

This legislation is a commonsense step in recognizing the truth that science has made more clear with the passage of time: the unborn child in the womb is alive and a functioning member of the human family.

Science has shown us that the most fundamental precursors to an unborn child feeling pain are already in place by 8 weeks in development. Necessary connections between the brain and spinal cord are in place and complete by 18 weeks.

The House Judiciary Committee heard testimony by expert physicians that the earlier premature babies are delivered, the more acutely they feel pain. It is clear that unborn children at 20 weeks of development are capable of feeling pain and deserving of protection.

In spite of the 60 percent of Americans who believe we should limit abortions after 20 weeks of pregnancy, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will continue to protest this sensible legislation, seeking to keep us in the company of only seven other nations that allow elective abortion after 20 weeks, which includes such well-known human rights leaders as North Korea, China, and Vietnam.

This vital, lifesaving legislation is not the only important legislation the House will consider this week. This rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 161, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act.

The Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act recognizes the positive impact America's shale revolution has had on energy prices and the potential it holds to lower them further. We are in the midst of another hard winter, and red tape reduction is necessary to ensure we have the infrastructure needed to ensure low-cost natural gas is able to reach our coldest States when they need it most without price shocks or shortages.

H.R. 161 introduces critical reform to ensure prompt consideration of necessary permitting requests for construction or updates to natural gas pipelines, providing certainty to energy companies and the consumers they serve.

The legislation would require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to approve or deny a requested pipeline certificate no later than 12 months after receiving a complete application that is ready to be processed and has engaged in the pre-filing process.

H.R. 161 also ensures that relevant agencies provide approval or denial within 90 days of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission completing its final environmental document.

Finally, the legislation would put permits into effect, notwithstanding agencies' failures to provide approval within the time mandated, with allowances for the addition of conditions consistent with the final environmental document.

H.R. 161 is the reintroduction of H.R. 1900, which passed this House on a bipartisan basis in the 113th Congress. H.R. 1900 received extensive committee consideration, including numerous hearings on the underlying issues, prompting the legislation, as well as the subcommittee hearing and subcommittee and full committee mark-ups on the bill.

Both H.R. 36 and H.R. 161 are truly important legislation that Americans would be well-served to have considered this week, and I commend both my bills to my colleagues as deserving of their support.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, while I have great respect for the gentlewoman from North Carolina, I don't have a lot of respect for this process. I would like to begin today by saying a word or two about the process being used by the Republicans here on the floor—actually, three words: "It stinks. Again."

We are all very happy—delighted even—to hear our Republican friends

say that they wanted to make this Congress into a place where we could work together, but actions speak louder than words, and here are some of their actions: five closed rules.

Until yesterday, 100 percent of our Rules Committee meetings have been called so-called emergency meetings, and 100 percent of the bills the committee has sent to the floor have drawn a veto threat, and once again, the Republicans are using one rule for multiple bills. This is a disturbing pattern that is quickly becoming a bad habit.

The Republican leadership apparently isn't content to exclude Democrats from offering substantive, germane, and thoughtful amendments. They are also shutting down the debate itself.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress is only a few weeks old. We have 23 months left to go. Are the Republicans really saying that we can't find an extra hour for debate during the next 23 months? Of course we can. They just prefer not to. It is unfair, it is undemocratic, it is unnecessary, and it needs to stop.

Now, as to the bill that is before us today, last night, as we all know, President Obama laid out a bold, clear, and exciting agenda to spur economic growth and ensure that prosperity is shared by all Americans, not just the wealthy few and special interests. I thought it was a terrific speech.

Apparently, my Republican friends weren't paying very close attention. I know they were there in this Chamber because I saw many of them. The Speaker himself was sitting right behind the President. Maybe they were sending each other cat videos or taking selfies because the President made it very clear that if Congress sends him bills that move us backward, he will veto them, and both of these bills deserve his veto.

The first, H.R. 161, is a solution in search of a problem. It is as simple as that. The bill would automatically approve natural gas pipeline projects if FERC or other Federal agencies do not act on required permits or certificates within a rigid, unworkable timeframe.

A GAO report concluded that FERC's pipeline permitting process is predictable and consistent, with 91 percent of pipeline applications receiving a decision within 12 months. During committee testimony last Congress, even industry representatives agreed that the current permitting process is "generally very good." It is not every day that regulators and industry agree that the current system works.

So why would we move forward on a bill that disrupts a system that works is beyond me. In fact, this bill makes it more likely that FERC will deny more projects just to comply with the severe timeline.

In Massachusetts, we are dealing with the proposed Tennessee Gas pipeline which would run through parts of my district and would cut through a number of environmentally sensitive

lands, including Northfield State Forest and the Montague aquifer and management area.

Yesterday, in the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment with my good friend Congresswoman NIKI TSONGAS, whose district would also be affected by the proposed pipeline, to keep the existing review process in place for proposed pipelines that cross Federal, State, or local conservation or recreation lands because, if we have already invested Federal and State money into identifying these lands as environmentally sensitive, it doesn't make any sense to expedite the approval of a pipeline that could bulldoze right through them.

It is worth a debate. Unfortunately, Republicans on the Rules Committee voted down this commonsense amendment in a party-line vote.

As the gentlewoman from North Carolina pointed out, both of these rules are completely closed. Even though they did not go through regular order, even though there were no hearings in this Congress or no markup, nobody—no Democrat, no Republican—can offer an amendment.

Then there is H.R. 36. This is just the latest Republican assault on women's reproductive rights. It is their latest attempt to put politicians in the middle of the private medical decisions of women. It is blatantly unconstitutional, and it fails to take into consideration the fact that some pregnancies can have catastrophic, heartbreaking complications, even after 20 weeks.

To make matters worse, this legislation lacks a reasonable exception for victims of rape and incest by requiring victims to report cases of rape and incest to law enforcement in order to have access to an abortion, this despite the fact that research shows that the majority of sexual assaults are unreported, and on top of that, the exception on incest is only for minors.

Mr. Speaker, what really bothers me about bills like this is that the same people who vote for them routinely vote to cut the WIC program, to cut Head Start and childcare programs and SNAP and school lunch programs, and elementary and secondary education funding. This hypocrisy is breathtaking.

Mr. Speaker, leading medical groups agree that doctors, in consultation with women and their families, should make medical decisions, not the politicians.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better. They deserve a better process, and they deserve better legislation. We certainly have a lot to do to help get this country to continue on the road to prosperity, to make sure that everybody can share in this economy's growth.

I urge my colleagues: let's focus on those issues, let's come together and do something for the American people, and enough of these message bills.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I need to remind this House that during the Democrats' time in the majority, there were two rules packages providing consideration of seven unrelated measures.

In the 110th Congress, their first year in the majority, the rules package provided for consideration of five measures.

In the 111th Congress, the Democrat majority provided for the consideration of two separate measures in the rules package.

The Democrat majority went directly to the floor with these bills, with no committee consideration and without even allowing the Rules Committee to debate these measures or report an appropriate rule for consideration.

In the 110th Congress, Ranking Member SLAUGHTER and Democrats on the Rules Committee reported three additional closed rules, starting the Congress out with eight closed rules in the opening weeks.

In the 111th Congress, Democrats reported out two additional closed rules, for a total of four closed rules in the opening weeks of that Congress.

Unlike our Democrat colleagues, the Speaker and Chairman SESSIONS had provided the opportunity to have hearings before the Rules Committee.

It is our goal to return to regular order now that our committees are organizing, but the false attacks by my colleagues do not stand up to the light of day when you compare our records.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), one of the preeminent defenders of life in this Congress.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very good friend for yielding and thank her for her strong leadership for human rights and for the unborn.

Mr. Speaker, pain—we all dread it, we avoid it, we even fear it, and we all go to extraordinary lengths to mitigate its severity and its duration; yet an entire age group of human beings are, today, subjected to a deadly, extraordinarily painful procedure, one of which is called the dismemberment method, the D&E.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is a modest but necessary attempt to at least protect babies who are 20 weeks old and pain capable from having to suffer and die from abortion. Children, including children with disabilities, Mr. Speaker, deserve better treatment than pain-filled dismemberment.

One leading expert in the field of fetal pain, Dr. Anand, at the University of Tennessee, stated in his expert report, commissioned by the U.S. Department of Justice:

The human fetus possesses the ability to experience pain from 20 weeks of gestation, if not earlier, and the pain perceived by a fetus is possibly more intense than that perceived by term newborns or older children.

□ 1245

Dr. Colleen Malloy, assistant professor, Division of Neonatology at Northwestern University, in her testimony before the House Judiciary Committee, said:

When we speak of infants at 20 weeks postfertilization, we no longer have to rely on inferences or ultrasound technology, because such premature patients are kicking, moving, reacting, and developing right before our eyes in the neonatal intensive care unit.

In other words, there are children the same age who, in utero, can be killed by abortion—and painfully—or who have been born and who are now being given lifesaving assistance. She went on to say:

In today's medical arena, we resuscitate patients at this age and are able to witness their ex-utero growth.

Dr. Malloy concludes:

I could never imagine subjecting my tiny patients to horrific procedures such as those that involve limb detachment or cardiac injection.

Again, that is what the abortionists do.

Surgeons today, Mr. Speaker, are entering the womb to perform life-enhancing and lifesaving corrective surgeries on unborn children. They have seen those babies flinch, jerk around, move around, and recoil from sharp objects and incisions. As they seek to heal, surgeons are today routinely administering anesthesia to unborn children in the womb—a best medical practice—to protect them from pain. We now know that the child ought to be treated as a patient and that there are many anomalies, sicknesses, and disabilities that could be treated with a degree of success while the child is still in utero. The child ought to be seen as a patient. When those interventions are performed, again, anesthesia is given.

Last June, TIME Magazine's cover story, "Saving Preemies," explored the premie revolution and how cutting-edge medicine and dedicated caregivers are helping the tiniest babies to survive and thrive. TIME says:

Thanks to advances that had not been made even a few years ago, the odds of surviving and thriving are improving all the time.

Abortionists, on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, are in the business of ensuring that children neither survive nor thrive. Children, including children with disabilities, deserve better treatment than pain-filled dismemberment.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the ranking member of the Rules Committee, I yield myself such time as I may consume as I want to respond to this issue about process.

When Speaker BOEHNER became the Speaker of this House, in his opening speech, one of the things he said was:

You will always have the right to a robust debate and an open process that allows you to represent your constituents—to make your case, to offer alternatives, and to be heard.

Clearly, we have not been granted that in any way, shape, or form.

While the gentlewoman may point to the sins of the past of Democratic majorities, nothing compares to what the Republicans did in the last Congress. The Republicans presided over the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America.

I mean, you made history, and that is not something to be proud of.

When my friends talk about openness and transparency and about the desire to allow this to be a deliberative place where people of varying viewpoints can have a forum to debate, it is not reflective of reality. We are beginning this Congress just as my colleagues conducted the last Congress—in the most closed way possible. I regret that very much, especially on bills that have not even been through the committee hearing process in this Congress or that have not been marked up.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I want to thank my colleague for his great work and for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, today, The Wall Street Journal polled the American public and found that these are their top three priorities: creating jobs, defeating ISIS, and reducing the Federal budget deficit.

Mr. Speaker, I insert that piece from The Wall Street Journal into the RECORD.

[From The Wall Street Journal]

POLL FINDS AGENDA GAP BETWEEN LEADERS,
AMERICAN PEOPLE

(By Janet Hook)

Republicans are trying to burnish their party's image—and Congress—by promising to “get things done” now that the GOP controls both the House and Senate. But a new Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll shows that the public doesn't care much about some of the first things the GOP, or President Barack Obama, is trying to do.

The poll conducted from Jan. 14-17 found that two of the major issues congressional Republicans and the White House have identified as candidates for bipartisan action—trade and simplification of the tax code—didn't even make the top five issues that people feel need to be addressed urgently.

The poll tried to identify the issues that are most important to Americans by asking which issues they considered an “absolute priority” for Congress and the president to act on this year, as opposed to issues that they think could be delayed.

The list was topped by enduring concerns: job creation, fighting Islamic militants in Iraq and Syria, reducing the federal deficit and securing the U.S. border.

But people are virtually yawning at the prospect of expanding U.S. trade, a priority for an administration trying to finalize a new free-trade agreement with Asian and Pacific Rim countries. Only 20% said that was an urgent priority for this year, 59% said it could be delayed until next year and 16% said it shouldn't be pursued at all.

“It's a reminder that this is for the most part a very distant economic issue and it's not one that people focus on,” said Bill McInturff, a Republican pollster who conducted the poll with Democrat Fred Yang.

The apathy about trade is bipartisan. Only 22% of Republicans and 21% of Democrats said it was a top priority.

Simplifying the tax code is also an issue that's not a top-five policy priority for most Americans, but is treated like a motherhood issue by politicians of both parties. Just over half polled said it was an urgent priority—less than the percentage who wanted to make “efforts to address Iran's nuclear program” a top agenda item.

Even some of the issues Washington lawmakers are fighting over are matters of only marginal concern to many people. Republicans have acted quickly on a bill to finish construction of the Keystone XL pipeline, and Mr. Obama threw down his first veto threat over it. But nearly four in ten people polled said they didn't know enough about the issue to have an opinion.

The survey of policy priorities underscored another trend that doesn't bode well for bipartisan cooperation: On all but a handful of issues, such as job creation and infrastructure repair, the poll found big disparities in the interests of the two parties. So, while 67% of Democrats identified income inequality as an urgent priority, only 19% of Republicans did. U.S. border security was a top priority for 79% of Republicans but only 43% of Democrats.

It's not surprising, then, that the poll found people were down on the idea of having divided government. Mr. Obama and Republicans in Congress may agree on the need to “get things done.” The problem is there isn't a lot of agreement on what “things” should get priority.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, why am I bringing that up? The offense, to me, is that there are so many people in Congress who always want to bring up this issue of eating away at Roe v. Wade. They don't have the nerve, I think, really, to try to take that away.

Roe v. Wade gave women a choice, and I believe that, if you don't want to have that choice yourself, don't use it; but what right do people who do not agree with choice have to make it the law of the land—to require everybody to live under what they believe is true?

Now, there is not a scintilla of scientific evidence that at 20 weeks pain is felt. The neural connections are not there to have that happen.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to insert into the RECORD what scientists—the executive vice president and others—have said from the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists in that this is not possible.

JANUARY 21, 2015.

DEAR MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, We, the undersigned medical and public health organizations, stand in strong opposition to H.R. 36, the so-called “Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act,” sponsored by Representative Trent Franks (R-AZ) and Representative Marsha Blackburn (R-TN). Politicians are not doctors and should not interfere in personal, medical decisions.

If enacted, H.R. 36 would ban most abortions in the United States at 20 weeks after fertilization, clearly before viability. The bill threatens providers with fines and/or imprisonment for providing professional and compassionate care, and is intended to intimidate and discourage doctors from providing abortion care. This bill places health care providers in an untenable situation—when they are facing a complex, urgent medical situation, they must think about an un-

just law instead of about how to protect the health and safety of their patients.

Politicians are not medical experts. H.R. 36 disregards the health issues and real life situations that women can face in pregnancy. Every woman faces her own unique circumstances, challenges, and potential complications. She needs to be able to make decisions based on her physician's medical advice and what is right for her and her family.

H.R. 36 would force a doctor to deny an abortion to a woman who has determined that terminating a pregnancy is the right decision for her, including women carrying a pregnancy with severe and lethal anomalies that may not be diagnosed until after 20 weeks in pregnancy and women with serious medical conditions brought on or exacerbated by pregnancy. H.R. 36 contains no exception to preserve the health of the woman. Instead, it includes a vague life endangerment exception which exposes doctors to the threat of criminal prosecution, limiting their options for care that is often needed in complex, urgent medical situations.

Moreover, H.R. 36 would dictate how physicians should care for their patients based on inaccurate and unscientific claims. Conclusive research shows that contrary to the sponsors' claims, the fetus doesn't have the neurological structures needed to experience pain until significantly later in pregnancy.

We strongly oppose governmental interference in the patient-provider relationship and criminalizing provision of care to women and their families. H.R. 36 jeopardizes the health of women in the U.S. by limiting access to safe and legal abortion and replaces personal decision-making by women and their doctors with political ideology. Our organizations urge you to oppose passage of H.R. 36.

Sincerely,

American College of Nurse-Midwives,
American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists,
American Medical Students Association,
American Medical Women's Association,
American Nurses Association,
American Society for Reproductive Medicine,
Association of Reproductive Health Professionals,
Medical Students for Choice,
National Abortion Federation,
National Association of Nurse Practitioners in Women's Health,
National Family Planning and Reproductive Health Association,
Physicians for Reproductive Health,
Planned Parenthood Federation of America,
Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine,
Society of Family Planning.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, as a scientist, I have learned that this Congress does not take scientific facts as facts but that it views them as, maybe, suggestions. Yet how often it is that we are playing with people's lives. It is the most personal decision one could ever make, and it should be made between the woman, her family, or whomever she wants to consult—her doctor, her priest, her pastor—anybody—but not the Congress of the United States.

Why do men in blue suits and red ties get to make that decision when it has nothing to do with scientific or medical facts? It is absolutely astonishing to me that this continues over and over again; and in the States that have passed 20-week abortion bills, the bills have always been overturned with regard to the constitutional question, and this will be as well.

Time and time again, when asked about it, neurobiology specialists, obstetricians, and gynecologists the world over have refuted the scientific and factual premises of this bill, but nobody cares about that here. I saw a great button that called the people here who are trying to do this today “gyneticians.” A “gynetician” is described as a politician who knows more about women’s health than doctors do.

We can go on with this, but what we need to remember is that, last night, half of the President’s speech dealt with people who are underpaid and who struggle to live in America.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 2 minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, let me get right to the chase here.

Barney Frank, our former colleague, said that many people believe that life begins at conception and ends at birth.

I want to know how this Congress is going to comply with what the President asked us last night: Will you give more money for child care? for daycare? Will you give more money for early education? Will you make sure that mothers are paid as much as the men they are working with and that the same jobs pay the same? Will you do something about paid sick leave? Will you help these children get to college?

Absolutely not. The record has been clear on all of these issues.

There is something really awful when we take up the time to please the base of some sort out there against all scientific belief and everything that we know about medicine. I wish this Congress would stop the folly. We are faced with a lot of serious problems in this country. Again, as my colleague points out, we have no ability to amend it. Nobody else can be heard on anything else. It is simply going to be voted on; the Senate may or may not ever take it up; and the President will not sign it. It is the same thing that we did over and over in the last session—kill health care.

Do everything you can. Nothing is going to be signed. No bills will be made. It is a shame. I have labeled it before as “legislative malpractice,” and that is exactly what is going on with this bill.

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

Once again, we find ourselves in a position in which we must correct the record.

Over the last 4 years, Republicans have implemented reforms to make the U.S. House of Representatives more open and transparent than ever. Under this GOP majority, Members on both sides of the aisle have been allowed to offer significantly more amendments—and the House has operated under far more open rules—than were allowed under the previous Democrat-controlled House.

The GOP majority allowed nearly 1,500 amendments to be considered on

the House floor in the 113th Congress. Under Speaker PELOSI, the House did not consider a single bill under an open rule throughout the 111th Congress. That is the definition of a closed process, Mr. Speaker, and it is precisely what Speaker BOEHNER successfully changed to start the 112th Congress and to continue throughout the 113th Congress. Under the current GOP majority, the House has considered 38 open or modified open rules.

When you compare the record of the Republican majority and the most recent Democrat majority, any fair analysis will show that Republicans are running a more open, transparent House of Representatives that allows for greater participation by all Members.

The problem throughout the last Congress resided in the Senate and its failure to act on almost everything passed by the House. When the Senate did decide to act, then-majority leader, Democrat HARRY REID, virtually locked down the amendment process on the Senate floor. When you compare the nearly 1,500 amendments considered on the House floor with the Senate’s record of inaction, a more accurate picture emerges.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN).

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and, most importantly, of the underlying bill, H.R. 161, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act. I encourage all of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to support this important job creation bill.

The great State of Maine is home to the most skilled papermakers in the world. Even so, last year, mills in Bucksport, Old Town, and Millinocket closed, laying off 1,000 of our workers. Soon, a fourth mill, which is in Madison, will temporarily shut down, furloughing another 215 workers.

For each mill, the high cost of electricity to run its machinery was a primary reason for closure. Almost half the power plants in New England burn natural gas to generate electricity. We must allow the increased production and transportation of natural gas to drive down the cost of electric power and save our mills, our factories, and save our jobs.

Today, I am proud to cosponsor this new legislation in order to expedite the permitting to construct more and larger capacity natural gas pipelines throughout America. I ask my Republican and Democrat colleagues to band together in supporting this critically important jobs bill. It is the fair and the right thing to do.

Hardworking American taxpayers deserve a more effective government that works together to solve our serious problems. We have the responsibility and the authority to help our families live better lives, with fatter paychecks and more financial security. Let’s get this done.

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

Let me just say for the record that facts are facts are facts. There is no denying that the last Republican Congress held the record for the most closed rules in the history of the United States.

Maybe I am misunderstanding the current rule, but to the best of my knowledge, not a single amendment is allowed, notwithstanding that in this Congress there have been no hearings and no markups.

Is it appropriate, Mr. Speaker, for me to ask unanimous consent to amend H.R. 36 and make it an open rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina would have to yield for such a request to be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina yield?

Ms. FOXX. I will not yield.

Mr. MCGOVERN. So there it is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. I want to thank the ranking member for yielding, for his leadership, and for really making it clear exactly what we are dealing with today and why many of us strongly oppose this rule and this bill.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the anniversary of Roe v. Wade. Over 40 years ago, the Supreme Court ruled that a woman could make her own personal health care decisions without interference from politicians. Yet here we are again, in 2015, debating this constitutionally protected right.

H.R. 36 would ban all abortions at 20 weeks, with extremely limited exceptions. A ban on an abortion after 20 weeks makes it harder for women who are already facing difficult circumstances. This is so bad. This is so wrong.

□ 1300

Every woman has a right to a safe medical procedure. And this decision, while difficult, is hers to make, not yours and not mine. This is her decision.

This bill is part of a broader effort to chip away at abortion access, a right that has already been decided by the Supreme Court and is the law of the land. Yet Republicans once again are focused on dictating what women can do with their bodies, denying their rights and endangering their health.

Mr. Speaker, this radical GOP bill undermines women’s constitutional rights under Roe v. Wade. This is a dangerous assault on women’s health freedoms. Women should not have to justify their personal medical decisions.

Abortions later in a pregnancy can involve rare, severe fetal abnormalities or pose serious risks to the health of women, but these procedures may be medically necessary to save the woman’s life.

This is an agonizing decision that a woman should make with her doctor,

her family, or whomever, but not her congressional Representatives. We have seen what happens when politicians interfere in these deeply personal medical decisions and tie doctors' hands.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE. Let me just say that the AMA has stated very clearly that this bill compromises a doctor's ability to provide medical treatment in the best interest of the patient.

Members of Congress have no right to interfere in health care decisions of women. This is a private matter. And the last time I looked, I thought we do have a right to privacy in this country.

So we have got to continue to fight against these attacks on women's health, on our constitutional rights, and on the right to privacy. I hope you vote "no" on this rule and "no" on this bill.

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

The gentleman from Massachusetts knows very well that the number of closed rules last Congress was a procedural effect of Republicans' efforts to reopen the government. America tires of this debate. Let's return to real issues with an impact on Americans' lives.

Mr. Speaker, we go to extraordinary lengths in this country to save the lives of born human beings because we value life so much. However, there are many who do not hold the unborn in the same esteem, and that is tragic for the more than 1 million unborn babies who lose their lives every year. There is nothing more important than protecting voiceless unborn children and their families from the travesty of abortion.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, over these next 2 days, you will hear many of my colleagues rise in support of H.R. 36, as well they should. This bill protects pain-capable, pre-born children from being subjected to violent, dismembering abortions, also known as D&E abortions.

One former abortionist, Dr. Anthony Levatino, testified in May 2013 before the House Judiciary Committee and described the procedure by saying:

A second-trimester D&E abortion is a blind procedure. Picture yourself reaching in with a Sopher clamp and grasping anything you can. Once you have grasped something inside, squeeze on the clamp to set the jaws and pull hard—really hard.

This is from a former abortionist describing the procedure:

You feel something let go and out pops a fully formed leg about 6 inches long. Reach in again and again with that clamp and tear out the spine, intestines, heart, and lungs.

How disgusting. How repugnant. How wrong. Any nation, any party, any person that claims to respect human rights and accepts basic science must reject this pain-filled act of barbarism.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule and, most important, in supporting H.R. 36.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and to the underlying bill. This bill is just as unconstitutional as it was when it was introduced in the last Congress. It poses just as serious a risk to the health and civil liberties of American women. And this time around, it comes with an additional slap in the face to women because, if this rule passes, the bill will come to a vote on the 42nd anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision in *Roe v. Wade*.

By attempting to outlaw almost all abortions after 20 weeks of pregnancy, this bill would clearly violate the constitutional principles the Court laid down in that decision a generation ago. Women must be allowed to decide their health care decisions. They need to do it in consultation with their doctors, with their families, and with their clergy and not have those decisions made for them by Washington politicians.

The Republican majority always claims to be against government overreach and for science. Well, they should take a look at the legislation they bring to the floor. This bill would extend the Federal Government's reach all the way into the doctor's office. And it denies medical science. It threatens providers with jail for performing a procedure that is constitutionally protected and often medically necessary. It places obstacles in the way of rape victims who seek help. It would put thousands of women at risk.

In short, this is another Republican ideological assault on women. We should reject it wholeheartedly. Our priority should be to help American workers with jobs, with increased wages—including women—and not turning the clock back to the 1950s with this kind of unconstitutional posturing.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule and the underlying bill and truly vote for women in the United States today.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is important to respond to the charge that this legislation is unconstitutional. In 2007, the Supreme Court upheld the Federal Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act as an appropriate use of Congress' powers under the Commerce Clause. This legislation follows that act's model by asserting Congress' authority to extend protection to pain-capable unborn children under the Commerce, Equal Protection, Due Process, and Enforcement Clauses of the 14th Amendment.

It is sad that opponents of this legislation are attempting to use the Constitution as a roadblock to prevent life-saving legislation, but the Supreme Court's position is clear.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, a great shadow looms over America, the home of the brave.

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 babies to torture and death without anesthesia. It is the greatest human rights atrocity in the United States today.

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

But, Mr. Speaker, I would submit to you that today the winds of change have begun to blow and the tide of blindness and blood is finally turning in America because today we take up the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act in this Chamber.

It is not perfect, Mr. Speaker. Each one of us would have written it a little differently if we could have done so. However, 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, it is a deeply sincere effort, beginning at the sixth month of pregnancy, to protect both mothers and their pain-capable babies from the atrocity of late-term abortion on demand, and, ultimately, it is one all humane Americans can support if they truly understand it for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing to these babies is real—and we all know it—and it is time to change and protect them.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), a champion for women's rights.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again. Instead of prioritizing the needs of women and families, we are once again discussing a bill that attacks women's rights.

When I ask women in my district what they need, they talk about not being able to find quality, affordable child care. But here in Congress we are talking about a bill that tells women they don't have a right to plan their own family.

Women in my district talk about making sure they receive equal pay for equal work. What are we talking about? A bill that tells women that politicians are better able to make their health decisions than they are.

Women in my district talk about making sure victims and survivors of domestic violence have the resources they need to build a better life. But we are talking about a bill that tells women that if they become pregnant because they were raped, they better have a police report to prove it.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. American women pay taxes, raise their families, contribute to our economy, and are over half of the electorate. Yet rather than helping these women succeed and grow our economy, we give them this bill that forces backward ideological beliefs into women's private medical decisions.

I urge my colleagues to get back to work for women and families of this country and reject this dangerous bill.

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

It is disappointing to hear my colleagues criticize this legislation in this way. We consider many weighty issues in this body with great implications for our future, but few of those issues command our attention as much as those that impact children, as this legislation does. This is right and appropriate.

I fear for both our future and our present if we continue to tolerate the death of innocent children in the womb. Every life matters. It is my hope that a culture of life will take hold and all children will be protected in law in the near future, but today we have an opportunity to come together and find consensus that nearly fully developed, viable children should be protected, particularly as individuals capable of experiencing great pain.

The necessity of that protection is made even clearer when considering the type of abortion these growing children are subjected to.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that the American people understand exactly what happens when they hear the word "abortion." According to Planned Parenthood, the largest abortion provider in America, babies aborted at 14 weeks or later are often subjected to dismemberment abortions, which are incredibly gruesome and painful.

What follows is heart-wrenching to describe, Mr. Speaker, but we must face the truth of what we are currently permitting. As if in a horror movie, the abortionist begins by suctioning out the amniotic fluid, then rips the limbs from the infant's body with a steel tool and finishes by crushing the skull of the infant he has dismembered.

Take a moment to consider that. This is the most common abortion per-

formed in the second trimester, not a rare tragedy.

As a Nation, we rightfully give the safety of our children the highest importance. In spite of that, we continue to allow these horrific procedures that an overwhelming majority of nations in the world have sworn off. As I mentioned before, only seven nations allow elective abortions after 20 weeks' gestation.

□ 1315

How can America continue to be one of them? We must leave this practice behind.

That is why I am a cosponsor of the underlying legislation to prohibit elective abortions in the United States past 20 weeks. The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is a commonsense reform to our American principles of protecting life as the most fundamental constitutional right.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for his leadership and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. After all the talk by our Republican friends about focusing their efforts on jobs and growing the economy, so far their rhetoric does not match their record.

Last week, we took up a pipeline bill that, according to the State Department, would only create 34 jobs, and the bill that we have on the pipeline today probably won't create one single job, but what it will do, it will make it easier to damage the environment.

The majority has also introduced six antichoice bills in the past 7 days, and what all these bills have in common is that they will not create one single American job.

Instead of a jobs agenda, the majority seems bound and determined to attack women's rights, to take away a woman's constitutional right to make for herself the most private and personal and intimate decisions.

Now, we are taking up this bill, H.R. 36, which is based on the insulting belief that women are incapable and unprepared to make decisions about their own bodies and their own health care.

Forty-two years ago this week, the Supreme Court, in *Roe v. Wade*, made it clear that a woman has a constitutional right to decide for herself these private issues concerning her own health and well-being.

This is not only insulting to the women of this country, it is just another pointless exercise in political posturing. It will never become law. It is a waste of Congress' time. What we should be doing instead is focusing on any idea or measure that can help create greater economic opportunity for all Americans.

The President pointed out last night that our economy is on the rise. Under

his leadership, we are experiencing the strongest private sector job growth we have had in 17 years, over 11 million new jobs.

Let's not squander this opportunity. Let's work together to create real jobs, not political posturing for the American people.

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

Thankfully, the American people recognize that we are speaking about protecting vulnerable lives here. A March 2013 poll conducted by The Polling Company found that 64 percent of the public supports a law like the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act prohibiting an abortion after 20 weeks, when an unborn baby can feel pain, unless the life of the mother is in danger.

Supporters include 47 percent of those who identified themselves as "pro-choice" in the poll. The poll also found that 63 percent of women believe that abortion should not be permitted after the point where substantial medical evidence says that the unborn child can feel pain. That finding was not an unusual outlier. It is representative of the true beliefs of the American people.

According to a 2013 Gallup Poll, 64 percent of Americans support prohibiting second trimester abortions, and 80 percent support prohibiting third trimester abortions. Even The Huffington Post found in 2013 that 59 percent of Americans support limiting abortions after 20 weeks.

Let no one believe that our concern is only for the child. A study in the *Obstetrics and Gynecology* journal found that a woman seeking an abortion after 20 weeks' gestation is 35 times more likely to die from an abortion than she would have been from an abortion in the first trimester. At 21 weeks or more, she is 91 times more likely to die. Abortion is a danger to both lives, the mother and the child.

Mr. Speaker, Congress cannot sit idly by while this grotesque and brutal procedure, which rips the tiny baby apart, limb from limb in the womb, and threatens the life of the mother, is performed in our country. This is why it is necessary for Congress to pass H.R. 36 and protect the lives of these unborn children from excruciating pain.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), somebody who believes in protecting women's rights.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. McGovern.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that pain is a subterfuge. This bill is not about pain to the fetus. This bill is about outlawing abortion and repealing *Roe v. Wade*.

The other side knows that the Supreme Court has set out in *Roe v. Wade* the conditions of viability, and viability is 22–24 weeks. Well, they couldn't get past that in the Court, they knew

they couldn't, so they created this new class of when the baby, the child, can feel pain.

They found a doctor that said he assumes they can feel pain, and they base their whole premise on that, an argument to try to repeal *Roe v. Wade* and to not give the women of this country the opportunity to exercise choice on their own lives and when they produce children.

This has been the law in this country since 1973. I consider it the right law. I was in law school when the Supreme Court brought down *Roe v. Wade*. It was progress, and we continue to march forward, but the other side wants to stop progress. If they could outlaw all abortions, they would do it, and this is the first step toward doing it.

They don't provide for the life of the mother in the bill. They don't provide for exceptions for rape and incest, and they didn't allow any amendments because they knew if they had amendments they would carry, and the full rape and incest exceptions which are in the law today would be put on this bill, and that would be difficult for them to swallow.

This is a sham on pain. This is an attempt to take women's rights away and to repeal *Roe v. Wade*. I would ask that when the bill comes up that we vote "no" and vote women first and progress.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time at this time until the gentleman from Massachusetts is ready to close.

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

Sadly, we have seen all too well how money has polluted our politics and is undermining our democracy, so I am going to urge people to vote against the previous question.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to allow for consideration of a sensible constitutional amendment, H.J. Res. 22, a measure that I have sponsored with my friends, TED DEUTCH of Florida, DONNA EDWARDS of Maryland, and JOHN SARBANES of Maryland, to overturn these decisions and make clear that Congress and States have the authority to regulate and set reasonable limits on the raising and spending of money to influence elections.

To discuss this proposal, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts, a leader in the fight to get money out of politics.

Last night, in his State of the Union Address, President Obama called on Republicans and Democrats in Congress to embrace a better politics where we spend less time fundraising and spewing sound bites and more time debating issues in good faith to find common ground.

A better politics, that is something all Americans want to see, and there is

no better way to restore their faith in Congress than by getting Big Money out of politics.

Today, my friends, is the 5-year anniversary of the Supreme Court's 5-4 ruling in *Citizens United v. FEC*, which granted corporations and megamillionaires a First Amendment right to buy unlimited influence in our elections. The results of *Citizens United* has been elections dominated by super-PACs and unaccountable outside groups, backed by a small group of the wealthiest Americans.

Indeed, during the 2012 Presidential election cycle, 93 percent of super-PAC funding came from just over 3,000 donors, amounting to less than .01 percent of the American population; likewise, the 2014 midterm election cycle was the most expensive in history, with recordbreaking spending by outside groups.

That is why, today, I ask the majority to join me and more than 80 of my colleagues in support of H.J. Res. 22, the Democracy for All amendment. This amendment will restore what the Supreme Court took away in *Citizens United*: the right of Congress and the States to pass laws limiting the influence of Big Money in our elections.

Seniors on Social Security don't have millions to funnel into super-PACs.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DEUTCH. And low-income children are not among the wealthy donors who hit the limits struck down in last year's *McCutcheon* ruling.

The sad truth is that, for most Americans, their influence in Washington has shrunk each time the Supreme Court has invited more money into our elections and allowed special interests to set the agenda.

Let's build a better politics by bringing H.J. Res. 22, the Democracy for All amendment, up for a vote today. Together, we can ensure that every American's voice, once again, is heard in America's democracy.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on ordering the previous question, so that we can consider the constitutional amendment, the Democracy for All amendment, that would rein in the excesses that have been unleashed by Big Money on our political system. That occurred 5 years ago in the *Citizens United* decision.

We have an opportunity, acting on behalf of the millions of Americans who feel their voices are drowned out, to push back on the influence of Big Money in this town and on this Chamber.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, that every week we get another example of how

Big Money is influencing policy here in Washington. Last week, it was the influence of Wall Street leaning on the institution to pass legislation that would get them out from reasonable regulation. This week, it is the energy industry leaning on the institution with respect to this Keystone bill that we are going to see—example after example of how Big Money has undue influence here in Washington.

It is time that we fought on behalf of the American people and made sure that their voices are the ones being heard, not the voice and the megaphone of Big Money.

Let's vote against ordering the previous question. Let's consider the amendment to the Constitution that would allow us to push back on the undue influence of Big Money here in Washington.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire as to whether the gentleman from Massachusetts is prepared to close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. How much time do I have left, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment that I will offer if we defeat the previous question in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

Let me just recap for my colleagues here. First of all, vote "no" on this rule. This continues a trend that has nothing but contempt for regular order. These bills had no hearings in this Congress. There was no markup, and now, they are brought to the floor with no amendments—two closed rules.

Notwithstanding the pledge of the Speaker for a more open and transparent process, people who have other ideas on ways to improve or change these bills are denied that opportunity.

I would say, with all due respect to my colleague from North Carolina, we can't use the excuse that we have got to keep the government running. We are in the beginning of the session. We are not doing much of anything. Clearly, the bills that we are debating in their current form are going to be vetoed anyway.

□ 1330

Secondly, I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule because of the bills that are being brought up: this bill that is clearly an attack on women's health and reproductive rights,

which does not belong on this floor; and the other bill is a bill that basically allows there to be a process for pipelines to be approved without necessarily going through all the proper oversight.

And I am going to urge Members to vote against the previous question so we can bring up this bill that I talked about earlier on campaign finance reform.

Look, the legislative agenda in this Congress is about rewarding the highest donors. I think to any objective observer, when you see what is coming on the floor, including this pipeline bill which is not in the interest of the American people, we are not out there trying to protect their safety and well-being. It is a big kiss to the energy industry. And I would argue that the reason why bills like that—or some of the tax bills that are brought to this floor that reward big corporations and the wealthiest individuals—are brought to the floor is because those people who represent those wealthy interests have the most sway in this Congress. They are the biggest donors to political parties. They are the biggest donors to Members of Congress.

And while that is happening every day here, average people who can't contribute tens of thousands of dollars to political parties, who can't contribute millions of dollars, are increasingly becoming marginalized. The issues that matter most to working people, those struggling in the working class, those struggling to get into the middle class, we don't even get a chance to debate those issues on the House floor.

I will say to my Republican friends: I have had many conversations with you over the years about how you hate raising money as much as I hate raising money. Too much of our attention in this Congress, whether you are a Democrat or a Republican, is about raising money for the next election, and it is getting worse and worse every election cycle. It is time to do something about that. It is time to give Congress the authority to regulate or put a cap on how much campaigns cost. I mean, we are going to spend billions of dollars in the next Presidential election. It is obscene. With all the problems that we have in this country, we ought to be spending more time debating those problems and not worrying about raising money.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so that we can bring up this commonsense campaign finance proposal, and I also urge a "no" vote on the rule.

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

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

As I said at the opening of this debate, this rule will provide for consideration of H.R. 161, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act. That legislation, which passed the House on a bipartisan basis last Congress, will

reduce red tape and ensure that Americans in all parts of the country will be able to benefit from the energy revolution that has occurred on our Nation's private lands.

It is the coldest season of the year. It is my strong hope that we will be able to enact this legislation soon, to ensure that in winters to come residents of the northeast and other high-cost areas of the country are able to heat their homes affordably.

Before we consider our budgets or the foolishness of red tape, though, we must return to our founding principles. We must remember that life is the most fundamental of all rights. It is sacred and God-given.

Even the President said in last night's speech: "I want our actions to tell every child, in every neighborhood: Your life matters, and we are committed to improving your life chances, as committed as we are to working on behalf of our own kids."

But, Mr. Speaker, millions of babies have been robbed of that right in this, the freest country in the world. That is a tragedy beyond words and a betrayal of what we, as a nation, stand for.

Before liberty, equality, free speech, freedom of conscience, the pursuit of happiness, and justice for all, there has to be life; and yet for millions of aborted infants, life is exactly what they have been denied. An affront to life for some is an affront to life for every one of us.

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

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

May we, in love, defend the unborn; may we, in humility, confront this national sin; and may we mourn what abortion reveals about the conscience of our Nation. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote for life by voting in favor of this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my frustration in the process by which this bill was brought to the floor and my disappointment that the process has yielded a bill that I cannot support.

This bill did not go through regular order. The Judiciary Committee did not hold any hearings or markups on the bill. And now under a Closed Rule, Members do not have the opportunity to offer amendments, let alone debate the merits of specific sections they wish to change.

I submitted an amendment to H.R. 36 that would have extended the exception for all incest victims. Under a Closed Rule, this amendment was rejected.

Incest victims are victims regardless of their age. What some people call "consensual incest" often begins as child sexual abuse. Even if the relationship continues into adulthood, there is still a perpetrator and still a victim. In addition, it is hugely unfair to require an incest victim to report a relative to the police.

In the future, should the House again consider legislation railing to abortion, I urge my colleagues to bring the bill through regular order so that all Members can participate in the debate over this sensitive issue.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 38 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 22) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections. The first reading of the joint resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. General debate shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the joint resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the joint resolution, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the joint resolution.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.J. Res. 22.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated

the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

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

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. FOXX. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. 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, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 182, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—238

Abraham	Barletta	Bishop (UT)
Aderholt	Barr	Black
Allen	Barton	Blackburn
Amash	Benishek	Blum
Amodei	Bilirakis	Bost
Babin	Bishop (MI)	Boustany

Brat	Huelskamp	Ratcliffe
Bridenstine	Huizenga (MI)	Reed
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Reichert
Brooks (IN)	Hunter	Renacci
Buchanan	Hurd (TX)	Ribble
Buck	Hurt (VA)	Rice (SC)
Bucshon	Issa	Rigell
Burgess	Jenkins (KS)	Roby
Byrne	Jenkins (WV)	Roe (TN)
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Carter (GA)	Jolly	Rogers (KY)
Chabot	Jones	Rohrabacher
Chaffetz	Jordan	Rokita
Clawson (FL)	Joyce	Rooney (FL)
Coffman	Katko	Ros-Lehtinen
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Roskam
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Ross
Collins (NY)	King (NY)	Rothfus
Comstock	Kinzinger (IL)	Rouzer
Conaway	Kline	Royce
Cook	Knight	Russell
Costello (PA)	Labrador	Ryan (WI)
Cramer	LaMalfa	Salmon
Crawford	Lamborn	Sanford
Crenshaw	Lance	Scalise
Culberson	Latta	Schock
Curbelo (FL)	LoBiondo	Schweikert
Davis, Rodney	Long	Scott, Austin
Denham	Loudermilk	Sensenbrenner
Dent	Love	Sessions
DeSantis	Lucas	Shimkus
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Shuster
Diaz-Balart	Lummis	Simpson
Dold	MacArthur	Smith (MO)
Duffy	Marchant	Smith (NE)
Duncan (SC)	Marino	Smith (NJ)
Duncan (TN)	Massie	Smith (TX)
Ellmers	McCarthy	Stefanik
Emmer	McCauley	Stewart
Farenthold	McClintock	Stivers
Fitzpatrick	McHenry	Stutzman
Fleischmann	McKinley	Thompson (PA)
Fleming	McMorris	Thornberry
Flores	Rodgers	Tiberi
Fortenberry	McSally	Tipton
Fox	Meadows	Trott
Franks (AZ)	Meehan	Turner
Frelinghuysen	Messer	Upton
Garrett	Mica	Valadao
Gibbs	Miller (FL)	Wagner
Gibson	Miller (MI)	Walberg
Gohmert	Moolenaar	Walden
Goodlatte	Mooney (WV)	Walker
Gosar	Mullin	Walorski
Gowdy	Mulvaney	Walters, Mimi
Granger	Murphy (PA)	Weber (TX)
Graves (GA)	Neugebauer	Webster (FL)
Graves (LA)	Newhouse	Wenstrup
Graves (MO)	Noem	Westerman
Griffith	Nugent	Westmoreland
Grothman	Nunes	Whitfield
Guinta	Olson	Williams
Guthrie	Palazzo	Wilson (SC)
Hanna	Palmer	Wittman
Hardy	Paulsen	Womack
Harper	Pearce	Woodall
Hartzler	Perry	Yoder
Heck (NV)	Pittenger	Yoho
Hensarling	Pitts	Young (AK)
Herrera Beutler	Poe (TX)	Young (IA)
Hice (GA)	Poliquin	Young (IN)
Hill	Pompeo	Zeldin
Holding	Possey	Zinke
Hudson	Price (GA)	

NAYS—182

Adams	Castor (FL)	DeLauro
Aguilar	Castro (TX)	DelBene
Ashford	Chu (CA)	DeSaulnier
Bass	Cicilline	Deutch
Beatty	Clark (MA)	Dingell
Becerra	Clarke (NY)	Doggett
Berra	Clay	Doyle (PA)
Beyer	Cleaver	Ellison
Bishop (GA)	Clyburn	Engel
Blumenauer	Cohen	Eshoo
Bonamici	Connolly	Esty
Boyle (PA)	Conyers	Farr
Brady (PA)	Cooper	Fattah
Brown (FL)	Costa	Foster
Brownley (CA)	Courtney	Frankel (FL)
Bustos	Crowley	Fudge
Butterfield	Cuellar	Gabbard
Capps	Cummings	Galleo
Capuano	Davis (CA)	Garamendi
Cárdenas	Davis, Danny	Graham
Carney	DeFazio	Grayson
Carson (IN)	DeGette	Green, Al
Cartwright	Delaney	Green, Gene

Grijalva	Maloney	Sanchez, Loretta
Gutiérrez	Carolyn	Sarbanes
Hahn	Maloney, Sean	Schakowsky
Heck (WA)	Matsui	Schiff
Higgins	McCollum	Schrader
Himes	McDermott	Scott (VA)
Honda	McGovern	Scott, David
Huffman	McNerney	Serrano
Israel	Meeks	Sewell (AL)
Jackson Lee	Meng	Sherman
Jeffries	Moore	Sinema
Johnson (GA)	Moulton	Sires
Johnson, E. B.	Murphy (FL)	Slaughter
Kaptur	Nadler	Smith (WA)
Keating	Napolitano	Speier
Kelly (IL)	Neal	Swalwell (CA)
Kennedy	Nolan	Takai
Kildee	Norcross	Takano
Kilmer	O'Rourke	Thompson (CA)
Kind	Pallone	Thompson (MS)
Kirkpatrick	Pascarella	Titus
Kuster	Payne	Tonko
Langevin	Pelosi	Torres
Larsen (WA)	Peters	Tsongas
Larson (CT)	Peterson	Van Hollen
Lawrence	Pingree	Vargas
Lee	Pocan	Veasey
Levin	Polis	Vela
Lewis	Price (NC)	Velázquez
Lieu (CA)	Quigley	Visclosky
Lipinski	Rangel	Walz
Loeb sack	Rice (NY)	Wasserman
Lofgren	Richmond	Schultz
Lowenthal	Roybal-Allard	Waters, Maxine
Lowe	Ruiz	Watson Coleman
Lujan Grisham	Ruppersberger	Welch
(NM)	Rush	Wilson (FL)
Luján, Ben Ray	Ryan (OH)	Yarmuth
(NM)	Sánchez, Linda	
Lynch	T.	

NOT VOTING—13

Brady (TX)	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Carter (TX)	Harris	Nunnelee
Duckworth	Hastings	Perlmutter
Edwards	Hinojosa	
Fincher	Hoyer	

□ 1404

Messrs. REED and SALMON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 181, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 39]

AYES—238

Abraham	Buchanan	Curbelo (FL)
Aderholt	Buck	Davis, Rodney
Allen	Bucshon	Denham
Amash	Burgess	Dent
Amodei	Byrne	DeSantis
Babin	Calvert	DesJarlais
Barletta	Carter (GA)	Diaz-Balart
Barr	Chabot	Dold
Barton	Chaffetz	Duffy
Benishek	Clawson (FL)	Duncan (SC)
Bilirakis	Coffman	Duncan (TN)
Bishop (MI)	Cole	Ellmers
Bishop (UT)	Collins (GA)	Emmer
Black	Collins (NY)	Farenthold
Blackburn	Comstock	Fitzpatrick
Blum	Conaway	Fleischmann
Bost	Cook	Fleming
Boustany	Costello (PA)	Flores
Brat	Cramer	Fortenberry
Bridenstine	Crawford	Fox
Brooks (AL)	Crenshaw	Franks (AZ)
Brooks (IN)	Culberson	Frelinghuysen

Garrett	Lummis	Roskam
Gibbs	MacArthur	Ross
Gibson	Marchant	Rothfus
Gohmert	Marino	Rouzer
Goodlatte	Massie	Royce
Gosar	McCarthy	Russell
Gowdy	McCauley	Ryan (WI)
Granger	McClintock	Salmon
Graves (GA)	McHenry	Sanford
Graves (LA)	McKinley	Scalise
Graves (MO)	McMorris	Schock
Griffith	Rodgers	Schweikert
Grothman	McSally	Scott, Austin
Guinta	Meadows	Sensenbrenner
Guthrie	Meehan	Sessions
Hanna	Messer	Shimkus
Hardy	Mica	Shuster
Harper	Miller (FL)	Simpson
Hartzler	Miller (MI)	Smith (MO)
Heck (NV)	Moolenaar	Smith (NE)
Hensarling	Mooney (WV)	Smith (NJ)
Herrera Beutler	Mullin	Smith (TX)
Hice (GA)	Mulvaney	Stefanik
Hill	Murphy (PA)	Stewart
Holding	Neugebauer	Stivers
Hudson	Newhouse	Stutzman
Huelskamp	Noem	Thompson (PA)
Huizenga (MI)	Nugent	Thornberry
Hultgren	Nunes	Tiberi
Hunter	Olson	Tipton
Hurd (TX)	Palazzo	Trott
Hurt (VA)	Palmer	Turner
Issa	Paulsen	Upton
Jenkins (KS)	Pearce	Valadao
Jenkins (WV)	Perry	Wagner
Johnson (OH)	Peterson	Walberg
Jolly	Pittenger	Walden
Jones	Pitts	Walker
Jordan	Poe (TX)	Walorski
Joyce	Poliquin	Weber (TX)
Katko	Pompeo	Webster (FL)
Kelly (PA)	Posey	Wenstrup
King (IA)	Price (GA)	Westerman
King (NY)	Ratcliffe	Westmoreland
Kinzinger (IL)	Reed	Whitfield
Kline	Reichert	Williams
Knight	Renacci	Wilson (SC)
Labrador	Ribble	Wittman
LaMalfa	Rice (SC)	Womack
Lamborn	Rigell	Woodall
Lance	Roby	Yoder
Latta	Roe (TN)	Yoho
LoBiondo	Rogers (AL)	Young (AK)
Long	Rogers (KY)	Young (IA)
Loudermilk	Rohrabacher	Young (IN)
Love	Rokita	Zeldin
Lucas	Rooney (FL)	Zinke
Luetkemeyer	Ros-Lehtinen	

NOES—181

Adams	Cuellar	Jackson Lee
Aguilar	Cummings	Jeffries
Ashford	Davis (CA)	Johnson (GA)
Bass	Davis, Danny	Johnson, E. B.
Beatty	DeFazio	Kaptur
Becerra	DeGette	Keating
Bera	Delaney	Kelly (IL)
Beyer	DeLauro	Kennedy
Bishop (GA)	DelBene	Kildee
Blumenauer	DeSaulnier	Kilmer
Bonamici	Deutch	Kind
Boyle (PA)	Dingell	Kirkpatrick
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Kuster
Brown (FL)	Doyle (PA)	Langevin
Brownley (CA)	Ellison	Larsen (WA)
Bustos	Engel	Larson (CT)
Butterfield	Eshoo	Lawrence
Capps	Esty	Lee
Capuano	Farr	Levin
Cárdenas	Fattah	Lewis
Carney	Foster	Lieu (CA)
Carson (IN)	Frankel (FL)	Lipinski
Cartwright	Fudge	Loeb
Castor (FL)	Gabbard	Lofgren
Castro (TX)	Gallagher	Lowenthal
Chu (CA)	Garamendi	Lowe
Cicilline	Graham	Lujan Grisham
Clark (MA)	Grayson	(NM)
Clarke (NY)	Green, Al	Luján, Ben Ray
Clay	Green, Gene	(NM)
Cleaver	Grijalva	Lynch
Clyburn	Gutiérrez	Maloney,
Cohen	Hahn	Carolyn
Connolly	Heck (WA)	Maloney, Sean
Conyers	Higgins	Matsui
Cooper	Himes	McCollum
Costa	Honda	McDermott
Courtney	Huffman	McGovern
Crowley	Israel	McNerney

Meeks	Richmond	Swalwell (CA)
Meng	Roybal-Allard	Takai
Moore	Ruiz	Takano
Moulton	Ruppersberger	Thompson (CA)
Murphy (FL)	Rush	Thompson (MS)
Nadler	Ryan (OH)	Titus
Napolitano	Sánchez, Linda	Tonko
Neal	T.	Torres
Nolan	Sanchez, Loretta	Tsongas
Norcross	Sarbanes	Van Hollen
O'Rourke	Schakowsky	Vargas
Pallone	Schiff	Veasey
Pascarella	Schrader	Vela
Payne	Scott (VA)	Velázquez
Pelosi	Scott, David	Visclosky
Peters	Serrano	Walz
Pingree	Sewell (AL)	Wasserman
Pocan	Sherman	Schultz
Polis	Sinema	Waters, Maxine
Price (NC)	Sires	Watson Coleman
Quigley	Slaughter	Welch
Rangel	Smith (WA)	Wilson (FL)
Rice (NY)	Speier	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Brady (TX)	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Carter (TX)	Harris	Nunnelee
Duckworth	Hastings	Perlmutter
Edwards	Hinojosa	Walters, Mimi
Fincher	Hoyer	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1413

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1415

NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PERMITTING REFORM ACT

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 38, I call up the bill (H.R. 161) to provide for the timely consideration of all licenses, permits, and approvals required under Federal law with respect to the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of any natural gas pipeline projects, 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 38, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 161

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 “Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act”.

SEC. 2. REGULATORY APPROVAL OF NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PROJECTS.

Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717f) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(1)(1) The Commission shall approve or deny an application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity for a prefilled project not later than 12 months after receiving a complete application that is ready to be processed, as defined by the Commission by regulation.

“(2) The agency responsible for issuing any license, permit, or approval required under Federal law in connection with a prefilled project for which a certificate of public convenience and necessity is sought under this

Act shall approve or deny the issuance of the license, permit, or approval not later than 90 days after the Commission issues its final environmental document relating to the project.

“(3) The Commission may extend the time period under paragraph (2) by 30 days if an agency demonstrates that it cannot otherwise complete the process required to approve or deny the license, permit, or approval, and therefor will be compelled to deny the license, permit, or approval. In granting an extension under this paragraph, the Commission may offer technical assistance to the agency as necessary to address conditions preventing the completion of the review of the application for the license, permit, or approval.

“(4) If an agency described in paragraph (2) does not approve or deny the issuance of the license, permit, or approval within the time period specified under paragraph (2) or (3), as applicable, such license, permit, or approval shall take effect upon the expiration of 30 days after the end of such period. The Commission shall incorporate into the terms of such license, permit, or approval any conditions proffered by the agency described in paragraph (2) that the Commission does not find are inconsistent with the final environmental document.

“(5) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘prefilled project’ means a project for the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of a natural gas pipeline with respect to which a prefiling docket number has been assigned by the Commission pursuant to a prefiling process established by the Commission for the purpose of facilitating the formal application process for obtaining a certificate of public convenience and necessity.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 161.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to natural gas production, we are number one. What was once a pipe dream is now a global reality, thanks to American ingenuity and technology. An impressive accomplishment, especially considering where we were only a decade ago—fearful of running out of supplies.

With this new wealth of natural gas, folks in Michigan and across the country should no longer worry about access to affordable energy. But budget-busting power bills are still hitting too many Americans.

The New York Times recently reported that customers in New England could expect electricity rates to spike