

who have less and already struggling families into have-nots. In Florida's 24th Congressional District, more than 200,000 children are food-insecure and go to bed hungry. Overall, 23 percent of individuals are food-insecure.

Feeding South Florida is a lifeline that runs food banks, a mobile food pantry that delivers fresh fruits and vegetables, a summer food service so students can continue to receive healthy meals when school is out of session, and a program that brings food to senior housing sites.

Just last week in this very Chamber Pope Francis reminded us that the fight against poverty and hunger must be fought constantly and on many fronts. Feeding South Florida does that every day and deserves all the support we can muster. That is why I wear this orange adornment today, to honor the entire organization, administration, and workers, of Feeding South Florida.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 29, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
*The Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 29, 2015 at 9:27 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 599.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3495, WOMEN'S PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT, AND WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS RE- PORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 444 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 444

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3495) to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow for greater State flexibility with respect to excluding providers who are involved in abortions. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended,

are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of October 1, 2015.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), 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 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, House Resolution 444 provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 3495, the Women's Public Health and Safety Act.

Over the past few months, extremely disturbing information has come to light about the activities of abortion providers and their sale of unborn children's hearts and other organs for compensation. In light of those discoveries, we provide for consideration today of crucial legislation to ensure States are free to ensure their limited taxpayers' dollars do not provide sustaining funding to abortion providers whose activities are found repugnant.

H.R. 3495, the Women's Public Health and Safety Act, allows States to make a decision identical to the one this House made earlier this month when we passed H.R. 3134, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act, which stopped the flow of taxpayer dollars to Planned Parenthood as investigations continue into its sale of unborn children's parts.

As my colleagues noted during debate on H.R. 3134, arguments from the minority that this bill will prevent women from accessing health care ring hollow. We know that federally qualified health centers and rural health centers outnumber Planned Parenthood clinics at a rate of 20 to 1.

Of these over 13,000 federally qualified health centers and rural health centers, women have access to any healthcare service provided by Planned Parenthood or other abortion providers with one obvious exception. Because they are federally funded, these true health centers do not perform abortions.

Clearly, despite opponents' best efforts to argue otherwise, this bill does not deny healthcare services to women. It does allow States to decide whether their Medicaid funds should support a provider whose atrocities have shocked our national conscience and devalued human life.

It is not surprising, though, that we are hearing these hollow arguments about access to healthcare services, as the political machinery of abortion providers has kicked into high gear with scare tactics to protect their business. Abortion is, after all, a business. Planned Parenthood is the single largest abortion business in the country.

□ 1230

Recently, they performed over 325,000 abortions in 1 year. That is nearly 900 every day, at a rate of over 35 an hour. They are able to continue that activity, in part, because Planned Parenthood has received over \$1 billion in 3 years from Medicaid alone. I have spoken previously on the floor about the absurdity of providing taxpayer funds to organizations that have had their willingness to accept compensation for the remains of unborn children exposed for all to see.

Several States, including Louisiana, Arkansas, Alabama, and Indiana, have recognized that alarming truth and acted on their own to stop providing abortion providers with taxpayer dollars through Medicaid. Unfortunately, the Obama administration has forced those States to continue providing taxpayer dollars to abortion providers.

Thankfully, when the Framers of our Constitution established our Nation, they saw fit to give States a right to determine their own affairs and the disposition of their citizens' taxes. Today, we restore federalism to the Medicaid program and enable States to make their own choices on which Medicaid providers to accept, allowing them to stop the flow of taxpayer dollars to organizations that accept compensation for the sale of well-developed unborn children's hearts and bodies.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this rule and the underlying bill to my colleagues for their support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

My friend, the gentlewoman from North Carolina, says that the minority speaks in a way that is hollow. I will tell you what is hollow: talk about regular order in this institution.

The general public may not know that there is a methodology that allows for all proceedings to go forward. Customarily, a measure of this kind would have had a committee hearing and a committee markup. It did not, and that is not regular order.

Mr. Speaker, we are now less than 48 hours away from another government shutdown, and instead of considering a

continuing resolution, we are debating legislation that will limit a woman's access to health services and make it harder for Medicaid patients to obtain care. I wonder about States like Florida and Texas that did not accept Medicaid money under so-called ObamaCare having charge of Medicare and Medicaid.

Like many of my colleagues, I am frustrated that we are again wasting precious time considering a bill crafted by ideological extremists, which, even in the unlikely event of Senate passage, would be vetoed by the President.

To be sure, this frustration isn't limited to my friends on this side of the aisle. Just this week, the fight over defunding Planned Parenthood and similar scuffles facilitated by fringe elements of the Republican Party led to the resignation of the Speaker of the House.

And on a personal note, I would like to thank the Speaker for his service and his forthright commentary regarding his leaving the House. In my judgment, he has done a credible job for this institution. He had people who would not let him do the things that were needed for all of us in this Nation.

The Republican Conference is really divided so fervently that we can again expect the real threat of a government shutdown in December. All we are doing today, in the final analysis on that subject, whenever it comes up—and it may come up today and tomorrow—is to kick the can down the road again. The can ain't got no more space for kicking. But we continue to do that, and this time until December, even if we are able to avoid the one currently looming over our heads.

Mr. Speaker, current Federal law already denies Federal Medicaid coverage of abortion except in limited circumstances, and Federal insurance coverage of an abortion is restricted.

Instead of debating bills like the one before us today, we should be coming together to find a balanced and responsible way to fund the government, pass a budget that represents our constituents' priorities, and invest in this great country.

H.R. 3495 seeks to amend title 19 of the Medicaid law to allow States to prevent qualified providers and institutions from participating in their Medicaid programs without a showing of cause or due process if they have any involvement—underscore that, “any involvement”—in abortions, a standard which has been left undefined and certainly vague.

Aptly termed the “free choice of provider” provision, title 19 currently mandates that Medicaid beneficiaries be permitted to obtain services from any qualified provider he or she chooses and is implemented in the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services' free choice of provider regulation. This regulation also explicitly states that under no circumstance can the free choice of provider protection be compromised with respect to providers of family planning services.

In short, current Federal law was designated to guarantee that State Medicaid programs provide beneficiaries with the same basic opportunity and rights to choose and receive covered healthcare services from any qualified provider in the same way as any member of the general population seeking healthcare services. The legislative language of this bill is so broad that, if enacted, it has the potential to have a devastating impact on patient access by giving States the ability to kick any provider out of Medicaid, including entire hospital systems, if that provider has even an attenuated connection to abortion services.

For example, it is entirely possible that, under this bill, a hospital could be excluded from providing any and all services in Medicaid if an obstetrician with admitting privileges at the same hospital provides, or even provided in the past, abortions as a separate part of his or her practice.

The American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, an organization of over 57,000 physicians and partners in women's health, have come out publicly against this legislation, as have the American Civil Liberties Union and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. I will include those endorsements against this measure in the RECORD.

THE AMERICAN CONGRESS OF OBSTETRICIANS AND GYNECOLOGISTS,

Washington, DC, September 28, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG), representing 57,000 physicians and partners in women's health, I urge you to vote NO on H.R. 3495, the Women's Public Health and Safety Act.

This intentionally vague bill should not be enacted into law. In falling far short of any standard for sound federal health legislation and policy, it would serve only to scare providers away from providing comprehensive, compassionate care to women, and leave women without the care they need. America needs more ob-gyns participating in the Medicaid program; this bill would do the opposite.

I urge you to vote NO on H.R. 3495 when it comes to the House floor. Don't be fooled by the title of this bill. This legislation is nothing more than the latest in a string of attacks against women's health.

Sincerely,

MARK S. DEFRANCESCO,
MD, MBA, FACOG,
President.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,

Washington, DC, September 29, 2015.

Vote “NO” on H.R. 3495

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), a nationwide organization with more than a million members, activists, and supporters that fights tirelessly to defend and preserve the individual rights and liberties that the Constitution and the laws of the United States guarantee everyone in this country, we urge you to vote NO on Rep. Duffy's bill, the misleadingly titled “Women's Public Health and Safety Act.” (H.R. 3495). Because of the critical importance of the civil rights and civil liberties principles involved, we will score the vote.

H.R. 3495 gives states virtually unchecked power to exclude women's health care pro-

viders from participation in Medicaid. It does so by undermining the longstanding free choice of provider provision which guarantees patients the ability to seek health care services, and specifically family planning services, from any qualified provider. This bill would allow states that are hostile to a woman's right to abortion in general, and to Planned Parenthood in particular, to target women's health providers for exclusion from Medicaid with impunity. In so doing, the bill forces doctors and organizations to choose between providing a constitutionally-protected medical service that one in three women needs in her lifetime and providing other necessary health care services to low-income patients who already face a dearth of qualified and willing medical professionals. Mandating such a choice not only raises serious constitutional concerns, but also threatens to devastate access to care for millions of low-income women and men.

As the latest component of the ongoing smear campaign against Planned Parenthood, this bill particularly jeopardizes access to the high quality, affordable health care that Planned Parenthood health centers provide. Planned Parenthood is a critical safety-net provider. One in five women will visit a local Planned Parenthood health center during her lifetime, and many low-income women and women of color rely on Planned Parenthood as their primary health care provider. Despite the fact that numerous investigations have already cleared Planned Parenthood of wrongdoing, opponents of safe, legal abortion continue to cite the deceptively edited videos that misrepresent the organization's fetal tissue donation practices as justification for legislation, like H.R. 3495, that would harm women's health.

H.R. 3495 would allow states to eliminate Planned Parenthood health centers from Medicaid without cause based solely on political motivations, effectively denying access to vital preventive care services, including wellness exams, cancer screenings, STI testing and treatment, and contraception to many patients. Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Utah have all recently attempted to do this, despite warnings from the Department of Health and Human Services that doing so likely violates federal law by illegally restricting beneficiaries' access to services. As defunding efforts in Texas and Indiana have demonstrated, eliminating Planned Parenthood as an option for those enrolled in public health care programs would leave a serious void that could simply not be filled by other health care providers.

H.R. 3495 would give these states and others that share this anti-women's health agenda broad discretion to exclude any person, institution, agency or entity that “performs or participates in the performance of abortions” from participating in Medicaid. Not only would this mean that all such women's health providers could be cut out of the Medicaid program under this provision, but states could also attempt to use it to eliminate a wide range of other health care providers, with serious consequences for low-income patients. For example, a hospital that provides emergency abortions to stabilize a woman's health, as required under federal law would be barred from Medicaid under H.R. 3495, leaving Medicaid patients without access to any care at that hospital. Simply put, this bill is extreme and would have a devastating impact on access to care.

The ACLU opposes H.R. 3495 and urges all members of the House of Representatives to vote “No.” Should you have any questions, please contact Georgeanne Usova.

Sincerely,

KARIN JOHANSON,
Director.
GEORGEANNE M. USOVA,
Legislative Counsel.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR
THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
Washington, DC, September 29, 2015.
Re: NAACP Strong Opposition to H.R. 3495, a
Bill to Prohibit Federal Funding to Pro-
viders of Abortions, Including Planned
Parenthood Federation of America.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the NAACP, our nation's oldest, largest and most widely-recognized grassroots-based civil rights organization, I strongly urge you to oppose and vote against H.R. 3495, which would eliminate all federal funding to any agency which provides abortions to women, including Planned Parenthood and its affiliates nation-wide. To ban all federal funding for Planned Parenthood and similar organizations would result in the elimination of a myriad of crucial and affordable health care services; for many in the communities we serve and represent, Planned Parenthood clinics represent the only health care services available. Furthermore, since a prohibition on federal funding for abortions is already in place, there is no justification for this reckless initiative.

The NAACP policy agenda has never taken a position on abortions, neither in opposition nor support. We are, however, very cognizant and very appreciative of the wide range of health care services offered to the communities we serve and represent by Planned Parenthood and its affiliates. The latest estimates indicate that Planned Parenthood serves over five million clients a year, and that 75% of their clients have incomes at or below 150 percent of the federal poverty level. Services provided at locations include screening for breast, cervical and testicular cancers; contraceptives; pregnancy testing and pregnancy options counseling; testing and treatment for sexually transmitted diseases; comprehensive sexuality education, menopause treatments; and vasectomies and tubal ligations. For many of Planned Parenthood's patients, the annual exams received at their facilities are the only access to health care they have.

Thank you in advance for your attention to the position of the NAACP; H.R. 3495 is extreme and should be opposed.

Sincerely,

HILARY O. SHELTON,
*Director, NAACP Washington
Bureau & Senior Vice President
for Advocacy and Policy.*

Mr. HASTINGS. The American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists stated that the bill falls far short of any standard Federal health legislation policy, and insisted that "it would serve only to scare providers away from providing comprehensive, compassionate care to women, and leave women without the care they need." Moreover, the group maintains this bill would prevent OB/GYNs from participating in the Medicaid program.

The reality is over 90 percent of the services of Planned Parenthood and similar organizations are preventative in nature, including cancer screenings, testing for sexually transmitted infections, and family planning services.

Medicaid beneficiaries already have limited access to doctors, and this bill will only restrict access for the poorest individuals in our society.

I said last night in the Rules Committee that wealthy women in our society don't have the problem of finding the doctor of their choice. Under this particular measure, poor women will be further restricted from having the ac-

cess to a physician of their choice as a Medicaid provider.

Knowing this, the title of the bill, the Women's Public Health and Safety Act, is as ironic as it is patronizing. H.R. 3495 will punish the most vulnerable Americans and will prevent women from accessing the care that keeps them safe and healthy.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have heard the question, Why haven't you done this before? Unfortunately, the full depths to which abortion providers have sunk was not previously public knowledge. The recent release of a number of hidden camera videos exposing the painful dismemberment of unborn children to facilitate the sale of their body parts by Planned Parenthood has provided clear evidence that truly repugnant activities are rampant in the abortion industry and that taxpayer support should never be provided to organizations that participate in the trade of human tissue.

One key Planned Parenthood abortionist even said: "We've been very good at getting heart, lung, liver, because we know that, so I'm not gonna crush that part, I'm gonna basically crush below, I'm gonna to crush above, and I'm gonna see if I can get it all intact."

In these days of 3-D ultrasounds and high-definition screens, it is impossible to hide the humanity of these child victims. They have fingers and toes, heartbeats, and organs developed enough that tissue collectors will pay \$60 a specimen for them.

In light of the serious questions raised by these videos, the House Committees on Energy and Commerce, Judiciary, and Oversight and Government Reform have each launched investigations.

While Planned Parenthood does not receive direct Federal funding for abortions, these investigations are warranted, as a recent report from the Government Accountability Office shows that the organization receives an average of 500 million taxpayer dollars each year for other lines of business. Money is fungible, and the Federal funds that Planned Parenthood receives ultimately subsidize their abortion services.

Mr. Speaker, that is why today's legislation is so important. In light of the atrocities uncovered in abortion facilities across the country, it is vital that States be empowered to choose to withhold Medicaid funds from flowing to abortion providers that deliberately dismember unborn children to receive compensation for their organs and other body parts.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), my good friend.

□ 1245

Ms. MATSUI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3495. This bill is misleadingly named the Women's Public Health and Safety Act when, in fact, it puts women's and men's health at risk.

This bill would allow States to block Planned Parenthood or any other health provider from Medicaid based on "involvement in abortions." Now, millions of American women and men depend on Planned Parenthood for essential health care.

The majority seems determined to take our Nation's healthcare system backwards. Planned Parenthood uses Medicaid funding to provide services like cancer screening, access to contraception, and pre-conception counseling that helps women prepare for healthy pregnancies.

Members of Congress should stop attacking women's ability to control their own health care. This bill disproportionately impacts low-income women and families and unfairly takes away one of their healthcare options.

Congress needs to get back to doing our job and stop this attack on women's health.

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

For those who complain that this bill isn't properly named, let us not forget that at least half of the unborn children who are victims of abortion are female who would grow up to be women. Far too many supporters of abortion on demand ignore that reality and the fact that many abortions are sex-selection abortions.

Until they confront that, how can they parse bill titles, particularly those that protect all existing funding for women's health, while ensuring women and their children are not party to the sale of tiny hearts and organs for compensation?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my colleague from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS).

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill very simply allows States to be partners in the Medicaid program. The Medicaid program is a partnership between the Federal Government and the States, except too often Washington tells the States exactly what they have to do.

This is one of those examples because this is not theoretical. There are two States that have attempted to defund with their use of taxpayer dollars in their States—these are not Federal tax dollars. They don't want their State's taxpayers dollars to fund Planned Parenthood. Instead, they want to fund other women's health services. They should be allowed to do that.

Why should the Secretary of Health and Human Services demand that one particular institution get funds?

Let's talk about that institution. The gentleman from Florida says, oh, this is going to deny women health care.

Let me tell you who is denying women health care in my district, in rural Lower Eastern Shore. We had a Planned Parenthood in Salisbury. They closed up in April. On their Web site, they said: The center in Easton will be open Monday through Friday. You can just get your care there, our Planned Parenthood Center, which is about 45 minutes up the road.

Mr. Speaker, just go on your tablet device and see what the hours at the Easton Planned Parenthood are that are supposed to develop this wonderful comprehensive health care to women in my district.

Now, if you want to go today, you are out of luck. They are closed. Now, if you went yesterday, they were open for 7 hours, from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. That is nice. I guess they are bankers' hours. I guess we just assume that everybody is going to get their health care between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m. So Monday they are open from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Tuesday they are closed.

Mr. Speaker, if one of the women in my Lower Shore want to go on Wednesday, they are out of luck. They are closed. If they want to go on Thursday, they are in luck. They are open for 7½ hours, from 11 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. But if they want to go on Friday, Saturday, or Sunday, they are out of luck because Planned Parenthood is closed. They are not delivering comprehensive services those days.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, as we know, Planned Parenthood doesn't deliver comprehensive women's health services. One of the most important services that you can deliver to a woman of child-bearing age is mammograms.

Not a single Planned Parenthood facility in this entire country has a mammography machine. Now, how do you deliver a mammogram without a mammography machine?

Mr. Speaker, it is an untruth. Planned Parenthood doesn't do comprehensive cancer screening. Because one of the most important screening techniques is mammography, and none of them can deliver it.

Let's contrast what the woman who is seeking comprehensive women's health care on the Lower Eastern Shore in Maryland—what her alternative is, because the gentleman from Florida mentions that our Medicaid patients won't be able to be seen if we pass this bill.

The alternative is our Federally qualified health center, our community health center, called Three Lower Counties. Now, if you go to Three Lower Counties today, you are actually in luck because they are open from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. and they have a mammography machine as well as the entire range of comprehensive services, with one exception. They don't do abortions. But, then again, the other Planned Parenthoods on the Eastern Shore of Maryland don't do it either.

So, in fact, if a woman who is on Medicaid really wants access to comprehensive health care in my district,

they have got to go past Planned Parenthood unless—well, that is not true.

I guess, if Monday and Thursday they want their health care, they can go to Planned Parenthood. Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday, Saturday, they can't.

But they could go to one of those at my community health center. In fact, nationwide there are only a little over 500 Planned Parenthood facilities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. FOXX. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HARRIS. There are 13,000 community health centers, each of which has to have radiology facilities. That is how you get the Federal money.

So, in fact, if we really want to let our States, by their choice—we are not forcing States. We are not saying that a State can't fund Planned Parenthood.

Look, I come from the State of Maryland. We will probably choose to do it.

But a State that chooses not to should be given the option to tell their women: If you really want it, really want comprehensive care, well, go to one of the community health centers. That is all this bill does.

This doesn't limit care. This expands care because this tells women: You don't have to go to the Monday-and Thursday-only clinic that can't give you a mammogram. You can actually go get comprehensive care somewhere else, even if you are on Medicaid.

My biggest objection—and the gentleman from North Carolina hit it on the head—is look at what else Planned Parenthood does. They actually—and, as a physician, I find this unbelievable.

They will change the abortion technique in order to better harvest the fetal tissue that they can then sell. That should be so morally objectionable that we should allow States to limit that funding.

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

I would just like to indicate to my friend from Maryland that, while there are 13,000 community health centers, many of them are overcrowded to begin with and can't provide even the daytime that you mentioned in Salisbury, all the services for various communities.

But, more important, you are correct. Planned Parenthood does not do mammograms. But they did in the last year 500,000 breast screenings. I could offer up anecdotal information that allows—you can go downstairs right here to the House physician. The House physician doesn't provide all of the services, but refers you out to GW or to Walter Reed Bethesda.

So referring out those women, if I were to pull up the anecdotal information of the number of women that did ultimately learn that they had problems, those statistics justify the continuation of this organization that provides compassionate services to women.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. Just 10 days ago the House took a vote to attack women's health. At that time, I said it felt like *deja vu*.

Now I am starting to wonder if this is the only issue that my colleagues care about.

Have we taken a vote to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank? No.

Have we taken a vote to extend the Land and Water Conservation Fund? No.

Have we taken a single vote this year to fix our broken immigration system? No.

Yet, somehow we found time to take vote after vote restricting women's access to care. It is reprehensible.

The bill we are considering today is one of the worst yet. It is a dangerous and unprecedented assault on women and their healthcare providers, and it does nothing to address the real issues that Americans are facing.

Mr. Speaker, voters didn't send us here to intimidate their doctors and interfere in their private medical decisions.

It is time for Congress to stop wasting time and get to work. I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3611, a long-term reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, to discuss our proposal, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend from Washington (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida.

I rise to oppose the demand for the previous question so that we might, in fact, take up the issue of a long-term reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

Something has changed. This is no longer an abstract philosophical conversation. This is a real, manifest, concrete conversation in which people are losing their livelihoods.

I stood here last week and reported that not one, but two, satellite sales were likely lost. A subsequent announcement by Boeing to lay off workers in El Segundo, California, is not abstract.

I referred to General Electric announcing that it was laying off 500 people as a result of the failure of this

body to do what it has done every chance it had under every President for 81 years, almost always unanimously.

This is no longer an abstraction. People are losing their livelihoods, and it will continue. It continued yesterday. General Electric announced another 350 jobs lost. They are moving them from Wisconsin to Canada.

This is not an abstraction. This is not some ideological tug of war. You are taking away people's jobs.

And, by the way, last week, when GE announced its first layoff of 500, the spokesman for the majority party said it was immaterial. They dismissed it. Well, if you opened up that envelope and found a pink slip, you wouldn't think it was immaterial.

Last week I revealed a dirty little secret. I shared with you that the Boeing aircraft company, the largest exporter in the United States of America, the heart of our manufacturing base, didn't make airplanes. They don't. They design and assemble them. They assemble them with parts made mostly in America.

Now, here is today's dirty little secret: domestic content. The Export-Import Bank requires anything it finances to be made out of 85 percent domestic content. Made in America, 85 percent.

Now, our largest exporter, in good times, finances about 1 in 5 of its sales through the Ex-Im. But it is counter-cyclical. In bad times, it is up to 40 percent, as a consequence of that material amount that is sold. And, by the way, 70 percent of its sales are international. They make all their airplanes with a minimum of 85 percent domestic content.

People, stop and think. If you do away with the Ex-Im, you do away with the 85 percent domestic content requirement.

Boeing wants to make airplanes in America with 85 percent domestic content.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HECK of Washington. I know this because 2 years ago there was a coalition formed to lobby to reduce the domestic content. Boeing left the coalition because they want to make airplanes in America. If you do away with Ex-Im, you do away with the domestic content requirement.

Six to 8,000 of the 15,000 businesses in Boeing's supply chain are small businesses. They are small businesses. You are holding a gun to the head of America's number one exporter and forcing them—forcing them—by virtue of competitive disadvantage to look at and consider outsourcing.

More pink slips. More people losing their livelihood. This is no longer an abstraction. You are taking away people's livelihoods.

Yes, it is unilateral disarmament. Every other developed country on the face of the planet has an export credit

authority, every other one, except us now.

In God's name, defeat the previous question.

□ 1300

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are talking about the Ex-Im Bank because they know when they talk about protecting organizations that sell babies' hearts and lungs, they are losing.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in the minority also claim that women would no longer have access to healthcare services. It is important to remember that this bill merely stops the Obama administration's current practice of using Medicaid to force States into including abortionists in their provider network. Each State can take its specific needs into consideration when determining what, if any, action to take under this bill. Claims that 13,000 federally qualified and rural health centers aren't sufficient fail to reflect the fact that community health centers have grown significantly since 2010.

According to HRSA data, health centers have grown so much that, in the years since 2010, they have acquired 3.4 million more patients, 1.9 million of whom are women. And as our colleague from Maryland pointed out, they are often open more days and more hours than Planned Parenthood clinics are. They are providing better and more comprehensive services to women.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), my very good friend who is the ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services and a real champion on both these issues that we are discussing here today.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the previous question so that this House may finally get on with the important work of supporting American jobs by reauthorizing the charter of the Export-Import Bank.

My friends on the opposite side of the aisle claim that they support business. They claim they support small business. They claim that this is something that is not paid enough attention to. Yet when we have the opportunity to support the Ex-Im Bank, what do they do? They turn it into a political question because they want to use it to divide.

Let me tell you some facts about the Ex-Im Bank.

The Ex-Im Bank supported \$27.4 billion of U.S. exports at no cost to American taxpayers; 164,000 American jobs were supported. Nearly 90 percent of Ex-Im Bank transactions directly supported small businesses. There was a \$675 million surplus generated for American taxpayers in funding year 2014 alone.

Ex-Im Bank's mission is American jobs. By financing the export of American goods and services, Ex-Im Bank has supported \$1.3 million private sector, American jobs since 2009, supporting, again, 164,000 jobs in funding year 2014 alone.

So, Mr. Speaker and Members, every day that this Republican-led House refuses to act is another day that American workers suffer the consequences.

It has been 3 months now since Republicans shut down our Nation's export credit agency, a vital financing tool that enables U.S. companies both large and small to compete for sales in the global marketplace, and businesses and their workers are feeling the pain.

The stories that we have received from across the Nation make the unfortunate consequences of the House Republicans' shutdown of the Ex-Im Bank distressingly clear. In describing the impact of the Ex-Im shutdown, the chief financial officer of Chief Industries, Incorporated, a Nebraska company that sells grain bins and elevators, said: "We've lost business. That's the easiest way to put it. We can't get that business back."

In my home State of California, the president of Combustion Associates, Incorporated, a power plant manufacturer, said that the shutdown of the Ex-Im Bank has put her small, woman- and minority-owned company at a "real disadvantage," saying that, as a result of fierce competition from Chinese and European firms: "If we don't get Ex-Im back soon, there's a very good chance we will lose three pending contracts to one of our competitors."

In describing the devastating consequence of losing the support of the Ex-Im Bank, the owner of U.S. International Trading Corporation, based in Nevada, said that the ideologically charged debate surrounding the reauthorization "is like being stabbed in the back by people who should be defending you."

Steve Wilburn, a long-time Republican and former marine, who owns a renewable fuels company in Arizona that lost a major Philippines green energy project due to the uncertainty over Ex-Im's future, recently remarked: "I never thought the day would come when the Republican Party would somehow view a small business like mine as crony capitalism."

While these small businesses and many like them are unable to successfully compete internationally without the support of the Ex-Im Bank, some of our Nation's largest manufacturers are losing contracts as well, with significant negative downstream consequences for the small business suppliers that make up their vast U.S. supply chains.

Making matters worse, in recent weeks, large companies, including GE and Boeing, have announced that the lack of export credit financing from the Ex-Im Bank has forced those companies to move some of their manufacturing operations abroad, where export credit financing is readily available.

Mr. Speaker, we should be ashamed of this. We should be doing everything we can to grow jobs in this country and give U.S. businesses the tools they need to succeed.

I have said it before and will say it again, a majority of this House supports reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank; and if we don't give Members the opportunity to vote up or down on re-opening the Bank's doors today, the self-inflicted shutdown of the Ex-Im Bank will continue to hurt workers and our economy. It is time to recognize the realities of the extremely competitive international marketplace that businesses must compete in.

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

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I don't know what they are afraid of. They like shutting things down.

You are going to shut down something in this country that is going to cause us to lose jobs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members of the House.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I repeat, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are talking about the Ex-Im Bank because they know that when they talk about protecting organizations that sell babies' hearts and lungs, they are losing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, we have known for some time that Planned Parenthood is the largest provider of abortions in this country. What we did not know until recently was just how vile and disgusting the nature of this organization truly is.

I rise today in support of H.R. 3495 because I believe States have the right to refuse funding to an organization that profits from the sale of aborted children's organs. Medicaid and CMS should not be allowed to force States to fund these horrific practices against the States' wishes.

The advancement of women's health should always remain a top priority for our healthcare community. However, we can achieve this goal without requiring States to provide access to institutions like Planned Parenthood.

Taxpayer dollars should not be going to the killing of unborn babies. Taxpayer dollars should not go to organizations like Planned Parenthood that support the practice of abortion and trafficking of aborted fetal tissue.

Taxpayer funds should go toward investigating and prosecuting the individuals that are responsible for trafficking in the selling of fetal tissue. Taxpayer funds should go toward the advancement of women's health.

I encourage my colleagues to support this bill, but we cannot stop here.

In addition to cutting off funding, the perpetrators behind these heinous crimes should be prosecuted to the full extent of the law. These disgusting acts are on par with those committed by the sickest of criminals behind bars, and that is exactly where the people who did this belong.

I urge my colleagues to support precious, innocent lives of the unborn.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from North Carolina says that we are discussing the Export-Import Bank because we are losing, as she put it, on the subject that is the base bill here today. We are not losing. This bill will pass the House of Representatives, and it will go nowhere. Why we are discussing the Ex-Im Bank is because we need American businesses to win.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), my classmate, who is a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly oppose this rule and support the motion to defeat the previous question.

Instead of bringing a bill to the floor that will go nowhere, we should, instead, be letting the House work its will; and we should be voting to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. Reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank is an economic imperative.

While some of my colleagues celebrate their misguided, ideologically driven agenda, hardworking Americans are losing their jobs, and American businesses and exporters are being outgunned by larger export credit agencies which are more than willing to provide financing to America's foreign competitors.

The Bank is an unbridled, market-driven success story which has broad bipartisan support in both Houses of this Congress as well as support from the majority of Americans. The Bank supports hundreds of thousands of good-paying jobs in this country.

If we fail to act now, we are shutting off a lifeline for many of our small businesses and exporters. In my congressional district alone, the Bank has supported thousands of small business and manufacturing jobs. These are good jobs in a very high-need area in Texas that would not have been possible without the Bank. These jobs are now in danger.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my GOP colleagues to let common sense regain a foothold in this House. We have the votes. Let Congress work its will and allow a vote on the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to how I began my remarks today, and that is to say that the measure before us has not gone through regular order in the House of Representatives. There

were no hearings, no markup. It just showed up in the rules for us. And somehow or another, that seems to be a pattern that is developing around here, where we are not legislating, we are rulemaking. In the final analysis, many Members and their constituents are being shut out.

Mr. Speaker, the decision to have an abortion is obviously a very, very difficult decision for a woman, and it is one that must be made, in my judgment—and my colleague from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) always says that it is not the Oversight Committee's—which is hearing right now, as we speak, from Planned Parenthood providers—or the Energy and Commerce Committee's decision for a woman's right to choose. The freedom of choice measure, since 1960, has been a part of Medicaid in this country, and now we would tear that fabric and divide this country with an issue that the only committee that should be in charge is the committee formed by a woman, her doctor, and God.

□ 1315

There is no place for the ideological whims of politicians in that determination. I said last night I know where this is headed. I have seen it now for 22 years. What the ultimate objective is is not this legislation today or the legislation that we considered 2 weeks ago or legislation like this that they have considered. For 22 years that I have been here, it has been headed toward trying to reverse *Roe v. Wade*.

Like it or not, the Supreme Court's ruling in *Roe v. Wade* conferred upon women the right to do with their own bodies what they determine best until the point of viability. It is unfathomable to me and countless others around this country and the world that we continue to entertain attacks on poor women's health to satisfy the extreme political agenda of a few in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle often articulate their support for measures such as the one we are considering today by insisting that it is our duty to protect the most vulnerable in society. To those individuals I ask: How does eliminating critical health services to our country's most poor and preventing those same individuals from being able to see the doctors of their choice that they know and trust help them to accomplish this worthwhile goal?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question and against this rule and the underlying bill. I want to ask us to get back to regular order and let us get into legislating.

No, my colleague from North Carolina, we are not losing. We asked on the Export-Import measure to allow for American businesses to win. Everybody here knows that this legislation, once it passes the House of Representatives, is going to get lost in that nowhere forest. I said last night, and I listened to

my granddaughter saying, "Let It Go." The words are different to this particular situation today, but the title of the song should be heard as a mantra by the Republican Party on the subject of the rights of women and their choice. They should just let it go.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

My colleagues continue to hold up regular order as an excuse for their unwillingness to stop the flow of taxpayer dollars to organizations that dismember children. Thankfully, there are committee hearings being held on this issue even now that will continue to expose the wrongs of the abortion industry. Here today, though, we take the simple step of stopping funding to organizations that sell children's body parts.

My colleague's newfound affection for regular order is a poor objection to the passage of this legislation to protect women and children from being parties to trafficking in human tissue. It is not extreme to want to protect the most vulnerable, the unborn, from having their body parts being sold and the use of taxpayer dollars to aid such enterprises.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard today about outrageous activities that are ongoing in the abortion industry as it takes apart tiny babies with beating hearts and cute little fingers and toes. It is truly saddening that the reaction in this Chamber isn't unanimous agreement that the clinics where this has occurred be closed and those responsible be sanctioned for their reprehensible actions. We haven't even been able to come to agreement with those on the other side that Federal grants to these organizations from the Department of Health and Human Services stop immediately.

Now we try again to find common ground. Today, the legislation before us would take the small but vital step of allowing those States that choose, and only those States, to stop funding abortion providers through Medicaid. This legislation wouldn't tell New York or Massachusetts or California that they can't give their taxpayer dollars to an organization that sells body parts. It would, however, enable Louisiana, Alabama, Arkansas, or Indiana to do so.

The principle of federalism, that Americans are free to come together with others in their community and establish the principles by which they will govern themselves, is a bedrock for our Nation. Even if opponents of this legislation have become callous to the unheard cries of unborn children dismembered for compensation, they should rally to the cause of federalism in order to allow their own communities to exercise the freedom it protects.

What a sad day it is when we can no longer even unite around our founding principles, one of which was that life is

the first unalienable right. When we ignore the need to protect that right for the smallest of our brothers and sisters, we should not be surprised by the erosion of our other rights, including the right to self-governance prohibited by federalism.

The exposure of the ongoing tragedy of crushed young lives must spur us to unite to stop this imposition of Federal power on States and their citizens and restore to them the choice of protecting children from being sold as organ donors before even taking their first breath. This is what H.R. 3495, the Women's Public Health and Safety Act, would accomplish, and I commend it and this rule providing for its consideration to my colleagues for their support.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 444 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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 bill (H.R. 3611) to reauthorize and reform the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3611.

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 de-

mand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

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

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon 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. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS. 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 of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 182, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 521]

YEAS—243

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

NAYS—182

Adams Boyle, Brendan
Aguilar F.
Ashford Brady (PA)
Bass Brown (FL)
Beatty Brownley (CA)
Becerra Bustos
Bera Butterfield
Beyer Capps
Bishop (GA) Capuano
Blumenauer Cardenas
Bonamici Carney
Carson (IN) Connolly

Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Lee
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Ellison
Hudson
Kelly (IL)

NOT VOTING—9

Larson (CT)
McDermott
Payne

□ 1349

Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. BASS, and Mr. NORCROSS changed their votes from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. FINCHER changed his 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. HASTINGS. 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 242, noes 183, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 522]

AYES—242

Abraham Barton Blum
Aderholt Benishek Bost
Allen Billirakis Boustany
Amodei Bishop (MI) Brady (TX)
Babin Bishop (UT) Brat
Barletta Black Bridenstine
Barr Blackburn Brooks (AL)

Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding

NOES—183

Adams Carson (IN)
Aguilar Cartwright
Amash Castor (FL)
Ashford Castro (TX)
Bass Chu, Judy
Beatty Cicilline
Becerra Clark (MA)
Bera Clarke (NY)
Beyer Clay
Bishop (GA) Cleaver
Blumenauer Clyburn
Bonamici Cohen
Boyle, Brendan Connolly
F.
Brady (PA) Cooper
Brown (FL) Costa
Brownley (CA) Courtney
Bustos Crowley
Butterfield Cuellar
Capps Cummings
Capuano Davis (CA)
Cárdenas Davis, Danny
Carney DeFazio

Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scallise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

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

NOT VOTING—9

Frelinghuysen	Larson (CT)	Reichert
Hudson	McDermott	Sanchez, Loretta
Kelly (IL)	Payne	Smith (TX)

□ 1357

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, September 29th I missed two votes on Ordering the Previous Question and House Resolution 444. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

□ 1400

WOMEN'S PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 444, I call up the bill (H.R. 3495) to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow for greater State flexibility with respect to excluding providers who are involved in abortions, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WAGNER). Pursuant to House Resolution 444, the amendment printed in House Report 114-269, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 3495

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 "Women's Public Health and Safety Act".

SEC. 2. INCREASING STATE FLEXIBILITY IN DETERMINING PARTICIPATION OF PROVIDERS WHO PERFORM, OR PARTICIPATE IN THE PERFORMANCE OF, ABORTIONS.

Section 1902 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a.) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(23), by striking "subsection (g)" and inserting "subsection (g), subsection (11)."; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(11) RULES WITH RESPECT TO DETERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION OF PROVIDERS WHO PERFORM, OR PARTICIPATE IN THE PERFORMANCE OF, ABORTIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning October 1, 2015, subject to paragraph (2), for purposes of this title, a State, at its option, may establish criteria with respect to the participation under the State plan (or under a waiver of the plan) of an institution, agency, entity, or person who performs, or participates in the performance of, abortions.

"(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to an abortion—

"(A) if the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest; or

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

"(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms 'institution', 'agency', or 'entity' mean the entire legal institution, agency, or entity, or any part thereof, including any institution, agency, or entity that controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with such institution, agency, or entity."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 3495.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3495, the Women's Public Health and Safety Act. This bill, at its core, is about choice as well as protecting the lives of millions of unborn babies across America.

H.R. 3495 would empower States with flexibility to include or not include in their Medicaid program providers who perform or assist in the performance of elective abortions.

The Hyde amendment already makes sure that Federal Medicaid dollars do not pay for elective abortions. This bill would amend current law so that States would have the flexibility and discretion to work with qualified providers of their choice.

This bill also means States would be able to remove the largest abortion

chain from being the recipient of millions of dollars of State and Federal funds, which are allocated within their States.

Planned Parenthood has received about \$1.2 billion through Medicaid over a 3-year period, and States who wish to eliminate Planned Parenthood from this funding stream are being blocked from doing so.

All Medicaid providers ought to be held responsible for their actions. However, the current administration is interpreting current law to protect the interests of political elites over the health care of those truly in need. States should be able to work with providers who prioritize and respect life and exclude organizations whose business model is built around the destruction of life.

Planned Parenthood is the Nation's largest abortion chain, doing over 327,653 abortions in the last reported year. That comes out to an average of 898 abortions per day every day, 37 abortions every hour, 3 abortions every 5 minutes, more than 1 abortion every 2 minutes.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, the new fiscal year starts in less than 36 hours, and Congress has still not passed the annual appropriations bills. If we don't do it, the government will shut down. During the last shutdown, we lost \$24 billion and 120,000 private sector jobs. I am sure we could expect just the same now.

The debt ceiling will need to be raised within the next couple months, Madam Speaker, and many Republicans are already threatening to refuse to perform even that basic task. This would throw the international economy into chaos. It would cause the loss of tens of thousands more jobs in the United States.

Of course, the Ex-Im Bank expired in June, and our business communities are clamoring for reauthorization. Why? Well, last year the Ex-Im Bank financed deals that supported 164,000 American jobs.

I would suggest, Madam Speaker, that the U.S. House should spend this week figuring out how to avoid a political and financial catastrophe rather than once again passing a blatantly political bill stripping women of their basic healthcare rights. This latest attack targets both the women who need to see a doctor or healthcare provider as well as the providers themselves.

I wonder if the people on the other side of the aisle actually read this bill on the floor today because it is so broadly written that it would target any medical provider—doctor, hospital, clinic, you name it—that has even the most tenuous connection to the provision of a full range of women's healthcare services.