

voiceless, and I kneel in submission to the author of life and ask for His blessings on this country and this initiative.

HONORING PALM SPRINGS POLICE OFFICERS JOSE VEGA AND LESLEY ZEREBNY

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the lives of Palm Springs Police Officers Jose "Gil" Vega and Lesley Zerebny, who were tragically shot and killed 1 year ago in the line of duty.

Officer Vega lived by the mantra of "To Serve and Protect." He served our community for nearly 35 years and was just 2 months away from retirement when he was taken from his family and our community.

Officer Lesley Zerebny had recently returned to work following the birth of her daughter, Cora. Now a year old, Cora will never hold her mother. Lesley's community will always remember her as a fighter and a protector.

This weekend, the entire Coachella Valley community will honor their memory by dedicating a 4-mile stretch of Highway 111 in their honor. I am proud of our community for supporting the Vega and Zerebny families. Let's come together to ensure they have what they need to mourn, recover, and prosper.

Officers Vega, Zerebny, and family: We honor you for your sacrifice, and we are grateful for your service. Officer Vega and Officer Zerebny, end of watch, October 8, 2016.

IN SUPPORT OF TAX REFORM

(Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of H. Con. Res. 71. It has been said frequently that our Federal Tax Code today is more than 60 times longer than the Bible, and it contains none of the good news.

It has been more than 30 years since we updated our tax system, and many Americans are struggling to make ends meet, to find decent paying jobs and prepare for retirement.

No matter where I travel in my district, Mr. Speaker, Louisiana's Fourth District, I hear story after story about how our excessive Tax Code and burdensome regulations continue to hinder our businesses and stunt our economic growth.

Congress must act now and deliver a Tax Code that meets the current demands of the 21st century economy.

Fortunately, my Republican colleagues and I have put forth a framework to do exactly that. Our plan will create more jobs, fairer taxes, and bigger paychecks for working class Americans and small businesses.

When the people are allowed to keep more of their hard-earned dollars instead of turning them over to an already bloated Federal Government, we will unleash the free market again.

It is well past time we get our economy back on track, and passing meaningful tax reform is a crucial first step in completing that mission.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO RICHARD THELEN

(Mr. BISHOP of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an incredible constituent in my district, Richard Thelen.

Seventy-two years ago, Mr. Thelen was aboard the USS *Indianapolis* with nearly 1,200 others when it was hit by two Japanese torpedoes and sank within a matter of minutes. He and 318 men of the crew survived 5 days in the ocean surrounded by sharks without any food or drinking water. He defied truly remarkable odds.

After this ordeal, Mr. Thelen went on to finish high school and was honorably discharged from the Navy. He was a truck driver for more than 40 years and raised six children. Today, he is 89 years young, and it is a privilege to have him as a part of the Eighth District community.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform this body that I am prepared to introduce legislation to honor Mr. Thelen of Lansing, Michigan, and the rest of his shipmates, with the Congressional Gold Medal award.

As we remember the survivors of this terrible tragedy, those we lost, and the recent finding of the ship itself, we thank you, Mr. Thelen, for your valiant service to our country.

□ 1230

COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS

(Mr. BARR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to act quickly to reauthorize the Community Health Center Fund, which expired last week on September 30.

Community health centers provide cost-effective and accessible primary care, mental health counseling, and substance abuse treatment for over 27 million patients nationally, including over 200,000 of my constituents in Kentucky's Sixth District.

The upfront Federal investment in community health centers leads to savings down the road by fighting the cycle of opioid addiction, preventing more complex health conditions, and diverting patients away from higher cost centers of care, such as the emergency room.

I have visited community health centers in my district, including White House Clinics, Sterling Health Solutions, Family Care of Bluegrass, and HealthFirst Bluegrass, and I have witnessed firsthand what a difference these organizations make in providing much needed care to at-risk Kentuckians.

Without the support of the Community Health Center Fund, these CHCs may soon be forced to cut back services, lay off staff, or even shut down clinics.

Mr. Speaker, admittedly, there is a robust debate in this country and a wide diversity of opinion about healthcare reform, the ACA, and what repeal and replacing the ACA should look like, but we should all agree that community health centers are part of the solution.

PROTECTING THE UNBORN

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my support to the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

This legislation is crucial toward protecting the most vulnerable among us: the unborn.

As a doctor, it is my job to stay current with the latest medical research, and I have done so in my job in Congress, too.

The research overwhelmingly shows that children 20 weeks or less are capable of showing pain. This is brought forth by the fact that when an in-utero procedure is done, both the mother and the unborn child are given anesthesia. Not to do so allows that child to recoil in pain and show a stress response in the uterus.

I have heard, personally, as a physician, heartbeats in babies as early as 6 weeks of age in utero.

So this legislation is critical, it is needed, it is past due, and I urge my colleagues to support this.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 36, PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 548 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 548

Resolved, That 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; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CHENEY. 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 Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 548, which provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

This important bill protects and extends compassion to the most vulnerable among us, the unborn, by prohibiting abortions, with limited exceptions, after the point at which scientific evidence shows that an unborn child can feel pain.

Mr. Speaker, this really should be called Micah's bill in honor of a little boy named Micah Pickering, who was here on the Hill last week with his mom. He was born at 20 weeks old. And we saw, and we see from babies like Micah, that with the right medical care, babies born at 20 weeks can survive and grow into healthy adults.

Micah's mother spoke last week about her experiences: "When Micah was born, his eyes were still fused shut. His bones were not hardened yet. He couldn't breathe on his own. He was medicated to stay comfortable from pain. We were told not to touch his skin, as his skin was so sensitive it could hurt him and tear the skin. I was there to see his first set of hiccups, his first sneezes, and his first drop of milk placed on his lips. His first smile, his first laugh. He was alive. He was fighting. He wanted to live."

Today, Mr. Speaker, Micah is a healthy 5-year-old boy.

Babies like Micah at 20 weeks have well developed brains and central nervous systems, developed enough so that medical evidence has increasingly confirmed these babies feel pain, and not only pain, but intense and possibly excruciating pain.

Research also indicates that, after 20 weeks, an unborn baby's responses to painful stimuli are similar to adult responses, to the extent that when surgeons, Mr. Speaker, are performing in-utero surgery, corrective procedures on these unborn children, surgeons have seen babies flinch, jerk, and recoil from those sharp objects and incisions.

In response to this, Mr. Speaker, surgeons routinely now administer anesthesia to unborn children in the womb before performing surgery. This anesthesia has been associated with a sig-

nificant increase in babies' stress hormone levels during medical procedures.

Mr. Speaker, late-term abortions, usually performed by inducing labor after the fetus has been injected with a lethal pharmacological agent or by the horrific practice of dismemberment, causing babies intense pain, should be illegal, and that is what this bill ensures.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this bill also takes important steps to protect women, providing exceptions for those cases of rape, and incest, and the life of the mother.

H.R. 36 also provides women with a cause of action, allowing them to sue abortionists who don't provide protection for aborted babies who are born alive.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act protects the sanctity of life by ensuring protection from pain for the most vulnerable among us.

Mr. Speaker, this is a moral obligation of this House and of our government. Therefore, I urge support for the rule to allow for consideration of H.R. 36.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, 44 years ago, the Supreme Court issued its landmark *Roe v. Wade* decision. It reaffirmed the constitutionally protected right of every woman to safe and legal healthcare, including the right to choose.

When life puts a woman in even the toughest of circumstances, the highest court in the land said the decision that she makes should be hers, free from any interference from the government.

Roe v. Wade is a firewall that women rely on, but with every passing year and every new session of Congress, politicians have tried to chip away at it brick by brick, hoping it will crumble away.

Most politicians are not medical professionals. We shouldn't be meddling in healthcare decisions that should be made between a woman, her doctor, her family, and anyone else that she chooses to include. The American people are tired of politicians who are not doctors, often playing one on television with this medical decision.

This is the only medical procedure that Congress has made an attempt to regulate, the only one, and it says quite plainly: We can't trust women to make a decision; we have to do it for them. The majority tries to direct this over and over again.

The medical professionals whom we should be listening to all oppose this ban. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists call it a part of a legislative agenda that is "not based on sound science" and that "attempts to prescribe how physicians should care for their patients."

That certainly speaks it loudly.

The American Medical Association said that it "strongly condemns any

interference by the government or other third parties that causes a physician to compromise his or her medical judgment as to what information or treatment is in the best interest of the patient."

Conservative political groups have also been pushing the bill to try to use it to run up the score in the next election. Why do they do it? Well, the main sponsor of this bill has admitted—and I hope everybody hears this; this is a Congressman from Arizona who sponsors this bill, who admitted the abortion bans are, in his words, good politics—"it will cost some people the election, but it will cost more Democrats the election than it will Republicans. I am convinced that in very few districts in America someone will lose because they voted" for this ban. "And if that is the case, maybe they need a different district anyway," whatever that means.

That makes it as plain as day, as far as I am concerned, as to why, year after year, for 40 years, we have been confronted with this.

It is abhorrent to me, and it should be to everyone here, that matters of personal conscience are being reduced to who is up and who is down in the polls.

This bill is dangerous, and it is unconstitutional. The Supreme Court established in *Roe v. Wade*, and reaffirmed in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, that a woman has the unequivocal right to choose abortion care. This is the Constitution of the United States that we all justly revere.

Meanwhile, every Federal court that has reached a decision on bans like this in States has blocked it every time. This includes rulings striking down bans in States like Arizona, Idaho, Arkansas, North Dakota.

Mr. Speaker, this bill before us is nothing more than the latest attempt by the majority to pass off political posturing as proven science.

Now, after birth, strangely, this body exhibits scarce attention to the well-being of the child, and that is proven by the fact that you cut back on food stamps; Women, Infants, and Children care; daycare; Head Start; one after the other, the same group that couldn't find it in their hearts last Friday to extend the Children's Health Insurance Program before it expired, along with community health services, which again helps children. More than 9 million children in America get their health insurance through the program that expired.

The majority did absolutely nothing after 20 children, 6-year-olds and 7-year-olds, were shot and killed at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut, 5 years ago. And funding, as I said, for both food stamps and the school lunch program is routinely cut.

I don't know anything else to call that but pure hypocrisy: We love it until it is born, and then it is somebody else's problem.

A 3-year-old girl in my district was recently killed by the adults she believed were supposed to take care of her. They abused her so violently that she was bruised from head to toe and was internally hurt. There were adults around, but not a single one helped her.

The Child Protective Services of Monroe County got two reports about abuse and neglect, but the agency was too overworked and stretched too thin to act in time, which is another hypocrisy: We are not going to fund those programs enough so that little children would live. Three years old, and nobody lifted a finger to help this child. They did nothing to save her life.

This is just some of the reality that children face today. All too often, this Congress does absolutely nothing to address it. To truly care about children is to care for them long after they are born.

Now, we have taken up this bill before, and it was a one-house bill, never able to pass the Senate, and I sincerely hope this bill sees that same fate.

When the American people went to the ballot box, they were electing politicians, not somebody to meddle around with their medical needs. It is simply appalling. Just remind yourself that the only procedure that we deal with is the fact of a woman's right to choose, which is protected by the Constitution of the United States. Enough already.

Mr. Speaker, the majority acts like a group of elected physicians. It has some. They are quiet. It is shameful.

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

□ 1245

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today not as an elected doctor, not as any elected thing except as a Member of Congress. But also I rise today as a father of a child who we were told before she was born that it would probably be best to kill her; that she had a disability, and it was probably best that there would be better choices for us to make in life than to not have her.

I rise today for Micah's bill simply for those that the statement has been made that once children are here, there are problems that are political choices and life circumstances. Those are things that we have to deal with and that we should actually look at, but those are only available for those who are lucky enough to have a birthday. This bill is really about a birthday. It is about giving the unborn a chance at life.

It is interesting to me today, Mr. Speaker, that many medical professionals who are against this bill also will choose to anesthetize those same babies in the womb because of their reaction to the procedure. They don't

want to talk about that. They want to talk about something else.

But I simply come back to saying that this bill is about life. And maybe, it is said, that this is something we are talking about, a procedure, but it is talking about life and it is talking about birthdays. It is talking about that life in that womb matters, and the potential from life until death is something that I believe God has given.

When we understand that, let's take it out of the realm of choosing a choice. We are standing here today and I am standing here today to take up for the rights of that baby in the womb and making sure that birthdays come, that life happens. When you look at someone like Micah and you understand that many people would have wrote them off as unviable, God had a different choice, and that is, today, that young boy that was on Capitol Hill last week.

But it doesn't take Micah for me. It just takes Jordan for me, my 25-year-old who just texted me just a few minutes ago to say: Daddy, I love you. Over 25 years ago someone told me and my wife that she was not worth having. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to stand for those still in the womb waiting for life.

Mrs. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise for Kerri from New Jersey. This is her story.

With the help of a fertility specialist, Kerri and her husband were thrilled to be expecting their first baby in January of 2016. All of Kerri's tests and scans were looking great until the 20-week ultrasound.

Kerri recounts: Our ultrasound tech spent a lot of time looking at her heart, and, finally, the doctor from maternal fetal medicine came in.

As she scanned, she told Kerri and her husband that there were some severe brain and heart abnormalities. The doctor also told them the chest cavity was small and that the lungs were not developing properly. A few days later, a geneticist told Kerri and her husband that the baby had three copies of every chromosome, a very rare condition. The doctor informed them that infants born with this condition very rarely survive more than a few days after delivery.

According to Kerri: We both calmly made the decision to have an abortion. We did not want our little girl to suffer. We would much rather take on that suffering for her.

On behalf of Kerri, New Jerseyans, and women everywhere, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule and vote "no" on H.R. 36.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to stand and support this

rule that will allow for the passage of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, which is also known as Micah's Law. The underlying legislation will protect thousands of unborn babies from the excruciating pain of abortion.

Twenty weeks post-fertilization is an incredible milestone in pregnancy for moms and their unborn babies. Children at this stage in development have fingers and toes, and they have well-developed neurological structures that can feel pain. In fact, babies at this age are hypersensitive, feeling pain more acutely than you and me.

Preemies, children born at the beginning of the sixth month, just like Micah, can survive outside the womb. These babies are the future doctors, nurses, scientists, teachers, law enforcement officers in our country.

H.R. 36 protects this next generation of America's children. Our country is unified in protecting life at 20 weeks. Six in ten Americans support the pain-capable legislation, and 20 States have passed similar legislation.

Let's put an end to the abortion of these potential children. Let's support this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak for April and against this unconstitutional underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, her story is about one of the most complex and painful decisions a woman can face, but it would have been even more painful if this bill that we are debating, which is opposed by the American Medical Association, was the law at the time.

Eighteen weeks into her pregnancy, she and her husband discovered that their baby had a birth defect, a lethal skeletal dysplasia, and was incompatible with life. The baby would never be able to breathe on its own. The baby would either die in utero or die immediately at birth. She was heartbroken. She went to other doctors for more tests. These tests took additional weeks. Tragically, the tests confirmed the diagnosis.

At 21 weeks, April had an abortion. With this bill, the Federal Government would compel every woman like April against their will to carry to term a fetus that they knew would either be stillborn or would suffer and die at birth.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this underlying bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members to heed the gavel.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 36, Micah's Law, which I proudly co-sponsored. It is said that nations are

judged by how we care for our weakest members. There are no more vulnerable than a preborn child, whom, unfortunately, we fail to protect.

The United States is one of only seven nations that allow elective abortions after 20 weeks of pregnancy, when science confirms that the babies feel pain. Accompanying us on this list are China and North Korea, nations with disturbing records of human rights violations.

Mr. Speaker, this is not simply about a medical procedure. It is about life. Micah Pickering was born at 22 weeks. He is now a happy, healthy kindergarten. There is a lot of talk around here about life. This bill is about life. It is not about being lucky enough to have a birthday. It is about giving every child the opportunity to grow, and we are responsible for them. We should take that action seriously.

I cosponsor the bill, I vote for the bill, and I urge everyone support Micah's Law.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise for my constituent, Allie, because we should not be playing politics in Congress with women's health choices and with the family decisionmaking rights of all Americans.

Last spring, Allie and her husband were thrilled to learn that she was pregnant with their second child. A few months later, they found themselves heartbroken in a doctor's office in order to terminate a pregnancy that they had so badly wanted.

Everything had gone smoothly until about 12 weeks, when a routine test returned with extremely abnormal results. Allie and her husband hoped for the best and waited several more weeks until they could perform an amnio.

Sadly, the results of the amnio were unbearable. They found that the fetus had grown from a compromised cell line. There were multiple genetic anomalies that would result if the pregnancy continued to term in a child with extraordinarily grave and untreatable physical, cognitive, and developmental problems.

The news was crushing and the decision was agonizing, but Allie knew the path forward for her family was clear. She would become part of the tiny group of women having abortions after 20 weeks, less than 2 percent of all abortions.

But Allie's story doesn't end with the decision that she and her husband made. Because she is a Federal employee, the Hyde amendment prevented her insurance from covering her abortion services. Fortunately, Maryland is a State where we respect women's choices, and Allie was able to go to a clinic and she paid \$900 out of pocket.

Allie recovered quickly from the procedure and she was able to get pregnant shortly thereafter. This summer, Allie and her husband were thrilled to welcome a beloved second child into their family.

Mr. Speaker, Allie has one thing to say to lawmakers here today: We made the choices that are best for our family, and I trust all women to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, an overwhelming majority of Americans—some 60 to 64 percent, according to pollsters—support legal protection for pain-capable unborn children at, at least, the 20th week, or about 5 months.

Today we know that unborn babies not only die, but suffer excruciating pain during dismemberment abortion, a cruelty that rips arms and legs off of a helpless child. Even Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy, the swing vote on the court in the Stenberg vs. Carhart decision said: "The fetus, in many cases, dies just as a human adult or child would. It bleeds to death as it is torn limb from limb."

He points out that, with a D&E dismemberment abortion, "the fetus can be alive at the beginning of the dismemberment process and can survive for a time while its limbs are being torn off."

Mr. Speaker, even if pain wasn't present, dismembering a child is violence against children, and it is inhumane. But these babies at this age actually suffer.

Dr. Robert White, a professor of neurology at Case Western Reserve University, has said: "An unborn child at 20 weeks is fully capable of experiencing pain. Without question, abortion is a dreadfully painful experience for that child."

Dr. Colleen Malloy, a professor at the Division of Neonatology at Northwestern, in her testimony before the House Judiciary Committee said: "When we speak of infants at 20 weeks post-fertilization, we no longer have to rely on inference or ultrasound imagery because such premature patients are kicking, moving, and reacting and developing right before our eyes in the neonatal intensive care unit."

Again, these children are there being assisted, and if you touch them, if you try to dismember them once they are born, they will feel the pain. In like manner, an unborn child at 20 weeks' gestation will feel the pain. She points out that she would never, ever commit such cruelty to a child.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this legislation, H.R. 36.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mr. Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding and for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, after what has happened in the last couple of days, this terrible tragedy in Las Vegas, this Congress should be spending every minute focusing on what we were sent here to

do: taking action to enact common-sense safety measures to reduce gun violence.

But what do we hear on that subject from the leadership on the Republican side?

Nothing. But what we get is yet another attack on the individual rights of women in this country to make decisions about their own healthcare, about their bodies, about themselves.

Those sorts of decisions should be made between a woman and her doctor. This has been confirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States. People in Washington, D.C., sitting in this Congress, should not be able to interfere in the private health decisions that women can only make for themselves.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE).

□ 1300

Mrs. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to send my love and prayers to the victims and the family members of those who were hurt in Nevada.

I would also like to plead to the American people today to be good to one another. We have enough people out there outside of our country trying to hurt us. We have enough natural disasters trying to tear down our homes and tear up our lives that we don't have to do that to each other.

I rise today as an American, as a wife, and mainly as a mother to address some of the double standards that we have in this country. As a member of the Select Panel on Infant Lives, I learned that Federal law increases criminal penalties for crimes involving pregnant women. These laws give protections to the mother and her unborn child—rightfully so.

However, this begs the question: When does the unborn have a right to protection just like their mother?

Obviously, this is an important issue.

Why is abortion not considered murder and killing a pregnant woman a double homicide?

Martin Luther King, Jr., said this about the civil rights movement: "The Negro cannot win as long as he is willing to sacrifice the lives of his children for comfort and safety." How can the dream survive if we murder our children?

Each human life should be protected under the rule of law. Each life that feels pain should be free from being tortured.

I cannot believe that we are here on the floor of the House, the people's House, continuing to plead and advocate for life. I am asking that we support H.R. 36 and help provide these protections for our unborn.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise for Dr. Jennifer and her patients. This is their story.

Dr. Jennifer's patients come from my home State of California. They were a married couple on their second pregnancy. They were so excited to grow their family. But they discovered, at 22 weeks, that the fetus was severely growth-restricted, had no fluid around it, had a cardiac anomaly, and would not survive the pregnancy. Although this was a wanted pregnancy, they chose to terminate the pregnancy at 23 weeks rather than prolong the suffering of the mother and her fetus.

Dr. Jennifer wants lawmakers to know that abortion restrictions would have forced her patient to carry this pregnancy until the fetus died in the womb, despite the medical advice that their baby would not survive to term. H.R. 36 and policies like it deny families their constitutional right to a choice about how they want to move forward with medical decisions that impact their bodies and their families.

On behalf of Dr. Jennifer and her patients, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 36. We must stop these bans.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, or Micah's Law, is of utmost importance. Not only does the bill recognize the common humanity and inherent rights that we share with the most vulnerable members of our society, it offers our Nation an opportunity to prevent excruciating pain for those same members, and it will stop a form of violence that has gone on for too long. This bill is a step forward in reversing a culture of violence and restoring a culture of life.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that passage of this legislation will save 2,750 children per year. That is 2,750 girls and boys who will have a chance to contribute to our society.

If you want to facilitate a culture of life, vote for this bill. If you want to begin to prevent violence in our country, vote for this bill. I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise for Jessica. This is her story.

Jessica's second pregnancy was difficult. At about 12 weeks, she discovered she was bleeding. After weeks of calls with midwives, visits to specialists, and numerous tests, it wasn't until 22 weeks, 5 days into her pregnancy when she was told the tragic news that her baby had a rare birth defect and would likely not survive through the two surgeries she would have needed. Jessica made the difficult, heartbreaking decision to end her pregnancy.

Under this bill, there would be nowhere for Jessica to turn. Jessica wants lawmakers to know, in her own

words: "I am so incredibly thankful that my daughter never had to suffer. . . . I am still grieving and I think I always will be. Having an abortion was the most compassionate choice I had available to me. My daughter deserved compassion."

A decision like Jessica's should be between the woman and her doctor, no one else. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 36. We must stop the bans.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

We come here today, of course, as Members of Congress, but as we look at what happened in our country the last several weeks, one of the things that has been lauded very much is first responders, those who are rushing to the scene to help people who have been affected, who are going through pain and suffering.

I would like you to consider today's legislation and the rule, as we are first responders. We stand for life. We stand for the ability, as a people, and there is no other nation in the world like the American people who respond when other people are in trouble, when they are suffering, when they are in pain, when their lives are in danger. And yet we turn a blind eye and a deaf ear to what we are doing to these children. These are little boys and little girls waiting to be born.

If we do not stand for them, who will stand for them?

If we are not the first responders, who will be the first responders?

If it is not us in the people's House who go beyond the hypocrisy of a political statement and go about the reason we are here—it is the people's House because we defend those people—let us be the first responders when it comes to pain and suffering. Let us pass this bill and stop this inhuman activity that we are doing.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, let's talk about pain here today.

Let's talk about Leslie and her husband, who found out that they were pregnant and were thrilled. Unfortunately, the pregnancy did not go well. Tests revealed that Leslie's fetus' brain never divided into two separate hemispheres, giving her child no chance for survival. Let's talk about pain.

By the time the test exposed this tragic news, Leslie was over 20 weeks pregnant, but she lived in a State without an abortion ban. Now she lives in Wisconsin, where abortions after 20 weeks are illegal. Had she lived there during this time, she would have been forced to deliver a baby and be pregnant for 20 more weeks, compounding the emotional horror of the experience. Let's talk about pain.

In Leslie's own words: "I still mourn my daughter every day, but I cannot

begin to understand how a position that would rather see me dead and neither of my sons ever born just to prolong a tragically doomed pregnancy can be called 'pro-life.'"

On behalf of Leslie, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 36. We must stop the bans and stop the pain.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think we should talk about pain on the floor today because, when you talk to physicians and OB/GYNs, they will tell you that, if they are doing work, if they are doing an amniocentesis, then that baby feels pain, that baby responds, that child in the womb.

So I would encourage my colleagues, talk to Dr. ROE, talk to some of the OB/GYNs who serve in this Chamber, because they fully understand, as we understand, that the gift of life is not something that comes through the law. That is a natural gift. That is a gift of God. And that child who is receiving that life, who is held in the womb, if they are poked or prodded or there is an uncomfortable situation, they experience pain. That is why this legislation is referred to as the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

I encourage support of this legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I remind the House that the House keeps the District of Columbia from spending its own funds for low-income women who want to end a pregnancy at even 1 week.

But today I rise for Christy Zink, a District of Columbia resident who was a mother of one, soon-to-be mother of two. However, at 21 weeks, an MRI detected a fetal anomaly regarding her unborn son's brain. A critical part of the brain of the fetus had simply not developed. She decided to end the pregnancy at almost 22 weeks.

On behalf of Christy Zink, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 36. We must stop the bans.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, which I was among one of the first cosponsors. God bless Representative TRENT FRANKS for his tireless leadership.

This is a commonsense, pro-life bill that prohibits late-term elective abortions on unborn babies after 20 weeks postfertilization. At this tender age, they can feel the excruciating pain of abortion.

America has always been a beacon for human rights. Yet, according to a 2014 report by the Charlotte Lozier Institute, the U.S. is among just seven countries that permit elective abortion

past 20 weeks. These countries include China and North Korea.

Our Nation suffers an egregious offense to be listed with North Korea and China, two oppressive regimes that show no respect for human life or human rights in allowing the killing of these precious babies as they endure these cruel abortions.

This bill is important, as we speak for those who cannot speak for themselves. As an engaged and active member of the Congressional Pro-Life Caucus, I fully support this bill, as I stand for life.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise for Rose from Michigan.

In Rose's first pregnancy, which was planned and very wanted, severe brain abnormalities were detected in the 22nd week. She made the decision, she said "I will take that risk," because the doctor said there was a 70 percent chance that the child would be able to function. But at 28 weeks, the doctor made an analysis that said a severe brain condition with a life expectancy under 4 years, with severe seizures and limited development.

We are talking about suffering now. The baby would have problems swallowing, breathing, even smiling. The baby would never be able to communicate or control her body. And today we are talking about suffering.

Rose made the choice between a short, painful life and peace. She chose the latter.

Rose says: "I believe we made the most compassionate and loving choice we could for our baby, but the grief was initially overwhelming."

On behalf of Rose, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 36. We must stop the bans.

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

I think that it is important to acknowledge the pain of the cases that those on the other side of the aisle are mentioning. But I would note, Mr. Speaker, that there has been no mention, no discussion on the other side of the aisle about the pain that these babies feel, and that when you are in a situation like the ones that have been described, what is happening is those babies are being subjected to really, oftentimes, a horrific procedure. The question is, because a baby is found to have some chromosomal anomaly, to have some very severe handicap, whether or not they deserve to be subjected to the pain we now know they feel.

□ 1315

In fact, Mr. Speaker, we have seen work done by Northwestern University that demonstrates that the pain that these young preemies feel may, in fact, be even worse than the pain that older babies feel, because the pain inhibitors develop later in life than the pain receptors do.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle not to ignore the challenges and the issues involved here with respect to the pain that these babies feel. I would also note, Mr. Speaker, that the CBO, in a very unusual step, has assessed that this bill itself would save 2,750 lives annually. That is something that the CBO doesn't often do, but it is very important for us to recognize.

I don't think we can have a discussion about this bill, about these issues, without acknowledging the pain that these babies feel, and I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to focus on that as well.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what my colleague is saying, but there is no scientific evidence or proof that an unborn fetus feels the pain. That is one of the reasons we are not discussing it over here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding. For over 40 years, the landmark Supreme Court decision, *Roe v. Wade*, has stood as a bulwark protection for women's reproductive rights and healthcare rights.

Now, in 2017, House Republicans are leading yet another unconstitutional, dangerous, and outright assault on women's health and privacy. This extreme bill not only takes aim at *Roe v. Wade* by lowering the ban on abortion to 20 weeks, it goes even further by promising to throw doctors in jail. This is a cynical, repugnant effort by Republicans to pander to a far-right base while jeopardizing women's health—all for a political payoff.

At the same time this House is considering a measure restricting a woman's right to choose, we have not found time to assist 3.5 million American citizens who are suffering and dying in Puerto Rico. You call that pro-life? I urge Republicans: listen to the majority of Americans who support a woman's right to privacy and a safe abortion. Reject this shameful bill.

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

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, that the scientific evidence is extensive in terms of the pain that these unborn babies feel. In particular, the standard of care, Mr. Speaker, for babies who are born prematurely, as well as for babies who are patients in vitro, is to provide anesthesia. And that standard of care is based upon evidence that these babies have pain receptors, that these babies react to pain, and that they feel pain.

Mr. Speaker, I think the notion that there is no scientific evidence for this is flat wrong. I don't think we can ignore the example of babies like Micah, babies who are born, babies who grow

up to lead very full and healthy lives and who deserve a chance.

Mr. Speaker, I think that as individuals and as Representatives, elected Representatives, it is our obligation, in fact, to do everything we can to protect these babies, and that is what this bill is about.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ), a doctor.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, like every physician, I took an oath to do no harm and make every decision in the best interest of my patients in the emergency department.

That oath drives every choice a doctor makes, whether it is prescribing medications, treating chronic illnesses, and even choosing how best to triage and treat a trauma patient. H.R. 36 would stand in the way of a doctor's ability to best care for their patients. This bill would force doctors to ignore the symptoms that they have learned through years of training and practice that show a patient's condition could become a more serious medical condition.

Can you imagine going into your doctor's office as a pregnant woman and being told your twins would not live and that giving birth could rupture your uterus, causing severe bleeding? That is what happened to Phil and his wife from Missouri. They learned at week 21 that she was at risk of a ruptured uterus and that the twins would die because of twin-twin transfusion syndrome.

Phil said: "Decisions about abortion need to be made with families and the best medical information available." I couldn't agree more. A physician's sole focus should be the health of their patient, not the consequences of an arbitrary law that has no basis in medical evidence, and no basis that this bill is even necessary or that it will improve health outcomes.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, that is why, as a physician and a father, I oppose this legislation. We need less bureaucratic obstacles that get in the way of a doctor caring for their patients. We cannot interfere with a provider's ability to deliver the best care for their patients.

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

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

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3440, the Dream Act, which deals with children as well. This bipartisan, bicameral legislation would help thousands of young people, children, who are Americans in every way except on paper.

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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO), to discuss our proposal.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, President Barack Obama, under his executive powers, established the DACA program which temporarily protected immigrants who were brought to the U.S. as children from potential deportation.

Our Nation made a promise to DREAMers that by coming out of the shadows, following the rules and laws of our great land, they would not be deported to a foreign country that they never knew or barely remembered.

DREAMers came to the United States under no volition of their own as young children, making this country the only home most have ever known. DREAMers have jobs, pay taxes, and contribute to the prosperity of our Nation's economy. Since its implementation, the DACA program has added over 50,000 jobs to our economy. Ninety-three percent of DREAMers are currently employed.

Over the next decade, DACA beneficiaries are projected to contribute \$460 billion to our Nation's GDP; \$24.6 billion in Medicare and Social Security; and an estimated \$2.5 billion annually for State and Federal contributions.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York. However, on September 5, President Trump announced he would end DACA and look to Congress to develop a legislative solution for DACA recipients.

Well, Congress has a solution. It is H.R. 3440, the Dream Act. We have heard about it from sea to shining sea. The Dream Act would allow DREAMers to earn lawful permanent residence with a pathway to citizenship. It would also give them the opportunity to continue contributing to their communities by encouraging them to pursue higher education, work for at least 3 years, or serve in our United States military.

To qualify under the Dream Act, a person must graduate from high school, pass a background check, demonstrate proficiency in the English language, and not have a felony or any other serious crime that could pose a threat to our country. With the DACA set to expire, now is the time for Congress to act.

We must bring the Dream Act to the floor for a vote because Congress has been silent for too long. DREAMers are

doing their jobs. What we ask is that Congress does theirs. It is time for Congress to do its job and pass the Dream Act without delay.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I believe Americans are compassionate people. I also believe Americans are angered by injustice, and I know Americans are eager to protect the defenseless.

In a past hearing before the Judiciary Committee on this bill, Dr. Maureen Condic said in her testimony: "Imposing pain on any pain-capable living creature is cruelty. And ignoring the pain experienced by another human individual for any reason is barbaric."

H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, gives us a chance to choose compassion by preventing abortions from taking place if the child is 20 weeks or older. Science proves that not only can these children feel pain, but since their pain inhibitors are undeveloped, they feel pain even more intensely than we can. In Dr. Condic's words: "We simply have to decide whether we will choose to ignore the pain of the fetus or not."

Mr. Speaker, I am choosing not to ignore their pain. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this compassionate bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the majority keeps trying to take the women's personal decision and put it in someone else's hands. Over the years, they have tried to allow bosses to make the healthcare decisions for their employees. They pushed a bill that would allow women to die if an emergency room employee coming to her aid had a "conscientious objection" to performing an abortion that would save her life.

Today, they are trying to pass an abortion ban that would put up even more obstacles and prevent women from receiving safe and legal abortion, which is protected by the Constitution.

The bill before us today strikes at the heart of Roe v. Wade. Opponents of the Supreme Court decision have been clear and outspoken that that is precisely their goal. The ban on abortions after 20 weeks does not contain reasonable exceptions for victims of rape and incest. The legislation flies in the face of what the American people—women and men—want us to be doing.

The majority must have quickly forgotten the national Women's March that took place in January. Millions of persons across the country and around the globe marched in the largest day of protest in our Nation's history. More than half a million people took to the streets right here in the Nation's Capital. They sent a message to the majority to respect their rights, including their right to choose.

If people sometimes ask women why we are still marching and calling and writing about the four decades after the Supreme Court's Roe v. Wade decision, which it has since upheld, it is because of bills like this. We constantly have to refight the battles our mothers and grandmothers won for us. This legislation, again, is proof of that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question to the rule and the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona for his work on this issue and for introducing this important bill. It is undeniable that we have a much better understanding today of life inside the womb than we did at the time of the passage of Roe v. Wade.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle express a commitment to science in all cases except where it matters most, in those cases that involve the preservation of human life. They don't want to talk about babies. They don't want to talk about the horrific procedures that we are dealing with today, and we have to. It is our obligation to.

Mr. Speaker, our country has banned partial-birth abortion in a decision that was upheld by the Supreme Court, and I would just urge my colleagues to look at the decision in that opinion, *Gonzales v. Carhart*, the decision written by Justice Kennedy: talking in specific, quoting a nurse, talking about the reaction of a 26-week-old baby who was a victim of partial-birth abortion, what their physical reaction is, the mother of little babies reading that, and the description of what happens to a baby when they are killed—watching their hands expand and then contract, as any mother of a newborn infant has watched many times.

It is truly horrific, and I think, as a society, Mr. Speaker, we have to be willing to face the exact nature of what it is we are talking about. We have an obligation as elected Representatives, Mr. Speaker, to protect the lives of these unborn babies. This legislation would do that.

We have a moral obligation, and it is our job. It is in the interest of the States to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that we do everything possible to protect life.

In this case, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a bill that would protect babies at moments when we know they can feel pain in the womb. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of both the rule and of H.R. 36 so that we can continue to protect and save lives.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 548 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER

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

SEC. 2. 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. 3440) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children 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 the Judiciary. 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. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3440.

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 con-

trolling 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. CHENEY. 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.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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 233, nays 184, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 546]

YEAS—233

Abraham	Calvert	Farenthold
Aderholt	Carter (GA)	Faso
Allen	Carter (TX)	Ferguson
Amash	Chabot	Fitzpatrick
Amodei	Cheney	Fleischmann
Arrington	Coffman	Flores
Babin	Cole	Fortenberry
Bacon	Collins (GA)	Fox
Banks (IN)	Collins (NY)	Franks (AZ)
Barletta	Comer	Frelinghuysen
Barr	Comstock	Gaetz
Barton	Conaway	Gallagher
Bergman	Cook	Gianforte
Biggs	Costello (PA)	Gibbs
Bilirakis	Cramer	Gohmert
Bishop (MI)	Crawford	Goodlatte
Bishop (UT)	Culberson	Gosar
Black	Curbelo (FL)	Gowdy
Blackburn	Davidson	Granger
Blum	Davis, Rodney	Graves (GA)
Bost	Denham	Graves (LA)
Brady (TX)	Dent	Graves (MO)
Brat	DeSantis	Griffith
Brooks (AL)	Diaz-Balart	Grothman
Brooks (IN)	Donovan	Guthrie
Buchanan	Duffy	Handel
Buck	Duncan (SC)	Harper
Bucshon	Duncan (TN)	Harris
Budd	Dunn	Hartlizer
Burgess	Emmer	Hensarling
Byrne	Estes (KS)	Herrera Beutler

Hice, Jody B.	McMorris	Scalise
Higgins (LA)	Rodgers	Schweikert
Hill	McSally	Scott, Austin
Holding	Meadows	Sensenbrenner
Hollingsworth	Meehan	Sessions
Hudson	Messer	Shimkus
Huizenga	Mitchell	Shuster
Hultgren	Moolenaar	Simpson
Hunter	Mooney (WV)	Smith (MO)
Hurd	Mullin	Smith (NE)
Issa	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Jenkins (KS)	Newhouse	Smith (TX)
Jenkins (WV)	Noem	Smucker
Johnson (LA)	Norman	Stefanik
Johnson, Sam	Nunes	Stewart
Jones	Olson	Stivers
Jordan	Palazzo	Taylor
Joyce (OH)	Palmer	Tenney
Katko	Paulsen	Thompson (PA)
Kelly (MS)	Pearce	Thornberry
Kelly (PA)	Perry	Tiberi
King (IA)	Pittenger	Tipton
King (NY)	Poe (TX)	Trott
Kinzinger	Poliquin	Turner
Knight	Posey	Upton
Kustoff (TN)	Ratcliffe	Valadao
Labrador	Reed	Wagner
LaHood	Reichert	Walberg
LaMalfa	Renacci	Walden
Lamborn	Rice (SC)	Walker
Lance	Roby	Walorski
Latta	Roe (TN)	Walters, Mimi
Lewis (MN)	Rogers (AL)	Weber (TX)
LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)	Webster (FL)
Love	Rohrabacher	Wenstrup
Lucas	Rokita	Westerman
Luetkemeyer	Rooney, Francis	Williams
MacArthur	Rooney, Thomas	Wilson (SC)
Marchant	J.	Wittman
Marino	Ros-Lehtinen	Womack
Marshall	Roskam	Woodall
Massie	Ross	Yoder
Mast	Rothfus	Yoho
McCarthy	Rouzer	Young (AK)
McCaul	Royce (CA)	Young (IA)
McClintock	Russell	Zeldin
McHenry	Rutherford	
McKinley	Sanford	

NAYS—184

Adams	Demings	Lawson (FL)
Aguilar	DeSaulnier	Lee
Barragan	Dingell	Levin
Bass	Doggett	Lewis (GA)
Beatty	Doyle, Michael	Lieu, Ted
Bera	F.	Lipinski
Beyer	Ellison	Loeb
Bishop (GA)	Engel	Lofgren
Blumenauer	Eshoo	Lowenthal
Blunt Rochester	Espallat	Lowe
Bonamici	Esty (CT)	Lujan Grisham,
Boyle, Brendan	Evans	M.
F.	Foster	Lujan, Ben Ray
Brady (PA)	Frankel (FL)	Lynch
Brown (MD)	Fudge	Maloney,
Brownley (CA)	Gabbard	Carolyn B.
Bustos	Gallago	Maloney, Sean
Butterfield	Garamendi	Matsui
Capuano	Gomez	McCollum
Carbajal	Gonzalez (TX)	McEachin
Cárdenas	Gottheimer	McGovern
Carson (IN)	Green, Al	McNerney
Cartwright	Green, Gene	Meeks
Castor (FL)	Grijalva	Meng
Castro (TX)	Hanabusa	Moore
Chu, Judy	Hastings	Moulton
Cicilline	Heck	Murphy (FL)
Clark (MA)	Higgins (NY)	Nadler
Clarke (NY)	Himes	Napolitano
Clay	Hoyer	Neal
Cleaver	Huffman	Nolan
Clyburn	Jackson Lee	Norcross
Cohen	Jayapal	O'Halleran
Connolly	Jeffries	O'Rourke
Conyers	Johnson (GA)	Pallone
Cooper	Kaptur	Panetta
Correa	Keating	Pascrell
Costa	Kelly (IL)	Payne
Courtney	Kennedy	Pelosi
Crist	Khanna	Perlmutter
Cuellar	Kildee	Peters
Cummings	Kilmer	Peterson
Davis (CA)	Kind	Pingree
Davis, Danny	Krishnamoorthi	Pocan
DeFazio	Kuster (NH)	Polis
DeGette	Langevin	Price (NC)
Delaney	Larsen (WA)	Quigley
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Raskin
DeBene	Lawrence	Rice (NY)

Roybal-Allard	Sewell (AL)	Tsongas
Ruiz	Shea-Porter	Vargas
Ruppersberger	Sherman	Veasey
Rush	Sinema	Vela
Ryan (OH)	Sires	Velázquez
Sánchez	Slaughter	Visclosky
Sarbanes	Smith (WA)	Walz
Schakowsky	Soto	Wasserman
Schiff	Snozzi	Schultz
Schneider	Swalwell (CA)	Waters, Maxine
Schrader	Takano	Watson Coleman
Scott (VA)	Thompson (CA)	Welch
Scott, David	Tonko	Wilson (FL)
Serrano	Torres	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Bridenstine	Johnson (OH)	Rosen
Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	Speier
DesJarlais	Kihuen	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Long	Titus
Garrett	Loudermilk	
Gutiérrez	Richmond	

□ 1353

Messrs. TED LIEU of California, O'HALLERAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut, CARSON of Indiana, CARBAJAL, TAKANO, GARAMENDI, and RUSH changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

Stated for:

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 546.

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 187, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 547]

YEAS—233

Abraham	Cole	Garrett
Aderholt	Collins (GA)	Gianforte
Allen	Collins (NY)	Gibbs
Amash	Cramer	Gohmert
Amodei	Comstock	Goodlatte
Arrington	Conaway	Gosar
Babin	Cook	Gowdy
Bacon	Costello (PA)	Granger
Banks (IN)	Cramer	Graves (GA)
Barletta	Crawford	Graves (LA)
Barr	Culberson	Graves (MO)
Barton	Curbelo (FL)	Griffith
Bergman	Davidson	Grothman
Biggs	Davis, Rodney	Guthrie
Bilirakis	Denham	Handel
Bishop (MI)	Dent	Harper
Bishop (UT)	DeSantis	Harris
Black	Diaz-Balart	Hartzler
Blackburn	Donovan	Hensarling
Blum	Duffy	Herrera Beutler
Bost	Duncan (SC)	Hice, Jody B.
Brady (TX)	Duncan (TN)	Higgins (LA)
Brat	Dunn	Hill
Brooks (AL)	Emmer	Holding
Brooks (IN)	Estes (KS)	Hollingsworth
Buchanan	Farenthold	Hudson
Buck	Faso	Huizenga
Bucshon	Ferguson	Hultgren
Budd	Fitzpatrick	Hunter
Burgess	Fleischmann	Hurd
Byrne	Flores	Issa
Calvert	Fortenberry	Jenkins (KS)
Carter (GA)	Fox	Jenkins (WV)
Carter (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Johnson (LA)
Chabot	Frelinghuysen	Johnson, Sam
Cheney	Gaetz	Jones
Coffman	Gallagher	Jordan

Joyce (OH)	Newhouse	Shimkus
Katko	Noem	Shuster
Kelly (MS)	Norman	Simpson
Kelly (PA)	Nunes	Smith (MO)
King (IA)	Olson	Smith (NE)
King (NY)	Palazzo	Smith (NJ)
Kinziger	Palmer	Smith (TX)
Knight	Paulsen	Stefanik
Kustoff (TN)	Pearce	Stewart
Labadador	Perry	Stivers
LaHood	Pittenger	Taylor
LaMalfa	Poe (TX)	Tenney
Lamborn	Poliquin	Thompson (PA)
Lance	Posey	Thornberry
Latta	Ratcliffe	Tiberi
Lewis (MN)	Reed	Tipton
Lipinski	Reichert	Trott
LoBiondo	Renacci	Turner
Love	Rice (SC)	Upton
Lucas	Roby	Valadao
Luetkemeyer	Roe (TN)	Wagner
MacArthur	Rogers (AL)	Walberg
Marino	Rogers (KY)	Walden
Marshall	Rohrabacher	Walker
Massie	Rokita	Walorski
Mast	Rooney, Francis	Walters, Mimi
McCarthy	Rooney, Thomas	Weber (TX)
McCaul	J.	Webster (FL)
McClintock	Ros-Lehtinen	Wenstrup
McHenry	Roskam	Westerman
McKinley	Ross	Williams
McMorris	Rothfus	Wilson (SC)
Rodgers	Rouzer	Wittman
McSally	Royce (CA)	Womack
Meadows	Russell	Woodall
Meehan	Rutherford	Yoder
Messer	Sanford	Yoho
Mitchell	Scalise	Young (AK)
Moolenaar	Schweikert	Young (IA)
Mooney (WV)	Scott, Austin	Zeldin
Mullin	Sensenbrenner	
Murphy (PA)	Sessions	

NAYS—187

Adams	Ellison	Luján, Ben Ray
Agullar	Engel	Lynch
Barragán	Eshoo	Maloney,
Bass	Españat	Carolyn B.
Beatty	Esty (CT)	Maloney, Sean
Bera	Evans	Matsui
Beyer	Foster	McColum
Bishop (GA)	Frankel (FL)	McEachin
Blumenauer	Fudge	McGovern
Blunt Rochester	Gabbard	McNerney
Bonamici	Gallego	Meeks
Boyle, Brendan	Garamendi	Meng
F.	Gomez	Moore
Brady (PA)	Gonzalez (TX)	Moulton
Brown (MD)	Gottheimer	Murphy (FL)
Brownley (CA)	Green, Al	Nadler
Bustos	Green, Gene	Napolitano
Butterfield	Grijalva	Neal
Capuano	Gutiérrez	Nolan
Carbajal	Hanabusa	Norcross
Cárdenas	Hastings	O'Halleran
Carson (IN)	Heck	O'Rourke
Cartwright	Higgins (NY)	Pallone
Castor (FL)	Himes	Panetta
Castro (TX)	Hoyer	Pascarell
Chu, Judy	Huffman	Payne
Ciçilline	Jackson Lee	Pelosi
Clark (MA)	Jayapal	Perlmutter
Clarke (NY)	Jeffries	Peters
Clay	Johnson (GA)	Peterson
Cleaver	Kaptur	Pingree
Clyburn	Keating	Pocan
Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Polis
Connolly	Kennedy	Price (NC)
Conyers	Khanna	Quigley
Cooper	Kildee	Raskin
Correa	Kilmer	Rice (NY)
Costa	Kind	Richmond
Courtney	Krishnamoorthi	Roybal-Allard
Crist	Kuster (NH)	Ruiz
Cuellar	Langevin	Ruppersberger
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Rush
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
Davis, Danny	Lawrence	Sánchez
DeFazio	Lawson (FL)	Sarbanes
DeGette	Lee	Schakowsky
Delaney	Levin	Schiff
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Schneider
DelBene	Lieu, Ted	Schrader
Demings	Loebbeck	Scott (VA)
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Scott, David
Dingell	Lowenthal	Serrano
Doggett	Lowe	Sewell (AL)
Doyle, Michael	Lujan Grisham,	Shea-Porter
F.	M.	Sherman

NOT VOTING—13

Bridenstine	Johnson, E. B.	Rosen
Crowley	Kihuen	Smucker
DesJarlais	Long	Titus
Deutch	Loudermilk	
Johnson (OH)	Marchant	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1359

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.

Stated for:

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 547.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

EARLY HEARING DETECTION AND INTERVENTION ACT OF 2017

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 652) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a program for early detection, diagnosis, and treatment regarding deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, and young children.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 652

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 "Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM FOR EARLY DETECTION, DIAGNOSIS, AND TREATMENT REGARDING DEAF AND HARD-OF-HEARING NEWBORNS, INFANTS, AND YOUNG CHILDREN.

(a) SECTION HEADING.—The section heading of section 399M of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-1) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 399M. EARLY DETECTION, DIAGNOSIS, AND TREATMENT REGARDING DEAF AND HARD-OF-HEARING NEWBORNS, INFANTS, AND YOUNG CHILDREN."

(b) STATEWIDE SYSTEMS.—Section 399M(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-1(a)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking "NEWBORN AND INFANT" and inserting "NEWBORN, INFANT, AND YOUNG CHILD";