

BRAIN INJURY AWARENESS DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today is Brain Injury Awareness Day, and I welcome those who are in Washington today to share their stories.

This issue is near and dear to my heart. For nearly 30 years, this was my area of practice and expertise as a therapist and rehabilitation services manager. I served as a board member for the Brain Injury Association of Pennsylvania and helped form a brain injury support group.

The theme for this year's campaign is Change Your Mind. This public awareness campaign strives to destigmatize brain injury; empower those who have survived, as well as their caregivers; and promote the many types of support available.

The need to raise awareness is great. More than 2.8 million Americans sustain traumatic brain injuries in the United States each year.

The 13 million Americans living with brain injuries want what we all want: to be defined by who they are as people, not by their injury.

Mr. Speaker, everyone recovers at a different pace, and we should do everything in our power to support and encourage brain injury survivors. They deserve no less.

GET SCREENED FOR COLON CANCER

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge each of my colleagues and the American people to talk to their doctors about getting screened for colorectal cancer.

Each year, I sponsor a resolution to recognize March as National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month. By raising awareness about this preventable cancer, we can save lives.

During this Congress, Representative CHARLIE DENT and I introduced H.R. 1017, the Removing Barriers to Colorectal Cancer Screening Act of 2017. This bill would eliminate surprise out-of-pocket costs for Medicare beneficiaries who have polyps removed during colonoscopies.

I also introduced H.R. 1578, the Donald Payne Sr. Colorectal Cancer Detection Act of 2017, which would expand Medicare to cover certain blood-based colorectal cancer screening tests.

Named after my father, who passed away from colorectal cancer, this bipartisan legislation would significantly increase colorectal cancer detection and treatment.

Each year, I lead the appropriations letter to increase the funding for CDC colon cancer research.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me on these important bills. Together, we can save lives from colorectal cancer.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE DAY

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, President Trump has declared today to be National Agriculture Day, a time of celebration and gratefulness to our Nation's farmers and ranchers. Whether we realize it or not, agriculture is a part of all of our daily lives from morning until night. In fact, each American farmer feeds over 144 people, providing vital nutrition, and helping us better connect with our God-given resources.

Every \$1 of United States agricultural products and food exports creates another \$1.27 in business activity. Our country's agricultural exports are valued at more than \$100 billion, including \$4 billion from my own home State of Florida. Every \$1 billion in exports supports approximately 8,000 American jobs. That is over 8 million jobs created by agriculture.

While celebrations such as these mark tremendous achievements for U.S. agriculture, we must continue to construct policies that support and strengthens all of our farmers and ranchers. As lawmakers, let us make this celebration a time of action and work towards initiatives that continually uplift our ag industry.

HONORING SHANTHI VISWANATHAN

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

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Mrs. Shanthi Viswanathan, a teacher at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida, whose quick thinking saved lives.

As the second alarm went off that day, Mrs. Viswanathan knew something was wrong and she locked the classroom door, telling her students to take cover.

When the SWAT team arrived and asked her to let them in, she would not because she didn't want to risk falling for a gunman's trick. Instead, she told them: "Knock it down or open it with a key."

When Mrs. Viswanathan knew there was danger, she exemplified the truest form of the Hindu concept of dharma, of duty, in protecting those she was responsible for.

These actions were brought to my attention by the Hindu American Foundation, which continues to support the victims of the shooting as part of their broader commitment to Ahimsa, the Hindu concept of nonviolence.

They have also pursued various measures of gun control, which I

wholeheartedly support. I commend them for their efforts here.

Thank you to Mrs. Viswanathan and the Hindu American Foundation for their exemplary work and for making America a better place.

EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the eighth anniversary of the Affordable Care Act.

Since it was signed into law, Americans have relied on the ACA for access to quality, affordable healthcare; but Republicans have attacked Americans' healthcare at every turn.

Last year, Republicans tried to pass TrumpCare, a bill that would have imposed a crippling age tax, raised out-of-pocket costs, and increased the number of uninsured Americans by 23 million.

After the American people stopped TrumpCare in its tracks, Republicans went after the Affordable Care Act again in their tax scam. On top of that, the administration waged a persistent campaign to discourage people from enrolling in the ACA plans.

Despite GOP sabotage, Americans still signed up for the Affordable Care Act. Americans want better, more affordable healthcare, and that is what Democrats offer: A Better Deal for better healthcare.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TERESA KIMURA

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

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Teresa Kimura.

Teresa traveled to the Route 91 festival in Las Vegas on October 1 with six of her friends. She was known for making every gathering an amazing experience.

Teresa worked at the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration.

She is remembered for her big heart, love of life, beautiful spirit, and infectious laugh.

I would like to extend my condolences to Teresa Kimura's family and friends. Please note that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieve with you.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUDD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to be recognized to address

you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

I come before this floor to address a topic that has been front and center in this country since 1973: when the Supreme Court came down with the decisions known as *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*, then the subsequent case in the early 1990s, *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*.

This is a nation that has traditionally—and from the very beginning of the very first founding document, the Declaration of Independence—respected and revered life.

As our Founding Fathers put that language together, and as John Adams coached Thomas Jefferson, and Thomas Jefferson put his pen to the Declaration of Independence: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, it wasn’t an accident that the order of these rights that come from God be started out with life, then liberty, then the pursuit of happiness.

Of all the scholars that I have talked to and the times that I have sat in the classroom and in my readings, it just never really claim clear. It is not educating our young people about what they were thinking about when they drafted that language in the Declaration: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights,” but the right to life is listed first. It is not second or third.

They didn’t put together a list of four or five or seven or ten different rights. They laid three out in the Declaration. And those three start with life, because life is the most paramount right.

The former Governor of Pennsylvania, Governor BOB CASEY, a Democrat, who has since passed away, was denied an opportunity to speak at the Democratic National Convention some years ago because he was a pro-life Democrat Governor and he would speak in favor of life. He said this: “Human life cannot be measured. It is the measure itself against which all other things are weighed.”

The measure itself.

Now, what does that mean and how do we think about this, Mr. Speaker?

It would be this: when the Frenchmen devised the metric system, they set up a distance that was divided out to mean a ratio of the circumference of the Earth in whatever manner of calculation they had. And they came down to—however many times they divided that around, it came down to the length of the meter.

□ 1600

Then they produced this meter that was a platinum rule that was set at precisely the length of the meter. And,

in controlled temperature and pressure, at standard temperature and pressure, what would the length of this platinum rule be? Exactly a meter.

Now, how long is a meter? I guess I could tell you, we can measure it by other measures. We can do some comparisons. But that meter, that original meter made out of platinum that is maintained at standard temperature and pressure, that is the measure itself; and all other measurements of length that are incorporated within the metric system, all of those measures of length are in relation to the meter itself. That meter stick, the original one, is the measure itself against which all other distances are weighed and measured in the metric system.

Human life is the measure itself against which we measure every other value that we have because human life is sacred in all of its forms. And then, once we accept that and this Nation accepts that human life is sacred in all of its forms—Democrats and Republicans do agree to that, I believe, generally speaking, maybe even universally—but the disagreement comes in, well, when does life begin? When does life end?

We can look at any one of the pro-life groups that are here in this country. You can ask the priests and pastors around America: When does life begin? The most consistent answer to that question is life begins at the moment of conception, the instant of fertilization, the instant of conception. That language is threaded throughout.

I have walked into gymnasiums, or maybe a whole school, K–12, or maybe a high school alone, and I will say to them: You will be faced with a couple of questions in your emerging young adult life, and the counsel that you would give to your friends perhaps, or maybe you, yourself, you will have to answer these two questions: Is human life sacred in all of its forms?

And I will say to them: Look at the person next to you. Is their life sacred? And they will nod their head.

Look at the person on the other side. Is their life sacred? And they will nod their head.

And I said: And they are looking at you, and they are nodding their head at you, too, because everybody in here, your life is sacred. It is precious. It is the measure itself against which all other things are weighed.

So once we universally agree that human life is sacred in all of its forms, then we have the next question and ask the question: At what moment does life begin, at what instant? And that is that instant at conception, that instant at fertilization. The rational, moral thought and faithful reasoning comes to that conclusion.

Yet the Supreme Court, in *Roe v. Wade* and in the accompanying case of *Doe v. Bolton*, on January 22, 1973, brought down a decision that decided that liberty and pursuit of happiness trumped life. They concluded that a mother could decide whether that child was inconvenient, whether they didn’t

want the child at the time, and allowed for abortion on demand. Coupling the two cases together, they allowed for abortion on demand.

Doe v. Bolton wrote everything in the list that could be exceptions: it could be the mental health; it could be the physical health; it could be even the familial health of the mother, which any of this could be affected by finances themselves. So if you don’t think you can afford this baby, *Doe v. Bolton* lets you say: Well, it affected my mental health. It affected my familial health, so I decided to abort the baby.

And any abortion doctor could conduct an abortion at will, staying within this framework that was manufactured by the Supreme Court that turned the principles that are in our Declaration on their head. They no longer recognize that life is the paramount right that is delivered to us from God and that liberty is secondary to life and that pursuit of happiness is tertiary to life.

Now, think of this. If any of us, in our pursuit of liberty, would decide that someone’s life is in the way of our liberty, we can’t go kill them. We would end up in prison or executed in some States. We can’t go kill somebody because they infringe upon our liberty. Their life is more important than our liberty.

Neither can someone, in their pursuit of happiness, trample on someone else’s liberties. Our liberties of freedom of speech, religion, the press, assembly, the right to keep and bear arms, the protections that we have on a reasonable search and seizure, a jury of our peers, the States’ rights that are enshrined in the Constitution that are subordinate to the enumerated powers in the Constitution, that is all laid out within a beautiful framework that has never been done better anywhere in the world in the history of the world, but it is based on the prioritization of God-given rights. Life is more important than liberty, is more important than this pursuit of happiness.

By the way, to define pursuit of happiness a little more thoroughly, some of the young people are growing up and they read that and don’t give it very much thought. They say, well, pursuit of happiness is a fun tailgate party before the ball game; it is getting together with my friends; it is sitting down with my Xbox and enjoying the video games that are going on. Maybe it is just listening to music. None of those things fit the categories that our Founding Fathers envisioned when they put pursuit of happiness in the Declaration.

Pursuit of happiness was lifted from the Greek term “*eudaimonia*,” which is spelled E-U-D-A-I-M-O-N-I-A—because we are friends, Christina. *Eudaimonia*, the Greek term, means pursuit of happiness in this concept that our Founding Fathers understood, and that was that development of the whole human being, not a party at all, not a joke at

all, not a time necessarily of laughter, but it was a component; to develop one's self intellectually, develop one's brain power with a knowledge base that was as strong as it could be, and for a lifetime, to develop one's mind and develop it thoroughly and contemplate deep thoughts to develop themselves. That is the intellectual component of it.

There was a theological component to develop one's self religiously, which they did. Even though they were pagan, in my view, they developed themselves in a belief in a hereafter and in a belief in higher beings. It was plural for the Greeks, the higher beings. But they were developing their intellect. They were developing themselves spiritually and theologically and also physically.

They kept their bodies in shape, and they worked out and they exercised, and they competed in the sports that are the foundation of our Olympics today. All of that was wrapped up in the eudaimonia of the time that our Founders read and understood. Thomas Jefferson thoroughly understood. There is no doubt he understood the meaning of the word "eudaimonia." He just didn't think the American people would understand it, so he wrote in there, "pursuit of happiness."

We have just kind of given a short and a brief definition of that. We haven't given it the full respect it was intended by the drafter and, in many cases, the author of our Declaration, Thomas Jefferson.

So now that I have reset this, life is paramount and it is the most important, and any of us should be willing to sacrifice at least some of our liberty to protect and save the lives of others because those lives are that precious and that important. Any one of us who is in pursuit of our eudaimonia, our pursuit of happiness, should be willing to give up some of that in order to secure and protect the liberties—not only our liberties, but the liberties of others.

So a nation that is built upon those principles would also be a nation that would do most anything to protect the lives of the most innocent among us, our unborn, our unborn that don't have the ability to scream out for their own mercy. They don't have the ability to come to Congress and lobby for themselves. They are silent. They have no chance to make a noise even until the day that they draw their first breath, if they have the opportunity to draw that first breath.

But the tally for the decision of *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton* on January 22, 1973, now has reached or exceeded 60 million babies—60 million babies sacrificed on the altar of choice.

Watching the prioritized rights that came from God, we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights. Our Supreme Court got it wrong, and they set the liberty of the mother over the life of the baby. They set the pursuit of happiness, the eudaimonia, presumably, of the mother, over the life of the baby.

We have a hole in our society; not only a hole that comes from the heavy, heavy guilt of tolerating this throughout these years, but it is a hole that is a multigenerational hole: 60 million babies not born that would otherwise be living, loving, laughing, learning, falling in love, having babies of their own, worshipping, and raising their children with the values that have made this America a great nation.

But that is all denied this Nation. It is denied the world. The solutions that they would have provided, the happiness and the joy they would have delivered, intellectual firepower that would come from 60 million babies is denied to us.

And to go back and look and think, also, a good number of those little girls that were aborted since 1973 would have otherwise been mothers today. And to look at it generationally, and this is a back-of-the-envelope calculation, to take those little girls and predict that maybe each one of them would have had three babies, each one, that calculates out to be, Mr. Speaker, another 60 million babies—another 60 million.

So the population of this country would be something like 120 million stronger if the Supreme Court had believed and had conviction on what I have just described about the right to life being the paramount right—more important than liberty, more important than the pursuit of happiness, eudaimonia, the right to life.

When the Supreme Court made that erroneous activist decision, they started this country in a downward spiral, a spiral where there is less respect for life than there was before 1973.

Mr. Speaker, if I just take you to the school shooting data and address that, we look back through the history and the records of the school shootings as well as mass killings that have taken place in schools, look back over the last century, the earliest one that we could find was 1924, in Michigan. It was a series of bombs that were planted in the schools there in Michigan, set to go off by alarm clocks, which would be the kind that we would see in the old cartoons today. Those bombs were timed to go off, and the result of that was 40 people were killed in the bombings at the school in Michigan in 1924, mass school killing. That is the largest mass school killing that we could find by sorting through history as deeply as we could research it, 40 killed, bombings, 1924.

Then not another mass school killing or shooting, not another killing until 1940, when an individual went into a school in Pasadena and killed five people with a pistol. Then not another school shooting, mass shooting of any kind at least, took place from 1940 on. It took us all the way to 1963, 23 years after that single mass school shooting in Pasadena.

Twenty-three years later, the Supreme Court came down with another erroneous decision called *Murray v.*

Curlett. *Murray v. Curlett* is the case that took prayer out of public schools. Up till that time, we went to school and we went into school and started the day with the pledge and a prayer in the classroom with the teachers, especially in elementary school. I remember that clearly.

But by the time the *Murray v. Curlett* decision came down, I was a freshman in high school, and I remember that order. The Supreme Court commands no more prayer in the public schools. Where did they get the authority to declare that we couldn't exercise our freedom of religion?

Now, I have been challenged on this a good number of times in subsequent years, but I remember them saying: Well, what will you do about the separation of church and state?

Well, first of all, there isn't a separation of church and state, but it is being exercised by Supreme Court decisions as a separation even not only of church and state, but church and school.

Now, the First Amendment of the Constitution writes, and what it specifically does is it prohibits Congress from establishing a law that creates a state religion. And it denies the ability of Congress to pass that legislation that establishes a state religion, so that is all it does.

And the freedom of religion shall not be infringed. We have a freedom of religion, but they still, the Supreme Court, made the decision to take prayer out of the public schools, an activist act that then began to scrub faith and morality out of our public schools.

□ 1615

I remember that freshman year when I learned this. I remember in that classroom—and these images are in my mind clearly. It was: How are they going to stop us from praying in our schools? What could they possibly do to keep us from praying?

They hadn't invented duct tape yet at that time, Mr. Speaker, but, you know, I am thinking the white adhesive tape that doctors use, the medical tape, and I had images in my mind: Well, they could tape our mouths shut with that tape. We could pray silently. They couldn't stop us from praying by taping our mouths shut.

The only way to stop prayer in the public schools, if we refuse to accept the order, was to empty the schools out themselves. That image is in my mind. Denison Community Schools, where I went to high school, I can still see the central building in my mind's eye, clearing out all the rooms, emptying the rooms, all the students going outside, outside of that school.

And the Army. The Army is in my imagination—Vietnam era—that the Army would come in, and they would have a new chain to roll around those bars that you push inside the doors to open the doors, wrap that chain around there, put a new padlock on it, and post a guard, an Army uniform outside those doors, every entrance into that

school. That is the only way they could have stopped prayer in that public school.

But they stopped it because we accepted the order of the Supreme Court. We accepted the beginning of the degradation of the moral core of America that was being taught in every public school in America at that time.

We revered our faith. We understood our history. We knew that our Founding Fathers, who put this country together, who I believe were moved around like men on a chessboard by the hand of God—I believe the Declaration is written not with divine inspiration, like the Bible, but with divine guidance, just a little bit lower standard of proof. We are gifted in this country with the divine grace that God guided the men and women who built this country in the nearly perfect foundation that they put in place in the Declaration and in also the Constitution.

But we let the Supreme Court, that was never designed to be the most powerful of the three branches of government—we let the Supreme Court rule. And then, now, today, we teach in those schools that there is three equal branches of government. They are not equal. They were not designed to be equal. The Founding Fathers put them together that the judicial branch of government was designed to be the weakest of the three branches of government, and they were not even the branch of government that was designed to come down with a rule on what is constitutional and what is unconstitutional.

The Constitution requires that Congress establish a Supreme Court. And I had made this case to, God rest his soul, Justice Scalia, an awfully hard man to say goodbye to for all that he has done for our country and all the clarity that he has brought to the understanding of the Constitution. I am grateful that Justice Gorsuch is there to replace him in picking up on the things that are so well perfected by Justice Scalia.

But in a meeting with 30 or 40 other members here several years ago, I made the point, Mr. Speaker, to Justice Scalia, and I said to him that Congress is the most powerful branch of government, the legislative branch of government, and the House, in particular, because all spending bills have to start here, and the Constitution doesn't require that we establish all of the Federal circuits that are out there or the Federal district courts below that.

The Congress only—and this is how I put it to Justice Scalia—Congress is only required to establish a Supreme Court. We could abolish all of the other Federal districts if we chose to do so. In fact, Congress did abolish two judicial districts back in about 1802. That is a pattern. It has been established.

So if Congress decided to do so, we could weaken the judicial branch of government, and we could reduce the judicial branch of government down to

just a Supreme Court, because it requires that we—constitutionally, we are required to establish a Supreme Court. But there is nothing that requires us to build a building, fund a building, or to fund an administrative staff and team for them.

So I said to Justice Scalia: We could eliminate all the Federal courts, except the Supreme Court. We could reduce the Supreme Court down to the Chief Justice at his own card table with his own candle, no staff.

And I think it was a bit of surprise for the very glib Justice Scalia to hear that out of a Member of Congress, especially in a setting that was, I will say, quasi-public at least.

He thought about it for a little bit. I am not sure if he had ever thought about what I had presented to him, Mr. Speaker, but he thought for a little bit, and he said: Well, I would argue that you could reduce the Supreme Court down to three Justices because, otherwise, if you don't have anything but a Supreme Court Chief Justice, there is nothing to be the chief of. So I would argue for three Justices.

And I said: Well, Justice Scalia, there have always been too many chiefs and not enough Indians.

And we, more or less, declared a case ready to move on for further discussion.

But the point of this exercise, Mr. Speaker, is to make the point that the Court's power exists because Congress empowers it. And if there is a struggle between the legislative branch of government, Article 1; or the executive branch of government, Article 2; or the judicial branch of government, Article 3, I would remind the folks involved in any discussion like that that the branches of government were prioritized in the Constitution in the same fashion that the God-given rights are prioritized in the Declaration—life, liberty, pursuit of happiness.

In the Constitution, Articles 1, 2, 3—legislative, executive, judicial branches of government—prioritized because our Founding Fathers envisioned that there would be a struggle between the three branches of the government, and they wanted to set up a static power base so that they expected that each branch of government would jealously protect its constitutional authority, and there would be that tug of war, a struggle, ethically and peacefully, they hoped, between each branch of government.

That is why they put the checks and balances in place. They gave the legislative authority to the United States Congress, and the spending authority to Congress, and the initiation of all bills that initiate spending to the House of Representatives. They didn't give it to the Senate because we were to be the hot cup of coffee, and the Senate was to be the saucer that that coffee cooled in.

That is why we are 2-year terms here, 6-year terms over in the Senate, but they wanted a legislative body that

would be a quick reaction for us, a fast response for if things got out of whack, if they needed to be addressed quickly, then they wanted the House of Representatives to perhaps turn over quickly so that the House could respond to these issues in a fast way.

They wanted a judicial body, that legislative body that could sit back, maybe fold their arms a little bit, and wait and be patient and think things through so it wasn't just emotional. It was also kind of a hard-charging reaction force in the House, and seasoned by experience, I might add, Mr. Speaker; and a more careful, slower moving body in the Senate, which I think they clearly achieved a more careful, slower moving body in the Senate.

But one of those examples in modern day, when things went against the American people in the elections of 2010, around March 23, 2010—it was March 23—the final passage of ObamaCare passed out from the Senate and the House to President Obama's desk, and he signed that bill as fast as he could get his signature on it. The American people had rejected a Federal Government takeover of our health insurance, at least as a minimum.

And I long said that, you know, our soul is the most sovereign thing that we have, and the government hasn't figured out how to nationalize that yet. I don't believe they ever will.

The second thing that is the most sovereign thing that we have is our bodies, our skin, and everything inside it. ObamaCare nationalized a Federal takeover of the management of our body, our skin, and everything inside of it, took out of our hands the ability to manage our own health in a free market system, and the public rejected such an idea. They rejected ObamaCare.

On March 23, it passed and was signed into law. That election that ensued the following November brought 87 freshmen Republicans to the House of Representatives. Every one of them pledged and every one of them ran on the ticket to 100 percent, rip it out by the roots, repeal ObamaCare. That is the reaction of the public when this body here was not responding to the will of the people. They changed that over in the very next election, which was just months later, from the third month to the eleventh month as—so you are only—and 8 months later, the election had taken place, and we had 87 new freshmen Republicans on the way.

We didn't get as far as we needed to get. We didn't get it fully ripped out by the roots, as I wanted to do, but you can see the effects of that election to this day, Mr. Speaker.

That is how our Founding Fathers envisioned it would work—the House of Representatives to be a quick reaction force. They reacted quickly in the 2010 election. The American people weighed in. When the executive branch gets out of line, there are provisions there. If there is going to be impeachment, the

House has to initiate that impeachment. But over in the Senate, the impeachment doesn't remove a President from office.

I believe it constitutionally requires a trial in the Senate, but to remove a President from office takes a two-thirds majority in the United States Senate. I don't think they served us very well in 1998, when the impeachment went before the United States Senate, when William Jefferson Clinton was impeached by the House of Representatives, because the trial in the Senate didn't bring us a verdict. It put all the questions together.

And instead of asking the question, "Did he commit the acts that the House had indicted him for," and in a separate question, "Should he be removed from office for that," they jammed those questions together, and it gave some of the Democrat Senators a way out. They didn't have to answer the question, whether they believed he was guilty or not, so they never really heard the case and gave us a verdict on the conclusion.

It was inconclusive in the Senate. I think that the way they framed those questions that were voted upon by the Senators, I think it was a disservice to the American people, a disservice to our Constitution.

But, nonetheless, there is a check and a balance. If an executive—if a President gets out of line, if his executive branch gets out of line, the House of Representatives can initiate impeachment. The House of Representatives can shut off all funding to that branch of government or—well, it wouldn't do that, obviously, but to a division within that branch of government, we could cut the funds to the funding to bring about the result that is necessary if we have the conviction here and if we believe it is prudent policy.

The House controls the spending. The House initiates any impeachment that might be required, and we don't want to ever exercise that unless it is judiciously done for good reason and good cause. And the Senate, the prudent group of the Senate, come up for election every 6 years, so they can sit back a little bit. Only a third of them have the level of apprehension that all of those who are up for reelection in the House of Representatives do.

But this balance, this check and balance between the three branches of government, was that the branch of government and the division within it—the legislative branch and the U.S. House of Representatives, the division within it was always designed to be able to control the other branches of government and, by the way, able to limit the United States Senate.

The reasons for that are why we are up for election every 2 years so the people would be sovereign. We the people are the ones who really do decide who is right in all of this Republican form of government, which is guaranteed to the American people in the Constitu-

tion. We are guaranteed, Mr. Speaker, a Republican form of government. But in this form of government, it is we the people; and we the legislators within the United States House of Representatives are the most accountable to the people, and, by that, we need to be the most responsive to the people as well.

I think history has proven that out. So it doesn't mean either that the Supreme Court gets to decide necessarily what the Constitution means. I will define what it means here, Mr. Speaker, and that is, the Constitution has to mean what it says. It has to mean literally what it says, but it has to also mean what it was understood to mean at the time of its ratification.

Every one of us takes an oath to support and defend the Constitution. Here, in the House, 435 of us; and over in the Senate, 100 Senators; and a good number of executive branch employees, a long ways down the line, take an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States.

Now, I take that oath seriously, and I carry a Constitution in my jacket pocket every day, as close to my heart as it can get, to remember what this means, what it means to me.

But I don't take the oath to support and defend the Constitution with the idea in mind that I am going to shift my oath and the meaning of my oath to conform to a Supreme Court decision that does not reflect the original understanding of the Constitution. None of us can take an oath to a living, breathing, moving interpretation of a document.

This Constitution, Mr. Speaker, this Constitution constitutes a contractual guarantee, an intergenerational contractual guarantee that this God-given liberty, as defined in our Declaration, and the Bill of Rights and the structure of our government and the function of our government, the enumerated powers that are in here, that this is an intergenerational contractual guarantee passed down to us generation to generation, and it can't change its meaning just because five Justices over there in the Supreme Court decided to change its meaning.

□ 1630

Now, I want to respect their jurisprudence and I respect almost all of the decisions that have come down, but there have been times in history when an activist court has decided that they are going to rewrite this society according to their whim.

I have always admired Congressman LOUIE GOHMERT of Texas, who is a former judge. He came to this Congress and he ran on this ticket. He has been to Iowa a few times, and he is coming back. He says this:

I found myself on the bench as a judge, and I was constrained to interpret the literal meaning of the Constitution and to interpret the literal meaning of the laws that were passed, and when I felt the urge to be a legislator, I knew my obligation then was to leave the bench and run for Congress.

That is what you need to do when you feel in your heart that you are a

legislator, when you reason that you can do more to contribute as a legislator than you can as a judge.

So LOUIE GOHMERT came to this Congress. Congressman LOUIE GOHMERT came to this Congress in the right way for the right reasons, to legislate, because that was his heart's desire, and that is where he believed, and I hope today he still believes, that he can do the most good for this country.

But the Justices that sit on the bench that decide that they can just ignore the meaning of the Constitution are undermining our God-given liberty. They are undermining the foundation delivered to us by the Founders. They are undermining the Declaration. They are undermining the Constitution itself.

I can think of a few of those decisions. The Kelo decision, where the Supreme Court ruled that private property could be confiscated, condemned, through eminent domain by a local jurisdiction of government and then handed over to another private interest.

Let's just say that there is a widow lady that lives in a certain section of town, and she wants to live in that house the rest of her life, but there are developers that own the rest of the land around her, and they want to put in a shopping mall. So they would come in and say to the lady: Hey, here is our offer. We want to buy your house.

And she says: No. No amount of money can buy my house. I am going to live in this house the rest of my life.

Well, in the Kelo decision, they went to government, and government condemned the property, took that property away from her. It was litigated all the way to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court ruled that local government could condemn property under the Fifth Amendment, the Fifth Amendment, which says "nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

And think of this. They didn't say "nor shall private property be condemned and handed over to other private interests, without just compensation," because the Founding Fathers never imagined that government would have the audacity to condemn private property to hand it over to other private interests.

But the function of that decision was, and so now the effect of the Kelo decision is, the Fifth Amendment now reads, in effect, de facto, we say: Nor shall private property be taken without just compensation. They struck out those three words "for public use."

That is the effect of a Supreme Court decision, and it is an erroneous decision. It is a wrong decision. It doesn't reflect the language in the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution.

The dissent was written by Justice O'Connor. I didn't know until after I had made my statement on the floor after that decision that her dissent mirrored almost exactly the statement

that I made on the floor in rejection of it. I didn't expect the gentleman at that time from Massachusetts, Barney Frank, to agree with me either, but Barney Frank, Justice O'Connor, STEVE KING, and many others agreed: an erroneous decision.

A Supreme Court amended the Constitution, in effect. They de facto amended the Constitution of the United States by coming down with a decision that effectively struck the words "for public use" out of the Fifth Amendment, "nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

So now there are extra constitutional takings of private property handed over to private property because local government has concluded they can collect more tax dollars off of that private interest that wants to build a shopping mall or a truck stop or whatever it might be to expand. That is the kind of decision that a Supreme Court can make that are activist decisions that effectively amend our Constitution if we let them do that.

So we think of a decision like *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*. How did they cook that up? Where does that come from?

Well, it comes from out of the emanations and penumbras, Madam Speaker, and it is rooted back in a decision called the *Griswold* decision from the sixties. I believe it was 1964.

Connecticut, at that time, a strong Catholic State, had decided that they would not allow for contraceptives to be sold in Connecticut. The *Griswold* couple, husband and wife, decided that they had a right to privacy to purchase contraceptives to exercise their liberties.

Now, that decision that was made by the State of Connecticut not to sell contraceptives was a part of the laboratory of the States. It is a State's right to pass a decision like that; and as soon as the people in the State of Connecticut decided they rejected that decision, they can elect some new people to their legislature.

But this was litigated to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court of the United States decided that that couple, the *Griswold* couple, had a right to privacy, and that right to privacy included the right to purchase contraceptives.

So they created a new right, a right to privacy. They created it out of thin air, which we now call out of the emanations and penumbras. That is a little shadow around the edge of the cloud that maybe a Justice in a black robe can see but the rest of us lay people or even the brightest attorneys in the land can't quite see because they aren't seated on the Supreme Court.

Well, if you can find rights out of the emanations and penumbras that you can't find in the very language of the Constitution or statute, for that matter, you are an activist judge, and you are trying to alter our society, amend our society into your own fashion. You are legislating from the bench.

So they created a right to privacy, and this right to privacy was then used as the foundation of the decision in *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton* that granted, those two cases together, abortion on demand—abortion on demand, at least before viability. And viability is a very vague measure of a baby that would be able to survive outside the womb.

Now, that length of maturity within the womb and the ability to survive outside the womb has changed substantially, Madam Speaker, since *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*. Now we have babies who survive clear down as early as into the 20th week. Viability has changed because medicine has gotten ahead of this, and we have saved more babies.

But viability wasn't the only measure, because *Doe v. Bolton* gave all the exceptions that I talked about earlier, made exceptions for the health of the mother, the physical health, the mental health, the familial health, the financial health, anything that might affect her psyche. So it amounts to abortion on demand for the sake of, well, let's wait until it is convenient to take the life of that innocent little baby.

But what we see now, Madam Speaker, what we see now is that we are watching these babies grow in the womb and the ultrasound. My iPhone has a number of little babies and the ultrasounds in it, and you can watch as those little babies will squirm and reach their arm out, suck their thumb. They look like they are trying to talk, stretch their legs out. They move around a lot more than we ever thought they did.

I have talked to mothers who say as they watch their little baby that is 19, 20 weeks along, squirming around in the ultrasound, that a lot of the time they can't yet feel that movement. We know that as we get later on, even us dads get to feel that movement, and it is a glorious thing. This is the development of a miracle, and you can't be a parent or a grandparent and hold a little baby that is flesh of your flesh and not be amazed at the miracle of a little baby.

When I took my firstborn in my hands, little David STEVEN KING, and put him in my hands and looked at him, it was with awe that I saw so many pieces about him: counted the fingers and toes, took a look at his eyes, saw every little feature that is there, that little son.

And I began to ask that question shortly after his birth: Could anyone take his life now within minutes after he was born? As squirmy and beautiful and miraculous, created in God's image as he was, could anybody take his life then? I don't know anybody who would be ghastly enough who could do so.

So I thought, if he is 20 minutes old and we can't take his life, if he is 5 minutes old and we can't take his life, if he is 1 minute old and we can't take his life, how could we take it a minute before he was born? or 5 minutes? or an

hour? or a day? or a week? or a month? Where along this continuum from this moment of conception would there be a time that we could say: Oh, he is only a blob of tissue?

He was never a blob of tissue. He was always a unique human being, joining together the DNA of his mother and his father in a unique fashion that would never be matched again.

Madam Speaker, think of this. Seven billion people on the planet, every one unique. Even the identical twins, the identical quadruplets that are there, their mother can tell them apart. Their father can tell them apart most of the time. And the older they get, the easier it is. But 7 billion faces on this planet, and God created those faces to be unique. No two faces are the same. Even if their DNA is matched up in identical twins or identical quadruplets or identical triplets, as rare as they are, their mothers can look them in the face and know which child is which. The rest of us can figure out everybody else, and we can, a lot of times, figure out the twins, too.

I have twin nieces that I could always tell apart. They would ask me how I could, and I would say: Well, one of you is really intelligent and the other is really beautiful. You two figure out which is which. I am not going to answer the question.

But we can tell them apart. Now, what a gift from God, the creation, to have the imagination to create faces, every one unique. No matter how many people on the planet there are, just the facial features are unique, let alone all the rest of us, let alone all the things that go on in our heads and in our minds and the experiences we have, the personalities that develop differently. That combination of nature or nurture that we will never unlock the mystery of that, that is all a gift from God.

We have aborted 60 million of the gifts from God—60 million—and another 60 million babies not born because their mothers were aborted. Children who never had the opportunity to live to draw that first breath of free air.

When I welcome a new grandchild into the world, I say a prayer over them, Madam Speaker, and I pray that they have a long and a healthy life, a faithful life, and a life that is long and healthy and faithful. And when that day comes that they are called home at the end of that long and healthy and faithful life, I pray that the last breath that they draw is more free than the first breaths that they are drawing on that day. And that is what we need to work for: more freedom, more God-given liberty, more young lives brought into this world.

The very source of all joy comes from little babies, from our children, and if we stopped having babies, the joy would finally just die down. The laughter, the giggling would just diminish day by day by day until there was no joy left in the world, because that is the source of it. And yet we are aborting 1 million babies a year.

That is why, Madam Speaker, I brought the Heartbeat bill to this House of Representatives, H.R. 490, the Heartbeat Protection Act. That is why we have worked so hard to get cosponsors on this legislation, we worked so hard to get the cosponsors.

People like former majority leader Tom DeLay came here to work pro bono. The leader of Faith2Action, Janet Porter, a driving force, worked to get cosponsors on this legislation, worked to send the messages in the right place. We carefully drafted language that reflects our intent to save the lives of as many babies as we can from the moment of the heartbeat.

We require that, if the abortionist is intending to commit an abortion, he must first check for a heartbeat, and that heartbeat would be detected at 7 to 8 weeks. If a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected, because we know that is a unique human being, a sacred human life.

□ 1645

I would like to go back to the moment of conception, but we can't yet medically identify that moment. But we can identify when a heartbeat can be detected. We all know that if there is a beating heart, there is a baby there. That heart doesn't just sit down there on its own beating away. It is in the chest of a baby, a little baby, a little unique boy or a girl who is a gift from God. That baby has at least a 95 percent chance of successful birth once we can detect that heartbeat in the womb.

So how could we allow for the ending of that unique human being's life without that baby ever having a chance to draw a breath of free air or to scream for its own mercy? How could we say no to that? How could we have in our earpieces that ultrasound of that beating heart?

That little granddaughter is 20 weeks along and her heart was beating last week, anyway, at 161 beats per minute. That beat is strong, firm, and solid. She has at least a 95 percent chance of successful birth and being welcomed into this world drawing that breath of free air, and I will pray as freely still on her last day many, many years from now.

But we need to get there. We need to protect these lives, and we need to get a bill before the Supreme Court. So here in this House, we are 170 cosponsors strong. We are far ahead of any other significant piece of pro-life legislation. I drafted the bill with the strategy in mind, Madam Speaker, to get the Heartbeat bill before the Supreme Court after the next appointment to the Supreme Court.

I am very pleased with what I see with Neil Gorsuch. When I hear the rumors of the potential retirements in the Supreme Court, our three oldest members of the Supreme Court are 84, 80, and 78 years old, Madam Speaker. So we can expect a retirement fairly soon. We need to have a bill out of the

House of Representatives sitting on MITCH MCCONNELL's desk long enough and hard enough that we can gin up the effort to get it passed out of the United States Senate.

There are four windows that need to be open before we can start to save lives in significant numbers, Madam Speaker. One of them is a pro-life majority in the House of Representatives. We have that, 237 votes behind the pain-capable 20-week bill.

The next one is a pro-life majority in the United States Senate. Senator ROY BLUNT made mention in our values team here a couple of weeks ago that they have a bare majority, a pro-life majority in the Senate. Fifty-one votes voted for the 20-week bill over there. They didn't break the filibuster, but 51. That is a pro-life majority. If they suspend the rules over there and get rid of the filibuster rule, the votes are there to pass Heartbeat bill over and send it to the President's desk. That is the third window.

The first window is a pro-life majority in the House. The second window is a pro-life majority in the Senate. The third window is a President who will sign the Heartbeat bill to protect these lives from the seventh or eighth week all the way through. I don't have any doubt President Trump will sign such a bill, and I don't have any doubt that Vice President PENCE will be standing right next to him when that day comes. I don't know whether I am going to be standing there, but I am going to do everything I can, Madam Speaker, to get the Heartbeat bill to the President's desk.

Yes, it will be litigated. The pro-abortion people will litigate everything that slows down the abortion mills in this country. So it would be litigated. And the timing of getting it out of the Senate to the President's desk and before the Court after the next confirmation means we are called upon to move the Heartbeat bill out of the House within the next few months because as we get closer to the election, it gets harder. Things get crazy around here. So if it gets passed around July, it is going to be really hard to move the Heartbeat bill.

There is a little rule that was handed down, I think, from the previous Speaker that says that pro-life legislation doesn't move off the floor of the House unless the top three pro-life organizations support it and will actively support it here in the House of Representatives.

Those organizations would be Family Research Council. Tony Perkins supports the bill. The next organization is Susan B. Anthony List. They also have agreed to support the bill. Yes, they have a priority they would like to have move ahead of that, but Marjorie Dannenfelser said:

Of course, I would never stand in the way of something so good as the Heartbeat bill.

The third organization is the one that is not fully on board. In fact, I don't see that they are supporting it in

any way, and back channel says to me that there are some statements made to try to slow it down. That is the National Right to Life, the oldest and the largest pro-life organization in the United States of America. They said that they don't oppose the Heartbeat bill.

Madam Speaker, this is right off of their electronic publication, whether it happens to be a tweet or whether it is their website, but here is their statement: National Right to Life, protecting life in America since 1968.

National Right to Life says they do not oppose the Heartbeat bill. I struck through there with a red line and said: Well, neither do they support it. They don't oppose the Heartbeat bill. Well, they don't support the Heartbeat bill.

They are stuck on this. They are hidebound on this. Their mission statement says that they support and protect life from the beginning of life until natural death. They define the beginning of life at the moment of fertilization.

So how can you be National Right to Life and not support the Heartbeat bill?

Their reasoning is that they are stuck in this. They refuse to challenge the Supreme Court. They refuse to challenge the viability standards that were written into *Roe v. Wade*, *Doe v. Bolton*, and *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*.

If the number one pro-life organization refuses to challenge the Supreme Court on those standards, then what they are really doing is accepting—and some would say accepting the idea that we are going to see 1 million abortions a year in this country, as far as the eye can see, because if you are not willing to challenge the Supreme Court, then you are accepting 1 million abortions.

That is what we get if we are trimming around the edges with pain-capable at 20 weeks. I support all of this legislation. Let's do it all, Madam Speaker. The pain-capable doesn't get the job done. It shies away from challenging the Supreme Court.

We wrote this Heartbeat bill, H.R. 490, in order to challenge the viability standard the Supreme Court has. We want to measure life—unique, precious, sacred human life—from the moment of conception until natural death, protected. By the way, protected in the 14th Amendment. We are all protected in there: life, liberty, and property. So all we need to do is define when life begins, and we are obligated by the Constitution to protect that life.

But the Supreme Court has different ideas. I don't believe they will after the next appointment to the Supreme Court.

So some of the people who agree with National Right to Life have said that not enough States have passed it. Okay. So we went to work. Here are the States that have passed heartbeat protection language: Ohio, North Dakota, and Arkansas.

Now, John Kasich vetoed that legislation.

Who lobbied him to do that?

The arm of National Right to Life and Planned Parenthood; side by side, by the way.

What brings them to do that, Madam Speaker?

Because they don't want to challenge the Supreme Court. There is testimony that went before the Ohio Legislature December 13, 2011, that said: We don't want to force Justice Kennedy to vote "no" on a Heartbeat bill because then Justice Ginsburg might write the majority opinion. If she does that, she might take away the things we have gained. And we should not go before the Court and risk what we have gained.

I would argue instead that every time we have gone before the Court, we have gained. We gain something. We gain ground. The Court is sensitive to the movement of our society. They were sensitive to that when they ran up the Obergefell decision that imposed same-sex marriage on America. They decided American society was ready for same-sex marriage, and they gave us an extraconstitutional decision and forced it on everyone in America.

They must have been right because there wasn't a very big fight that was put up. But by their rationale, we are a lot more ready to protect innocent unborn human life than we ever were for gay marriage. Yet we need to get this legislation before the Court.

Tonight at 6 o'clock eastern time, 7 o'clock central time, there is a full hearing before the Iowa House of Representatives on their Heartbeat legislation, which has passed the senate 30-20. It went before the house. It has passed out of committee out of the house last Thursday night in the last hour that was available in what they call funnel week. Now this hearing is called for by the pro-abortion people who want to have a full house hearing. The witnesses will be lined up there. They will stand up for life tonight.

If the hearing goes the way we expect, I expect the bill will come before the Iowa House of Representatives and it will pass. Watching the expressions on our excellent and wonderful first female Governor in the State of Iowa, Kim Reynolds, I can't imagine she would do anything but sign it. I don't want to put words in her mouth. I am just anticipating a wonderful result.

I believe in 1 week or 2 weeks that becomes law in Iowa. Likely the pro-abortion people will litigate like they did in Mississippi on Mississippi's 15-week bill that we have just seen before today, an injunction that is going before the Sixth Circuit. The viability standards in *Roe v. Wade*, *Doe v. Bolton*, and also *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* will be challenged in the Fifth Circuit on the basis of the Mississippi law. Then that means that the Iowa law that I anticipate also will be litigated.

Why wouldn't we send this standard over to the Senate and on to go before the Supreme Court?

H.R. 490, the Heartbeat Protection Act, litigated at the same time before the United States Supreme Court along with Mississippi's 15-week bill and Iowa's Heartbeat bill. That looks to me like a good result. That brings it from several different angles.

I would remind the body that there were three Federal circuits where the partial-birth abortion legislation was heard simultaneously. They arrived packaged up in one case before the United States Supreme Court, and life prevailed in that case, as eventually life will prevail in the United States of America.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2154. An act to rename the Red River Valley Agricultural Research Center in Fargo, North Dakota, as the Edward T. Schafer Agricultural Research Center.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 21, 2018, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4304. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Vermont; Nonattainment New Source Review and Prevention of Significant Deterioration Permit Program Revisions; Infrastructure Requirements for National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R01-OAR-2017-0589; FRL-9975-16-Region 1] received March 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4305. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's withdrawal of direct final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Revision to References for Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Sector to Incorporate Latest Edition of Certain Industry, Consensus-based Standards [EPA-HQ-OAR-2017-0472; FRL-9975-19-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT53) received March 8, 2018,

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4306. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality Plans; Pennsylvania; Lebanon County 2012 Fine Particulate Matter Standard Determination of Attainment [EPA-R03-OAR-2017-0479; FRL-9975-00-Region 3] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4307. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources; Amendments [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0505; FRL-9975-10-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT59) received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4308. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Lipochitooligosaccharide (LCO) SP104; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0080; FRL-9973-39] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4309. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Washington: Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R10-RCRA-2017-0285; FRL-9974-35-Region 10] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4310. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Massachusetts; Logan Airport Parking Freeze [EPA-R01-OAR-2017-0590; FRL-9974-96-Region 1] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4311. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Redesignation of the Delta, Ohio Area to Attainment of the 2008 Lead Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2017-0256; FRL-9975-46-Region 5] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4312. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Amendment to Ambient Air Quality Standard for Ozone [EPA-R03-OAR-2016-0592; FRL-9975-13-Region 3] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4313. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Removal of Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) Trading Programs [EPA-R03-OAR-2017-0215; FRL-9975-32-Region 3] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.