

For millions of families, their local public school simply cannot provide the education that their child needs. For instance, recovery schools create a safe environment for students who are struggling with addiction to drugs and alcohol.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood and Secondary Education, I accompanied Secretary DeVos last September when she visited the H.O.P.E. Academy, a recovery school located in Indianapolis, Indiana.

There, I heard the story of Jeremy, who, like many kids, wanted to fit in. One day, Jeremy reconnected with an old friend, who offered him marijuana. Before long, he was using and selling even harder drugs. Eventually, he was blacking out and was arrested. He could not find the help he needed at his local school.

Thankfully, he and his parents found and enrolled in H.O.P.E. Academy. Because of H.O.P.E. Academy, Jeremy got clean, enrolled in seminary, and met his wife. Just 1 year ago, they welcomed their first child.

It is because of these stories, and so many others, Mr. Speaker, that I fully support the right of parents to find the school that works best for them and their kids.

ABORTION BAN

(Mrs. LAWRENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, we are close to a government shutdown. The Republicans' top priority, however, is taking away a woman's right to choose.

The abortion survivors bill is nothing but an insensitive, insulting, and unconstitutional attack against a woman's right to make her own healthcare decisions. No matter how sneaky the Republicans have been in drafting this bill, it is still, plain and simple, an abortion ban. It criminalizes doctors and intrudes into the doctor-patient relationship.

Politicians are choosing what is best for a woman's health, instead of a woman making a choice with her doctor. This bill is part of the Republicans' agenda to take healthcare away from women.

On the eve of the Women's March, we say again: Enough is enough. This bill will intimidate and close down reproductive health clinics across the country, leaving women who truly need help with no choices at all.

READING EAGLE HISTORY

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

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a pillar of journalistic integrity in our democracy, the Reading Eagle, a newspaper in my district in Berks County, Penn-

sylvania. This month, the paper celebrates its 150th anniversary.

On January 28, 1868, the Reading Eagle published its first daily paper and is now one of the oldest family-owned newspapers in our country. Today, the paper operates its headquarters in downtown Reading and serves as a valuable resource for news to many of my constituents.

Congratulations to the Reading Eagle and its staff on this exciting milestone; and thank you for providing community news, great local content, national news, and providing transparency and accountability of government at all levels for the betterment of our democracy.

In spite of all of the competing sources of information and evolving technology of today, the Reading Eagle remains the greater Berks region's go-to source for reliable local news and information.

IMPEACHMENT

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the many people around the country who have supported the cause of impeachment.

I rise to thank the many Members of the House. Today, 66 voted to advance the cause of impeachment. Previously, 58 voted to advance the cause.

I rise to thank all who have been supportive and who are advancing the cause to protect democracy, to protect the Republic, and to make sure that what we have is never eliminated from the face of the Earth, and that is the greatest country on the face of the Earth.

PROTECTING LIFE

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, today is a day where tens of thousands of people come to Washington, D.C., to march for the sanctity of life for the real purpose of speaking up for those who can't speak for themselves.

Each year, we see an unbelievable number of people coming to not only proclaim what a pro-life position is, but to come out in unison to make sure that we once again return to our roots of protecting life and knowing that every life is precious.

Sadly, much of the Main Street media will not be covering this today; but in this House, on this day, let us know that, indeed, we are still one nation under God and willing to protect life.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GALLAGHER). The Chair will recognize

Members for Special Order speeches without prejudice to the possible resumption of legislative business.

MARCH FOR LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 here on the floor of the House of Representatives to carry on some of the discussion that is taking place around this city and around this country today on March for Life day.

It would take you back 45 years ago to January 22, 1973, when the case of Roe v. Wade and Doe v. Bolton came before the United States Supreme Court. They manufactured a legal opinion out of the emanations and conundrums to quote the decision that resulted in abortion on demand in this country. Some say abortions soared up to as many as 6 million a year in some of those years in the 1970s.

America wasn't ready for such a decision. We didn't understand, in 1973, the magnitude of the decision the Supreme Court had made. We knew that it was going to open up abortion. We suspected it would be abortion on demand. We did not expect that, 45 years later, we would be here in this city still marching, marching for life, marching to defend the lives of the innocent unborn, and praying in most, if not every single church in America, to defend innocent, unborn human life.

Some of the questions that have come before us in that period of time as two generations of Americans have grown up with the guilt of abortion, with the shadow hanging over our heads, two generations of Americans have grown up having to answer this question: Is human life sacred? Is it the value, is it the measure that we put up when we evaluate all things we do?

Our Founding Fathers understood that when they laid out the original founding document of the Declaration of Independence. They wrote that we have the unalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Now, it is no coincidence that life is first in that list, Mr. Speaker. Our Founding Fathers understood that they were prioritized rights, that the right to life is paramount and that the right to life is sacred, but that liberty comes from God. He confers his God-given liberty on us, and we have to handle it responsibly. And behind that came pursuit of happiness.

Now I will take it from the bottom up, Mr. Speaker.

Pursuit of happiness was understood differently by our Founders than I think we understand it today. It seems to me that, if you go into a high school classroom, those who have been studying our founding documents—our Declaration and our Constitution and the Federalist Papers—and ask them what does "pursuit of happiness" mean, they

might say: "Well, a good tailgate party," or "a fun time with your friends," or any one of a number of other things that they do for recreation.

But, truthfully, Mr. Speaker, that is not how our Founding Fathers looked at that pursuit of happiness. They don't even call it the rich things we draw from our families, exclusively. But they understood "pursuit of happiness" as the term is understood in Greek, which is the foundation for that term. It is the word "eudaimonia," spelled E-U-D-A-I-M-O-N-I-A.

Eudaimonia, the breadth of the pursuit of happiness, if described and understood properly, is this: It is becoming the whole human being, the whole person; developing yourself physically with the God-given bodies that we have with exercise and nutrition; developing our skill sets with the gifts that we have that are physical skills. And it includes, also, the intellectual component, where we develop our minds as far as we can, educate ourselves and fill that God-given brain up with all the information that is relevant and useful. That is the second component.

□ 1215

The third component is spiritual. They expected and called upon this pursuit of happiness, this eudaimonia—the effort to become a complete human being, a complete human being spiritually, intellectually, and physically, that was the package of eudaimonia, the pursuit of happiness—but even that couldn't trump another individual's liberty, couldn't take aside the God-given liberty to live free and be free and have free movement and rights to property and a number of those components.

So our effort to pursue happiness can't trample on someone else's God-given liberty. We understand that. You can't take away somebody's property because it makes you happy. It is a pretty simple equation. Neither, then, can a pursuit of liberty be allowed to justify the taking of a human life, because life is the highest priority.

It is always prioritized, life, liberty, pursuit of happiness; or in Burke's language, life, liberty and property. Life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness is always prioritized with life as the highest priority that stands above all else.

I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, that when you want to know how we measure, the meter, invented by a Frenchman, is set to be that 39-point-something inches, and they have a platinum meter stick that is set up so that they could have a finite measure that they keep in a controlled atmosphere so it doesn't expand or contract, and it is the most precise measurement of a meter. That is the basis for distance measuring in the metric world, most of the rest of the world. That is the basis to distance measuring.

That meter stick—that platinum meter stick is the measure itself that they measure everything else against

in components of or multiples of that meter stick.

Well, I would take you to the former Governor of Pennsylvania, Bob Casey, Sr., who has passed away and who was the father of Senator BOB CASEY. He made this statement:

Human life cannot be measured. It is the measure itself against which all other things are weighed.

Now, here is the comparison that I have drawn. The meter stick is the measure itself of distance, but human life is the measure of all of our values.

Human life is sacred, it is finite, and the value of life from the moment of conception until natural death is the same. We don't punish people differently when they commit murder against someone who is 101 years old versus someone who is 1 year old. Somebody who has, perhaps, a century of life ahead of them, we don't say their life is worth more than someone who almost certainly doesn't have a decade of life ahead of them, because human life is sacred and it is the measure itself against which all other things are weighed.

So once we understand that human life is sacred in all of its forms, there is only one other question to ask, and that is: At what moment does life begin? At what instant does life begin?

We can look through this whole period of human development and we can make arguments about viability and trimesters and ability to breathe or live outside the womb. Those things are always vague, you can never nail that down to anything precise, because even the Pain-Capable legislation that we passed out of this House a couple of months ago that bans abortions after 20 weeks, we say that baby can feel pain at 20 weeks, so that is abhorrent to our conscience and we reject aborting a baby that can feel pain.

We don't know whether they can feel pain prior to that or not, but that is not a precise moment. It is a relatively vague moment that is a consensus conclusion of OB/GYN doctors, perhaps, but life itself cannot be measured and neither can we take that life and say: Well, we might not have.

I have often stood in a high school or even a middle school gymnasium and talked to the youth in there whose ears and minds are open, and I asked: If someone walked by the door of this gymnasium and looked away from you and poked a gun in the door and pulled the trigger, did he kill somebody?

And they looked at each other and said: Well, we don't know.

And I said: Neither does he. But if there is somebody laying there in the bleachers that is dead, then what happened?

They said: Then we know he killed somebody.

I said: Well, can you take a chance with that? Is he guilty of murder if he poked a gun in the door and the crowd was full and he pulled the trigger and somebody died?

They said: Yes.

Mr. Speaker, so neither can we take a chance with innocent unborn human life and say it really isn't a life prior to 20 weeks, or it really isn't a life prior to viability, or it really isn't a life until the third trimester.

So what we have done in this Congress is we have brought in a number of pieces of legislation, incremental pieces of legislation to try to put an end to this killing, because the pro-life community knows and believes—all the pro-life community is convinced that life begins at that moment of conception, that instant of conception, and we have to protect that life from that moment.

Anybody who has picked up a little baby, especially if it is your own, in awe at the miracle of this little child created in God's image from the DNA of mom and dad, to be nurtured and shaped, to live, to love, to learn, to laugh, to worship, to have children of his or her own, understands that miracle and how precious it is to us.

There are at least 500,000 couples in America that are waiting to adopt because they want a baby to love so badly, yet we have watched as 60 million babies have been aborted since 1973, in the last 45 years; 60 million babies weighing on the conscience of America, a sin committed by the government of our country. There have been people complicit in this that have advocated for it.

Just a little bit ago, we had the vote on the Born-Alive bill here on the floor that enhances the penalty. If an abortionist isn't successful on the first try, what they often do is put that baby in a cold room and close the door and let that baby die in that cold room. There are other more ghastly methods that get used as well.

So we moved legislation here on the floor to statutorily protect that baby that survives the abortion. In essence, what it really says in the end is this: If you try to end the life of this baby through abortion and fail, we are going to punish you if you need a second try.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is nearly enough. I think it is a start, but it is not nearly enough. Actually, we need to be accelerating our pace in incrementalism, not taking our foot off the throttle on the incremental approach to ending abortion.

So in 45 years, 2 generations, 60 million babies. I am glad we have passed the legislation that protects a born-alive baby from being killed by the abortionist. I am glad we did that today, but we should not see it as a premier piece of legislation that is going to end even one abortion. Instead, it might end some of the killing post-abortion. So it says something about our defense of life, but it doesn't say nearly enough about our defense of life.

Through the time that I have been here in this pro-life movement in Iowa and here in this Congress, 2 decades more altogether, I have gone from trying to get legislation passed that required that if a young mother was

seeking an abortion—a minor mother was seeking an abortion—that she needed to have parental notification. That was about all we could get back when I started on this in 1996. Notify a parent, even then they defined the parent as, well, she can notify a mom or a dad, a stepmom or a stepdad, a grandmother or a grandfather, an aunt or an uncle, a brother or a sister in the whole or half blood.

That is how Planned Parenthood lobbied to define this parent that would be notified that this child mother was going to get an abortion. There is still not parental consent in my State, but, instead, it is parental notification with this long list of what a parent is: a father, a mother, a guardian, a legal guardian—those are okay—then grandparents, aunts, uncles, brothers, sisters in the whole or half blood.

I said: You left out the neighbor, the family cat or the family dog. Couldn't you just name everything as a parent? Maybe you could seal an envelope up and put it in a safety deposit box, and they could open up the archives in 100 years, and that would be the notice, for all the impact they had.

They did everything to restrict anything that might protect an innocent unborn baby. That is what it was like in 1996 for me in my State.

So through that time, we have marched through this march of incrementalism.

Prior to that—God bless Henry Hyde. From where I stand and from the floor of this House, time after time he stood up and he defended life. The Hyde amendment, along with the Mexico City policy, over the effect of these many years along the way, has cumulatively saved somewhere in the neighborhood of 2 million lives. Now, that sounds like a big number, 2 million lives, and it makes me feel good about Henry Hyde.

I recall going to his funeral and saying good-bye to Henry. I know that if there is anybody who has stood here and talked at the podium who is in heaven, it is Henry Hyde. The number one pro-life activist, effective worker here as a former chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, he used the tools of his job and his character and his faith to save roughly 2 million lives.

Then I try to figure out: How many others did we save with the incrementalism that we have?

I was involved in the effort. I want to tip my hat to STEVE CHABOT, who was the chairman of the Constitution Committee at that time when I came to this Congress, and we had the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act. That was passed out of this Congress and written into law, but they litigated that to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court came down and turned it down in a decision that said you can't ban partial-birth abortion because that procedure is written too vaguely within the law, so the physician—put that in quotes, the “physician”—can't determine exactly what is lawful and what isn't. On

top of that, we hadn't determined that a partial-birth abortion is never necessary to save the life of the mother.

So we went back to work and we rewrote that legislation to conform with the Supreme Court's “no” decision. We precisely defined the ghastly act of partial-birth abortion in law. We held multiple hearings. Through the course of that, we established congressional findings that a partial-birth abortion was never medically necessary to save the life of the mother.

So we answered both of the Supreme Court's objections, and that went back out again, where it was litigated through the three circuits that were converging before the Supreme Court. I was part of that, and I sat through one of those cases in Lincoln, Nebraska, and then came to hear the case here in the United States Supreme Court as well, and there we prevailed.

Now, I don't know how many lives we have saved with the ban on partial-birth abortion. They will find another way to abort that baby, but at least we put another principle in place. We are still stuck at about 2 million babies saved over the course of 45 years.

I look at some of the other legislation we passed out of the House but not the Senate. Senate Democrats are blocking piece after piece of legislation, but a couple of months ago we passed the legislation over to the Senate that, as we call it, Pain-Capable, or the 20-week abortion ban, and that legislation is the legislation I mentioned a few minutes ago. We have determined that a baby can feel pain. We have evidence of them squirming and struggling to get away from the surgeon's tools, and we have got the testimony of abortionists that tell us how a baby struggles and exhibits pain.

Many of you, I believe, Mr. Speaker, have seen the surgery that was being conducted on about a 7-month gestational baby. The incision went into the womb, and that baby reached outside his mother's womb and held the finger of the surgeon. That picture will be in my mind forever. We can't think that a baby that can grasp the finger of a surgeon 2 months before he is born is not a human being and not a human life. Of course they are.

So we in this House banned abortion after 20 weeks under the definition that they are capable of feeling pain. That is a step in the right direction and it is a pretty big chunk of incrementalism as well that goes further than maybe anything that has come off the floor of this House so far.

We also have legislation waiting here that has pieces of incrementalism, but the Born-Alive legislation that passed this morning here is incrementalism, and it is a small incrementalism that actually doesn't stop a single abortion, but does put a statement down on the value of that baby.

Then there is legislation here that prohibits sex-selected abortion, because we are seeing now with ultrasound that you can determine at

an early stage whether it is a boy or whether it is a girl. We have people who say: Well, I think I will abort the girl because I want my first child to be a boy. I will take my chances the next time.

How do you do that? How do you do that? If you believe that human life is sacred in all of its forms, how can you take the life of a little baby and say, “I don't want this child to be the sibling to my next child because it is a girl instead of a boy,” or, and less often, “a boy instead of a girl?”

We know what that has done statistically in China with the one-child policy in China, which they have just lifted to some degree, and you have family after family that will abort any pregnancy that is not a boy because they want a boy to carry on the name.

□ 1230

I have a former constituent named Gill Copper, now passed away. Gill Copper was one of Merrill's Marauders who fought down out of the Asian subcontinent in the Second World War. For a while, he was stationed in India, and there, under the Ganges River that goes through New Delhi, or Delhi, India, I believe that is the river—but he would go down and wait under that bridge, especially towards evening, and he would just stand in the water, say, up to here, and he would listen and watch and listen for the splash.

When he heard the splash, he knew what brought that about. The splash was, many times, a little girl baby who was being thrown off the bridge into the river because they didn't want a little girl. Gill Copper would swim out there, in that dirty river, get ahold of that little baby, bring that baby and swim back to shore with that baby, dry that baby off, get that baby breathing, and carry that baby down to the orphanage and start that baby's life there.

He saved dozens and dozens of little girl babies by posting himself in that river in India, as a warrior defending our freedom in the Second World War, and he became a pro-life activist. He already was. He came back to America a pro-life activist.

I want to do all we can to support his sacrifice in his memory, and in Henry Hyde's, and in Joe Pitts', and in CHRIS SMITH's, and in Trent Franks'. Those are the names of the people who have led on this issue since I have been in this Congress and before. All of them deserve a special place in all of our heads and hearts for the work that they have done.

We are at a place now where the pieces of legislation that have come through this House of Representatives and have been sent to the Senate, or are poised to come through this House and sent to the Senate, now it comes down in the House to this: we have the bill that prohibits sex-selected abortion. Let's see. We have no sex-selected abortion, and Pain-Capable legislation has already passed.

And then CHRIS SMITH has legislation that prohibits abortion on the dismemberment. To describe this, Mr. Speaker, is also ghastly and ghastly, and that is the process of the dismemberment abortion, where the surgeon reaches in with specially made forceps and grips a part of a baby and pulls—we had a doctor who had committed I don't know how many thousands of abortions describe this before the Judiciary Committee—and pull with very strong force, pull hard and come out with an arm or a leg or a part of a torso, and arrange those pieces in a stainless steel pan to see if he got all the pieces of the baby who he was tearing apart.

CHRIS SMITH's legislation stops that ghastly process. It doesn't end abortion, but it ends the ghastly process of dismemberment abortion, and I support that legislation. In fact, I have signed on to every piece of pro-life legislation that has come through this House of Representatives, unless I just missed one somewhere. I believe it is every single one.

But as I watched this incrementalism take place, I have always looked for, when do the stars align themselves right? How do we get to this place where we do what we know is true, and right, and just? When will it be aligned right?

And the alignment, we have known this for 45 years. We can save these lives, those who will be aborted in the future; we can save them if we have a pro-life majority in the House of Representatives that is willing to take action, if we have a pro-life majority in the United States Senate that can figure out how to get past the 60-vote filibuster rule, if we have a President who will sign the legislation, and if we have a Supreme Court that will uphold that legislation.

Four windows, Mr. Speaker, four windows we need to have open. And they almost have to be open, they have to be open in sequence, and they have to be open at the right time.

So, today, we have a pro-life majority in the House of Representatives ready to move, if we can get it to the floor, any reasonable piece of pro-life legislation that is consistent with the philosophy that I have articulated here in the last half hour. The House is ready.

The Senate has a pro-life majority. They don't have, yet, a way to get past that 60-vote threshold of the filibuster; except, all MITCH MCCONNELL needs to do is go out there and make a motion to amend the rule, by suspending or deleting the filibuster rule, and that can pass by a simple majority in the United States Senate. So all he needs is 51 votes. And I will bet you MIKE PENCE would fly back from the Middle East to cast that 51st vote if it meant opening up the door to save these lives and put an end to the discretion of aborting babies because they happen to be inconvenient, or for other purposes.

So the House is ready. The Senate has a pro-life majority. They have got

to get past the filibuster. The President will sign legislation to save lives; and he is giving a speech, maybe about now, talking about the value of innocent, unborn human life.

We have never had such a pro-life President. We have never had—and I will say this twice—we have never, never had such a pro-life Vice President, MIKE PENCE, who sat next to me on my elbow on the Judiciary Committee for, I believe it was, 10 years. I understand his convictions, and I know what he will be saying to the President. I understand the President's convictions.

We need to get legislation to the President's desk. What a tragedy if we failed to move when we had the chance to move. What a tragedy if we weren't bold when we had the opportunity to be bold. What a tragedy if we are stuck in the rut of incrementalism and this little, dinky war of attrition that goes on between factions here within the House and within the Senate when we know what is the true, right, and just thing to do.

But I have described how we have to be precise in the way we draft legislation that prohibits practices; it prohibits abortion, along with other things. And we have to determine the rationale for our decisions here in the House and in the Senate.

So I drafted legislation a year and a half ago, and it is called the Heartbeat Protection Act. The Heartbeat Protection Act is H.R. 490, and it does this: it directs that, if an abortionist is planning to commit an abortion, he must first check for a heartbeat. If a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected. That is the center of the legislation. It is only a few pages. It is not complex. We stripped it down so it was clean and everybody could understand it.

We define the check for the heartbeat to be within the parameters of modern medicine. We can determine a heartbeat, we know the heart will beat as early as 18 days, but it can be determined with confidence at about 6 weeks. So the 20-week bill is the Pain-Capable. This Heartbeat bill can be thought of in, say, roughly 6 weeks from conception. But our definition is the heartbeat, not any time frame. The heartbeat is precise.

You can say then to the Supreme Court, we are not going to end the lives of these babies if their heart is beating. We can determine whether the heart is beating or not.

One hundred percent of the time that a baby's heart is beating, you have got a live baby; and so we know if we stop that beating heart, we have ended the life of a baby. It is really clear and simple, and it doesn't take a Rhodes Scholar to figure that out, even at the Supreme Court level.

It is within our hearts, and I look across the countryside, and the miles and miles, thousands and thousands of miles, that I have driven over the last 45 years, and each year, I see more and

more of the billboards up, many of them put up by the Knights of Columbus, that say, "Abortion Stops a Beating Heart," or "We All Start Small."

They have gotten into our heads and into our conscience and into the culture of America. When we see those billboards, we know what that says. It says, defend these little innocents. They might be the ones who produce the miracles going forward. Every one of them is a miracle; every one of them created in God's image.

But we know that abortion stops a beating heart, and we have all heard that rhythm of the ultrasound. We have all heard that sound of a beating heart. If the rules didn't prohibit it, I would take out my iPhone and play this into the microphone because I have got one of those glorious things that is really close to me in my iPhone right now, the beating of that little heart, 158 beats per minute, a healthy, healthy little child. I have had them sent to me by constituents. They want me to listen, and they will show me the ultrasound.

I have a district representative who framed the first ultrasound for his firstborn, and that little guy now—that frame has been in his office for all these years. That little guy now, his name is Joseph Dean Anderson, is 9 years old, and he is my godson. His first picture is of his ultrasound. It is still framed, it is still cherished by his parents, and he is cherished by me.

These lives are utterly precious. They are the future of our country. Today, we have 102 million Americans who are working, they are of working-age, simply not in the workforce.

We are hearing debates here and in the Senate going on this week and next week, and many weeks thereafter, about how we don't have a workforce in America to do the work; so we have to go to foreign countries and bring people here who bring with them a different culture, which, if they embrace ours, is fine. They will assimilate to Americanism.

But we have got a large segment of America that is coaching them not to do that, to stick with the old ways, rather than our ways. There is a consequence to that that is for another discussion, another time, Mr. Speaker.

But I will submit this: 60 million babies aborted since Roe v. Wade in 1973. Roughly half of them were girls. I went back through this decade by decade and did the math to calculate how many babies would those 30 million girls who would have grown by now, many of them into women, how many babies would they have had?

By my measure—and it is back-of-the-envelope only, but it is all we really need to understand the concept—another 60 million. We are not only missing 60 million babies in this country who were aborted since Roe v. Wade, we are missing another 60 million babies who were not born because their mothers were aborted. Now that is 120 million Americans who are missing,

and they weigh on our conscience. That is a third of our population, or 320 million Americans.

So I can say to a school auditorium, to two girls, two boys, or to a boy and a girl, I can say: You two look at each other. And they look at each other.

And then I will say: Do you know what's missing? Your classmate. Your friend would be sitting between you now if it had not been for abortion.

For every two we have, there is another one that would be sitting—every two Americans we have, there is another one that would be sitting in between that would have needed a pair of shoes and a ball glove and maybe a dance contest costume, all the little things that come from little boys and girls, all the joy and all the laughter.

Can you imagine shutting down a third of the laughter in a country? Or can you think about what America would be like if we were a country that we just stopped having babies? I mean, it is dialed down even worse in other countries, but that is where the joy and the laughter comes from.

Without babies, there is no joy. Without babies, there is no laughter. It slowly silences itself as the years go by, if we had no more babies born in America. That means the 1-year-olds would be where we get the giggles and the laughs from. They laugh and giggle for a few more years, and by the time they got into their twenties, that would diminish down some.

They don't have any children, remember. They don't have children to love; so their joy is going to be less. And as they get older, the hope would be gone because what would you be preparing for, except your own death?

But we live for the next generation, and I want that next generation, all of them, to be born. I want them to live, to love, to learn, to laugh, to play, to work, to be parents, to have children of their own, to raise those siblings, to broker the disagreements that come along with that, to develop themselves and feel how full you are when you are a person that is completely gifted by the blessings of children and grandchildren.

But that has been snuffed out by shortsightedness because of the permissibility of the Supreme Court decision in 1973, *Roe v. Wade*, and *Doe v. Bolton*. And we are here in this town today marching, marching from the Mall to the Supreme Court Building for, I guess it would be technically, the 44th time.

What did we accomplish? Some things. We supported Henry Hyde, the Hyde amendment. The Mexico City policy has saved about 2 million lives. We banned partial-birth abortion. We have passed a bill out of the House of Representatives that bans abortion after 20 weeks, when we believe that they are—and they are—pain-capable of suffering the grueling pain of abortion. We have done that.

But we sit here with the Heartbeat bill. It is the strongest, best supported

pro-life bill at this stage of it that is before the United States House of Representatives ever. Even Pain-Capable came in to the announcement that there would be a floor vote on it with about 151 or 153 signatures on it.

□ 1245

The Heartbeat bill—which requires the abortionist to check for a beating heart, and if a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected—has today 170 cosponsors on it. It has another good, long list of people who say: I am not ready to sign on, but if you put it on the floor, I will vote for it.

We can pass that bill off the House of Representatives and send it over to the Senate. And if there are those who think, “Well, we don't want to let the Heartbeat bill get ahead of the Pain-Capable bill,” I don't know why we wouldn't do that. I think that is a better policy, actually, and anybody who wants to save lives ought to be for that. But if that is their decision, fine. The Heartbeat bill can push the Pain-Capable bill out onto the floor of the Senate and there can be a debate and a vote on Pain-Capable, the 20-week bill, in the Senate.

But there is no debate going on over there today. They don't have pro-life legislation moving through the United States Senate today. It is blocked up and balled up because they have a filibuster rule, and they are a little preoccupied, by the way. But if all this United States Congress can do on March for Life day is to bring a bill that deals with post-abortion, born-alive, saving those babies, I am glad we did it. We should have done another bill. We should have done the Heartbeat bill here today.

Mr. Speaker, the circumstances are this. The whip team for the Heartbeat bill deserves a lot of credit. Janet Porter, Faith2Action, deserves a lot of credit. She is a driving force on this, Mr. Speaker.

Our former whip and majority leader, Tom DeLay from Texas, has been working pro bono on this case for a long time, for a good year. He has been strategizing on that. He has been pulling votes together on it. His greatest regret as a now-retired majority leader in the United States House of Representatives is that he wasn't able to end abortion while he was the leader here in this Congress.

And his word to our leadership here and to all of us is: Don't let this opportunity get away from you. This is the best opportunity. This is the best scenario. The window is open with a pro-life majority in the House and it is open with a pro-life majority in the Senate. The President will sign the bill, and the Vice President will stand next to him, feeling good about it.

By the way, the Vice President and his wife, Karen, will probably hold hands and offer a prayer right before an act like that would happen.

And the Supreme Court is poised for one or two more appointments to that

Supreme Court; and those appointments being, I expect, consistent with President Trump's pledge that he will make those nominations out of the list that was produced by The Federalist Society and confirmed and supported by The Heritage Foundation and by me, by the way, and many other pro-life activists within this Congress and across this country. The selection that President Trump made out of those 21 potential Justices to the Supreme Court was excellent.

Neil Gorsuch, there is no better choice, in my view. And one of the things that I think is important that goes into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is some, I will say, very solidly confirmed back-channel information is this: that the White House interviewed all 20 or 21 of those candidates for the Supreme Court. Out of those, they asked the same question of each one of them. And it was this, Mr. Speaker: If it is not going to be you as the nominee to the Supreme Court, who shall it be?

Every other candidate, every other Judge under consideration for appointment to become a Supreme Court Justice, said: If it is not to be me, it needs to be Neil Gorsuch.

You could not get a higher endorsement on such a high-level position than that, that all of your peers that were in the running said: If it is not to be me, it needs to be Neil Gorsuch.

We are going to be very happy with his process and his decisions that he makes for us, and I have a lot of reasons to have great confidence in him. But I offer that for consideration, Mr. Speaker.

But our job here needs to be all we can do. When the window is open, we have got to go through that window. The window is open to pass the Heartbeat bill now. 170 cosponsors. We have 129 national organizations and leaders that support the Heartbeat bill. It is about as close to unanimous across the entire movement in this country as it could possibly be.

So with 170 cosponsors and another high number of those who say, “I will vote for it, put it on the floor,” the vast majority of the Pro-Life Caucus wants it to come to the floor, the vast majority of the Values Action Team wants it to come to the floor. I actually don't know who the dissenters are here in the House that say it is a bad idea to have the Heartbeat bill in law.

There are a couple of people who disagree with the strategy, but they don't disagree with the policy, at least on this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker.

So when the leadership tells the top pro-life organizations in the country, “You must be unanimous in this and be on the same page,” and when one organization says, “I don't want to see this moved,” then we have a problem. We have a problem because the will of the people needs to be reflected here in the House of Representatives.

This is a republican form of government by constitution. The Constitution guarantees a republican form of

government, which means a representative form of government. That is, each one of us who have been elected here has a district of about 750,000 people, and it is our job to draw from them their best ideas and couple them with the principles that we have said we stand for, come here and bring those ideas into the House of Representatives, and then let those ideas, out of 435 congressional districts, compete against each other so that the best ideas rise to the top.

The ideas that rise to the top need to be the ideas that have the most support, not something that was pulled off the shelf and dropped in down here in a bit of a token for something to do here on March for Life day.

What is the most important thing we can be doing?

Saving innocent, unborn human life.

What is the highest priority we should have—the highest priority for the Members of the House of Representatives? What pro-life bill has the most cosponsors on it by far?

That is the Heartbeat bill.

So why wasn't it on the floor here today, Mr. Speaker? Why not?

The reason is because I believe that there was—shall I call it—an arrangement made by a previous Speaker that pro-life legislation only moves when it is unanimously supported by the top three pro-life organizations in the country.

I will name them. I count them all as people who have done a lot of good for this country.

Family Research Council, led by Tony Perkins, who is a tremendous pro-life, pro-family warrior. And that is also true, we know, because his office has been targeted in the past and they face violence down there in the entryway to his office. Tony doesn't blink. He is a former marine. We have ridden the road together and been out there in those battles. They are a strong, strong pro-life organization, one of the top three.

Susan B. Anthony List, another one of the top three. That is led by Marjorie Dannenfelser, who has a terrific heart, who is very driven and awfully intelligent, and who has a terrific memory about the components of the movement that have gone on.

Her sidekick—I will call her that—is an even closer friend, Marilyn Musgrave, who I served here in the House of Representatives with for a good number of years, and she was a mentor to me, and she braced me up sometimes when I was trying to make sense of things that didn't make sense.

Mr. Speaker, I count them as friends and pro-life warriors, terrific workers, and people who are go-to people who I count on keeping things on the rails while I am distracted with other things. But we are always on the same page together. Almost always on the same page together, Mr. Speaker.

The other organization is National Right to Life. National Right to Life has been granted also a de facto veto

power, which the effect of it is to block a bill from coming to the floor of the House of Representatives.

Now, I have said there are 129 organizations and leaders that have endorsed and/or support the Heartbeat bill, H.R. 490. There is only one that does not, and that is the National Right to Life, and that is led by Carol Tobias and David O'Steen. And I have spoken with both of them at great length, not in person. I have been trying to get those kinds of meetings. But I spoke on the phone with Carol Tobias, the president, a week or so before our Christmas break, about 45 minutes of intense discussion. And throughout all of that, she has insisted that they are not going to endorse the bill, they are not going to promote the bill. I couldn't get her to move one inch, even though every other organization is on board. I couldn't get her to move one inch.

She told me that they had had a board meeting, sounded to me like a couple months earlier, and that nobody on the board supported the Heartbeat bill.

How big is that board?

This is back channel. I am told about 50.

Can you imagine 50 pro-life activists sitting on the board of National Right to Life and not one of them thinks that protecting a baby that has a detectable heartbeat is an endeavor that they want to support right now when their mission statement says something entirely different?

Well, that didn't seem right to me, and I hoped there was another way to get this resolved, so I told her at the end of the conversation: I guess we have got a couple weeks before the tension starts to build, but I don't have many nice things I can do yet, and I don't think your advice is going to be, to me, to just give up and put the Heartbeat bill in a drawer and say: H.R. 490 was a nice try, but we came up short so I guess it wasn't a good idea.

How would I go to those 129 organizations and leaders and say to them, "Well, I think we will just give up now because National Right to Life is not supporting our bill because Carol Tobias and 50 members of the board, presumably, and also David O'Steen, don't think it is a good idea to move the Heartbeat bill out of the House of Representatives, that they want to wait until the Supreme Court is ready to receive such a bill, apparently without calculating that it takes time to get legislation through the House and the Senate and to the President's desk"?

And it may not happen this year if we put the Heartbeat bill on MITCH MCCONNELL's desk in the Senate. It may not happen that the bill would even be taken up. We have got to have time to bring that bill to the floor of the Senate. We are going to have to work on it. I want time to do that.

The longer we stall, the closer we get to the next election. If we get to the next election and lose seats in the

House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker, this window in the House could close, and then what do they say? They will say: Well, it was our judgment. We wanted to wait until the Supreme Court was ready. It wasn't our fault that the window closed in the House or the Senate, or perhaps the Presidency.

When you have the opportunity to move the agenda, you move the agenda. We have the opportunity to do that. And it is de facto veto power right now that the National Right to Life has because of that arrangement that was put together some years ago that says these top three pro-life organizations have to all be in agreement before we are going to move any legislation off the floor of the House.

Why would any Speaker grant de facto authority to an outside organization, none of whom have been elected in this republican form of government? Why would that be allowed to trump the will of the people? Why would that have more value than the considered judgment of the vast majority of the Republican Conference in the House of Representatives? How can we say to any one of those 170: Your opinion doesn't matter at all because you don't yet have the unanimous enthusiasm of the top three pro-life organizations in the country?

It comes back to National Right to Life. They put out a statement that says: We do not oppose the Heartbeat bill. We do not oppose the Heartbeat bill. The other side of that coin is, and it is the same coin: We do not support the Heartbeat bill. That is the message.

That is the message that Speaker RYAN gets, and that is why this bill wasn't on the floor today. It is the blockage that comes from inactivity. And all that needs to happen is David O'Steen or Carol Tobias needs to pick up the phone, call Speaker PAUL RYAN—call my office if you like, and I will patch you through—and say: Do you know what? We want to move it while we have got the chance.

The window is open in the House of Representatives. You don't have to do a single thing beyond that. You don't have to whip the bill. You don't have to go visit any Members. You don't have to spend a single dime of those hard-earned dollars that are being raised in the pro-life movement except for the cost of the phone call, and I will pay for it.

Call the Speaker. Call Leader MCCARTHY and say: Do you know what? We do think it is a good idea.

Instead of saying: We do not oppose, when really it is you do not support, all you have to do is say: Let that bill go.

Just like Charlton Heston as Moses, let our people go. Let those little babies with heartbeats live. Get a bill out of the House to the Senate, and then let's turn the pressure up in the Senate. It isn't going to happen unless we take the first step like a little baby that is wobbling and tottering. They

learn to walk. They need a chance to get that chance to walk.

□ 1300

We need to be able to move the bill off the floor of the House of Representatives. This isn't a stretch for public opinion. The public opinion is with us. In fact, the polling has been a little higher in support for H.R. 490, the Heartbeat bill. It is even a little higher than it is on the 20-week Pain-Capable one, which has been out there. They have been working on it for years, and I respect that and appreciate it.

But there isn't some kind of a rule that says you have to struggle for years before your bill can be heard. The strongest and best ideas that have weathered the debate need to come forward and be moved off the floor of the House of Representatives.

Here is what it is: 170 Members signed on; 129 organizations or leaders support the bill. I don't know why one group has veto power, de facto veto authority over this bill. We need a vote on the Heartbeat bill, and it is now being blocked because of that inaction. One phone call, or, if they just wanted to post it on their website, instead of "we do not oppose the Heartbeat bill," just post on there "we now support the Heartbeat bill." God bless them if they will do that, because things will move.

Now, this Heartbeat bill is the most popular pro-life bill that is pending in the House of Representatives today, and it has been for a long time, for almost this whole Congress. It prevents about 95 percent of the abortions. And this does push the Senate. It pushes Pain-Capable off of MITCH MCCONNELL's desk and perhaps to the floor of the Senate for a vote. It moves the agenda. It helps the other pieces of legislation as well.

Here is a polling, though, Mr. Speaker, that I think should give people some confidence; and that is that, all in all, across the spectrum of Democrats, Independents, and Republicans, the Heartbeat bill, as written, has 69 percent of adults all the way across the spectrum.

This is a Barna poll that took place last year—not that long ago—and here is how it breaks down by party, in case people are worried about that: 86 percent of Republicans support the Heartbeat bill, H.R. 490; 55 percent of Democrats support the Heartbeat bill, H.R. 490. A majority of Democrats support the Heartbeat bill, 55 percent, and 61 percent of Independents.

When you put that all together and you match it up for the demographics—so the percentages that are Democrats versus Independents and Republicans—and you merge that together, 69 percent support the Heartbeat bill. That is a little better than the 20-week Pain-Capable bill. People understand this.

That beating heart is in our hearts, and so are these little babies. And I would say to National Right to Life, whose mission statement almost commands them to support the Heartbeat

bill, you ought to amend your mission statement or support the Heartbeat bill.

Here is one of their founders, a founder of the pro-life movement and the founder and former president of National Right to Life—now passed away, sadly—and he surely did his part, Dr. John C. Willke. Here is what he had to say:

"When I founded the pro-life movement, it wasn't to regulate how abortions would be done; it was to bring the abortion killing to an end. We have waited too long, and that wait has cost us too much"—Dr. John C. Willke.

Take this back to 1973. The missions there were to end abortion. And yet we are stuck in a rut of incrementalism, moving a tiny little bit at a time. We saved 2 million lives in all of this—maybe a few more than 2 million lives, no more—and we watched 60 million babies be aborted. And I am hearing the argument of, well, we really can't move because the Supreme Court is not ready, and we don't know if there are going to be any retirements in the Supreme Court.

I know there will be retirements in the Supreme Court. I am certain of it. There will be that. There are three ways out of the Supreme Court, and those folks who were there 100 years ago aren't there now. So we know there is going to be a change in the Court. What we don't know is this Court may well uphold Heartbeat because it is more precisely written and more carefully drafted, and it answers the right kind of questions. I think it has a better chance of being upheld before the Supreme Court than Pain-Capable.

But those who pushed Pain-Capable, 20-week didn't have those reservations on their bill, but they seem to wonder about this one and say we shouldn't move Heartbeat until we have another appointment to the Supreme Court.

How can you let that happen? Well, perhaps the window closes in the House or the Senate or Presidency. Sitting here twiddling our thumbs and watching babies be aborted at a rate of—oh, by the way, I did get this piece from National Right to Life in a conversation just yesterday that, when they began this effort, there were as many as 6 million abortions a year in America—I hadn't heard that number before, and I didn't go back to verify it, but that is what my ears heard yesterday—and we have now gotten that number down to under 1 million abortions a year. That is considered progress, and it is progress.

Then he gave me the exact number 900-and-some thousand abortions last year. I didn't commit that number to memory, but it means something different to me. That is 1 million abortions a year, every year. That means, in 45 years, we will have another 45 million abortions on our conscience. And that 60 million abortions for today turns into 105 million abortions if we just double the time span from *Roe v. Wade* another 45 years.

And to take pride in getting it down to less than 1 million, as if that is a milestone, troubles me considerably. It might not have if I had just only heard it in that context, but I heard it in a different context 4 or 5 months ago, standing over here on the floor, Mr. Speaker.

There is a gentlewoman from the Democratic Party who is one who—really, there are only a couple of pro-life people over here anymore, so you know that she is not pro-life. She asked me why I have this heart on my lapel, and I told her it was for the Heartbeat bill, H.R. 490, and I want to protect these babies. From the moment a heartbeat can be detected, the baby must be protected. And she said: I don't know why you want to do that, STEVE. We have got abortions down to under 1 million a year.

I said: I want to save them all. I want to save every single one of them. That is why I am going to wear this on my lapel until we get this job done.

But it was stunning to me that she would say that, being a pro-choice Representative here in the United States House of Representatives. And when I match that up with almost the same thing from a leader in the National Right to Life, I think: We have got to take a fresh look. They are too stuck in their ways. We will never get to the end of abortion if we are married to tiny incrementalism. We have an obligation to take the opportunities that God has given us and the voters have given us and act on them.

I would go to personhood, the moment of conception, and do that in an instant if we could get that done, but we can't define medically and precisely that moment of conception. But we have defined medically and precisely the heartbeat. That is our marker, the heartbeat in that ultrasound.

We had a little witness come before the Constitution and Civil Justice Subcommittee, which I chair. We held a hearing on the Heartbeat bill. And this little guy was the youngest witness to testify in the history of the United States Congress, I believe. He is an 18-week developed little boy in his mother's womb. And we had the ultrasound sitting next to his mother, but the tape of the ultrasound that they had taken hours before.

This little boy's name is Lincoln Glenn Miller. And that little guy, we showed his ultrasound and we showed him there in his mother's womb, and we listened to his heartbeat. His arm was out like this. And I said into the microphone, "Lincoln, will you move your arm?" and, in an instant, he jerked his arm toward his mouth. And I said, "Lincoln, can you suck your thumb?" and, in a moment, he put his thumb in his mouth and began to suck his thumb.

And I said, a little bit later, "Lincoln, can you talk to us?" and you can see his mouth moving as if he is trying to talk in this ultrasound on the big screen in the United States Congress in

the House Judiciary Committee, the Constitution and Civil Justice Subcommittee. We watched this little guy, Lincoln Glenn Miller, testify to the humanity of an 18-week developed little child.

We know this life begins at the moment of conception. We know that we can precisely define that heartbeat. We know that, if you have to check for that heartbeat, it is awfully hard to lie about it when you have to keep the records. We know that it has gotten into our conscience that abortion stops a beating heart, and we all, in our mind's ear, can hear that rhythm of that beating heart.

I used 158 beats per minute. That is what is in my iPhone right now. And I can listen to that little baby as that little baby grows and develops. I want to see all of these babies grow and develop. I want to see every one of them come to birth and full term. I pray that they are mentally healthy and that they are physically healthy, and I don't have any more asks after that.

Boys or girls, God, bring them to me in whatever order they might come, but let's get them born and let's take care of them and nurture them in mind, in body, and in faith, as our Founding Fathers envisioned when they wrote the language into our Declaration of Independence and prioritized life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

God bless them. Let's do the right thing.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 0101

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS) at 1 o'clock and 1 minute a.m.

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 Friday, January 19, 2018, after 6 p.m. and for the balance of the week on account of family illness.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on January 17, 2018, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 984. To extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe.

H.R. 4641. To authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to John L. Canley for acts of valor during the Vietnam War while a member of the Marine Corps.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Saturday, January 20, 2018, at 9 a.m.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. JONES, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. LONG, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LATTI, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BUCK, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 4844. A bill to ensure that women seeking an abortion receive an ultrasound and the opportunity to review the ultrasound before giving informed consent to receive an abortion; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 4845. A bill to provide that the Federal Communications Commission and communications service providers regulated by the Commission under the Communications Act of 1934 shall not be subject to certain provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the National Historic Preservation Act with respect to the construction, rebuilding, or hardening of communications facilities following a major disaster or an emergency declared by the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 4846. A bill to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana (for herself and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 4847. A bill to streamline the process for consideration of applications for the placement of communications facilities on certain Federal lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 4848. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to eliminate automatic increases for inflation from CBO baseline projections for

discretionary appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 4849. A bill to require States to report information on Medicaid payments to abortion providers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. NORMAN):

H.R. 4850. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to alter the deadlines by which an application for asylum must be made, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. MESSER, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 4851. A bill to establish the Kennedy-King National Historic Site in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. FASO, Mr. YODER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. COLE, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER):

H.R. 4852. A bill to make continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a shutdown of the Federal Government, to reduce the pay of Members of Congress during periods in which such a shutdown is in effect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BABIN (for himself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana):

H.R. 4853. A bill to require FERC to examine certain hydropower licenses; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER of Texas (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. RATLIFF):

H.R. 4854. A bill to amend the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 to provide additional resources to State and local prosecutors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. POCAN, Ms. DELAUNO, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CARDENAS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. POLIS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CLARKE of New York, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. LAWSON of Florida):

H.R. 4855. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to provide an incentive for households participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program to purchase certain nutritious fruits and vegetables that are beneficial to good health; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mrs.