

right to life has been denied to more than 60 million unborn children. We don't know what those children would have grown up to do. Perhaps they would have cured cancer, found a solution to Alzheimer's. The possibilities are endless with the loss of those lives.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today with so many of my colleagues. We know that there is hope on the horizon. The life movement is strong, and I look forward to continuing to advocate on behalf of pro-life policies. It is my hope that one day those unalienable rights will extend to all Americans born and unborn. It is my prayer that this will be the last march for life with *Roe v. Wade* being the law of the land. When we march next year, it will be in celebration for what we have accomplished for the protection of the unborn.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD), a good friend and colleague.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in defense of life.

This Saturday, as many of the previous speakers had alluded to, is the 49th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*. As such, it is a fitting time to talk about this administration's radical anti-life policies for which some of us were caught off guard when President Biden was running for the Presidency.

Over the past year we have watched President Biden and the Democrats continually push what I would consider an anti-life full agenda. First, they gutted the Hyde amendment, a long-standing provision of appropriations bills that prevents taxpayer funding for abortions and has saved an estimated 2 million lives.

Then the Biden Administration's Department of Health and Human Services changed the rules to essentially require healthcare providers to perform abortions, despite any moral objections they may have.

Finally, my Democrat colleagues passed a radical bill that removes existing limits on abortion and allows abortions on demand, no matter the age of the fetus.

Mr. Speaker, I will always push back on their anti-life stances with a clear and strong message of full opposition. I believe that every human life is precious and should be protected at every stage. Throughout my career, I have always stood for life. I will continue to fight against this administration's anti-life policies.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today, after decades of noble struggle and sacrifice, pro-life Americans are hopeful that government-sanctioned violence against children and the exploitation of women by abortion may be nearing an end, although in a very real way the struggle to defend innocent human life now enters a critically important new phase.

Because of the *Dobbs* case, because the Supreme Court has finally seemingly accepted a relook at *Roe v. Wade* and subsequent decisions, the Federal

Government and the States-based suit have new authority to protect the weakest and the most vulnerable among us. Protection for unborn children is at a tipping point. In 2022, the Supreme Court can begin dismantling the culture of death that it has imposed on America.

Mr. Speaker, for decades and right up to this very moment, abortion supporters have gone through extraordinary lengths to ignore, to trivialize, and to cover up the battered baby victim. With stolid resolve, they defend the indefensible.

Why does dismembering a child with sharp knives, pulverizing a child with powerful suction devices, chemically poisoning a baby with any number of toxic chemicals—one method euphemistically called medical abortion—why does all of this fail to elicit so much as a scintilla of empathy, mercy, or compassion from the so-called pro-choice crowd?

Have the physical and emotional consequences of women been underreported? You bet they have. I have been in the pro-life movement for almost 50 years. Both my wife, Marie, and I do work with a lot of women who have had abortions. They tell us stories of agony that, just like the fact of the unborn child's worth and dignity, has been trivialized by the other side of this issue.

Mr. Speaker, why are children born alive during some late-term abortions not given the same standard of care and respect as premature infants born at that very same age? They are left to die, or they are just killed after they are born.

President Biden understands the gruesome reality of abortion and this injustice. At least he once did. As Senator Biden wrote to constituents in explaining his support for the Hyde amendment, for example, prohibiting taxpayer funding for elective abortions, he said it would protect both the woman and her unborn child. He stated at the time he had consistently, on no fewer than 50 occasions, voted against Federal funding of abortions. Further, those of us who are opposed to abortion should not be compelled to pay for them.

Today, the President has weaponized the entire Federal bureaucracy to aggressively promote abortion on demand at home and overseas, including full court press to force taxpayers to fund abortions on demand including the repeal of the Hyde amendment.

Last September, the House passed a bill, the abortion on demand until birth act. Of course, it had a different name that just cloaked the misery that it would impose. That bill would not only codify late-term abortions, it would also nullify nearly every modest pro-life restriction ever enacted by the States including a woman's right to know laws in 35 states, parental involvement statutes in 37 states, pain-capable unborn child protection laws in 19 states, sex-selection abortion bans in

almost a dozen states and waiting periods in 26 states. By his words and his deeds, the President has become the abortion President. I think he wants to own that.

Mr. Speaker, this all comes at a time when ultrasound imaging has made unborn babies more visible, with a greater clarity than ever before. Breakthrough research has now found that unborn children can feel pain at a gestational age of 15 weeks and maybe earlier.

□ 1345

Today modern medicine treats an ever-increasing number of unborn children with disability and disease as patients in need of diagnosis and life-enhancing treatments before birth. Unborn babies are society's youngest patients and deserve protection, not death by abortion. Science informs us that birth is merely an event—albeit a very important one—in the life of the child. It is not the beginning of his or her life.

As most people know, after the ultrasound the grandparents, the parents, and the friends get pictures of the child in utero. The ultrasound pictures are the first baby pictures that are now plastered on all of our refrigerators in great expectation for that event called birth.

The right to life is the first human right, and it must be guaranteed to everyone regardless of race, age, sex, disability, stage of development, or condition of dependency. Life is not just for the planned, the privileged, or the perfect.

We need to protect these innocent children.

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

LET'S HAVE A DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleagues who have been down here on the floor of the House of Representatives for the most part of the last hour talking about the importance of defending life, those infamous—or famous or important words, I should say, in the Declaration of Independence: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Nothing can be more important than this body focusing on defending life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and my colleagues' focus on life, as we sit here now 49 years removed from a Supreme Court decision taking out of the hands of the people and putting it into the hands of unelected judges' decisions, about the beginning of life, when life begins, the important reality of a people defending life.

What is controversial about defending life?

It is a question for this body.

What is controversial about defending life when we talk about life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and when we talk about living on this Earth while God gives us the precious time we have here?

What are we going to do with that time?

Are we going to live free?

Are we going to be able to pursue happiness?

Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness: one might wonder here now 1 year into the current administration, the Biden administration, whether the average American would say that he or she is free to pursue happiness.

Are we free?

Are we free to pursue happiness when, in fact, just a few miles away—and, frankly, a few thousand feet—from this Chamber where we are right now, restaurants are being chastised and pursued by the Government of the District of Columbia representing this area that forms our Nation's Capitol because those restaurants may not believe that it is in their interest or the interest of the people whom they serve to be checking papers and to be checking so-called vaccine passports or vaccine passes?

One restaurant in particular over on H Street—which was one of the early restaurants on H Street as it was revitalizing—has been fined, berated, and harassed by the Government of the District of Columbia for wanting its doors to be open and not wanting to harass its patrons. They want them to use their own free will to make a decision about what is in their interest. They don't want to live in a republic where you are forced to show papers to walk about and to engage in society, to freely move about and engage in commerce.

The very heart of the kinds of ideas that the Founders meant and what Jefferson meant when he penned pursuit of happiness is that we not allow a government through tyrannical policies to interfere with our pursuit of happiness: our ability to go have a business, our ability to go out and take care of our family, our ability to move about and to engage in commerce, our ability to create wealth and opportunity for our children and our grandchildren, to be able to get healthcare, and to be able to be secure in our possessions, secure in our belongings, and secure in our own homes.

I would ask this question: Is the United States more secure than it was 1 year ago?

Is the United States stronger economically than it was 1 year ago?

Is the United States stronger on the world stage?

Are we safer from our enemies than we were 1 year ago?

Is our border secure?

Are we able to afford energy and have reliable energy to heat our homes, fuel our cars, provide jobs, and keep us warm in the winter and cool in the summer?

Are we able to do that better more than 1 year ago?

The answer very clearly to all of those questions is a resounding “no.”

Do you think it is an accident that I just spent 2 hours in a hearing in the Judiciary Committee bemoaning the United States Senate for holding the line on the filibuster which Democrats and this President wanted to throw over the wall in the name of voting rights because nobody can oppose something called voting rights?

They put up those words, they call it the Voting Rights Act, and they name it after people we serve with in the Chamber to provide maximum guilt if you dare stand up and say, Mr. Speaker, that the people in the States ought to be able to decide how to ensure that the elections of the people who represent them are secure; that you dare to have a voter ID favored by 80 percent of the American people.

But yet let's go back to what I just said: I have to have an ID just to walk in and buy a hamburger in the Nation's Capitol, but I cannot have an ID to vote. No. No. No. That is Jim Crow 2.0 I am told by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

I actually had colleagues on the committee today walking through the horrors of the poll tax—the jelly bean counting and all of the obstructions put into place for voting in the 1950s and 1960s that the Voting Rights Act nobly pursued to correct—and then tried to compare that to voter identification.

They tried to compare that to wanting to make sure that mail-in ballots aren't abused by anybody in any party, even though, by the way, those bastions of crazy conservatism, Jimmy Carter and James Baker, came out in a report over a decade ago that The New York Times quoted saying precisely that mail-in ballots are the area where you have the most fraud.

Now, all of us want to have integrity and belief in our elections. But our Democratic colleagues want to use that issue to divide us, as President Biden literally admitted yesterday. In his 1-hour marathon wandering, meandering press conference, he literally said that he could not say whether the elections will be legitimate this fall unless—unless—we embrace the legislation that he says must get passed and that we must set aside the traditions of the Senate to jam it through. And all of it, very clearly, is to set the stage for a lack of faith and belief in the elections that are coming this November.

Again I ask: Is America stronger or weaker?

Is it richer or poorer? More secure or less safe?

We know the answer, and that is why my colleagues on the other side of the aisle wish not to talk about those issues. We don't want to have a debate about crime on the floor.

Do any of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to come down to

the floor right now and have a debate about crime in the United States?

Do they?

Do you think a 50 percent increase in crime in Austin, a 50 percent increase in crime in San Antonio, a 19-year-old woman shot in a Burger King in New York City, a 24-year-old student murdered walking the streets of Los Angeles, train robberies in 21st century America with litter all over the tracks in Los Angeles, is an accident?

Or could it be that radical leftists who are funded to take over the district attorneys' offices in cities across America and radical city councils like the Austin City Council and leftists in this Chamber believe that letting criminals out on the streets and believe in not prosecuting people is going to make our country safer?

It is empirically and obviously untrue.

The American people see it. And I promise you, Mr. Speaker, take this bet: We will not have a debate on the floor of this body about crime while I am here this year. It will not happen. My Democratic colleagues would not dare have a debate about crime because they would get absolutely decimated.

They sure as heck do not want to have a debate about the border.

Do you want to talk about 2 million apprehensions?

Do you want to talk about 1 million people released?

Do you want to talk about dead Texans?

Do you want to talk about fentanyl pouring into our communities, 100,000 dead Americans, opioid poisonings of our youth, and kids taking Xanax and dying because cartels are flooding into our country while China drives them right up through Mexico?

Not a person in this Chamber on the other side of the aisle wants to come to the floor and have an adult debate about why our country is much less secure and much more endangered at the hands of the cartels and of people making money trafficking in human beings and undermining our security and safety in the United States of America.

I promise you, Mr. Speaker, Joe Biden and the NANCY PELOSI Democrats have no interest in having a debate about the border because it is an embarrassment and it is a travesty.

Ranches are getting overrun, people are dying, bullets are being fired across at our own Border Patrol, the National Guard is having to fire at cars coming across the border, livestock is getting out, bodies are stacking up in body trailers in Brooks County, Texas, and cartels are making hundreds of millions of dollars on a daily basis driving fentanyl into our kids' communities and schools.

No, no, no. We do not want to have a debate about the state of our border.

Do we want to have a debate about the state of healthcare mandates?

No. No. This body has no debate but embraces rules. We must wear masks, they say. For a year and a half we have

been excoriated—even fined—if you don't wear a mask the floor of the House of Representatives—masks which are very clearly proven—fabric masks—to have no real discernible benefit over the last year and a half of the mandates that say you must wear a face covering.

They said: Well, are we going to mandate N95s?

Are we going to have to wear N95s on the floor?

Do they want to talk about the negative effects in the study that wearing N95s for a prolonged period of time, what that does for people's health and well-being, breathing carbon dioxide, minimizing your cognitive ability if you wear N95s for a long time?

Some people might joke: Would it make any difference on the floor of the House if you minimized the cognitive ability of the Members of the House? You could argue that it may not make any difference whatsoever. I am looking in the mirror myself.

We do not want to have a debate on the floor of the House on anything, by the way, much less the reality of what has been happening with respect to this virus and our response to it; and what Anthony Fauci engaged in with respect to the reality of the truth of funding gain-of-function research knowing full well the dangers, working to cover that up and hide from the American people how this virus came about; not wanting to pursue the truth on that, not wanting to pursue the truth or conduct studies on natural immunity.

We have study after study after study coming out right now. I could pull out on my phone and pull up study after study now finally demonstrating and showing how natural immunity is more powerful than vaccinations, and people don't want to be able to have that honest conversation.

□ 1400

An adult leadership would have done like the Nation of Japan saying: We believe that vaccines are effective for a large group of people. We believe that there are some risks. You are adults. We won't mandate. You decide.

We can't do that in the supposed land of the free? We sit up here and we stare at that American flag and we talk about the Senate being the greatest deliberative body. They don't really debate. This being the people's House, the people's Chamber, when was the last time the Speaker heard a robust debate on the floor of the House with multiple Members?

When was the last time we offered an amendment on the floor of the House in open debate that wasn't predetermined by all of the Rules Committee overlords who govern our lives? Democrat and Republican, I do want to say.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 6 years since we have had an amendment offered on the floor of the House in open debate. Do you want to know why we can't do anything in this Chamber? Because we don't ever debate. We don't ever actu-

ally have a discussion, throw things out there and then vote. Maybe, just maybe, we come to some bipartisan agreement.

I am happy to work with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. DEAN PHILLIPS and I worked on the PPP Flexibility Act. ABIGAIL SPANBERGER and I have introduced legislation called the TRUST Act to deal with stock trading believing that might help improve people's faith and confidence in this body. I have introduced numerous bills and passed numerous bills with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. That is not what this is about.

It is about a broken body refusing to actually debate, refusing to actually engage, refusing to offer amendments. Both sides do it. That needs to end.

The last point that I will make on that point, if you want this body to function again, you have to stop spending money we don't have. If you keep writing blank checks, how on Earth is there a check against the wisdom of the policy? You just keep writing a check to keep doing the same thing or to do something different. You can't run a business that way. You can't run a home that way. You can't run a church that way. You can't run a legitimate school that way. But no, no, we just keep writing checks to fund the expansion of government, to fund the creation of programs no matter who is in power.

Over the last year, we have seen what that causes when it is then left in the hands of an administration that literally does not care about the rule of law.

To be very clear, this administration is ignoring the rule of law, ignoring their oath, ignoring their duty to enforce the laws of the United States, ignoring their duty to secure the border, ignoring their duty to stand up in defense of the men and women in blue, to follow the laws around the United States, ignoring their oath to stand up and defend the United States against our foreign enemies; hold the line against Russia; push back on Russia; sanction them; hold the line on Nord Stream 2; stand alongside Ukraine; push back on China; stop appeasing them.

Don't leave \$85 billion sitting there in the hands of terrorists when we walk away and abandon our duty and leave those men and women in the field, and then have 13 dead marines to show for it.

That is the legacy of the first year of this administration. But will President Biden, when he strolls to that podium on March 1 for his so-called State of the Union, and we are all spread out, and all wearing masks, and doing whatever the heck we are going to do—not actually doing the people's business—will he address any of those issues?

Will he talk about border security? Will he talk about how we are weaker around the world? Will he talk about the crime on the streets of Los Ange-

les, New York, Austin, San Antonio, and Chicago?

Will he talk about the businesses getting crippled by mask mandates and health mandates?

Will he talk about the children who are now having mental health issues, the people who are sick; the diseases that weren't dealt with, all to push a vaccine mandate that goes contrary to the pursuit of happiness and our right as Americans to live free?

Will he talk about any of those things? Will he talk about the fact that the United States of America is sitting on one of the world's largest reservoirs of energy and, yet, we are wondering even in Texas whether you can have the lights on because we built no nuclear power plants.

We slowed down our production of clean burning natural gas, all chasing unicorn energy policies of wind and solar as if they can possibly, possibly power the world at the level that is needed for the proper amount of human flourishing while 3 billion people around this planet do not have access to abundant energy and power.

Will the President of the United States come down here and talk about that or will he get up there and just talk about: Well, we are going to be net zero in our carbon production by 2035, or 2050, or make up some totally arbitrary number without regard at all to what that does to the price of energy and the availability and abundance of energy.

All of this has real-life consequences for Americans. People die. Houses get cold. People can't get access to energy. They can't afford energy. They lose jobs. You have stagnation and then you have the brilliance of this administration and the brilliance of those in the media starting to talk about energy and food price control because, of course, that is what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will resort to.

They will sit there and bemoan markets when they don't let the markets work. Healthcare markets never work. We haven't had a healthcare market in decades. It is an absolute lie; and I am looking at you Big Healthcare. I am looking at you Big Pharma. I am looking at you hospitals. I am looking at you Big Insurance. You made out like bandits after ObamaCare. You minted money. And probably three-quarters of the people in this Chamber fattened their wallets and their portfolios riding the back of all of that Big Healthcare enrichment, all at the expense of poor Americans around this country trying to get access to a doctor without having to call some bureaucrat in the government, the VA, or an insurance company, or however it may be, but it sure as heck isn't their doctor.

We don't have health freedom in this country. We have mandated Big Healthcare, Big Government, Big Insurance, bureaucracy. And everybody knows it. Everybody knows it because you all had to deal with it. You have

had to call somebody. You had to call some kid sitting in Omaha in some phone bank telling you which doctor you can go to 2,000 miles away. That is the truth, and we all know it. We sit in here, we roll in here and we say: Let's spend more money and create a government program. Let's spend more money we don't have.

Not one person in this body will come down here and truly debate any of these truths when you are \$30 trillion in debt; when you are funding the very FBI going after parents for daring to stand up and defend their children in a school board meeting; when you are funding the Department of Homeland Security that is literally lying to the American people saying our border is secure while hundreds of thousands of people come across.

You want to know what happened in that synagogue? Because we don't have a dang clue who is coming to the United States, and this administration doesn't care. They don't care. They don't care what list they are on. They don't care whether they pose a danger to the United States of America. They don't care at all who is coming into this country. And they sure as heck don't care what is happening to the people of Texas, Arizona, or, frankly, everybody around this country who is having to bear the cost, who is having to bear the burden of what wide-open borders means to the United States of America.

Complain about Mayorkas? We should impeach him for failing to faithfully execute the laws of the United States of America, endangering Americans in the process, ignoring the laws of the United States. And that is what is happening. That is what is happening.

America is poorer, sicker, and less safe a year into the Biden administration, and that is the truth. Our enemies know it. That is why Russia is going after Ukraine. That is why China is rattling on a daily basis. That is why Russia, China, and Iran are talking about joint exercises. That is why the cartels are emboldened. That is why there are people marching through Mexico from all over the world coming to our southern border. That is why there are people on the streets breaking into businesses, assaulting people on the streets and killing them, raping them. It is happening every single day in the United States of America with reckless abandon while Democrats in district attorney's offices, Democrats in the House of Representatives, Democrats in this administration do nothing about it and do not care that the American people are left holding the bag.

Then they want to talk about taking away our Second Amendment rights and our ability to defend ourselves. Well, that crap ain't going to happen because we are going to defend ourselves in the land of the free. We are going to stand up and defend our communities and defend our families. We are going to stand up in defense of the

Constitution and limited government and freedom to be able to protect our families and protect our States when this administration is letting this country burn.

It dares to do an hour-long press conference, lecturing the people for wanting to make sure their elections are secure, for daring to say that we should have voter identification when that same administration is ordering vaccine mandates that are causing healthcare workers to lose their jobs; causing healthcare workers in long-term health facilities to be unable to carry out their jobs.

And then there is the talk about, oh, the burden on hospitals. Well, you just caused 20 percent of nurses to have to leave because you were mandating they take a jab for something that is a year old that Pfizer is making billions of dollars on. Then we won't even have a hearing about why on Earth we are having this virus in the first place, because of what Anthony Fauci knew and what NIH was up to and what China was up to.

We won't have a hearing about natural immunity. We won't have a hearing about the dangers and levels of dangers of the vaccines, what they may be. Again, my polio-stricken father who is 79 has been vaccinated. I refuse to say whether I have been vaccinated. I think it is a principle for Americans that they shouldn't have to say.

My point is, there are people for whom the vaccine makes sense. There are people for whom the vaccine does not make sense. Mandating a jab in a 5-year-old is irresponsible and it is dangerous. We should have that conversation instead of blindly walking around preaching what other people should stick in their dang arm.

But that is what we do in the people's House. I am sitting here in an empty Chamber—with the Speaker, respectfully—and that is it. They are all jet-fumed out, leaving town. Oh, we shut down earlier. Let's get out of here. Or they are out at some fundraiser or something.

Let's have a debate on these issues. Let's seek the truth. I don't know all of the truth on all of those issues. I don't know the specific risks. I have read a lot about what is going on with the vaccines, positive and negative. But it is becoming very, very clear that it doesn't do squat to stop the spread. So you are left basically saying: Well, it is better for you so that you don't die in the hospital.

Well, let's look at the data on that. But why don't we just present the information and let the American people decide? Japan's vaccine rate is a lot higher than ours and ours has mandates. All they did was say: We think it is good. There are some risks. You decide. We can't do that in America?

We can't just go down to the border and say: You know what, it is better for migrants, better for Texans and all Americans, bad for cartels, bad for China, if we secure our border. That is

the truth. Talk to the migrants getting abused. Talk to the people in south Texas. Go to Laredo and Webb County. Sit down with the Brown people in Laredo who will say: We are pretty ticked off with this administration about how they are handling the border.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle might be up for a rude awakening pretty soon about their expectations of what voters are voting for them and what voters are not because there are a lot of people in this country that are sick and tired of the elite in this town, immersed in the swamp, promoting Big Healthcare, promoting Big Tech, promoting Big Government, minimizing the rights and the abilities of Americans to live their lives the way they see fit.

That is our calling as we head to 2026, our 250th birthday of the United States of America, which comes up in 4-and-a-half years. Will we be able to say that we live in the land of the free? Will we be able to say that we are pursuing happiness; that we are the country of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?

We will only be able to do that if we stand up and secure our Nation's sovereignty, defend our streets, protect our families, stand up to enemies around the world, and limit this body to the job that it was given in the Constitution: limit our spending to the dollars that we have and responsibly lead this country and represent the people so that this country can, in fact, be great in our agreements and our disagreements in a Federalist Republic where we are able to live free.

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

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 452.—An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Willie O'Ree, in recognition of his extraordinary contributions and commitment to hockey, inclusion, and recreational opportunity.

S. 2959.—An act to provide that, due to the disruptions caused by COVID-19, applications for impact aid funding for fiscal year 2023 may use certain data submitted in the fiscal year 2022 application.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 21, 2022, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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