

chapters at the beginning of part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking "Partial-Birth Abortions" and inserting "Abortions".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to section 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

#### ENSURING ACCESS TO ABORTION ACT OF 2022

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1224, I call up the bill (H.R. 8297) to prohibit the interference, under color of State law, with the provision of interstate abortion services, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1224, the amendment printed in part B of House Report 117-405 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 8297

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act".

#### SEC. 2. INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE ABORTION SERVICES PROHIBITED.

(a) INTERFERENCE PROHIBITED.—No person acting under color of State law, including any person who, by operation of a provision of State law, is permitted to implement or enforce State law, may prevent, restrict, or impede, or retaliate against, in any manner—

(1) a health care provider's ability to provide, initiate, or otherwise enable an abortion service that is lawful in the State in which the service is to be provided to a patient who does not reside in that State;

(2) any person or entity's ability to assist a health care provider to provide, initiate, or otherwise enable an abortion service that is lawful in the State in which the service is to be provided to a patient who does not reside in that State, if such assistance does not violate the law of that State;

(3) any person's ability to travel across a State line for the purpose of obtaining an abortion service that is lawful in the State in which the service is to be provided;

(4) any person's or entity's ability to assist another person traveling across a State line for the purpose of obtaining an abortion service that is lawful in the State in which the service is to be provided; or

(5) the movement in interstate commerce, in accordance with Federal law or regula-

tion, of any drug approved or licensed by the Food and Drug Administration for the termination of a pregnancy.

(b) ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General may bring a civil action in the appropriate United States district court against any person who violates subsection (a) for declaratory and injunctive relief.

(c) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—Any person who is harmed by a violation of subsection (a) may bring a civil action in the appropriate United States district court against the person who violated such subsection for declaratory and injunctive relief, and for such compensatory damages as the court determines appropriate, including for economic losses and for emotional pain and suffering. The court may, in addition, award reasonable attorney's fees and costs of the action to a prevailing plaintiff.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "abortion service" means—

(A) an abortion, including the use of any drug approved or licensed by the Food and Drug Administration for the termination of a pregnancy; and

(B) any health care service related to or provided in conjunction with an abortion (whether or not provided at the same time or on the same day as the abortion).

(2) The term "health care provider" means any entity or individual (including any physician, certified nurse-midwife, nurse practitioner, physician's assistant, or pharmacist) that is—

(A) engaged or seeks to engage in the delivery of health care services, including abortion services; and

(B) licensed or certified to perform such service under applicable State law.

(3) The term "drug" has the meaning given such term in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(4) The term "State" includes the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, each Indian tribe, and each territory or possession of the United States.

(e) SEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person, entity, government, or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, or the application of such provision to all other persons, entities, governments, or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit the fundamental right to travel within the United States, including the District of Columbia, Tribal lands, and the territories of the United States, nor to limit any existing enforcement authority of the Attorney General or any existing remedies available to address a violation of such right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their re-

marks and add extraneous material on H.R. 8297, the Ensuring Access to Abortion Act of 2022.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 8297, the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act, introduced by Representative FLETCHER, a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Last month, when the Supreme Court overturned a woman's constitutional right to abortion, it also gave license to extreme Republican politicians to pass dangerous laws across the Nation. These State laws criminalize healthcare and create an environment of fear for healthcare providers or anyone else assisting someone who needs an abortion.

Already, abortion bans are in effect in 9 States, and more are expected soon. Republican politicians and anti-abortion extremists are also actively considering even more actions. They want to prevent private citizens from legally crossing State lines to obtain an abortion. They also want to deputize private citizens to track down anyone who might help a woman legally obtain an abortion in another State.

These actions clearly violate the Constitution and the right to travel freely, and this legislation will put those States on notice that their actions to limit their citizens from obtaining the healthcare they need cannot be enforced.

H.R. 8297 reaffirms the right to travel across State lines to obtain a lawful abortion. It protects healthcare providers who provide lawful abortion care to out-of-State residents, and it protects anyone who may assist a woman in crossing State lines to obtain a lawful abortion, such as a friend, partner, or volunteer.

Madam Speaker, the bill also prohibits individuals acting under State law from restricting or impeding access to medication abortions, which States are rushing to restrict despite the clear authority of the Federal Government.

Madam Speaker, while we need the Women's Health Protection Act to become law to restore access to abortion in all 50 States, we must also mitigate some of the extreme and dangerous laws Republicans are enacting now to prevent women from making their own healthcare decisions.

This legislation does that, which is why I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 8297, the Ensuring Access to Abortion Act.

Just like the Democrats' abortion on demand until birth act, this bill is part of an extreme agenda to nationalize abortion for all 9 months of pregnancy. Abortion is a false choice between taking care of a woman and taking care of a baby.

What a woman needs is support. Every life is meaningful, and our actions are significant. Seventy-six percent of women seeking an abortion say that they would choose life if their circumstances were different.

Instead of promoting ways to support women and children with better healthcare, education, financial stability, and changing their circumstances, Democrats, including President Biden, are spreading fear, anxiety, and misinformation. This is a blatant attempt to spread fear and present abortion at any stage of pregnancy as a woman's only option.

So I will be very clear:

It is already unconstitutional to prevent a woman from traveling between States.

The pro-life movement does not support and has always rejected criminalizing and punishing women, period.

State laws currently in effect have exceptions to save the life of the mother.

And pro-life laws do not prevent women from getting care they need in cases of miscarriages and ectopic pregnancies.

Regarding this legislation, the Ensuring Access to Abortion Act, I have many questions and concerns. Its vague language, designed to promote more abortions, undermines parental consent for minors, opens loopholes for abuse, and eliminates medical supervision for chemical abortions.

This bill does nothing to explicitly prevent an unrelated adult or a sexual abuser from taking a minor out of State for an abortion without parental consent. It would prevent healthcare professionals, social workers, and schools in every State from reporting instances of child abuse, sexual abuse, and neglect because they could be seen as delaying or hindering access to abortion.

□ 1100

It also undermines parent rights. Parents can be targeted by the Federal Government and sued for wanting to help their child just by asking them to delay traveling to get an abortion.

If their child is 16, for example, the parents lose power to protect their teenager from being coerced by an older man to get an abortion.

The Ensuring Access to Abortion Act undermines the health and safety of women by preempting State laws regulating the practice of medicine. It overrides the majority of States that have determined it is safest for doctors to prescribe pills for chemical abortions. This puts women and minors in danger if they experience complications.

Finally, these same provisions give sexual abusers and human traffickers

more direct access to chemical abortions in all 50 States and ensures that doctors in States like California, where there is no parental consent, can effectively become pill mills by prescribing and mailing abortion drugs to children and minors and end lives all over the country.

This is extreme.

Again, I ask my colleagues to abandon this agenda for unlimited abortions with no restrictions. It only promotes more fear, pain, and dehumanization of the most vulnerable, the helpless among us.

Instead, let's come together. Let's come together around human rights of every person in this country, the born and unborn. Let's celebrate the dignity, the value, and the potential of every person. This is our chance to lead a new era of hope and healing in our country for every person, for moms and babies at every stage of life.

Every life is worth living.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mrs. FLETCHER. Madam Speaker, in my beloved home State of Texas, we are in a crisis, a healthcare crisis, a humanitarian crisis.

Since last September, access to abortion has been severely limited. Since last month, it has been eliminated.

In response, Texans who can do so have been traveling out of State to obtain abortion care, first to Oklahoma, Louisiana, and New Mexico. As some of these States have banned abortion, they are now traveling even farther.

Now, in response to this exercise of their constitutional right to travel between the States, lawmakers in Texas and in other States across the country are threatening to take away that right, too.

This is not hypothetical, it is not hyperbole, and it is nothing like what we just heard from the minority in response to this bill.

Just last week, a group of lawmakers in Texas publicized a letter that they sent to at least one law firm in Texas threatening the firm and each of its partners with felony criminal prosecution and disbarment because of the firm's policy to reimburse employees for travel costs associated with out-of-State travel for abortion care.

It is not just Texas. Lawmakers in Missouri have already considered legislation to prohibit its residents from traveling outside of the State for abortion care to States where it is legal, and groups are working on model legislation to introduce in States across the country as we speak.

Not only do these threats fail to reflect the will of the majority of people in this country who favor a legislative framework that takes into account the complex circumstances of pregnancy that we have discussed this morning,

these threats fail to reflect the fundamental rights guaranteed in our Constitution.

Congress has the authority and the responsibility to protect people from these unconstitutional efforts to prevent, restrict, impede, or otherwise punish a person traveling to another State to obtain a legal abortion and to protect those providers and others who are helping them.

This morning, we are doing exactly that in passing the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act.

I thank the chairman, the Speaker, original cosponsors Representative STRICKLAND and Representative RASKIN, and all of our cosponsors for, once again, responding with urgency to the cruel efforts to deprive my fellow Texans and our fellow Americans of their constitutional right to travel by bringing this bill to the floor today, and I urge everyone in this body to vote "yes."

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLORES), a new Member just elected from the great State of Texas, the first Member who was born in Mexico, and a great member of our Republican Conference.

Mrs. FLORES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address my strong opposition to H.R. 8297, the Ensuring Access to Abortion Act.

Protecting the voiceless ought to be a top priority in this House and in every corner of this land.

As a mother of four beautiful and strong children, I find it hard to believe there are those who think defending life is optional, even to the last month of pregnancy.

H.R. 8297 is the opposite of what brought me to Congress, and it is the opposite of the values of the people of my district, Texas 34.

Let's be clear what this bill does: Undermines the ability of States to hold sexual abusers accountable, stops States from preventing abortion pill mills, and it gives human traffickers and abusers more direct access to chemical abortions in all 50 States.

Protecting life shouldn't be political. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 8297.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Eshoo), the chairwoman of our Subcommittee on Health.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman of our committee for his leadership.

I rise in strong support of this legislation. It is aptly named, Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act.

I have listened to the debate so far on this bill, and I really find it hard to believe what I am hearing. I think the people of this country need to know, before we get to the reproductive freedoms, that the Republicans are opposed to contraception. That is a fact around here.

Now, because of what the Supreme Court has unleashed with the Dobbs decision, we have a patchwork of States with different laws. Some States provide full healthcare for women; others don't.

Now, those living, as the author of this legislation stated, in Texas, they are fleeing Texas to go to other States; but those States want to stop women from traveling. That is what this is about. Stop women from traveling. What are they going to do? Put their Highway Patrol on the border to interview people to find out where they are going and why? This is extreme in terms of what these States want to do.

Today, the House, in its votes, makes it crystal clear to those States that they cannot take this freedom away. This bill establishes protections for women who travel for care and for healthcare professionals who provide that care.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, just to clarify, not a single legislature or Congress is debating making contraception illegal. Contraception is not abortion. It prevents conception. The scare tactic about making contraception illegal is another scare tactic by the Democrats to advance a radical abortion agenda to end life up until 9 months.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER), a member of our committee.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act. In the wake of the overturning of Roe v. Wade, this legislation is necessary to ensure that those in States that have restricted abortion care can travel across State lines to seek the care they need and not be criminalized for doing so.

I am proud that women in my home State of Delaware still have access to abortion care and that we can serve as a safe haven for those from other States.

But the reality for far too many people across the country is that they live in States where access to reproductive care has been so severely restricted that it is unavailable. While the bills we are voting on today are necessary, we must also confront the realities of what overturning Roe means.

Now, my middle name is Blunt, so let me be clear about who is going to be hit the hardest: poor women, young women, women in rural areas, and women of color, people who may not have the ability to travel hundreds of miles to get the care they need.

Madam Speaker, I was 10 years old when the landmark case of Roe was decided. Half a century later, I am standing on the floor of the House of Representatives, standing in the gap for doctors and healthcare providers, so

that they don't have to consult with a lawyer before they decide to give good care to their patients, standing for those who stood before us and fought for us to have this right for reproductive rights in the first place. I am standing for our young people so that our daughters and granddaughters don't need a health passport to travel from State to State or need to worry about being criminalized for seeking care.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members of the House to support both the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act and the Women's Health Protection Act. The bottom line: There is no room for politicians in our wombs.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. HARSHBARGER), a strong defender of the right to life.

Mrs. HARSHBARGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share my concern for the extraordinary lengths that my colleagues across the aisle will go in order to rip away a chance at life from unborn children.

H.R. 8297, the Ensuring Access to Abortion Act, is a deceptive ploy to circumvent the authority of States to set their own laws about abortion procedures or, more plainly, the procedures that violently end an unborn child's life.

On June 24, the Nation received historical news from the highest court in the land that Roe v. Wade had been overturned. This decision was an answer to nearly 50 years of prayer and a decision that rights a wrong that was committed in the very same court almost half a century ago.

The Supreme Court ruling verified that our Constitution gives no protections for abortion procedures. Abortion was never a constitutional right, and that has been the big lie to millions of women for the past 50 years. It was determined that this decision should not be mandated by Washington but chosen by the people through their State legislatures.

The Ensuring Access to Abortion Act is not only a blatant attempt to undermine State sovereignty; it also opens the door to incredibly dangerous consequences.

For one, the bill would restrict enforcement of State laws that require physicians to be present when chemical abortions are administered. This supervision is a safety measure to ensure that a patient does not have an ectopic pregnancy, which could lead to fatal consequences.

The primary pillar of the pro-life movement is that all life is precious. We must consider the health implications of women who receive an abortion or partial procedure across State lines and return to their home State in need of dire medical attention.

Women who have abortion procedures face a myriad of increased risks that can occur later. Sterilization, mis-

carriage, and tubal pregnancies are not uncommon.

Are we to assume that the responsibility for treatment of these subsequent health risks falls on the State whose laws were circumvented? Because that is what would ultimately happen.

And as a woman in Congress, I urge my colleagues to look at how this legislation puts at-risk minors and women in vulnerable positions. The language in this bill is so vague that it makes no consideration for abusers, those abusers that transport minors across State lines to receive abortions after their abuse.

We can't afford to be vague and allow blanket protection for anyone assisting in an abortion. We cannot be that naive, especially when these procedures have life and death consequences.

□ 1115

To be clear, not a single State has banned interstate travel for women seeking abortion. This bill isn't about protecting women from the State; it is about dramatically restricting States from protecting their citizens and forcing pro-life States to absorb the burden of safety complications that follow the superseding of their protective measures.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to think about the damaging consequences.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. UNDERWOOD). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. HARSHBARGER. Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to think about the damaging consequences of taking power from the States. Not only does it set a dangerous precedent of Federal overreach and taking power from the people, but it also has terrifying health implications for expectant mothers and at-risk youth, and the protection of bad actors.

I will always be a steadfast defender of an unborn child's right to live, and I will never back down from a fight to protect women and those unborn children. We cannot put both at risk with this damaging legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), who chairs our Consumer Protection and Commerce Subcommittee.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I lived the days before abortion was safe and legal in the United States of America, and I remember the desperation of women, some of them my friends, some of whom had to make really dangerous decisions about how they were going to be able to exercise control over their own bodies and make this most personal decision on their own. Some women died because they sought these dangerous methods on their own to end a pregnancy.

Let's be clear: *Roe v. Wade* wasn't the beginning of women having abortions; it was the end of women dying from abortions.

Abortion is healthcare. When *Roe v. Wade* finally became the law of the land, women were able finally to control their own bodies.

This bill is about freedom, and one of the most precious freedoms that we have is the freedom to travel from State to State in the United States of America.

What happens to the woman who is happily pregnant and who may be going to visit her family in Illinois, where, thank God, abortion is still legal? Are you going to check her out? Is she going to have to prove somehow that she is not going for an abortion? How are you going to enforce this without going into all the personal history of women who are traveling across State lines?

Enough is enough. In the United States of America, the right to travel is sacred. It is protected under the Commerce Clause, and we will not go back. Women will not go back.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), our whip and a strong defender of life.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, for leading on this issue.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this radical movement by our colleagues on the left to go way further than *Roe*, under the guise of codifying *Roe*, to push some of the most extreme packages of pro-abortion legislation that we have seen.

Where would this push us if they got their way? Under this package of bills that the House is taking up today, the United States would end up among just a handful of countries, including China and North Korea, in radical abortion on demand up until birth policy.

Now, there has been a lot of misinformation presented since the Supreme Court made their decision, a decision that I applaud because, Madam Speaker, it is a decision that finally said *Roe* was a flawed decision and that, in fact, elected leaders should be the ones debating this.

How much can we debate how to protect life? States have been having this debate. *Roe* didn't end the debate. It started a movement, a movement for almost 50 years. The March for Life. You see young people, tens and hundreds of thousands, coming up to Washington, just praying and marching for the opportunity to protect life. Now, those States and Congress can have that debate about how much more we can do to protect life.

In fact, we brought an amendment because whether it was before the *Dobbs* decision or even today, a State like New York has such a radical law that a baby can be born alive outside

the womb, and they can murder that baby and call it abortion. That is still legal today in States like New York. It should not be. It is murder. If a baby is born alive outside the womb, how in America can that baby be murdered under the guise of abortion? Yet, that is what is allowed.

We had the motion to recommit we brought forward—we will have a vote on that shortly—to say that barbaric act can no longer happen again in America, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. Everybody should vote for that. People pro-choice have said they think it is radical that a baby can be born alive outside the womb and still be murdered under the name of abortion.

We will have the opportunity to right that wrong today on the House floor. I hope everybody votes for it. Unfortunately, so far, we haven't gotten any support from my Democratic colleagues.

I will end with this, Madam Speaker: Our Founding Fathers empowered us with three unalienable rights, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The first among those is life. Let's do all we can to protect life, not have this radical, extreme agenda pushed forward today.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER).

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, this new post-*Roe* reality that we are living with is still sinking in for most of us, but if you are a woman who is pregnant now and needs to end that pregnancy, and you are in one of the States that has outlawed abortion, every day is filled with panic and horror, trying to figure out how to get the care you need. This is a crisis.

Now, politicians in some of those States are threatening to criminalize travel to another State for abortion care and to criminalize doctors and anyone else who might help, for example, with transportation. This is outrageous.

Such extreme laws are nothing less than an attack on women—on our autonomy, on our freedom, on our health, and on our privacy. These are backward positions. They are extreme and draconian.

The decision to have an abortion is one for a woman to make in consultation with her doctor—no one else, definitely not politicians.

As a doctor, I have been in the room with women making the extremely difficult and personal decision about whether to end a pregnancy. Politics has no place there. I have been in the room with a woman with an ectopic pregnancy for whom abortion is the standard of care.

Let's be clear, State laws that criminalize abortion and also criminalize travel across State lines for abortion put doctors in an impossible situation and put women at risk.

As a doctor, I took the Hippocratic Oath to "first, do no harm," and I want

you to think for a moment about the harm of a delayed or more complicated abortion, or that ectopic pregnancy, or the harm of having a rape victim carry a pregnancy to term, or the rates of maternal mortality in this country.

Make no mistake. These bans are draconian. Banning travel is extreme, controlling, and dangerous. Women will die because a bunch of politicians decided that they should be in charge of women's bodies. This is reprehensible.

I will keep doing everything I can to protect women's access to abortion no matter where they live, and I implore my House and Senate colleagues to pass these bills.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEUBE) to continue our fight for human rights for all.

Mr. STEUBE. Madam Speaker, let me address the complete misrepresentations of fact that we have been hearing from Democrats since *Roe* has been overturned.

There has never been a constitutional right to end the life of an innocent, unborn child—never. It doesn't exist in the Constitution, and Congress has never passed a law allowing for the murder of the unborn. In fact, the opposite exists.

In the Fifth and 14th Amendments to the Constitution, there is a constitutional right for any person to not be deprived of life, liberty, or property.

Certainly, an unborn child is a person. What else could it be? Therefore, that person shall not be deprived of life pursuant to the Constitution, period.

Finally, the U.S. Supreme Court got it right and made it clear that "the Constitution does not confer a right to abortion."

Over 63 million children have been murdered since *Roe* was decided. That is not freedom. That is genocide.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his extraordinary leadership on this subject not only as we face the Court decision but, over time, his chairmanship of the Energy and Commerce Committee in terms of health in general, women's health in particular, reproductive health as we gather today. I thank members of the committee, and I thank the authors of this legislation as I proceed.

I rise on this momentous day as our pro-choice, pro-women Democratic majority proudly takes further action to defend the fundamental right of health freedom.

As extremist Republicans continue their assault on reproductive rights, our Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act will ensure that the fundamental right to travel and obtain needed healthcare remains in the hands of the American people.

Our Women's Health Protection Act will once again make the protections of *Roe v. Wade* the law of the land.

Let us salute the patriotic and persistent leadership not only of our distinguished chairman, Mr. PALLONE, but also Congresswoman LIZZIE FLETCHER and Congresswoman MARILYN STRICKLAND, who are leading the charge on the right-to-travel bill, working with JAMIE RASKIN, who is a member of the Judiciary Committee and who has been part of this.

I also salute Congresswoman JUDY CHU, who will have now twice secured House passage of the Women's Health Protection Act; Pro-Choice Caucus co-chairs DIANA DEGETTE and BARBARA LEE; and Energy and Commerce Chairman FRANK PALLONE.

Three weeks ago, the Republican Party finally achieved its dark, dangerous, long-held goal to rip away a woman's freedom over her most fundamental decisions about her body, her health, and her life.

Since the Republican-captured Supreme Court eviscerated *Roe v. Wade*, at least nine Republican-controlled States have already banned abortion. More have enacted draconian restrictions so that exercising this fundamental right is practically impossible.

In doing so, these extreme measures have forced countless women to seek reproductive care in nearby States. But now, Republican lawmakers across the country are advancing proposals to block women from crossing State lines to get the care they need and punish those who, in their words, "aid or abet" them.

Is this the United States of America, where Republicans in these States can say to women, "You cannot cross State lines for your own good health?"

This has been especially devastating for women who do not have the means to access care, often women of color and women from low-income communities.

This reality is sickening. It is despicable. It demands action.

With our Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act, we will prevent Republicans from punishing women for exercising their right to travel and receive the healthcare they need, and it will protect healthcare providers who deliver reproductive services and all those who help women make the journey to receive those services. This means no criminal charges, no lawsuits, no fees or fines, no threats of retaliation.

Importantly, this legislation also reaffirms the right to travel, a freedom we often take for granted but is fundamental to liberty and privacy.

Republicans supposedly once stood for these values, but today, they are seeking to restrict where you can go and who you can see and to stand between you, your family, your doctor, and your God in making intimate health decisions.

This is not only anti-women; it is anti-American. House Democrats are fighting back.

Madam Speaker, today, our majority will also pass the Women's Health Protection Act, which protects the right to an abortion found in *Roe v. Wade*, ensuring the Federal right of healthcare providers to provide reproductive care and the Federal right for patients to receive that care.

By passing this legislation, we will preempt and prevent State-level bans and restrictions put forth by extremist, anti-women State legislators.

□ 1130

We will ensure that all Americans enjoy the same fundamental rights to reproductive care—regardless of background or ZIP Code.

We offer help to the American people who treasure our freedoms and who are overwhelmingly with us in our mission to defend them.

What do Republicans have in store next?

You can't travel to buy a book?

You can't travel to see a concert or a play—if it doesn't meet their, shall we say—I wouldn't use the word standards—their what?

Today, we must pass this legislation for a second time. We first passed this bill last September after Texas severely restricted the ability of women to access reproductive care with SB8, an outrageous bounty hunter bill. We do so again today, in the wake of the outrageous Supreme Court ruling that erased the vital protections of *Roe v. Wade*.

The Court's disgraceful decision has already unleashed catastrophe: women denied care after experiencing the heartbreak of miscarriage; survivors of sexual assault facing the possibility of forced birth; doctors under threat of persecution for offering reproductive services.

Many of these situations are well-known and are publicized—they are in the public domain. There are many more than are just in the public domain. Make no mistake, eviscerating the protections of *Roe* was only the opening act of the cruel Republican crusade to criminalize women.

In recent days, we have heard again of the tragic story of a young girl who was a survivor of sexual assault and had to travel to a neighboring State to receive the reproductive healthcare she needed. Now, the State attorney general—a Republican who served here in the House—is now investigating the doctor who legally provided her services. She is 10 years old. This move is intended to intimidate healthcare providers and produce a chilling effect on access to reproductive care.

The Republican agenda is not just a threat to families in red States. House Republicans' overwhelming opposition to our legislation make clear that they do not want anyone to access reproductive care anywhere. Indeed, their endgame is a barbaric ban on abortion in all 50 States.

As the Associate Justice Clarence Thomas said, they have only just

begun in terms of their restrictions in terms of contraception and the rest. They will not stop there. These extremists are even threatening to criminalize birth control, in vitro fertilization, and post-miscarriage care.

Democrats will never stop fighting back against this extreme assault because we know that every woman everywhere has the basic right to reproductive healthcare.

Right now, the rights of women and every American are on the line, Madam Speaker.

House Democrats are ferociously defending freedom with these two important bills. We need two more Democratic pro-choice Senators so that we can eliminate the filibuster and make this legislation the law of the land.

Madam Speaker, as the radical Republican Party seeks to wind back the clock of 50 years of hard-fought progress, I am reminded of an extemporaneous debate in which I participated as a high school student.

A young woman, a friend of mine, drew a question from a bowl on a slip of paper that read: Do women think?

Today, it seems that some wish to debate that same question: the extremist Republican assault on women's rights harkens back to this darker time.

Do women think?

Indeed, because of Donald Trump, MITCH MCCONNELL, and a radical right-wing Republican Party, and their supermajority in the Supreme Court, right now American women have less freedom than their mothers.

By passing this legislation, the Democratic House is standing on the side of freedom for women and for every American.

The young lady who drew the insulting question answered that question with grace and strength, and she won the debate.

Just as Democrats intend to win on the question of women's health and freedom, not only here in the Halls of Congress, but with the American people in November.

Madam Speaker, I urge a very strong vote for the Women's Health Protection Act and the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act. I hope we have a strong vote and I hope a bipartisan vote.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, as we celebrate a record number of pro-life women serving in the United States House of Representatives today and an army of pro-life women all across this country from every corner, we are fighting for the human rights of all, especially the unborn.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK), one of those mighty warriors.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to stop lying. Stop lying. *Roe* did not make abortion illegal, it returned the issue to the

States. Now we see that you all want to take those rights away from the States—strip them, in fact.

Under this bill that we are considering here today, you want to take this issue further than Roe ever did and take away the rights of children, those most vulnerable. The notion that women will somehow be stopped at checkpoints, in some 1984 scenario, this is insane and political fear-mongering at its best. You know that. You know that.

I hear constantly about these “extreme positions” that conservatives and those in the pro-life movement are taking, but what is extreme is not taking a stand for the child that survives an abortion attempt. That is extreme. Denying medical care for that child, that is the extreme.

Madam Speaker, I always say—and bless your heart, 36 years of service, that is incredible, 2 years longer than I have been alive.

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, in that 36 years of service, Madam Speaker, 60 million children have been murdered, with over 30 percent of them being minorities, African Americans and Hispanics.

It is curious logic that we murder these children to empower them.

Where were the rights of those young, little girls that were murdered? They didn't have a voice.

Yet here we are debating the fact that this is a right. A right?

No, no, no. This is an issue that has gone back to the States. Not an issue for us here in this Chamber to be deciding, when we know that this Nation is based on life: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It starts at life.

The extreme positions, they are being held on that side of the aisle. We are a Nation of equal opportunity, not equal outcome. We know that abortion is equal outcome. Give those children the opportunity to live.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this ridiculous bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. STRICKLAND), who is the chief cosponsor of this bill.

Ms. STRICKLAND. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act, which my colleagues and I wrote to support reproductive choice.

Simply put, this bill codifies the constitutional right to travel, which includes the ability to cross State lines to get safe and legal access to abortion.

The reality is that an increasing number of women are now forced to either carry an unwanted pregnancy against their will, even in cases of rape and incest, or travel hundreds of miles just to safely receive reproductive healthcare.

This is especially dangerous for indigenous women, who are 2½ times more at risk for rape and sexual assault. We cannot force women to give birth. Worse, those forced to carry out an unwanted pregnancy are giving birth in a Nation with one of the worst maternal mortality rates in the developed world.

When compared to Canada, United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, France, Germany, Switzerland, Australia, and New Zealand, the United States' maternal death rate is more than twice the rate of these countries.

What is more, Black and indigenous women will be among the most at risk because they are more likely to die from pregnancy or childbirth. They are also two to three times more likely to experience a pregnancy death than their White counterparts.

If access to safe and legal abortion becomes more restricted and inaccessible, the Black maternal mortality rates are expected to jump by a whopping 30 percent or more.

All told, taking away Federal protections for abortion hits Black women, indigenous women, women of color, low-income women, LGBTQ+ women, and women with disabilities the hardest.

This is about healthcare justice. This is about social justice. This is about economic justice. Taking away our right to safe and legal abortion is yet another way to try and control us.

Please listen carefully. Black women will not be stopped. Indigenous women will not be stopped. Women of color will not be stopped. LGBTQ+ will not be stopped. Women will not be stopped.

This bill ensures our right to reproductive freedom by reaffirming the constitutional right to travel. Those who hold the literal words of the Constitution and so-called States' rights as the absolute standard, you must do one thing: you must recognize the constitutional right to travel guaranteed by the 14th Amendment and vote “yes” on this bill.

We know you won't because for you this isn't about the Constitution or States' rights, it is about control. It is about controlling women's bodies and forcing people to give birth against their will.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), another defender of the right to life.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for the opportunity to come and talk about this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition. It has been noted this morning, the legislation that we are considering today doesn't just reverse the Supreme Court's recent ruling of Roe v. Wade, it goes much further.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have assembled this bundle of policies in an effort to undermine the enforcement of pro-life State laws.

As the Republican whip just pointed out a little earlier, in combination with what is called the so-called Women's Health Protection Act, it seeks to undermine the will of the people, and places the U.S. on a short list with North Korea and China as countries with the most extreme abortion policies in the world. We don't want to be on a list with those two countries.

Instead of undermining State law, we should be enabling States that have chosen to extend the responsibility of protecting its citizens to also include the unborn.

The Alabama legislature enacted the Human Life Protection Act in 2019, reflecting the will of the citizens of the State. I cannot allow those voices to be silenced by radical Federal abortion bills.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure that we are voting on this morning, and all of the extreme measures yet to come attacking the most vulnerable among us.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I would ask how much time is remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 14 minutes remaining and the gentlewoman from Washington has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 8297, the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act.

The Supreme Court's disastrous decision in Dobbs to overturn Roe v. Wade has exacerbated what was an already dire crisis in abortion care access—one that threatens to undermine women's equality and health.

In the wake of the Dobbs decision, State legislatures across the country are moving to ban abortion outright. As if that wasn't draconian enough, some States are also passing laws targeting people who help others obtain an abortion. This includes the notorious Texas law, SB8, which permits any person to collect a \$10,000 bounty by suing someone who “aids or abets an abortion.”

Not content to strip women of their bodily autonomy and equality in their own States, some State legislatures are now contemplating efforts to inhibit the ability of women to travel out-of-state to obtain lawful healthcare, including by threatening their friends, families, or even employers with legal action.

H.R. 8297 would put State legislatures considering such laws on notice by providing additional Federal legal protections that reaffirm and enhance enforcement of the constitutional right to interstate travel, which includes travel to obtain legal healthcare services like an abortion.

This legislation is not enough. Many people, a disproportionate number from

communities of color, do not have the option of traveling across State lines because they lack the resources to bear the costs of out-of-state travel, which include the related costs of childcare, lodging, or time off from work.

□ 1145

That is why it is essential that we also pass H.R. 8296, the Women's Health Protection Act of 2022, which would protect the right to abortion nationwide. The House has already passed this bill, but the Senate Republicans have twice blocked its passage. This is unacceptable. We must do everything we can to ensure protection of abortion access in a post-Roe world.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on both H.R. 8297 and H.R. 8296.

But this is not enough either. We face a radical Supreme Court deliberately packed with extremists by a plot by the Federalist Society, by MITCH MCCONNELL, and by Donald Trump to pack the Supreme Court with extremists who have no regard for our liberties and who will destroy every liberty we have if we don't do something about it. That is why Congressman JOHNSON, Congressman JONES, Senator MARKEY, and I have introduced legislation to unpack the Supreme Court by increasing the number of Justices by four.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE), who is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee. Dr. JOHN JOYCE is continuing our fight for the right to life.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

When I was in medical school, I learned about the development and the journey of a child in the womb of the mother.

Madam Speaker, let me review that journey with you today. At 6 weeks, a child is developing a mouth, nose, ears, and—most important—a heartbeat of their own. At 12 weeks, a baby has fingers and toes.

Continue on this journey with me. At 15 weeks, a baby can sense light and even has taste buds. At 19 weeks, a child can hear and knows the voice of their mother.

These lives are precious, and they must be protected.

By 22 weeks, many babies can survive outside the womb if they are born prematurely.

Clearly, these are human lives. Clearly, we in Congress have an obligation to protect these human lives.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this bill and support all human life. It is time for us to stand up for the American people and to stand up for all human life.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I was horrified when I heard about the plight of

a desperate Houston woman. She was 1 week pregnant beyond Texas' 6-week abortion ban, and with four children already, she knew she was not in a position to have another. So she packed her husband and four children in a car and drove over 22 hours and over 1,500 miles to my district in Pasadena, California, for her abortion.

Texas' law forced her into a situation no family should ever have to face, and the Supreme Court's overturning of Roe has made conditions far worse.

H.R. 8297, the Ensuring Access to Abortion Act of 2022, will ensure that every American has the right to travel to seek abortion care.

Madam Speaker, we will not give up in this fight. We will not go back.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), who is a great member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding time.

In the 1970s it was misleading, but pregnancy was described as a clump of cells and a lump of tissues.

How many people listened to that and didn't ascribe the agency to the young life that was developing?

Then medical sonography was just coming into its own at the same time that Roe was decided; and for two generations of Americans since then, the first picture in their baby book is their sonogram picture.

Is it any surprise that two generations of Americans now ascribe agency to the unborn child because they see from whence they came?

Having an abortion is not a simple fix to a problem; it is not a simple procedure; and it is not birth control. An abortion is highly complex, and it is a deeply emotional procedure. Obviously, it is going to affect the baby, and obviously, it is going to affect the woman.

Do you know what, Madam Speaker? It even affects the provider.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlemen for yielding.

Madam Speaker, as the doctor has just said, this is an extraordinarily complex and difficult issue for all.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill and the Women's Health Protection Act that we are also considering today.

Three weeks ago today, the United States Supreme Court's unprecedented decision reversed nearly 50 years of established precedent overturning Roe v. Wade and paving the way for trigger laws across the country to criminalize access to abortion instantly. With this ruling, women in 2022 will now have fewer rights than their mothers or grandmothers and less control over their own bodies and their own healthcare.

Today, the House of Representatives is responding to protect the women of

our country. Today, this House will vote to stand with women and affirm their freedom to make their own healthcare decisions.

It is not an easy decision, and it is not made lightly, but it ought to be free from interference from politicians. We must do everything, in my view, in our power to ensure that women are free to travel wherever they need in order to access reproductive care safely, legally, and without fear of punishment.

That is why I brought to the floor this bill, the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act. This legislation would prohibit States from preventing, impeding, or obstructing women from traveling to other States for reproductive care or retaliating against them for doing so.

Over a century and one-half ago it was legal to own people because of the color of their skin. They could escape, as Harriet Tubman did and as Frederick Douglass did, from their slavery on the Eastern Shore of our State and go to a so-called free State. But then, tragically, the Congress enacted a bill which allowed people to go and reimpose slavery on those folks. Let's none of us do the same.

This legislation would prohibit States from preventing, impeding, or obstructing women from traveling to other States for reproductive care where it is legal or retaliating against them for doing so. These draconian and authoritarian laws that States are talking about are going to criminalize behavior no matter whether it is legal in the State to which you went.

One of the first bills I voted on in 1967 when I first went to the State senate—at that point in time I was about 8 months out of law school—was to repeal the miscegenation statutes which said that a Black person could not marry a White person or a person of Japanese extraction or Chinese extraction. The Supreme Court held that unconstitutional.

It would be like saying: You can go to a State where that certainly is legal for an African American and a Caucasian to marry, but if you come back here, you are going to be a criminal.

That is draconian, authoritarian, and almost Communist-like. It is dictatorship that China tried to pursue and did.

This bill would also extend the same protections to healthcare providers who perform abortions for out-of-state patients and to anyone who helps them with transportation. Let us not set up a society where people are watching their neighbor, reporting on their neighbor, and criminalizing behavior which has, for one-half century, been the decision of a woman. Yes, she could consult her doctor and she could consult others, but it was her body that was at stake. It is her decision.

Additionally, this bill would protect the movement in interstate commerce of prescription drugs approved by the FDA to end pregnancies safely at home.

I am grateful to Representatives LIZZIE FLETCHER, MARILYN STRICKLAND, and JAMIE RASKIN for introducing this legislation and to Chairman PALLONE for advancing it through the Energy and Commerce Committee so speedily. I also want to thank DIANA DEGETTE and BARBARA LEE for their leadership on this issue as co-chairs of the Congressional Pro-Choice Caucus.

While protecting interstate travel is an important step, Congress must do much more to ensure that every woman in our country can access healthcare and reproductive choice safely, legally, and affordably. That is why we are also considering an updated version of the Women's Health Protection Act today.

I thank JUDY CHU, again, for her leadership on this effort.

Make no mistake, Madam Speaker, until we codify *Roe v. Wade's* 49-year precedent in Federal statute, women in many parts of our country will not be safe or have access to the healthcare they need. I am old enough to remember when it wasn't legal and when people died in back alleys going to charlatans and did not have proper medical care. Let's not return to those dark and tragic days.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, to support freedom, and to support the women of our country. That is the right thing to do.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD), who is a great defender of the human right to life.

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Speaker, the pro-life issue used to be a bipartisan issue in this Chamber even as we recognized that our essential liberties of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness were inalienable rights given to us not by government but by God, and the claim that the left is making that our attempts to protect life are somehow criminalizing women could be nothing further from the truth.

Setting aside the fact that the left can't even define for the moment what a woman is, 50 years of scientific evidence have unveiled to us the mystery and the amazing thing that is happening in the development of a child. We know so much more—even the fact that a child feels the pain of abortion. We will always stand with life.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS), who is a member of our committee.

Mr. PETERS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act.

After the Supreme Court eliminated the Federal right to abortion, only 20 States continue to protect a woman's right to choose. Even before *Roe* fell, States across the country were working to pass laws banning abortion even in cases of rape, incest, and when the life of the mother is at stake. That is

not pro-family, and that is not pro-life. That is barbaric.

Republican efforts to criminalize abortion will pit neighbors against neighbors, punish women for exercising their bodily autonomy, and imprison doctors who took an oath to protect their patients. That is happening right here in what is supposed to be the freest country in the world. That is why I am standing here, today, to protect a woman's right to travel in search of legal healthcare.

Madam Speaker, if the Supreme Court won't protect Americans, then we in Congress must do everything in our power to stand up for our basic freedoms. That starts with this bill, and I urge my colleagues to pass it.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON), who is continuing our fight for life.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Washington State.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle's efforts to create a national policy that allows for terminating a pregnancy at any stage, for any reason is not only extreme and outside of the mainstream of America, it is wholly inconsistent with our values and the founding principles of our great Nation.

This abortion on demand legislation taken together will put us in the dubious company of the likes of China, North Korea, and only five other countries that I guarantee you, Madam Speaker, do not have America's values.

I commend the Supreme Court for restoring the integrity of the Constitution and returning power back to the States and We the People.

God bless America, and God bless our fellow Americans both born and unborn.

□ 1200

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who co-chairs the Pro-Choice Caucus.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 8297.

Yes, as co-chair of the Pro-Choice Caucus, along with my colleague, Congresswoman DIANA DEGETTE, I thank our colleagues, Representatives FLETCHER, STRICKLAND, and RASKIN, for introducing this very important bill, and also Chairman PALLONE and Speaker PELOSI for bringing it to the floor.

Everyone deserves the freedom to make personal decisions about their health, their bodies, their futures, as well as the right to travel. Yet, the Supreme Court's decision has stripped this fundamental right to reproductive freedom from millions of people in this country.

Now, I remember the days before *Roe*, and we aren't going back.

Not only are some States moving to enact extreme abortion bans, but some anti-abortion State legislators are working to prohibit people from traveling across State lines to access care and are targeting people who assist those in need.

What in the world is happening to our democracy?

First of all, you are trying to take away our own healthcare decisions, the ability to make our reproductive healthcare decisions. You are trying to criminalize people for making their own reproductive healthcare decisions.

You are trying to set up an environment for people to spy on each other when they are trying to exercise their reproductive healthcare decisions and freedoms.

You are trying to take away people's right to travel.

What in the world is this? Is this America?

You all talk about other countries. I don't even recognize what you are trying to do in this country.

Please, just know that this is a slippery slope. They come for me today; they are coming for you tomorrow.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" and to reaffirm the right to travel and seek care, not further erode our reproductive freedoms and personal liberties.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, we are working on a privacy bill, but that is a separate bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER), a great defender of life.

Mr. FULCHER. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the proposed Federal authorization of what amounts to be abortion on demand.

There are reasons the life issue is so polarizing. How we prioritize life, from before birth to the end of life, often defines our value systems. I believe life is the very character of God, that, indeed, we all have inalienable rights, the most important of which is the right to live.

I will close my comments by pointing out three relevant position statements my friends on the other side of the aisle struggle with.

All too often, they will support taking of life of the pre-born by abortion, but not taking of life of convicted murderers by capital punishment.

All too often, they will support the statement "my body, my choice," but not when it comes to vaccines.

And all too often, they will support so-called reproductive health, but not if it is reproductive or healthy.

Debates and decisions like these belong to the people, not the Federal Government.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LOIS FRANKEL).

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, a Supreme Court, out of touch with the American people,

says that State legislatures can ban abortions and give our most important personal decisions to politicians, and Republicans are on a mission to do just that.

Madam Speaker, my, my, my, their plans are getting crazier and more extreme by the minute. Listen to this: National anti-abortion groups and their allies, Republican allies in State legislatures, are scheming to stop people in States where abortions are banned from seeking the procedure elsewhere.

As we speak, there is a proposal in Missouri, a State that bans abortion, that would allow private citizens to sue anyone that helps a Missouri resident have an abortion in another State.

They are going to punish doctors, Uber drivers, spouses, and the rest just for helping a woman who is getting the healthcare that she needs. We stop that today.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST), a leader defending life.

Mr. MAST. As all remarks are supposed to be directed to the Chair, Madam Speaker, when is a life a life?

Madam Speaker, when is a life a life?

I will open it up for the rest of my colleagues over there. I would wager none of my colleagues on the other side will tell us when life begins. I have a \$20 bill here. It is not worth as much as it used to be worth. I will put it down here on the table. Any one of you or your colleagues wants to speak up and tell us when life begins, it is sitting here for you.

Madam Speaker, when is a life a life? When does it begin?

That is the most extreme idea to come out of this body, that you won't acknowledge when a life is a life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MAST. Madam Speaker, point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his point of order.

Mr. MAST. Madam Speaker, did I address my remarks to you?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a point of order.

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA).

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 8297 by my colleague and friend from Houston, Congresswoman FLETCHER.

First, let me be clear. There seems to be some fixation from the other side that this decision should be left up to the States because the Supreme Court said that. They need to re-read the opinion. It simply says that it is returned to the people and their elected Representatives. Last time I looked, I was an elected Representative, and we all are elected Representatives.

So, we can pass these two bills today and put them in statute and make it

the law of the land because, I can tell you, if we leave it to the States, things will be more extreme.

In my home State of Texas, extremist Republicans have created a patchwork that is scary, discriminatory, and oppressive, and they are doing that to limit our right to make our own deeply personal, private healthcare decisions about our own bodies together with our families and our providers.

This bill would restore women's rights in Texas and across the country. It would stop Republicans from criminalizing, fining, or suing women who exercise their constitutional right to travel across State lines to obtain an abortion.

This is important since many companies have announced policies that cover travel expenses for employees seeking abortion care who are not able to get them in their own home State. They are threatening businesses in Texas that they will throw them out of Texas.

This bill is necessary. We are the elected Representatives. We get to decide.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), a defender of life fighting for the right to life.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 8297.

I heard my Democrat colleagues passionately state that women will not be stopped and that we should support freedom. Yet, sadly, these same people fail to realize that their own radical abortion legislation will, indeed, stop women's rights because their radical agenda stops a future woman's right and freedom forever by ending her life.

If this bill were to become law, healthcare professionals would be seen as obstructing victims' access to abortion if they delay the abortion to report this case of child abuse. That is not protecting women and girls.

To make this bill even worse, this legislation eliminates medical supervision requirements for chemical abortion pills. The FDA deems these pills as high-risk drugs that can cause intense pain, excessive bleeding, infections, and, in some cases, death. This means a woman or a little girl could literally bleed out without a doctor even knowing or being there to help.

Abortion is not healthcare. This is a lie from the abortion industry that has, time and time again, placed its agenda over the health and safety of women and girls.

Healthcare is meant to help patients. Yet, a successful abortion results in the death of a baby 100 percent of the time, except, of course, for those born alive, which my Democrat colleagues don't even want to save them.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation.

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER), a real champion for women, for health, and for families.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, it gets more painful every single day. When you think about it, you have an AG in Indiana who has smeared a healthcare professional in that State who did exactly what she was supposed to do in providing an abortion to a 10-year-old. But he was going to bring charges against her.

We have a colleague on the other side of the aisle who is now putting down \$20 bills as if we are going to race over there to get that \$20 bill to answer his question.

I mean, what are we doing here? Have we lost it?

This bill simply codifies what is interpreted in the Constitution in the Fifth Amendment.

Now, we have a Justice, Kavanaugh, who was asked the question: May a State bar a resident of the State from traveling to another State? The answer is no. But, interestingly enough, the right to travel, those words, are not in the Fifth Amendment.

So, if we have an originalist Court, we do have to pass this bill, which has been introduced by Congresswomen FLETCHER and STRICKLAND and other Members, because women should be able to travel. Right now, we cannot even guarantee that to a woman who wants to get an abortion.

I have had an abortion. I have had miscarriages. I have had to live with a dead fetus in my body. I know what that experience is like. Not everyone over there does. I would say most Members over there don't.

But it is my personal right. It is every woman's personal right.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON), who is on the leadership team in the House and a great defender for life.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for leading and for all of her courageous leadership on this important issue.

Madam Speaker, I have to say, we have been stunned here in the last hour of this debate by a lot of what we have heard, not the least of which is when one of our Democrat colleagues actually exclaimed on this floor in the last hour: "Thank God abortion is still legal."

I just sat here and said wow. Thank God? Thank God for what? That innocent, unborn children can still be killed in many States? Thank God?

The other side in this debate has not only abandoned reverence, all reverence, all morality, all reason, but they defied medical technology.

They have also completely abandoned the first self-evident truth boldly proclaimed in our Nation's birth certificate, the Declaration of Independence, that all men are created equal—not born equal—created equal by God, and it is He who gives our inalienable rights, beginning, obviously, with the right to life.

I mean, seriously, please don't come on this floor and thank our creator for

your zeal to terminate the innocent lives that He has created. God have mercy on us.

Madam Speaker, today, the Democrats have brought two bills to this floor. The first is a complete overhaul of all pro-life protections, which will allow for taxpayer-funded abortion on demand through all three trimesters of pregnancy.

The second bill, the so-called Ensuring Access to Abortion Act, creates an open door for women to be preyed upon by traffickers and does nothing to protect minors who are transported by predators across State lines to obtain abortions.

In order to prohibit these heinous acts, I introduced the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act, which, by the way, I should note, passed this House by a wide margin in 2005 in the 109th Congress. How far the other side has devolved since then. Because of that, now more than ever, we have to highlight why this bill is so important in protecting the lives of minors and their unborn children.

The Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act will help cut down on predators and traffickers taking advantage of minors by making it a crime to knowingly transport a minor across State lines to obtain an abortion without first satisfying State-level parental involvement laws.

□ 1215

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, it is simple. A parent should be involved in the life of their child, and State laws should never be circumvented to benefit those seeking to take advantage of minors.

When a State says a guardian or parent should be notified that their minor is seeking an abortion, that law ought to be respected and followed. Our States' parental involvement laws are well-written and reasonable, and there are exceptions built into the statutes for extreme circumstances.

We also know that forced coercion to abort an unborn child is real, and it must be addressed. Predators, traffickers, and their accomplices must be held accountable for the damage they have done to minors.

I am so glad that our side is offering tangible solutions to real problems; but it is unfortunate that it is in response to such terrible pieces of legislation that only further endanger the lives of minors and their unborn children.

I urge opposition to the other side's callous and barbaric agenda and their bill, and I support our motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the text of the amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman

from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), where this is top of mind.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friends, LIZZIE FLETCHER and MARILYN STRICKLAND and JAMIE RASKIN, for understanding the Constitution.

Patricia Hughes and Jeremy Donahue threw a Molotov cocktail in a clinic, an abortion clinic, in Shreveport, Louisiana. David McMenemy of Rochester crashed his car into the Edgerton Women's Care Center. A package left at a woman's health center in Austin, Texas, contained an explosive device. It goes on and on and on.

A Texas woman has been charged with murder after a so-called, self-induced abortion. It is clear that our friends are trying to criminalize the right to reproductive freedom.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from NPR and a document entitled "Violence Against Abortion Providers."

VIOLENCE AGAINST ABORTION PROVIDERS,  
CLINICS, AND ACTIVISTS

December 12, 2005: Patricia Hughes and Jeremy Dunahoe threw a Molotov cocktail at a clinic in Shreveport, Louisiana. The device missed the building and no damage was caused. In August 2006, Hughes was sentenced to six years in prison, and Dunahoe to one year. Hughes claimed the bomb was a "memorial lamp" for an abortion she had had there.

September 11, 2006: David McMenemy of Rochester Hills, Michigan, crashed his car into the Edgerton Women's Care Center in Davenport, Iowa. He then doused the lobby in gasoline and started a fire. McMenemy committed these acts in the belief that the center was performing abortions; however, Edgerton is not an abortion clinic. Time magazine listed the incident in a "Top 10 Inept Terrorist Plots" list.

April 25, 2007: A package left at a women's health clinic in Austin, Texas, contained an explosive device capable of inflicting serious injury or death. A bomb squad detonated the device after evacuating the building. Paul Ross Evans (who had a criminal record for armed robbery and theft) was found guilty of the crime.

May 9, 2007: An unidentified person deliberately set fire to a Planned Parenthood clinic in Virginia Beach, Virginia.

December 6, 2007: Chad Altman and Sergio Baca were arrested for the arson of Curtis Boyd's clinic in Albuquerque. Baca's girlfriend had scheduled an appointment for an abortion at the clinic.

January 22, 2009: Matthew L. Derosia, 32, who was reported to have had a history of mental illness, rammed an SUV into the front entrance of a Planned Parenthood clinic in Saint Paul, Minnesota, causing between \$2,500 and \$5,000 in damage. Derosia, who told police that Jesus told him to "stop the murderers," was ruled competent to stand trial. He pleaded guilty in March 2009 to one count of criminal damage to property.

August 29, 2009: Two days after a nearby anti-abortion protest, an unknown arsonist threw a molotov cocktail at a Planned Parenthood in Lincoln, Nebraska. The bomb fell short of the building, leaving no property damage or casualties.

January 1, 2012: Bobby Joe Rogers, 41, firebombed the American Family Planning Clinic in Pensacola, Florida, with a Molotov cocktail; the fire gutted the building. Rogers told investigators that he was motivated to

commit the crime by his opposition to abortion, and that what more directly prompted the act was seeing a patient enter the clinic during one of the frequent antiabortion protests there. The clinic had previously been bombed at Christmas in 1984 and was the site of the murder of John Britton and James Barrett in 1994.

April 1, 2012: A bomb exploded on the windowsill of a Planned Parenthood clinic in Grand Chute, Wisconsin, resulting in a fire that caused minimal damage.

April 11, 2013: Benjamin David Curell, 27, caused extensive damage to a Planned Parenthood clinic in Bloomington, Indiana, vandalizing it with an axe: Curell was convicted in state court of felony burglary, and pleaded guilty in federal court to one count of violating the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act. In the federal case, he was sentenced to three years of probation and ordered to pay restitution.

October 3-4, 2013: 32-year-old Jebediah Stout attempted to set a Planned Parenthood clinic in Joplin, Missouri on fire two days in a row. Stout previously set a fire at a Joplin mosque.

September 4, 2015: A Planned Parenthood clinic in Pullman, Washington was intentionally set on fire. No injuries were reported due to the time of day, but the FBI was involved because of a history of domestic terrorism against the clinic. The crime was never solved. The clinic reopened six months later.

October 22, 2015: A Planned Parenthood clinic in Claremont, New Hampshire was vandalized by a juvenile intruder. Damaged in the attack were computers, furniture, plumbing fixtures, office equipment, medical equipment, phone lines, windows, and walls. The flooding that resulted from the vandalism also damaged an adjacent business).

February 24-25, 2016: Travis Reynolds, 21, vandalized a Baltimore-area women's health care clinic with antiabortion graffiti. After being arrested, Reynolds "admitted to police that he defaced the clinic's doors, walls and windows because he thought that it would deter women from using the clinic." Reynolds pleaded guilty in federal court to one count of violating the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act in October 2016.

March 7, 2016: Rachel Ann Jackson, 71, vandalized a Planned Parenthood clinic in Columbus, Ohio, with the message "Satan den of baby killers . . ." She pleaded guilty to felony counts of breaking and entering and vandalism and a misdemeanor count of aggravated trespass. Jackson was sentenced to probation, with the judge citing her struggle with serious mental illness as a mitigating factor.

February 10, 2019: Wesley Brian Kaster, 43, threw a Molotov cocktail at a Planned Parenthood clinic in Columbia, Missouri. Kaster admitted to setting the fire because Planned Parenthood provided abortions, although Planned Parenthood stated that the clinic was not providing abortions at the time due to a state law. Kaster was sentenced to five years in prison.

January 3, 2020: A high school student, Samuel Gulick, spray-painted "Deus Vult" on a clinic in Newark, Delaware before throwing a Molotov Cocktail at the front window. Gulick was sentenced to 26 months in prison by a federal judge.

October 10, 2020: A man threw multiple Molotovs at a Planned Parenthood clinic in Fort Myers, Florida.

January 23, 2021: An unknown individual fired a shotgun at a Tennessee Planned Parenthood clinic; no one was injured. News outlets noted that the attack took place on the anniversary of the Roe v. Wade decision and at a time when Tennessee's governor, Bill Lee, was involved in a heated online debate regarding abortion and health care.

December 31, 2021: On New Year's Eve, a fire destroyed a Planned Parenthood in Knoxville, Tennessee. The building was closed at the time for renovations. The Knoxville Fire Department and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives ruled the fire arson. The clinic had previously been shot at in January of the same year.

May 25, 2022: A masked woman set a fire at a planned abortion clinic in Casper, Wyoming. The ATF offered a \$5,000 reward for information leading to her arrest.

[From NPR, April 10, 2022]

A TEXAS WOMAN HAS BEEN CHARGED WITH MURDER AFTER A SO-CALLED 'SELF-INDUCED ABORTION'

(By Carolina Cuellar)

A Texas woman has been charged with murder for a what authorities are calling a self-induced abortion.

Ayesha Rascoe, Host:

In South Texas, 26-year-old Lizelle Herrera is being charged with murder because of a, quote, "self-induced abortion." She's been arrested and will be arraigned Wednesday. The Starr County District Attorney's Office has yet to comment on the case. Here's Texas Public Radio's Carolina Cuellar with what we know.

Unidentified Person: (Chanting in Spanish).

Unidentified People: (Chanting in Spanish).

Carolina Cuellar, Byline: On Saturday, across the street from the Starr County Jail, a sparse crowd of pro-abortion rights activists chanted for Herrera's release.

Unidentified Person: (Chanting in Spanish).

Unidentified People: (Chanting in Spanish).

Cuellar: At the protest, Cathy Torres, the organizing manager for Frontera Fund, said based on what she knows about Herrera's case, it isn't likely to be unique.

Cathy Torres: This is only setting a precedent for other cases. She's not the first. She won't be the last.

Cuellar: She said many women in Texas are having to choose self-administered abortions because of the state's restrictive abortion legislation, like Senate Bill 8. While SB8 explicitly exempts pregnant women who get an abortion from criminal repercussions, it makes it nearly impossible to access abortion services in Texas, and many people are left with little to no legal options to terminate their pregnancy.

Steve Vladeck, who is a law professor at the University of Texas School of Law, said that based on current information, the murder charge doesn't make sense.

Steve Vladeck: The Texas murder statute does apply to the killing of an unborn fetus, but it specifically exempts cases where the person who terminated the fetus is the pregnant woman.

Cuellar: It's unclear whether Herrera induced her own abortion or assisted someone else's self-induced abortion. He said details like which statutes were used to charge her will help paint a clear picture of how prosecutors avoided the exemption if Herrera performed her own abortion. But right now, this information is unavailable. Nonetheless, Vladeck said Herrera's situation shows what will happen as legal protections around abortion crumble.

Vladeck: You know, I think what this case really is is an ominous portent of what things are going to look like on the ground in states that have aggressive abortion restrictions.

Cuellar: Jessica Brand agrees. She's a former prosecutor and founder of The Wren

Collective, a criminal justice nonprofit organization.

Jessica Brand: We've had a lot of wake-up calls in Texas for how far people are willing to go to prosecute women, to strip women of their rights.

Cuellar: According to Brand, while legal ground for the case is shaky, it shows how legislation like SB8 emboldens people to push legal boundaries around abortion. She adds that as restrictions continue to grow, they will disproportionately affect marginalized communities, like those along the Texas-Mexico border. This is because they often lack the resources that would allow them to travel out of state and obtain safe medical abortion services.

Brand: It's very, very dangerous. If they decide that a self-induced and termination of pregnancy is, in fact—qualifies as murder, you can imagine the horrific precedent that sets.

Cuellar: Shortly after the protest, a legal defense fund covered Herrera's \$500,000 bail. I'm Carolina Cuellar in Rio Grande City.

Ms. JACKSON LEE, Madam Speaker, I stand, as I said earlier, with a 10-year-old victim who had to run to be able to secure an abortion after being raped.

I stand on the Constitution where the Fifth Amendment says that we are due life and liberty. I stand in front of "In God We Trust," and I tell my friend from Louisiana that the Constitution says that we have a right to freedom of religion.

We speak what we believe. That is what this legislation does, and that is what reproductive freedom is. It is to ensure that the GOP does not criminalize abortion in all 50 States.

It is to ensure that Republicans are not plotting a nationwide ban to criminalize. This Constitutional expose, and explanation, indicates that we have the right to travel and the right to be constitutionally secure in that.

Further, we need to go a step further and criminalize anyone who is a bounty hunter and hold them accountable and put them in jail.

Specifically, this bill provides and makes sure that we prohibit any person or healthcare providers who provide legal abortion or services, that we don't stop that, that we don't stop any person or any entity for helping healthcare providers. Let me thank you and ask support of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise in strong support of H.R. 8297, the Ensuring Access to Abortion Act of 2022.

H.R. 8297, the "Ensuring Access to Abortion Act of 2022" will protect women and girls from others preventing or interfering with a person's ability to access abortion care across state lines.

H.R. 8297 prohibits anyone acting under state law from interfering with a person's ability to access abortifacient drugs, abortion counseling, or abortion services out-of-state.

When I cosponsored this bill, I was specifically thinking of the women in my hometown of Houston, who now must travel 12 hours to reach the nearest abortion clinic in New Mexico.

I fear that Texas women and girls will because of the state's antiabortion laws will be living behind a new "Iron Curtain."

The harrowing stories of people escaping across the Berlin Wall to freedom will be re-

placed by women escaping Texas to save their own or a loved one's life.

I am concerned that there will be a new Underground Railroad with conductors ferrying women to New Mexico where they will have the freedom to make their own medical decisions.

It is the landmass of the state of Texas that makes this bill desperately needed.

Texas is the second-largest state in the US with an area of 268,597 square miles or 171,902,080 acres which is more than 7.4 percent of the United States total land mass.

In comparison, Texas is about 1.65 times larger than California, at 163,696 square miles.

Texas is not the largest state, however. Alaska, the largest state in the US is nearly 2.5 times larger than Texas at 663,300 square miles.

Texas has 29 million residents and the 13th highest GDP in the world at 1.78 trillion as of 2019.

If Texas were its own country, it would be the 40th largest out of 193 countries in the world, bigger than every country in Europe.

It is the quantitative, logistical, and legal challenge of driving to gain abortion services.

To the South is the country of Mexico with passport requirements which costs hundreds and often many weeks to obtain.

Those women living in regions of the state that border other states with prohibitions on reproduction options for women will make travel to New Mexico the only option.

To give some perspective on the size of Texas.

Austin is closer to New Orleans than it is to El Paso.

San Diego is closer to El Paso than it is to Houston.

The distance from Washington, D.C. to New York City is about 228 miles, or four hours driving.

The distance from Dallas to Houston, which is roughly 230 miles, or a little over four hours in a car.

To the north and northeast are Louisiana, Arkansas, and Oklahoma all of which have and made add to the hurdles of reaching a service provider by car.

It takes around 13 hours to drive the 805 miles from the northernmost point to southernmost Texas. You would start in Texhoma, a small town that sits on the border of Texas and Oklahoma then drive south through Lubbock, San Antonio, and all the way down to Brownsville, the southernmost city on the tip of Texas.

It takes 11 hours to drive 773 miles from easternmost to westernmost points across Texas.

Any drive of just a few hours may place women in the jurisdiction of unincorporated areas, rural towns, and counties where aggressive enforcement of a state law may be a priority.

Republican Texas lawmakers have already passed SB 8, one of the most barbaric and archaic anti-abortion laws in the country, that denies women the right to bodily autonomy after carrying a fetus for more than 6 weeks.

If left to their own devices, those lawmakers hope to prevent Texan women from seeking abortions not only in Texas, but elsewhere as well.

That is why I wholeheartedly support H.R. 8297, the "Ensure Access to Abortion Act of 2022."

This bill would prohibit any person acting under state law from preventing, restricting, impeding, or retaliating against:

health care providers who provide legal abortion services to out-of-state residents;

any person or entity who helps health care providers provide such services;

any person who travels to another state to obtain such services;

any person or entity who helps another person travel to another state to obtain such services; or

the movement in interstate commerce of drugs that are approved to terminate pregnancies.

Women in Texas and in other states with anti-abortion laws are already in crisis. They are already forced to flee their communities, incur undue financial costs, and combat social stigma to seek abortion care beyond their state boundaries.

We cannot allow these women to then be additionally prosecuted for exercising their right to abortion care in states where that right is still upheld.

The "Ensuring Access to Abortion Act of 2022" would protect women in need of abortions from litigation.

But it goes admirably beyond that by protecting those who support women in exercising their reproductive rights.

Many organizations and community networks have rallied around women since the Supreme Courts Dobbs decision.

Churches, non-profits, and private companies have all stepped up to the plate to support women carrying unwanted pregnancies whether it be through financial contributions, transportation assistance, housing options, or access to abortion drugs.

The "Ensuring Access to Abortion Act of 2022" would shield them from those who wish to make personal gains off the private medical decisions of women.

Just last week, a 10-year-old rape victim from Ohio was denied an abortion in her home state because she was six weeks and three days pregnant.

I will say it again: A 10-year-old girl. Six weeks and three days pregnant.

The anti-abortion trigger laws in her state forced this little girl to travel 175 miles to Indianapolis in order to have her rapists' fetus removed from her young body.

This little girl had to leave the comfort of her community, leave her state, and drive for hours in order to get the necessary medical care she undeniably needed.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would have preferred it if she could not have done even this.

Many conservative lawmakers would have preferred to see lawsuits filed against the family member who made her abortion appointment, the nurse who greeted her at the clinic, the parent who drove her home.

Maybe they would have even preferred to see lawsuits against the owner of the gas station where the family refueled their car, or the search engine that helped them locate the abortion clinic that saved their child from becoming a 10-year-old mother.

Imagine if lawmakers had decided that this little girl had to see a physician 24 hours in advance of her appointment. Imagine if they had mandated that she see an ultrasound of her fetus. Imagine if they had required the physician who cared for her to counsel this child on the benefits of adoption.

That is the reality many Republican lawmakers would like to see.

That is why these two bills are so important. I stand in proud support of both H.R. 8296, the "Women's Health Protection Act of 2022," and H.R. 8297, the "Ensuring Access to Abortion Act of 2022."

I urge my colleagues to stand up for women and girls and the providers who meet their medical needs every day.

We cannot let those who wish to relegate women to second-class citizens turn back the clock any further.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS) has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON).

Ms. WILSON of Florida, Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. This is just annoying to me that everyone on the Republican side is so concerned about the children before they are born, and once they are born, they want nothing to do with them.

So these children land in the hands of grandmama who is trying to raise them alone. The only time I see them is when they are on the floor fussing about grandmama's Social Security and her Medicare, trying to take away her food stamps while she is trying to take care of Nina's children, Jose's children, and all of these children. Shame on you. You have never carried a baby for 9 months. Shame, shame, shame.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Madam Speaker, in the United States of America, we continue our search for a more perfect Union. We all get to be a part of that.

In our history, the Supreme Court has overruled 300 of its own cases, cases such as the Dred Scott decision, and now, Roe v. Wade.

Abortion is a false choice between taking care of a woman and taking care of a baby. What a woman needs is support.

Every life is meaningful, and our actions significant. Ending abortion is the human rights issue of our generation. Every life has value and dignity.

And to every person all across this country, may each one of us open our eyes and see one another. May each one of us open our ears and hear one another. May each one of us open our hearts to one another.

We are a Nation founded on the inalienable, God-given rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. As has been noted by others, life comes first. You can't have liberty without life. You can't have the pursuit of happiness without life.

That should guide us and be the bedrock for our moral authority so that

abortion would become unthinkable in America.

Today before this House is a radical agenda. The Democrats' abortion agenda is much more radical than anything that was in Roe. This is extreme.

It nationalizes abortion for all 9 months, making America just as radical as China, North Korea. It legitimizes discriminatory abortions at any stage based upon baby's sex, race, or disability, including Down syndrome. It overrides State laws that protect women from coercion.

There is no part of this that celebrates the dignity, the value, or the potential of human life. Pew Research reports that in Washington, D.C., in the 29 States that provide racial and ethnic data on abortion to the CDC, 38 percent of women who underwent an abortion in 2019 were non-Hispanic or Black, though U.S. Census numbers indicate that Black people comprise 13.4 percent of the population.

CDC data from 2019 also indicates that Black women are five times more likely to have an abortion than White women.

Madam Speaker, we stand on the side of life. Let's defend life. It is the human rights issue of our generation. Reject this bill. I yield back the balance of the time.

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, once again, I speak as a woman, a mom, a doctor, and a pediatrician who has rescued many babies in the neonatal intensive care unit.

I tell you that we have heard a lot of statistics on the other side of the aisle, but one statistic that has not been said is that 100 percent of women who choose abortion make that decision on their own and for themselves, and that is the way that it needs to stay.

This is a healthcare decision that only a woman can make in consultation with her doctor. That is why we are here today, to protect women's autonomy over their own healthcare, over their own lives, over their own destinies, and that is a fundamental right.

When we talk about freedom, we want to talk and we need to talk about the freedom of a woman to control her destiny, to make her own decisions; and that is why these bills are so important, to protect a woman's right to choose and to make sure that if her State does not allow it, she can choose, freely, to travel to another State and get the care she needs.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1224, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommend.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Johnson of Louisiana moves to recommend the bill H.R. 8297 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The material previously referred to by Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana is as follows:

Add at the end of the bill the following:

**SEC. 3. TRANSPORTATION OF MINORS IN CIRCUMVENTION OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO ABORTION.**

Title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 117 the following:

**“CHAPTER 117A—TRANSPORTATION OF MINORS IN CIRCUMVENTION OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO ABORTION**

“Sec.

“2431. Transportation of minors in circumvention of certain laws relating to abortion.

“2432. Transportation of minors in circumvention of certain laws relating to abortion.

**“§ 2431. Transportation of minors in circumvention of certain laws relating to abortion**

“(a) OFFENSE.—

“(1) GENERALLY.—Except as provided in subsection (b), whoever knowingly transports a minor across a State line, with the intent that such minor obtain an abortion, and thereby in fact abridges the right of a parent under a law requiring parental involvement in a minor’s abortion decision, in force in the State where the minor resides, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

“(2) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this subsection, an abridgement of the right of a parent occurs if an abortion is performed or induced on the minor, in a State or a foreign nation other than the State where the minor resides, without the parental consent or notification, or the judicial authorization, that would have been required by that law had the abortion been performed in the State where the minor resides.

“(b) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(1) The prohibition of subsection (a) does not apply if the abortion was necessary to save the life of the minor because her life was endangered by a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness, including a life endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself.

“(2) A minor transported in violation of this section, and any parent of that minor, may not be prosecuted or sued for a violation of this section, a conspiracy to violate this section, or an offense under section 2 or 3 of this title based on a violation of this section.

“(c) AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE.—It is an affirmative defense to a prosecution for an offense, or to a civil action, based on a violation of this section that the defendant—

“(1) reasonably believed, based on information the defendant obtained directly from a parent of the minor, that before the minor obtained the abortion, the parental consent or notification took place that would have been required by the law requiring parental involvement in a minor’s abortion decision, had the abortion been performed in the State where the minor resides; or

“(2) was presented with documentation showing with a reasonable degree of certainty that a court in the minor’s State of residence waived any parental notification required by the laws of that State, or otherwise authorized that the minor be allowed to procure an abortion.

“(d) CIVIL ACTION.—Any parent who suffers harm from a violation of subsection (a) may

obtain appropriate relief in a civil action unless the parent has committed an act of incest with the minor subject to subsection (a).

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section—

“(1) the term ‘abortion’ means the use or prescription of any instrument, medicine, drug, or any other substance or device—

“(A) to intentionally kill the unborn child of a woman known to be pregnant; or

“(B) to intentionally prematurely terminate the pregnancy of a woman known to be pregnant, with an intention other than to increase the probability of a live birth or of preserving the life or health of the child after live birth, or to remove a dead unborn child;

“(2) the term ‘law requiring parental involvement in a minor’s abortion decision’ means a law—

“(A) requiring, before an abortion is performed on a minor, either—

“(i) the notification to, or consent of, a parent of that minor; or

“(ii) proceedings in a State court; and

“(B) that does not provide as an alternative to the requirements described in subparagraph (A) notification to or consent of any person or entity who is not described in that subparagraph;

“(3) the term ‘minor’ means an individual who is not older than the maximum age requiring parental notification or consent, or proceedings in a State court, under the law requiring parental involvement in a minor’s abortion decision;

“(4) the term ‘parent’ means—

“(A) a parent or guardian;

“(B) a legal custodian; or

“(C) a person standing in loco parentis who has care and control of the minor, and with whom the minor regularly resides, who is designated by the law requiring parental involvement in the minor’s abortion decision as a person to whom notification, or from whom consent, is required; and

“(5) the term ‘State’ includes the District of Columbia and any commonwealth, possession, or other territory of the United States, and any Indian tribe or reservation.

**“§ 2432. Transportation of minors in circumvention of certain laws relating to abortion**

“Notwithstanding section 2431(b)(2), whoever has committed an act of incest with a minor and knowingly transports the minor across a State line with the intent that such minor obtain an abortion, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both. For the purposes of this section, the terms ‘State’, ‘minor’, and ‘abortion’ have, respectively, the definitions given those terms in section 2435.”.

**SEC. 4. CHILD INTERSTATE ABORTION NOTIFICATION.**

Title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 117A the following:

**“CHAPTER 117B—CHILD INTERSTATE ABORTION NOTIFICATION**

“Sec.

“2435. Child interstate abortion notification.

**“§ 2435. Child interstate abortion notification**

“(a) OFFENSE.—

“(1) GENERALLY.—A physician who knowingly performs or induces an abortion on a minor in violation of the requirements of this section shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

“(2) PARENTAL NOTIFICATION.—A physician who performs or induces an abortion on a minor who is a resident of a State other than the State in which the abortion is performed must provide, or cause his or her agent to provide, at least 24 hours actual notice to a parent of the minor before performing the abortion. If actual notice to such parent is

not accomplished after a reasonable effort has been made, at least 24 hours constructive notice must be given to a parent before the abortion is performed.

“(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The notification requirement of subsection (a)(2) does not apply if—

“(1) the abortion is performed or induced in a State that has, in force, a law requiring parental involvement in a minor’s abortion decision and the physician complies with the requirements of that law;

“(2) the physician is presented with documentation showing with a reasonable degree of certainty that a court in the minor’s State of residence has waived any parental notification required by the laws of that State, or has otherwise authorized that the minor be allowed to procure an abortion;

“(3) the minor declares in a signed written statement that she is the victim of sexual abuse, neglect, or physical abuse by a parent, and, before an abortion is performed on the minor, the physician notifies the authorities specified to receive reports of child abuse or neglect by the law of the State in which the minor resides of the known or suspected abuse or neglect;

“(4) the abortion is necessary to save the life of the minor because her life was endangered by a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness, including a life endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself, but an exception under this paragraph does not apply unless the attending physician or an agent of such physician, within 24 hours after completion of the abortion, notifies a parent in writing that an abortion was performed on the minor and of the circumstances that warranted invocation of this paragraph; or

“(5) the minor is physically accompanied by a person who presents the physician or his agent with documentation showing with a reasonable degree of certainty that he or she is in fact the parent of that minor.

“(c) CIVIL ACTION.—Any parent who suffers harm from a violation of subsection (a) may obtain appropriate relief in a civil action unless the parent has committed an act of incest with the minor subject to subsection (a).

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section—

“(1) the term ‘abortion’ means the use or prescription of any instrument, medicine, drug, or any other substance or device—

“(A) to intentionally kill the unborn child of a woman known to be pregnant; or

“(B) to intentionally prematurely terminate the pregnancy of a woman known to be pregnant, with an intention other than to increase the probability of a live birth or of preserving the life or health of the child after live birth, or to remove a dead unborn child;

“(2) the term ‘actual notice’ means the giving of written notice directly, in person, by the physician or any agent of the physician;

“(3) the term ‘constructive notice’ means notice that is given by certified mail, return receipt requested, restricted delivery to the last known address of the person being notified, with delivery deemed to have occurred 48 hours following noon on the next day subsequent to mailing on which regular mail delivery takes place, days on which mail is not delivered excluded;

“(4) the term ‘law requiring parental involvement in a minor’s abortion decision’ means a law—

“(A) requiring, before an abortion is performed on a minor, either—

“(i) the notification to, or consent of, a parent of that minor; or

“(ii) proceedings in a State court; and

“(B) that does not provide as an alternative to the requirements described in subparagraph (A) notification to or consent of

any person or entity who is not described in that subparagraph;

“(5) the term ‘minor’ means an individual who has not attained the age of 18 years and who is not emancipated under the law of the State in which the minor resides;

“(6) the term ‘parent’ means—

“(A) a parent or guardian;

“(B) a legal custodian; or

“(C) a person standing in loco parentis who has care and control of the minor, and with whom the minor regularly resides, as determined by State law;

“(7) the term ‘physician’ means a doctor of medicine legally authorized to practice medicine by the State in which such doctor practices medicine, or any other person legally empowered under State law to perform an abortion; and

“(8) the term ‘State’ includes the District of Columbia and any commonwealth, possession, or other territory of the United States, and any Indian tribe or reservation.”

**SEC. 5. CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**

The table of chapters at the beginning of part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 117 the following new items:

**“117A. Transportation of minors in circumvention of certain laws relating to abortion ..... 2431**

**“117B. Child interstate abortion notification ..... 2435”.**

**SEC. 6. SEVERABILITY AND EFFECTIVE DATE.**

(a) The provisions of this Act shall be severable. If any provision of this Act, or any application thereof, is found unconstitutional, that finding shall not affect any provision or application of the Act not so adjudicated.

(b) This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to section 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

- Motion to recommit, H.R. 8296;
- Passage of H.R. 8296, if ordered;
- Motion to recommit H.R. 8297;
- Passage of H.R. 8297, if ordered; and,
- Motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 8351.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

**WOMEN’S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT OF 2022**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 8296) to protect a person’s ability to determine whether to continue or end a pregnancy, and to protect a health care provider’s ability to provide abortion services, offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 209, nays 218, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 359]  
YEAS—209

- |               |                 |               |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Aderholt      | Garbarino       | Meijer        |
| Allen         | Garcia (CA)     | Meuser        |
| Amodei        | Gibbs           | Miller (IL)   |
| Armstrong     | Gimenez         | Miller (WV)   |
| Arrington     | Gohmert         | Miller-Meeks  |
| Babin         | Gonzales, Tony  | Moolenaar     |
| Bacon         | Good (VA)       | Mooney        |
| Baird         | Gooden (TX)     | Moore (AL)    |
| Balderson     | Gosar           | Moore (UT)    |
| Banks         | Granger         | Mullin        |
| Barr          | Graves (LA)     | Murphy (NC)   |
| Bentz         | Graves (MO)     | Nehls         |
| Bergman       | Green (TN)      | Newhouse      |
| Bice (OK)     | Greene (GA)     | Norman        |
| Biggs         | Griffith        | Obernolte     |
| Bilirakis     | Grothman        | Owens         |
| Bishop (NC)   | Guest           | Palazzo       |
| Boebert       | Guthrie         | Palmer        |
| Bost          | Harris          | Pence         |
| Brady         | Harshbarger     | Perry         |
| Brooks        | Hartzler        | Pfluger       |
| Buchanan      | Hern            | Posey         |
| Buck          | Herrell         | Reschenthaler |
| Bucshon       | Herrera Beutler | Rice (SC)     |
| Budd          | Hice (GA)       | Rodgers (WA)  |
| Burchett      | Higgins (LA)    | Rogers (AL)   |
| Burgess       | Hill            | Rogers (KY)   |
| Calvert       | Hinson          | Rose          |
| Cammack       | Hollingsworth   | Rosendale     |
| Carey         | Hudson          | Rouzer        |
| Carl          | Huizenga        | Roy           |
| Carter (GA)   | Issa            | Rutherford    |
| Carter (TX)   | Jackson         | Salazar       |
| Cawthorn      | Jacobs (NY)     | Scalise       |
| Chabot        | Johnson (LA)    | Schweikert    |
| Cline         | Johnson (OH)    | Scott, Austin |
| Cloud         | Johnson (SD)    | Sessions      |
| Clyde         | Jordan          | Simpson       |
| Cole          | Joyce (OH)      | Smith (MO)    |
| Comer         | Joyce (PA)      | Smith (NE)    |
| Conway        | Katko           | Smith (NJ)    |
| Crawford      | Keller          | Smucker       |
| Crenshaw      | Kelly (MS)      | Spartz        |
| Curtis        | Kelly (PA)      | Stauber       |
| Davidson      | Kim (CA)        | Steel         |
| Davis, Rodney | Kinzinger       | Stefanik      |
| DesJarlais    | Kustoff         | Steube        |
| Diaz-Balart   | LaHood          | Stewart       |
| Donalds       | LaMalfa         | Taylor        |
| Duncan        | Lamborn         | Tenney        |
| Dunn          | Latta           | Thompson (PA) |
| Ellzey        | LaTurner        | Tiffany       |
| Emmer         | Lesko           | Timmmons      |
| Estes         | Letlow          | Turner        |
| Fallon        | Long            | Upton         |
| Feenstra      | Loudermilk      | Valadao       |
| Ferguson      | Lucas           | Van Drew      |
| Fischbach     | Luetkemeyer     | Van Duyne     |
| Fitzgerald    | Mace            | Wagner        |
| Fitzpatrick   | Malliotakis     | Walberg       |
| Fleischmann   | Mann            | Walorski      |
| Flood         | Massie          | Waltz         |
| Flores        | Mast            | Weber (TX)    |
| Fox           | McCarthy        | Webster (FL)  |
| Franklin, C.  | McCaul          | Wenstrup      |
| Scott         | McClain         |               |
| Fulcher       | McClintock      |               |
| Gaetz         | McHenry         |               |
| Gallagher     | McKinley        |               |

Westerman  
Williams (TX)

Wilson (SC)  
Wittman

**NAYS—218**

- |                 |                 |                |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Adams           | Garcia (TX)     | O’Halloran     |
| Aguilar         | Golden          | Ocasio-Cortez  |
| Allred          | Gomez           | Omar           |
| Auchincloss     | Gonzalez,       | Pallone        |
| Axne            | Vicente         | Panetta        |
| Barragan        | Gottheimer      | Pappas         |
| Bass            | Green, Al (TX)  | Pascrell       |
| Beatty          | Grijalva        | Payne          |
| Bera            | Harder (CA)     | Perlmutter     |
| Beyer           | Hayes           | Peters         |
| Bishop (GA)     | Higgins (NY)    | Phillips       |
| Blumenauer      | Himes           | Pingree        |
| Blunt Rochester | Horsford        | Pocan          |
| Bonamici        | Houlihan        | Porter         |
| Bourdeaux       | Hoyer           | Pressley       |
| Bowman          | Jackson Lee     | Price (NC)     |
| Boyle, Brendan  | Jacobs (CA)     | Quigley        |
| F.              | Jayapal         | Raskin         |
| Brown (MD)      | Jeffries        | Rice (NY)      |
| Brown (OH)      | Johnson (GA)    | Ross           |
| Brownley        | Johnson (TX)    | Roybal-Allard  |
| Bush            | Jones           | Ruiz           |
| Bustos          | Kahele          | Ruppersberger  |
| Butterfield     | Kaptur          | Rush           |
| Carbajal        | Keating         | Ryan           |
| Cárdenas        | Kelly (IL)      | Sánchez        |
| Carson          | Khanna          | Sarbanes       |
| Carter (LA)     | Kildee          | Scanlon        |
| Cartwright      | Kilmer          | Schakowsky     |
| Case            | Kim (NJ)        | Schiff         |
| Casten          | Kind            | Schneider      |
| Castor (FL)     | Kirkpatrick     | Schrader       |
| Castro (TX)     | Krishnamoorthi  | Schrier        |
| Cherfilus-      | Kuster          | Scott (VA)     |
| McCormick       | Lamb            | Scott, David   |
| Chu             | Langevin        | Sewell         |
| Ciциlline       | Larsen (WA)     | Sherman        |
| Clark (MA)      | Larson (CT)     | Sherrill       |
| Clarke (NY)     | Lawrence        | Sires          |
| Cleaver         | Lawson (FL)     | Slotkin        |
| Clyburn         | Lee (CA)        | Smith (WA)     |
| Cohen           | Lee (NV)        | Soto           |
| Connolly        | Leger Fernandez | Spanberger     |
| Cooper          | Levin (CA)      | Speier         |
| Correa          | Levin (MI)      | Stansbury      |
| Costa           | Lieu            | Stanton        |
| Courtney        | Lofgren         | Stevens        |
| Craig           | Lowenthal       | Strickland     |
| Crist           | Luria           | Suozi          |
| Crow            | Lynch           | Swalwell       |
| Cuellar         | Malinowski      | Takano         |
| Davids (KS)     | Maloney,        | Thompson (CA)  |
| Davis, Danny K. | Carolyn B.      | Thompson (MS)  |
| Dean            | Maloney, Sean   | Titus          |
| DeFazio         | Manning         | Tlaib          |
| DeGette         | Matsui          | Tonko          |
| DeLauro         | McBath          | Torres (CA)    |
| DelBene         | McCollum        | Torres (NY)    |
| Demings         | McEachin        | Trahan         |
| DeSaulnier      | McGovern        | Trone          |
| Deutch          | McNerney        | Underwood      |
| Dingell         | Meeks           | Vargas         |
| Doggett         | Meng            | Veasey         |
| Doyle, Michael  | Mfume           | Velázquez      |
| F.              | Moore (WI)      | Wasserman      |
| Escobar         | Morelle         | Schultz        |
| Eshoo           | Moulton         | Waters         |
| Espallat        | Mrvan           | Watson Coleman |
| Evans           | Murphy (FL)     | Welch          |
| Fletcher        | Nadler          | Wexton         |
| Foster          | Napolitano      | Wild           |
| Frankel, Lois   | Neal            | Williams (GA)  |
| Gallego         | Neguse          | Wilson (FL)    |
| Garamendi       | Newman          | Yarmuth        |
| Garcia (IL)     | Norcross        |                |

**NOT VOTING—3**

Cheney  
Gonzalez (OH)  
Huffman

□ 1302

Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Messrs. COURTNEY, CARSON, PHILLIPS, LARSON of Connecticut, KILMER, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Messrs. HOYER, RUSH, FOSTER, and SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. NORMAN and BABIN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”