



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 24, 2017

No. 13

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOST).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 24, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE BOST to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

BENEFITS OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the Affordable Care Act and the Trump administration's efforts to repeal the health care of millions of Americans.

Every person in this body has constituents who have health insurance because of the Affordable Care Act. Whether you represent the rural community in Kentucky where the uninsured rate declined 60 percent under the ACA or you represent the most lib-

eral district in the country, you should be committed to working across the aisle to fix what is wrong with the ACA and build upon what is working.

While the law and President Obama may not be popular in many districts, political expediency has no place in this hallowed body, especially when the economy and American lives are at stake. It is not just Democratic districts that benefit from the ACA. Everyone—everyone—has Americans in their districts that benefit from the ACA.

While I am the only Democrat in Alabama, my district has only the fifth highest population of enrollees in Alabama, behind four Republican districts. Alabama's First Congressional District has over 29,000 enrollees, and the Fifth District has over 25,000 enrollees. The Sixth and Fourth Districts of Alabama both have over 23,000 enrollees. My district has 22,000 people who are enrolled in the ACA.

In total, there are 165,000 Alabamians who have coverage through the healthcare marketplace, and over 20 million nationwide. There are many who benefit in Alabama and across this Nation from the ACA. And while we all benefit from not having to have pre-existing conditions be a deterrent to getting health care, all of us will not benefit from the repeal. In fact, it should not surprise many of us that the repeal of the ACA will benefit the wealthiest Americans.

According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, ACA repeal will lavish Medicare tax cuts on our Nation's 400 highest income households, while 7 million low- and moderate-income households will lose premium tax credits. The average annual income of those top 400 families is \$300 million apiece, and they will benefit from an average annual tax cut of approximately \$7 million apiece. What my Republican colleagues do not want Americans to know is that the repeal of the

ACA will not benefit the majority of Americans but, rather, only the rich.

An average income of \$300 million is more than 6,000 times the average household income in Alabama and nearly 9,000 times the average household in my district. Mr. Speaker, 99.9 percent of my constituents make incomes below \$200,000. I know that they will never see the tax breaks that the repeal of the Affordable Care Act will give to the wealthy.

While healthcare costs have been growing nationwide at the slowest rate in over 50 years under the ACA, we cannot ignore the hardworking Americans who are facing outrageous premium hikes in States that have not expanded Medicaid like Alabama. On average, States that have been hostile to the law are facing the largest premium increases for 2017. One study showed that States that fully embraced the ACA will see increases of 18.2 percent, as opposed to States that have fully resisted the law—like Alabama—which saw increases of 29.8 percent.

Mr. Speaker, it is unacceptable to Americans that we have this rise in premiums at any level, but my point is simply this: We should not be looking to repeal the Affordable Care Act without replacing it with something; because the fact of the matter is, in this great country that we live in, no one—no one—should not have access to affordable, quality health care.

Alabamians enrolled in employer-based healthcare insurance are paying more in their employee contributions than those in California, even though Californians have a significantly higher cost of living. This is one of the reasons why I have worked across the aisle to try to make meaningful changes to the ACA that don't compromise the law's benefit.

The American people deserve Representatives that will work together to fix what is wrong with the ACA and build upon what is working. We need to

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H611

work together to increase access, market stabilization, and minimize premium cost rises. We need to work with States that haven't expanded Medicaid to bring down premium costs for the self-insured.

I stand ready to work with my colleagues to achieve these goals and protect the millions of Americans and thousands of Alabamians who are more financially secure today because of the protections of the ACA.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TOM MURRAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today on behalf of myself and all readers of the Daily Local News, a newspaper in my congressional district, Pennsylvania's Sixth Congressional District, to honor the life of Tom Murray, the editor of the Daily Local News, who just passed.

Mike Rellahan, in writing an obituary on Mr. Murray, accurately had this to say:

Tom Murray's personality shone through in the way he dealt with reporters, photographers, other editors, and colleagues on the multiple newspapers and media outlets he worked at over the years. It showed in his passion for helping people get better at their craft, in his own strong work ethic and in his sense of humor and humanity.

He was a hard-core newspaperman who loved a good lead paragraph, a clever headline, and an action-packed photo. He believed the society page was as important in the Main Line papers he worked for as the sports page was to the Gloucester, New Jersey, Daily Times, where he held the post of sports editor for 9 years, because he believed a newspaper at its best reflects its readers.

More than that, however, Murray stayed true to the ideals of old-school print journalism, loving the traditions and storytelling while at the same time embracing and chasing the future with enthusiasm. He began reporting when electronic journalism was in its infancy, but became so involved in the new digital age that one of his happiest moments came when a video screen showing the realtime activity of the Daily Local News' Web site was installed in the newsroom.

Tom Murray, you will be missed. Thank you for your service and your contribution to journalism, to our democracy, and to sharing news with those throughout the tri-county area for so long.

REALIZING FULL POTENTIAL OF ADVANCED NUCLEAR ENERGY

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 590, the Advanced Nuclear Technology Development Act, legislation that takes an important step towards developing safer, more reliable clean energy. Nuclear energy accounts for approximately 20 percent of all U.S. electricity and, very importantly, 60 percent of all carbon-free electricity in the U.S.

As our existing nuclear infrastructure moves closer to retirement, ad-

vanced nuclear technology offers a modern solution to ensure that American families have a safe, affordable, and reliable source of clean energy for generations to come. However, in order to fully realize the potential of advanced nuclear, we must remove the costly red tape that prevents innovation and streamline existing practices to allow for the safe and effective development of this technology.

I thank Congressman LATTI for his leadership on this bipartisan issue, and I am pleased to support it and see it pass the House.

KEEPING PERSONAL DATA SECURE FROM SPOOFING

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 423, the Anti-Spoofing Act, a bill I also supported last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, call spoofing is a telephone scam used to change the information on a caller ID and pose as a trusted source, such as an official government agency, a medical center, or a bank.

The intention behind call spoofing is to collect valuable personal information, such as banking information, to defraud or cause other harm to an individual or family. Seniors and veterans are frequently targeted in these scams.

In an effort to protect your personal information, this bill would close existing loopholes and direct the Federal Communications Commission to ensure those who engage in spoofing face criminal fines and penalties.

Call spoofing is not just limited to voice messages. Those using this tactic also utilize text messages, and H.R. 423 would include text messages in these fines and penalties. This bill would keep personal data secure and protect consumers, and I am pleased to see that it has passed the House.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE HIRING FREEZE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Trump issued an executive order. He imposed a hiring freeze on the Federal workforce. It was not only a freeze, but an attack on those serving our country and a misguided action that will achieve the opposite of what is intended.

For those who are listening in the Chamber, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I am proud to represent 62,000 Federal employees. Hopefully, all of us refer to them as working people. We all say we want to be supportive of working people. Some people, however, in this body and down the avenue exempt Federal employees as working people.

They are not only working people, but they are working for the American people. Let's not forget that two-thirds of Federal employees live and work outside the Greater Washington area. It is very nice to say "all of those bureaucrats in Washington," but two-

thirds of our Federal employees serve in every community around our country, serve in protecting them: FBI agents; agents around the world who work for the Central Intelligence Agency—117 of whom died in service, and the President spoke in front of their memorial the other day—employees of the Centers for Disease Control keeping us healthy as communities and as a country, protecting our children and our families from diseases that would attack us; Federal employees at the National Institutes of Health studying how we prevent and cure cancer, heart disease, lung disease, diabetes, autism, other afflictions that confront our country, both health care from a physical and mental standpoint; and, yes, nurses at our veterans hospitals. A freeze so that if a nurse leaves, you can't replace her or him; a doctor at a veterans hospital leaves, you can't replace that doctor, apparently; even at the IRS where we talk about making sure our tax system is fair and making sure that everybody pays their fair share, we undermine the ability to make that a reality; our Border Patrol to keep our borders safe; homeland security to keep our homeland safe—they serve the public in every State and every congressional district in the country.

This hiring freeze will not save us money or do anything to make the government more efficient. Should we do both? Yes. Will this policy do it? No. Its effect will be a reduction in the level of service benefiting the American people, greater difficulty in recruiting and retaining the most talented Americans to public service, and increased costs as a result of having to hire more expensive private contractors to do the work that still needs to be done.

That is something that the public doesn't understand, that, frankly, we exploded, in the early part of this century, the contracting out, which gave us less control and more cost. It is more expensive to contract out.

□ 1015

Already, our Federal employees have made significant sacrifices toward achieving a greater fiscal sustainability in this country. Now, let me give you the magnitude of that. Federal employees, over the last 10 years, have given up \$159 billion in pay and benefits to which they would otherwise have been entitled, but we withdrew those resources from them.

Instead of continuing to vilify Federal civilian employees, as they have done for years—and when I say they, the politicians have done it, mostly on the Republican side of the aisle, but perhaps not exclusively—vilified our Federal employees. Republicans in Congress and in the White House ought to be thanking them for their hard work. I can't imagine any of us would treat our own employees, Mr. Speaker, in a fashion that said we are going to lay you off, we are going to undercut

your pay, we are not going to give you the benefits which we promised you, and think that they were going to keep personnel on board with high morale and highly motivated to do the job, not only for us Members but for the American people. No employer would think that they can mistreat their employees and expect the highest performance out of them. And certainly no employer would think that if I treat my employees the way we have been treating Federal employees that we could recruit and retain the best and the brightest to serve our country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the President to rescind his order. That is not to say that executives in all of these agencies should not look at making sure that we have the proper number of employees on board and are acting efficiently and effectively and working hard to accomplish the objectives that we as a Congress, on behalf of the American people, have given them. That is the issue.

I urge my Republican friends, in this House and in the Senate, to speak out against it. And I urge all Federal employees and their families to speak up in their communities across our country to remind their fellow Americans of the important work they do and why this hiring freeze would be so harmful to our country.

Giving one another respect in America is not political correctness. It is the way we ought to treat one another. And we ought to treat our public employees who work for us and our country with the same kind of respect that we would want for ourselves. Frankly, respect of one another was a victim in this last campaign, but it should not be and must not be the norm.

PROTECTING THE UNBORN AND DEFENDING LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on an issue that I care deeply about: protecting the unborn and defending life. This week, I reintroduced the Life at Conception Act.

I am honored to be the lead sponsor of the Life at Conception Act, which simply defines human life as beginning at the moment of conception. As a result, unborn babies are entitled to legal protection under the Constitution. We had a record number of original cosponsors this past Congress, and I pray this bill will pass Congress swiftly.

I believe that we have a moral obligation to protect the unborn at every stage of development. It is something I have always been passionate about. I was president of my college's pro-life group, the Dartmouth Coalition for Life. I can still remember the conversations I had with my fellow students as I discussed the value of human life with them. It was a great feeling to know that I was opening eyes to the

value of all human life one student at a time.

Protecting life is one of the issues that compelled me to run for office. When I first asked for the opportunity to serve you as your representative in Congress, I promised I would be a strong defender of the unborn. I am proud to say I have delivered on that promise.

The Life at Conception Act is a crucial part of the long-term battle to protect the unborn. It started 44 years ago to the week, in 1973 in the Roe v. Wade decision when the Supreme Court asserted that, because the beginning of life is not legally defined by Congress, it is up for interpretation by the court. The Life at Conception Act simply fills that gap and defines that human life begins at the moment of conception.

Even Vice President Joe Biden, a Democrat, recently restated publicly his belief that human life begins at conception. There is bipartisan agreement on this issue. It is important for Congress to define human life because the unborn are the most helpless among us. They need us to have enough courage to step up and protect them.

My bill also sets a standard for promoting and encouraging a culture of life. If enacted, it would simply affirm what we all know in our hearts and minds to be true: that unborn babies deserve our protection.

Last year, the Life at Conception Act had 146 cosponsors in the U.S. House of Representatives, including my two colleagues in West Virginia, DAVID MCKINLEY and EVAN JENKINS. I hope that more Representatives will join me in promoting respect and protection for all human life.

I continue to be guided by my faith and values. I look forward to working with my colleagues to defend the innocent and give voice to the voiceless. I welcome the marchers this week coming for the annual March for Life. I thank them for their participation in defending the unborn.

CONGRATULATING THE NEW ENGLAND PATRIOTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the New England Patriots on reaching their NFL record ninth Super Bowl. The very questionable suspension of Tom Brady early in the season could not stop New England or the determination and dedication to excellence that defines the New England Patriots.

Fans throughout New Hampshire and beyond are incredibly proud of their team and the unparalleled success of Tom Brady and Bill Belichick. But they would be the first to tell you that the success of the Patriots lies with not one individual but instead is built upon the core value of team before self. This year, the motto made famous by

New England, "Do Your Job," is as true as ever.

When the Patriots face the Atlanta Falcons in Super Bowl LI, I will be joined by everyone across New Hampshire and throughout New England in offering them good luck. Go Pats.

NO ONE IN AMERICA SHOULD GO HUNGRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the importance of nutrition as it relates to agriculture policy in America. Proudly, I am the vice chairman of the House Agriculture Committee for the 115th Congress and chairman of the Nutrition Subcommittee.

Agriculture policy is near and dear to my heart, as it is the number one industry in Pennsylvania. It brings nearly \$6.9 billion annually in cash receipts to the Commonwealth. Almost half a million jobs are tied to the industry, which positively impacts all Pennsylvanians.

Our farmers feed America. Farmers play a pivotal role in the nutrition of families in this country. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, food insecurity has decreased across the Nation in recent years. However, USDA found that 12.7 percent of all households in the United States faced hunger in 2015. Mr. Speaker, no one in America should go hungry.

The Nutrition Subcommittee oversees the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, which used to be referred to as food stamps. Over the past 2 years, under the leadership of Agriculture Committee Chairman MIKE CONAWAY, this subcommittee examined what is working with SNAP and what could be improved. More than 43 million Americans rely on SNAP to put food on the table for themselves and their families.

SNAP has grown from a pilot program that served just 500,000 people in 1964 to a program that served more than 47 million Americans at the height of the recession. SNAP is now the largest program under the Agriculture Committee's jurisdiction, accounting for almost 80 percent of farm bill spending, and is the largest Federal food program serving low-income families in the United States. SNAP is literally a lifeline for many of the least fortunate among us.

During the subcommittee's examination of SNAP, it hosted more than 16 hearings and had 60 witnesses testify. The goals of these hearings were to better understand SNAP and the population it serves, to review how SNAP utilizes cash and noncash benefits to serve that population, and to examine ways the program could be improved.

Four themes emerged from the hearings:

First, serving SNAP recipients through innovation and flexibility in

program delivery. The need for nutrition assistance cannot be addressed by just one program or just one group. It requires more collaboration between governments, charities, businesses, health systems, communities, individuals, and many others.

Second, climbing the economic ladder through work. Mr. Speaker, the number one leading causes of poverty are unemployment and underemployment. We must promote pathways to employment as the best way to help individuals climb the economic ladder out of poverty and into self-sufficiency.

Third, maintaining program integrity. SNAP needs clear program goals and must be evaluated according to metrics aligned with those goals to generate program improvement. While we want to give States flexibility in administering SNAP, it should not jeopardize the overall integrity of the program.

Fourth, improving food access and promoting healthy food. This theme really gets at the heart of the issue: Americans in both urban and rural communities cannot improve their diets without adequate access to healthy food. Offering nutrition education is essential to help SNAP recipients develop healthy lifestyles and healthy eating habits. There is so much at stake when it comes to SNAP. Most SNAP recipients face more challenges than food insecurity. They also face housing, utility, transportation, and child care costs, among others.

Through the subcommittee's thorough investigation, we were able to fully review how to deliver SNAP to those who need it most. We also examined ways to keep the program viable for years to come. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office currently projects that SNAP will cost an average of \$69.75 billion per year over the next 10 years, making it the largest Federal food program serving low-income families in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I recently volunteered at the Central Pennsylvania Food Bank to help area veterans and their families to ensure they do not go hungry. When we help meet the nutritional needs of military families, it allows them to focus on other pressing issues. The same goes for all families in America.

I am committed to ensuring that SNAP continues to work for those who need it most, and to make certain that the program remains viable for decades to come. I look forward to getting to work on this in the 115th Congress.

**HONORING JOHN ALBERT
MCNEILL, SR.**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the life of John Albert McNeill, Sr.—a fine American.

John McNeill was born in Whiteville, North Carolina, in 1918. From the time he was born until he graduated from college, John helped his folks run their family pharmacy in Whiteville, which first opened in 1875, and is, to this day, Mr. Speaker, North Carolina's oldest family-owned pharmacy.

When McNeill graduated from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1940 as a pharmacist, he had intentions to return home to Whiteville and work in the drugstore, but that didn't happen. The United States had joined the Allies in World War II, and McNeill found himself at the recruiting station trying to enlist. Much to his dismay, he quickly discovered that he wasn't tall enough to qualify for the Navy.

John McNeill was undeterred. Determined to serve his country, McNeill spent the next 2 months of his life stretching, and he added 2 inches to his height—just enough to qualify for the Navy. Having been accepted to the Navy, John completed his midshipman's training at Columbia University and gained his commission in early 1942.

During the war, McNeill commanded landing craft in the Pacific theater and served with distinction as he participated in hundreds of landings in the Solomon Islands while reinforcing Guadalcanal.

□ 1030

After finishing his time in the Navy, John returned to Whiteville to help run the drugstore. The day after returning home, he opened the family store, walked across the street, and introduced himself to his future wife, Margaret Powell. They were married a year later and raised six children together. Around this time, McNeill got involved in Scouting—first in a Sea Scouting troop at Lake Waccamaw, and then later with the Boy Scouts of America as his children were growing up.

Mr. Speaker, John McNeill's devotion to the Boy Scouts was well known across North Carolina as he took his troops to places as far away as the Arctic Circle and the Yucatan Peninsula. A famous story he told involved his troops hiking across the State of North Carolina and stopping to have breakfast with the Governor one morning along the way. Mr. Speaker, under John's leadership, some 55 Boy Scouts in Whiteville, North Carolina, achieved the rank of Eagle Scout—Scouting's highest rank.

While John's legacy as a Scoutmaster is near legend, thousands in Columbus County will remember his hospitality, too. Every Fourth of July, at his pier—his dock—on Lake Waccamaw, John and his family gathered to celebrate the signing of the Declaration of Independence, an event thousands have attended. All the while, John continued running his family's drugstore; and, for many years, he held the distinction of being North Carolina's oldest licensed pharmacist.

Sadly, John passed away in September, at the age of 98.

Mr. Speaker, John Albert McNeill, Sr., lived an extraordinary life, and the difference he made in the lives of countless others in his community will be remembered for years and generations to come.

STAFF SERGEANT JAMES
"JIMMY" MORIARTY—TEXAS
GREEN BERET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, November 4, 2016, a military base in Jafr, Jordan, was attacked. A hail of violent gunfire suddenly rang out while three Americans were returning to base. They were ambushed. After the smoke cleared, three Green Berets from the 5th Special Forces Group were killed in support of Operation Inherent Resolve. One of those heroic men was 27-year-old Staff Sergeant James "Jimmy" Moriarty.

To be clear, neither the family nor I is satisfied that we have received all of the facts about the deaths of those three Green Berets, but we do know the facts about Staff Sergeant Moriarty of the United States Army.

Staff Sergeant Moriarty was a Texas native—one of Houston's own. He was a proud Green Beret. He was scheduled to come home in 2 weeks to spend the holidays with his family. Jimmy was, unquestionably, one of the best. Growing up in Houston, he earned a bachelor's degree in economics from the University of Texas. He spoke fluent Arabic—maybe with a Texas accent, Mr. Speaker. As part of the 5th Special Forces Group, he was 3 months into his third tour of duty in Jordan. Upon graduation from the University of Texas, Jimmy made the choice to serve his Nation in the United States Army. He was a volunteer. He was a proud member of the United States Army Special Forces. During his service to America, he earned the Good Conduct Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the NCO Professional Development ribbon, and an Army Service Ribbon.

The brave men of the Green Berets are our Nation's warriors. They are sent to take on the toughest missions that our Nation faces. From the jungles of Vietnam to the desert sands of the Middle East, they are, as John Wayne once said, America's best. These men are the warriors our enemies fear. They respond to terrorists and other outlaws to keep America safe throughout the globe. Proudly wearing silver wings on their chests, they are, without question, America's finest warriors.

Mr. Speaker, in the words of Navy SEAL Marcus Luttrell, another Texan:

In times of uncertainty, there is a special breed of warrior ready to answer our Nation's call—a common man with an uncommon desire to succeed. Forged by adversity,

the Green Beret stands alongside America's finest special operations forces to serve our country and the American people and to protect their way of life.

Jimmy Moriarty was one of those men.

Moriarty was loved by his two sisters, who incessantly saw to it that their younger brother would be a well-rounded man. It is without a doubt that this distinguished soldier will be missed by his family, his friends, and his community.

We grieve the loss of this American warrior, but we celebrate and honor his life and his service. We are fortunate to have Green Berets like Moriarty standing in support of our country. We are fortunate that a man like Jimmy served this Nation as a volunteer. He stood for the best of those American ideals and values that the Special Forces represent. He was a son of freedom and a son of liberty and a son of Texas. He epitomized everything that is good and right about America.

Our thoughts and prayers go out to him and his family and friends and to the other two Green Berets who were killed in Jordan.

On December 5, 2016, taps was played for the last time as Staff Sergeant James Moriarty was buried in the deafening silence of Arlington National Cemetery—next to thousands of other Americans who gave their lives for this great Nation. Jimmy Moriarty was a rare breed. He was the American breed.

During World War II, General George Patton said:

While we mourn the loss of such men, we should thank God that such men ever lived. And that is just the way it is.

NEW LIFE REFUGE MINISTRIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, January is Human Trafficking Awareness Month, and I would like to highlight a great organization that is fighting to end this modern day slavery.

The New Life Refuge Ministries is working to bring an end to the domestic sex trafficking of children. In 2015, in my hometown of Corpus Christi, Texas, we had 29 cases of child sex trafficking. The youngest victim was only 8 years old.

Founder and executive director Minta Moore has been working since 2010 to build a home for survivors so that they will have a safe place to heal and a safe place from which to transition back to a healthy lifestyle. This all-volunteer organization has cleared land, has laid a road, has poured a foundation, and is now in the construction phase of opening its first cottage. It is its hope to open its doors this May.

I applaud this organization and others like it that fight to eradicate human trafficking and that work to protect innocent children who have been victimized.

SCHOOL CHOICE

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, as the father of two daughters, I understand the importance of giving a high-quality education to our children. That is why I am here today to bring awareness to National School Choice Week.

School choice is a straightforward concept in that parents should have the choice about where to send their children to school and about picking the best educational environment for their children. This includes many options: traditional public schools, charter schools, magnet schools, private schools, homeschooling, and more. By choosing the appropriate educational options for their children, parents enable them to succeed.

Nationwide, approximately 2.6 million students are currently enrolled in more than 3,200 public magnet schools; more than 3 million are enrolled in charter schools; and 2.3 million are homeschooled. According to the National School Choice Week's organizers, 70 percent of Americans support school choice, and those numbers are even higher among growing demographic groups.

Some would say that school choice hurts public schools. I beg to differ. Studies have shown that student outcome in public schools actually improves with the more choices there are. I believe in competition in education and in giving control back to parents, teachers, and locally elected officials so that these groups can pursue initiatives that best help our children.

CONGRATULATING PRESIDENT TRUMP

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate President Donald Trump on his inauguration last week. I look forward to working with him to accomplish many of our shared goals.

One of the first goals we must accomplish is the repeal and replacement of ObamaCare, which has been hurting people nationwide with its increasingly high premiums and deductibles. I am confident we will have a better system in place that will provide great health care to all Americans.

I also look forward to working with the President to improve our Nation's infrastructure, including ports like the Port of Corpus Christi and the Port of Victoria. By widening and deepening our Nation's ports and waterways, we will allow the United States not only to remain competitive, but to increase our exports to other nations, which will create jobs and make America great again.

Another goal President Trump and I share is increasing border security and stemming the surge of illegal immigrants through our Southern border. As a Texan, every day I see the disastrous impact that illegal drugs, human trafficking, and other illicit activities have on our children, border communities, and the Nation as a whole. Together, we can work to secure our borders and make America safer.

Finally, regulatory review and tax reform will put people in good-paying jobs.

The next few weeks are going to be busy for those of us here in Washington, D.C., but that is why people like me decided to come here—to make a difference, to help people, and to restore American exceptionalism.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 40 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Thank You, God, for giving us another day.

As the difficult work of governing now resumes, bless the Members of this assembly with wisdom, patience, and goodwill as they tackle the ongoing issues challenging our Nation.

We thank You again for the inspiration of our Nation's Founders and the legacy they left us with. May the Members of this assembly, and all Americans, be worthy of that legacy.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LAWSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LAWSON of Florida led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 24, 2017.

Re Resignation from the United States Congress.

House Speaker PAUL RYAN,
U.S. Capitol,
Washington DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: I write to inform you officially that, effective January 24, 2017,

ahead of being sworn in as California's Attorney General, I will resign from my office as the Representative of the 34th Congressional District of California in the U.S. House of Representatives.

It has been a distinct honor to serve the people of Los Angeles and my country in Congress for more than 24 years. I am eternally grateful to my constituents for their tremendous counsel and support over those two decades.

I leave my work in Congress with mixed emotions. The People's House has been home to some of America's greatest patriots and talent. I have learned from them and been fortunate to have had a chance to add my grains of sand—as we say in Spanish—to build a better America.

In service to my country I will always look for the best way to make the biggest difference for our people. Working as Attorney General on behalf of the more than 39 million Americans in California—the sixth most vibrant economy in the world—will give me that chance to fight for all Americans to share in the forward-leaning values and opportunities that have made California so great.

I hereby submit my resignation from the House of Representatives. I look forward to working with all of my colleagues in Congress in the future for the betterment of our great nation.

Sincerely,

XAVIER BECERRA,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 24, 2017.

Re Resignation from the United States Congress.

Governor JERRY BROWN,
*State Capitol,
Sacramento, CA.*

DEAR GOVERNOR BROWN: I write to inform you officially that, effective January 24, 2017, ahead of being sworn in as California's Attorney General, I will resign from my office as the Representative of the 34th Congressional District of California in the U.S. House of Representatives.

It has been a distinct honor to serve the people of Los Angeles and my country in Congress for more than 24 years. I am eternally grateful to my constituents for their tremendous counsel and support over those two decades.

I will do my utmost to uphold your faith in me to serve as our great state's next chief law enforcement officer and legal advocate. And while I leave Congress with mixed emotions, I am ready to begin my work as Attorney General. California's hard-working families are counting on us, and we won't let them down.

Sincerely,

XAVIER BECERRA.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), the whole number of the House is 433.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

MOVE PAST POLITICAL DIVISION

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

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is clearly divided. The division was displayed when a group of students from Marion High School in my district came to Washington for the inauguration weekend.

On the way back to their hotel on Saturday night, a group of protesters surrounded their bus, threw projectiles through the windows, and painted the bus. Imagine that. A group of history students coming 13 hours across this great Nation and wanting to participate in the peaceful transfer of power only to be intimidated.

Free speech is essential to our democracy. However, acts of violence and intimidation have no place. Now is the time for both parties to move to get past this political division that is going through this country.

TAKE AWAY ANTITRUST EXEMPTION FROM HEALTH INSURERS

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I remember the bad old days of health insurance before the Affordable Care Act. They could refuse to sell you a policy if you had ever been sick. They could refuse to renew your policy if you got sick. Oh, and they had another thing called rescission, where they could put a group of examiners on you and try and take away your policy if you got sick, and this happened numerous times due to technicalities.

They can't do those things anymore.

They had a cap on your benefits. If you had a really expensive disease: Oh, sorry, your benefits are exhausted. You just go die now.

So those things are gone; but if they totally repeal the Affordable Care Act, they are likely to come roaring back.

The Republicans say competition will take care of that. The problem is there is no competition in the insurance industry. They are exempt from antitrust law. They can and they do collude to set rates, to redline people, to decide what States they will sell policies in.

Therefore, today, I am introducing the Health Insurance Fair Competition Act. It would subject the health insurance industry to the same laws that apply to every other industry in America—except for professional sports are exempt from antitrust law. This is a commonsense solution.

If they can rely on competition, we need competition. There wouldn't be any unless we take away their antitrust exemption.

REPEAL MANDATES AND TAXES OF OBAMACARE AND REFORM TAX CODE

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

Mr. GIBBS. Madam Speaker, this Congress must keep our promises to the American people. Our first responsibility is to institute policies that will grow our economy and create jobs.

For 8 years, Americans looking for work have suffered while the regulatory state sucked nearly \$2 trillion out of our economy. We must rescind these burdensome regulations and enact a commonsense approach to regulations.

ObamaCare has failed, and it is time to repeal or replace it with a patient-driven plan that incorporates free market-based principles. We have to repeal the mandates and taxes of ObamaCare and make sure no one falls through the cracks.

Finally, we have to reform our Tax Code. It is far too long and complicated. We have to cut the tax rate from a maximum of 15 to 20 percent.

These policies will jump-start the American economy from a stagnant growth rate to more than 4 percent GNP growth rate. Only a vibrant economy can provide for a strong national security and robust infrastructure capable of supporting jobs.

OPPOSE REPEAL OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. LAWSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise to voice my strong opposition to the current efforts to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Nearly 20 million Americans have gained access to health care because of the Affordable Care Act, including nearly 1.5 million Floridians. Because of the ACA, over 278,000 children in Florida have gained healthcare coverage, and 132,000 young adults in Florida have been able to remain on their parents' health insurance plan until they reach age 26. Women in Florida and across this Nation can now purchase health insurance for the same price as men because of the ACA's ban on gender rating.

Repealing the law could endanger the health and welfare of hundreds of thousands of Floridians and their families. Repealing the ACA would not only make America sick again, but it would threaten the economic security of every American. I will not stand by and allow my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to dismantle the ACA and threaten the health and economic security of millions of hardworking Americans.

REMEMBERING A PILLAR OF ST. CLOUD, DICK BERNICK

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

Mr. EMMER. Madam Speaker, this past week our community lost a dedicated leader and a friend. Dick Bernick, the patriarch of the third generation to run family-owned Bernick's Companies, passed away after an incredible life.

Bernick's Companies is a Minnesota success story. This past year, Bernick's and the Bernick family reached an amazing milestone with the 100th anniversary celebration of the business. Dick played a huge role in that success by guiding and growing the family business through good and financially difficult times.

Dick Bernick's life was an American success not just because of his business, but because his life was filled with family, friends, and service to the community he so loved. Dick gave so much to the St. Cloud community. In fact, his company continues to donate a percentage of its profits back to different charities and organizations in the communities that Bernick serves.

We send our sincere condolences to Dick's wife, Lila; his children; and the rest of his family. We hope that you will find comfort in the fact that Dick's life and his legacy of generosity have left an indelible mark on the community that he loved, and that he will always be remembered.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S FAILURE TO DIVEST OWNERSHIP INTERESTS

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, it doesn't take a law degree. It doesn't take imagination. All it takes is common sense to see that President Trump's ownership and his family's operation of hotels and golf courses and rental properties is ripe for corruption.

President Trump's failure to completely divest his ownership interest not only violates tradition followed by every other modern President, it is unconstitutional. The Constitution prohibits any U.S. official—including President Trump—from taking payments from foreign governments.

His ongoing involvement in The Trump Organization will let foreign governments funnel payments to his businesses. Foreign operatives will try to curry favor with the administration with no accountability to the American people.

When he took the oath of office last week, President Trump swore to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. Sadly, his refusal to cut his business ties has broken that vow in these very first days of his administration.

HONORING RUTH SAMUELSON

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in memory of Ruth Samuelson, a long-time leader in the North Carolina House of Representatives and a former member of the Mecklenburg County Commission. Ruth is now in Heaven following a courageous battle with ovarian cancer.

Ruth infused her faith in God in all aspects of her family, political, personal, and civic life. Because of her vibrant faith and commitment to focusing on what truly matters, Ruth was known as a thoughtful mediator throughout her tenure in the North Carolina House, someone who approached tense, partisan issues with grace, yet never backed away from her convictions.

In 2013, Ruth was in line for a top leadership role, but instead, she walked away, choosing instead to focus on her passions for family, faith, and philanthropy. Ruth's last public statement was: "I want people to know that God is my good friend."

May the Lord bring comfort to her husband, Ken; to her children, Bobby, David, Joy, and Alex; her four grandchildren; and the countless lives that she touched.

WOMEN'S RIGHT TO MAKE INFORMED DECISIONS ABOUT HEALTH

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of every woman's right to make her own informed decisions about her health, including access to family planning and reproductive health care.

While the rest of the world moves forward, we are turning the tide clock back to the era of "Mad Men." However, unlike President Trump and my Republican colleagues, I have heard the voices of hundreds of thousands of people I marched with last Saturday.

I accept the overwhelming research opposing the outrageous policies that President Trump and the Republicans in Congress have placed at the center of their agenda, policies like the global gag rule and H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. These dangerous and irresponsible policies are a disgraceful attack on women's rights domestically and throughout the world.

Let's get this straight, Madam Speaker. What this is about is keeping low-income women from accessing the health care they so rightfully deserve.

□ 1215

SUPPORT FOR H.R. 7

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Madam Speaker, barring the use of certain Federal funding for abortion is not a new concept. The Hyde amendment has, more or less, called for this ban for 40 years, but the Hyde amendment is not permanent and must be re-introduced every year for it to go into effect. As such, it has been reformed from time to time, and, sooner or later, I believe it will cease to be implemented; so it is time to make the Hyde amendment permanent law. It is long overdue.

Madam Speaker, this bill we are debating is not about man versus woman; it is not about liberal versus conservative; H.R. 7 is not about taking away the rights of a woman. It is about protecting the rights of the unborn because, at the end of the day, this is what this comes down to. Who knew something so obviously and so morally right would be so controversial?

I ask my colleagues to support this bill as we protect the lives of those who cannot speak for themselves.

In God we trust.

H.R. 7 AND GAG RULE

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

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 7, the latest attack on women's reproductive rights.

Today's bill comes on the coattails of the new administration's yesterday reinstating the global gag rule, which limits women's reproductive health care outside the U.S.—and all of this after 3.2 million women and men across the country participated in the women's march last Saturday. The march sent a clear message that this administration should not undermine women's rights and women's health care.

And this is the response—to undermine women's reproductive health care?

Madam Speaker, the people of our country are watching; they are showing up; they are paying attention; and they will not back down in the face of attempts to move this country backwards.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 7.

SITES RESERVOIR IS OVERDUE

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, while it might be raining lately in California, we still need additional water supply infrastructure to meet the needs of agriculture and a growing population. The Sites Reservoir is the only project in California that will improve the water supply for cities, farms, as well as for the environment.

If the Sites Reservoir were in place today, California would have an estimated additional 600,000 acre-feet of water stored so far this winter in addition to similar amounts from last year and even water that could have been impounded during the high flows during the drought years. Had we had this infrastructure in place, we would have had enough water to supply 4.8 million Californians for an entire year just on this winter's flows, and the winter is not even over yet. The Sites Reservoir will not only capture enough high winter flow, but it will also allow for the reuse of water released from Lake Shasta so that human and environmental water use are no longer mutually exclusive.

Madam Speaker, let's not lose this opportunity to conserve water and to not be delayed again and again.

IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 7

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

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

I speak for my constituents of the Ninth Congressional District of New York and for women across the Nation when I say that H.R. 7 is not only dangerous, but it is misleading and would be detrimental to women's health everywhere.

This bill not only creates barriers for women who want to access abortion care, but it unfairly targets low-income women with there being a particularly disproportionate effect on women of color, who are more likely to live below the poverty level and become eligible for Medicaid. Additionally, it penalizes small businesses that want to provide comprehensive healthcare coverage to their employees, including reproductive health care.

Let's not punish the single mother who recently left her abusive husband and who has no money, no job, and no health insurance—except for Medicaid—in making her unable to receive the abortion care and services she desperately needs. Let's not punish the young woman who is suffering from cancer, whose life will be in danger if she cannot access an abortion.

This past weekend, millions of women and men across the country, including me, marched with one goal in mind: to let the world know that our rights must be respected and protected. A woman's right to an abortion should be a personal choice that she makes, not a decision that government makes for her.

SUPPORT FOR H.R. 7

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

H.R. 7 codifies policies that have been enacted for more than 30 years, on a case-by-case basis, that prohibit the Federal funding of abortion, including the Hyde amendment, which prohibits funding for elective abortion coverage through any program funded through the annual Labor, Health, and Human Services Appropriations Act; the Smith FEHBP amendment, which prohibits funding for health plans that include elective abortion coverage for Federal employees; the Dornan amendment, which prohibits the use of congressionally appropriated funds for abortion in the District of Columbia; and the restrictions on elective abortion funding through the Peace Corps and Federal prisons.

GLOBAL GAG RULE

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, look at this picture. Where are the women?

Yesterday, the President signed an executive order affecting and restricting health care for millions of women across the world while no woman was present. Clearly, he did not hear the voices of the millions of women who marched for their rights and for their health care this past weekend. Reinstating the global gag rule will cut off funding for global healthcare organizations that offer reproductive health care for women from some of the poorest and neediest countries in the world.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the global gag rule and any other assault on women's rights in America or around the world.

LA ROSA BLANCA'S 58TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, January 28 marks the 58th anniversary of the founding of La Rosa Blanca, or as it is known in English, The White Rose.

Founded by Rafael Diaz-Balart, The White Rose is an important organization that is dedicated to opposing Castro's Communist tyranny and to offering a blueprint for Cuba's future reconstruction. It promotes democracy and freedom and prepares for the day that Cuba will finally be returned to the people of Cuba.

These ideas are embodied in The White Rose Institute, which is a non-profit that was started by Rafael's son, my dear friend and legislative brother, Lincoln Diaz-Balart. The White Rose Institute will honor two Cuban leaders who have come to embody Rafael's

ideas: Jorge Luis Garcia Perez "Antunez" and Felicia Guillen Amador.

Bravely fighting the Castro dictatorship for even the most basic of human rights, Antunez, Felicia, and those like them are the real future of Cuba, which is a future without the Castros' dictatorship, without the brutal repression. It is a future as Rafael and The White Rose envisioned—of freedom, sacred freedom.

HOMEOWNERSHIP FOR THE WORKING AND MIDDLE CLASS

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

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, for millions of Americans, homeownership stands as a source of personal and economic security and is a defining part of the middle class life.

Earlier this month, under President Obama, the Federal Housing Administration announced a plan to make mortgages more affordable for nearly 1 million working and middle class families who are buying their first homes. In his first hours in office, President Trump reversed President Obama's plan with an executive action that will cost Americans an average of \$500 more per year to get a mortgage. Experts project that 40,000 families who would have bought homes will no longer be able to do so.

The Trump administration's order to make mortgages more expensive will not strengthen our economy; it will not create jobs; it will not make America great again—but it will make life harder for working families.

NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK

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

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I rise to celebrate National School Choice Week. Allowing parents to choose the best educational outcomes for their children gives every child a better chance to succeed and prepares students for their futures.

School choice has greatly benefited Arizona—from charter schools to vocational schools, to private school scholarships, to education savings accounts. I am grateful that my State is a national leader in diverse school choice programs.

Arizona's scholarship tax credit program gives taxpayers a dollar-for-dollar tax credit to enable low-income and disabled children to attend private schools. In Arizona, more children per capita attend exemplary charter schools, and, indeed, they are some of the best charter schools in the country. We have significantly expanded the education savings account model so students can receive the best education possible that meets their unique needs, including those of tribal families who live in reservation communities.

Arizona recognizes that all children are unique, that they learn differently, and that each child should have the opportunity to attend the school that will help him learn to love learning and succeed. I hope other States will look at Arizona's example as they expand school choice. I am pleased President Trump has made school choice a priority by nominating Betsy DeVos to lead the Department of Education.

IN SUPPORT OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, let me share with you and the Members an Affordable Care Act story from Gwyneth Packard, from my hometown of Bourne, Massachusetts. Gwyneth contacted me to tell me about her uncle, Wayne Dickason.

It was Thanksgiving 2015, and Wayne went to see his doctor because he was not feeling well. His doctor ran some tests. The next day, Wayne received an unnerving call asking him to come back in. Before he could make the next appointment, Wayne's insurance provider called his employer to inform the company that its rates would be going up because one of its employees had cancer. Wayne had been a computer technician at his company for 18 years. His boss knew he had not been feeling well, so it was not hard for him to figure out which employee was the cause since Wayne was the only one who was sick. At work the next day, Wayne's boss called him into the office and said he was laying him off because his company couldn't afford the new premium.

Thankfully, Wayne was able to purchase coverage through the insurance exchange. Wayne saw his doctor, got his official diagnosis, and began formulating a plan. Because he was able to purchase health care, even with his having preexisting conditions, Wayne got the lifesaving surgery he needed.

IN SUPPORT OF THE SECOND AMENDMENT

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

Mr. DUNN. Madam Speaker, when I ran for Congress, I made a promise to hang my family's Revolutionary War musket in my office as a steadfast reminder of the reason I am here in Washington: to support and defend the Constitution and to honor those who have fought for the Constitution and those who continue to fight for our freedom. We must never forget how precious our constitutional rights are, and the right to bear arms is one of the most important because that right ensures our ability to defend all of our rights.

As a veteran of the United States Army and as a life member of the NRA,

I will fight in Congress to defend our right to bear arms. It is a special honor to represent the great people of the Second District of Florida and to fight for their conservative values in Congress.

□ 1230

STOP THE CRADLE-TO-GRAVE NEGLECT

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, as the House begins consideration of H.R. 7, I rise in solidarity with the women of the world. I rise in outrage at yet another attempt to control our bodies and our access to quality care.

Madam Speaker, it is my body. It doesn't belong to this House. I alone bear the burden, pain, and joy that it brings. Please stop trying to regulate my reproductive organs. They belong to me.

Have you ever had a menstrual period? Have you ever felt the unbearable pain in every bone of your body during childbirth?

Madam Speaker, there are millions of mothers living in inadequate public housing and trailer parks, raising their children alone. And we are here to consider anti-choice bills that restrict access to women's care?

If the Republican House passes H.R. 7, will it support universal pre-K and Head Start? Will this House reform foster care and stop greasing the prison pipeline with unwanted children?

It seems to me that this Republican House cares about babies right up until the minute they are born into the world, and then they disappear and desert the children forever. It is time to stop the cradle-to-grave neglect.

How many more anti-choice bills do we need to put on the floor before we do what is important to build a society?

Madam Speaker, we need to give women and their families and their doctors the ability to make decisions for their bodies. Leave my body alone.

HONORING RUTH SAMUELSON

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

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I stand here to share with you a few words about North Carolina's dear friend, Ruth Samuelson.

Ruth was only 57 when she went to glory yesterday morning. Her grace in the fight against cancer was a trait that was seen in her life as a wife of 35 years to Ken, as a mom, and as a public servant.

It was this strength rooted in her Christian faith that provided her with the grace to lead and to champion causes that she held dear. Although

Ruth worked in the often divided world of politics, she garnered respect from all sides.

This week we will discuss an issue that was very dear to Ruth: the right to life. She fought hard for the lives of the unborn with heart and compassion that earned admiration from all.

Her grace and leadership will forever continue to inspire all she encountered.

I would like to end with a passage of significance to Ruth and her husband, Ken. It is from Matthew 6:33:

"But seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you."

We will miss you, Ruth, but we know that you have been added to the Kingdom of God.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

A WOMAN'S RIGHT AND LIBERTY TO MAKE OWN HEALTH DECISIONS

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak against H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act.

We are here to represent all of our constituents, even the ones we don't agree with. It should be the woman alone who makes the decision, not Republicans, not Democrats, not the Trump administration, no one but the woman and her doctor.

I support choice so every woman in America could make the decision that is right for her, her family, her God, her health, and her reproduction.

Creating access issues and removing coverage does not stop abortions; it drives them underground. H.R. 7 essentially creates a disparity between poor women and rich women.

For women, children, foster youth, for the LGBT community, for the middle class, working class, poor people, people of color, undocumented residents, and people who see health care as a right and not as a privilege for those who can afford it, they should have the right and liberty to make their own health decisions.

THE IMPORTANCE OF SCHOOL CHOICE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, this week marks National School Choice Week, an opportunity to recognize the importance of providing families choice in education.

As the husband of a retired school-teacher and the grateful father of four sons and eight grandchildren, I know firsthand the benefit of school choice. We should strive for education that recognizes the individual needs of our students.

Last week, I was appreciative to visit schools to experience school choice at work. I visited a charter school, a public school, and a homeschool group. Thank you to Mark Brown, principal of Horse Creek Academy in Aiken; to Dr. Bill Coon, principal of Meadow Glen Middle School in Lexington; and Wendy Hoyle, the president of the Aiken Area Home Educators. You make a remarkable difference for students.

I believe that Education Secretary Betsy DeVos will make a very positive difference in the tradition of Education Superintendent Molly Spearman of South Carolina.

In conclusion, God bless our troops and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

INFRINGING UPON WOMEN'S RIGHTS

(Ms. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act.

A woman's right to choose shouldn't depend on her location, income, or insurance. It is just 2 days since the 44th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, and Republicans are, once again, attacking women's health care.

This legislation would prevent Federal funds from being spent on health benefits that include abortion coverage, causing women and families who depend on ACA to lose their coverage.

A woman who can't afford an abortion and needs one should not be stripped of her constitutionally protected right to one because of her insurance.

We have to stand up and fight for our sister's right to choose and her right to control her own body. It is not the Federal Government's business. It is personal. It is my business.

I will continue to challenge any attempt to infringe upon women's rights and strongly encourage my colleagues to join me in protecting that right.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION AND ABORTION INSURANCE FULL DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2017

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 55 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 55

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the

House the bill (H.R. 7) to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 55, which provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act. This bipartisan bill will codify and make permanent what is commonly referred to as the Hyde amendment and expand Hyde amendment restrictions to all Federal agencies.

First offered in 1976, the Hyde amendment prevents taxpayer dollars from being used to fund abortions through government programs like Medicaid. These restrictions have been maintained for more than 40 years through the annual appropriations process, including the most recent continuing resolution passed last December. It is time that these important protections against the use of taxpayer funding to pay for abortion be made permanent.

A GAO report in 2014 found that, under ObamaCare, over 1,000 insurance plans covered elective abortion. Those plans are purchased with taxpayer subsidies. H.R. 7 would stop this and make ObamaCare conform to the Hyde amendment. If the Hyde amendment had been applied to ObamaCare, as President Obama promised it would be, the number of federally subsidized plans with elective abortion coverage would have been zero.

As we work to repeal and replace the deeply flawed ObamaCare, we need to ensure taxpayer subsidies are not used to pay for abortion coverage.

According to a Marist Poll conducted last July, 62 percent of respondents—a majority of the women asked—and including 45 percent of those who identify as pro-choice do not support taxpayer funding for abortions. H.R. 7 sim-

ply codifies and makes permanent a protection against the use of taxpayer funding for abortion that the majority of Americans and certainly a majority of my constituents in Wyoming support.

Therefore, I urge support for the rule to allow consideration of H.R. 7.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY) for the customary 30 minutes.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to yet another closed rule. Last night in the Rules Committee, there were three thoughtful amendments that were brought forward. They were all germane and all complied with the rules of the House. Yet, once again, the Republicans in the Rules Committee denied each and every one of them.

There is no opportunity for any amendments to be heard here today and no opportunity for there to be a real debate, and I regret that very much. Again, that is the trend that we see in this Congress.

Madam Speaker, I also oppose the underlying bill. I have a fundamental belief that politicians in Washington should not have the right to interfere in the health decisions of a woman; and this deceptively titled bill will do just that. It continues this Republican majority's never-ending crusade against women, and it is an attempt to take away the constitutionally protected right to abortion services for millions of women, especially middle class and low-income women. That is wrong.

Madam Speaker, these healthcare decisions should be made between women and their doctors, not politicians in Washington.

Who the hell are we in this Chamber to make these private and oftentimes painful decisions for women?

Republicans claim that this bill is about codifying the Hyde amendment, which has been around for four decades. That is 40 years too long, in my opinion. But this bill isn't really about the Hyde amendment. Despite what Republicans claim, this extreme and sweeping bill would go even further by placing unprecedented limits on women's access to reproductive health services even if they want to pay for abortion coverage out of their own pockets.

Placing restrictions on how women with private insurance can spend private dollars when purchasing health insurance would radically change our Nation's longstanding policy. It is deeply troubling and must not become law.

Madam Speaker, just days ago during the nationwide Women's March, millions of people gathered all across the country and around the globe to defend women's rights. These marches were likely the single largest day of protest in American history. More than half a

million people took to the streets right here in our Nation's Capital; and I was proud to march with these dedicated men and women, along with my wife and my daughter. My son, I am also proud to say, joined the march in Boston.

The marches were peaceful. Not a single arrest was reported in Washington, D.C. And they were also clear, sending a message to each of us that women's rights are human rights.

But far from respecting those rights, the majority is here today attacking a woman's constitutional right to make her own decisions about her health, her family, and her future.

Despite this dangerous bill passing the Republican-controlled House in previous Congresses, it has traditionally died in the Senate; and I hope the Senate keeps with that tradition.

The ultimate goal of congressional Republicans and of Donald Trump is to overturn *Roe v. Wade*. Make no mistake about it. They want to take us back to the days of back-alley abortions where women lost their lives. That would be an awful thing to do.

I hope people who believe in upholding a woman's right to choose are watching this debate, and I hope that they are just as outraged as I am by this attempt to roll back women's healthcare rights. I hope they call their Representatives in Congress today to speak out. This is a time for action, and we need all of you to make your voices heard.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, our colleague on the other side of the aisle asked: Who the hell are we to be here speaking on this legislation and passing this legislation?

Well, Madam Speaker, we are the Representatives of the people of this country.

Madam Speaker, the most conservative estimates show that we have lost 54 million children to abortion since 1973. In a nation founded upon principles that recognize the dignity of every human life, we should not tolerate this extermination of innocent lives.

□ 1245

The majority of Americans recognize this tragedy for what it is, and there is consensus among them that they do not want their tax dollars paying for a practice they sincerely oppose, and we are their representatives.

Since 1976, the Hyde amendment has been included in relevant appropriations bills to prohibit Federal funding of abortions. Each year it has been consistently renewed and supported by congressional majorities and Presidents of both parties.

Estimates from the Congressional Budget Office indicate that the Hyde amendment has prevented hundreds of thousands of abortions each year. That

means millions of Americans are alive today because of the Hyde amendment. After 40 years, it is time for this life-saving amendment to become permanent law.

H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act, makes the Hyde amendment and other current abortion funding prohibitions permanent and government-wide. This commonsense measure restores a longstanding agreement that protects the unborn and prevents taxpayers from being forced to finance thousands of elective abortions.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote to respect our Nation's consensus on abortion funding and affirm life by voting in favor of this rule and H.R. 7.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, a few days ago, I stood immersed in a sea of women, of men, and of children of all colors, creeds, and backgrounds; citizens who fiercely believe that the diversity of their opinions anchor, that they do not undermine, the values that we share, and that their personal activism and unique advocacy could be traced back to one collective, guiding principle—equality.

As hundreds of thousands of people swarmed this Capital, Boston Common, town greens from Wilton, New Hampshire, to Newport, Oregon, they sent a clear message to their government that when you treat any of us as less, you threaten all of us.

And that is what this bill does. It tells women across this country that their health can be compromised; that constitutionally guaranteed means something different to them than it does to men.

If this was a simple attempt to limit a woman's legal right to abortion or reproductive health care, that would be bad enough. But it is more than that.

Combined with yesterday's reinstatement of the global gag rule, this bill crystallizes the fact that our new GOP-led government sees women's health care as expendable, both within and far beyond our borders.

Make no mistake, if my colleagues continue down this path, I know that there will be a few million men, women, and children willing to keep marching.

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

I would just note that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have referred several times now to the massive turnout for the women's march here, and we, ourselves, will be having, I am sure, a very large turnout this week; as well as I would like to point out that that women's march excluded groups that were pro-life women's groups. And so the notion that somehow it was reflective of all women in this Nation is fundamentally misleading.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes of my time to the gentleman from New

Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the cosponsor of this bill who has done tremendous work.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman for yielding, and I want to thank her for her leadership, for being one of the prime cosponsors of the bill, H.R. 7, along with Mrs. BLACK, Ms. FOXX, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. HARTZLER, and all the others who have joined in as sponsors of this lifesaving legislation.

I would also like to thank Speaker RYAN, Majority Leader MCCARTHY, Whip SCALISE, and Conference Chair CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS for their extraordinary leadership in defending the most innocent and the most vulnerable among us, unborn children, as well as providing protections for their mothers, and for bringing this legislation, H.R. 7, to the floor.

Forty years ago, Madam Speaker, Congress enacted the Hyde amendment, a law that continues to this day to proscribe Federal Medicaid funds from being used to subsidize abortion in most circumstances.

More than 20 peer-reviewed studies show that more than 2 million people are alive today, 2 million, because of the Hyde amendment. Two million people who would have been aborted, instead, survived because public funds were unavailable to effectuate their violent demise, while their mothers benefited from prenatal health care and support; 2 million survivors who have had the opportunity to live and to enjoy the most basic and the most elemental of all human rights, the right to life.

Madam Speaker, we are experiencing a megatrend in America, consistently reflected in polling data, including the most recent polling data from the Marist Poll yesterday, that showed that 61 percent of Americans are against public funding for abortion, and most want, even those who identify as pro-choice, more restrictions to protect the innocent unborn.

People are seeing the truth of who abortion actually destroys, as today's proudly shared, first baby pictures are most often of ultrasound imaging photos depicting the amazing miracle of the developing child in the womb.

Growing numbers of Americans are often shocked to learn that the methods of abortion include dismemberment of a child's fragile body, including decapitation, and the severing of arms and legs, or the use of drugs like RU-486 that literally starve the child to death before forcibly expelling her or him from the safety of the womb.

Yet, the billion-dollar abortion industry continues to cleverly market the chief sophistry of choice, while going to extraordinary lengths to cover up, ignore, and trivialize the battered victim child in the womb.

Madam Speaker, pro-life Americans struggle for the day when abortion violence will be replaced by compassion and empathy for women and respect for

the weak and most vulnerable among us, the child in the womb. They believe, as do my pro-life colleagues, that we ought to love them both, mother and child, and not fund the destruction of children through abortion.

Lawmakers also need to hear the courageous voices of women who are silent no more, a rapidly expanding number of women who share the agony and heartbreak that they have endured after procuring an abortion.

As I mentioned, yesterday there was a poll that came out, and, again, it found that 61 percent of Americans oppose taxpayer funding for abortion, and only 35 percent support it, which is precisely what we seek to accomplish with enactment of H.R. 7. It would make the Hyde amendment and other current abortion funding restrictions permanent and government-wide.

I would note, parenthetically, that soon after the Hyde amendment was enacted in 1976, other abortion funding riders were enacted into law, and Hyde itself was upheld by the Supreme Court in 1980.

In 1983, I authored the ban on funding abortion in the Federal Employees Health Benefits program. Most must be renewed legislatively each and every year. This legislation would make it permanent.

The legislation ensures that the Affordable Care Act, until repeal, conforms with the Hyde amendment.

I would remind my colleagues that just a few feet from where I stand, on September 9, 2009—and I have his speech right in front of me—the President of the United States said: “And one more misunderstanding I want to clear up—under our plan, no Federal dollars will be used to fund abortions, and Federal conscience laws will remain in place.”

Well, on the latter, the conscience laws remained in place, but they were just simply not enforced.

And of course we know now, as my good friend, Ms. CHENEY, mentioned, we know that, according to the GAO—because people kept saying in the early years, oh, there is no funding, public funding for abortion, so we asked GAO to look into it. They came back and said there is much—over 1,000 plans pay for abortion on demand.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article that appeared in *The Washington Post*: “Does Obamacare provide federal subsidies for elective abortions?” It talks about the GAO report, and it basically says that those who claim that it does, they earn three Pinocchios.

[Jan. 26, 2017]

DOES OBAMACARE PROVIDE FEDERAL SUBSIDIES FOR ELECTIVE ABORTIONS?

(By Michelle Ye Hee Lee)

“The president’s health-care law authorized massive subsidies to assist millions of Americans to purchase private health plans that will cover abortion on demand. In other words, hard-earned taxpayer dollars are now being used to pay for elective abortions. This is simply unacceptable.”—Rep. Virginia Foxx (R-N.C.), House debate, Jan. 22, 2015

The argument that the Affordable Care Act, a.k.a. Obamacare, provides federal subsidies for abortions came up several times during the House debate on an antiabortion bill.

The bill would prohibit using federal funds for any abortions or for any health plans that cover abortions. Under Obamacare, federal funds can be used to cover abortions for pregnancies caused by rape or incest, or that endanger the mother’s life. But no federal subsidies for premiums can be used for elective abortions. The House debate centered on whether this restriction is being enforced, and whether additional protection for taxpayers are needed.

There often is overheated rhetoric in the abortion debate that cannot be fact-checked. (The Fact Checker previously examined Democrats’ claims following the Hobby Lobby ruling.)

The bill’s opponents, who support abortion rights, say the system works and that the measure would unnecessarily restrict women’s private insurance choices. Lawmakers who oppose abortion rights don’t buy it; they say the system is just an accounting gimmick. The goal of this fact check is not to relitigate the debate but to examine evidence to support the above statement, which was repeated throughout the debate.

Foxx, one of the lawmakers arguing for the bill, was among several Republicans who claimed federal subsidies are paying for elective abortions. Does this accurately portray how abortions are covered under Obamacare?

THE FACTS

The House passed H.R. 7, No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act of 2015, on the anniversary of the Supreme Court’s *Roe v. Wade* decision. The bill was a watered-down measure that the House took up at the last minute after GOP leaders pulled an initial, more restrictive bill.

Public funding for abortions is intricately structured. Under the Hyde Amendment, federal funds can’t be used for elective abortions under Medicaid-funded plans. Some states do pay 100 percent of the cost of elective abortions without passing on any cost to the federal government.

Under Obamacare, health insurance plans could cover some or all elective abortions, but they can’t use federal tax credits and subsidies to offset the cost. Insurance providers that cover elective abortions must charge consumers separately and deposit the money into a separate account that contains no federal money. Providers need to bill enrollees separately for elective abortions by itemizing them separately in monthly bills or sending separate bills.

States can pass laws to ban or restrict health plans from providing coverage for elective abortions. In 2014, 23 states restricted coverage for these procedures. There were 1,036 plans in 28 states that provided some or all coverage for elective abortions.

In a speech to Congress and a subsequent executive order, President Obama gave assurances that federal subsidies would not be used to cover elective abortion services. He ordered Health and Human Services and the Office of Management and Budget to issue a guideline for states so they can comply with billing and funding segregation requirements.

Obama’s not keeping his promise, say supporters of H.R. 7. Staffers for Foxx and two of the other lawmakers who made similar claims—H.R. 7 sponsor Rep. Chris Smith (R-N.J.) and Rep. Ana Wagner (R-MO.)—pointed to a September 2014 Government Accountability Office report. At the request of GOP leaders, the GAO examined whether health plans were following the elective abortion billing requirements.

GAO picked 18 plans in 10 states with no laws restricting abortion coverage as a non-probability sample representing a quarter of all health plans that cover elective abortions. GAO found 17 of 18 issuers were not separately billing consumers. The one remaining issuer said its bills show there is a charge “for coverage of services for which member subsidies may not be used.”

These issuers did not give blanket coverage for all abortions. One covered abortions that a health-care provider determines necessary, and two limited coverage to no more than one elective abortion a year. All 18 issuers had payment requirements such as co-pays, deductions and out-of-pocket costs.

The report did not examine whether the providers were illegally using federal subsidies to pay for elective abortion services. In response to the report, HHS released a new set of regulations to clarify billing and funding segregation requirements.

Experts say the GAO’s findings do not necessarily mean insurance providers are inappropriately using federal subsidies to cover abortion services. There is no government or industry agency tracking insurers’ compliance, making it impossible to know whether providers are following the law, they said.

“It’s really not clear how these different plans are being operationalized,” said Alina Salganicoff, Kaiser Family Foundation’s director of women’s health policy.

The GAO report found premium amounts collected from elective abortion services ranged from 51 cents to \$1.46 per enrollee per month. To put this in context, the national average premium for a 40-year-old person purchasing coverage through the marketplace was between \$224 to \$270 per month, according to the Kaiser Family Foundation. (An earlier, non-age-specific average monthly estimate was \$241.) Even if the maximum charge (\$1.46) was added to the cheapest health plan (\$224), the elective abortion surcharge is less than 1 percent of the monthly bill.

The key point made by lawmakers and advocacy groups who oppose abortion rights is that money is fungible, and that it doesn’t matter exactly how the money is being collected. A dollar is a dollar, they say, and every dollar paid to an insurance provider in the marketplace ultimately goes into collective risk pools that are used to rim government-subsidized health insurance, so taxpayers are effectively paying for elective abortions.

“The point is the federal subsidies provided for those 1,036 plans are funding abortion just as much as the private funds contributed by the individual. That is consistent with the commonly held understanding that money is fungible and the funds received by the insurance company are used to pay all benefits,” Sheridan Watson, Foxx’s communications director, wrote to *The Fact Checker*.

THE PINOCCHIO TEST

The GAO’s report found that the insurers it studied were not following billing requirements. But experts say that does not necessarily mean the providers were illegally using federal subsidies for abortions. Even if they were, Foxx’s statement that Obamacare authorized “massive” subsidies is an exaggeration. Based on the estimates above, abortion charges would range from 0.2 percent to 0.65 percent of an enrollee’s monthly bill.

The claim that “hard-earned taxpayer dollars” are paying for abortions “on demand” implies that taxpayers foot the abortion bill for any woman who requests one. But in reality, some providers still imposed their own restrictions on which abortions to cover, and all 18 issuers had payment requirements, such as out-of-pocket costs and co-pays.

Lawmakers like Foxx who oppose abortion rights discredit the billing and funding separation requirement for elective abortion services. Billing doesn't matter, they say, because federal tax dollars used for subsidies pay for everything in a health plan. This is an opinion, and something that can't be fact-checked. But to say that massive federal subsidies are paying for abortions on demand is not an accurate portrayal of this complex issue, and the facts in the GAO report do not support this argument.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 7.

On Saturday, I joined millions of women, men, and children who took to the streets and raised their voices in defense of equality. We marched because women's rights are truly human rights. We marched because women should be able to make their own choices about their own bodies. We marched because everyone deserves health care, not just the privileged few.

And yet, here we find ourselves voting on another Republican attempt to cut off reproductive health care from the people who need it the most. H.R. 7 would be devastating for all women, but would disproportionately impact low-income families, women of color, immigrants, and young people.

But we were reminded this weekend that, as women, our destinies are tied together, and we will not be silent as Republicans attempt to interfere with a woman's constitutional right to choose. Women are watching.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule to provide consideration of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act. This bill is, quite literally, the least we can do for American taxpayers and our voiceless unborn.

Frankly, the fact that we are even here discussing this, and that there is opposition to this bill at all, really does break my heart, and it speaks to the depths of the entanglement with the big abortion industry that exist in some corners of this Chamber. Because, at the end of the day, you know what this bill really is about? The right to choose.

We hear our friends across the aisle use the phrase a lot. But what about the other right to choose, the right of the taxpayer to choose not to pay for the practice that violates everything that they believe? That is what we are here to protect.

The American people support this policy, with 6 in 10 surveyed saying that taxpayer dollars should not be used to fund abortions. And these are both pro-life and pro-choice.

So today, Madam Speaker, I am asking my colleagues across the aisle to honor the will of their constituents. I am asking them to remember the good old Democratic rallying cry of safe,

legal, and rare abortion. Obviously, abortion is not rare today when over 330,000 abortions are performed in 1 year.

If my colleagues still believe these words, they will join us in supporting this modest solution to keep unsuspecting taxpayers off of the hook for this practice. And if they can't vote for this bill then there is truly not a single limit on abortion that they will accept, and that is a sad commentary on the state of politics.

I urge a "yes" vote on the rule.

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

Let me just clarify for the RECORD that there is no Federal funding for abortion. All you have to do is read the Hyde amendment, which has been in effect for 40 years. I don't support it, but that is the law of the land.

The majority of Americans believe abortion should be legal. So if you want to talk about polls, the overwhelming number of Americans believe that abortions should be safe and legal.

I also would like to say that while my colleagues are working overtime to try to defund organizations like Planned Parenthood, it is because of Planned Parenthood, the counseling that is provided, and the reproductive services that are provided at their clinics, and contraception, that the number of abortions have decreased in this country.

Madam Speaker, I am going to ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question. And if we do, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation, which I am happy to be a cosponsor of, along with Ms. ESHOO, that would require sitting Presidents and Presidential nominees to disclose their last 3 years of tax returns.

□ 1300

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

The gentleman may continue.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Despite the long tradition of Presidents and Presidential nominees of disclosing their tax returns, Donald Trump has refused to release his, and his spokesperson recently said that he has no intention of doing so. The American people expect and deserve transparency, which this legislation would ensure.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, between his refusal to release his tax returns and all these business conflicts of interest, this Presidency is on a collision course with corruption.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support our effort here.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I thank our wonderful colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying legislation, and I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that this bill that I have authored, the Presidential Tax Transparency Act, can be made in order for immediate floor debate and a vote.

Now, the Presidential Tax Transparency Act would require the President and future Presidential nominees of both parties to disclose their tax returns. Many Americans took for granted that this was covered by law, but what we have had is a decades-long tradition of voluntary disclosure by both Republican and Democratic nominees for the Presidency.

For the first time since the immediate post-Watergate era, candidate Trump and now President Trump has refused to release his tax returns to the public. Those who seek or hold the most powerful office in the world should be held to the highest standard of transparency to ensure the best interests of the American people are met.

Tax returns provide an important baseline disclosure because they contain highly instructive information, including whether the candidate paid any taxes, what they own, what they have borrowed and from whom, whether they have made charitable donations, and whether they have taken advantage of tax loopholes or offshore tax shelters.

The President and his spokesperson have both recently said that he will not release his tax returns because the American people "don't care." I beg to differ. The top petition on the Web site of the White House calls for the release of the President's tax returns with over 300,000 signatures already on it. A Washington Post-ABC News poll released last week found that 74 percent of the American people, including 53 percent of whom are Republicans, believe the President should release his tax returns. We want a President free of conflicts of interest.

For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to reject the previous question and to vote for the Presidential Tax Transparency Act.

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

Madam Speaker, it is no surprise that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would rather talk about just about anything besides the text and the substance of the rule and the bill that we are about to consider.

The transparency that is important to this debate and that is relevant for this discussion today is transparency that is in the rule and in this bill that would require that insurance companies make sure that people understand what they are purchasing and whether or not they are purchasing a plan that will, in fact, provide abortion coverage.

I also just want to note that although there may be some in this Chamber who view The Washington Post Fact Checker as the oracle and font of all wisdom, he got this one wrong, as he has in many cases, and, in fact, failed to understand that there are, as we meet here today, monthly advanced payments of U.S. taxpayer funding going to insurance companies or to exchanges to pay for health insurance plans that subsidize abortion on demand.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Wyoming.

Madam Speaker, regardless of attempts from the other side to distract and derail what we are discussing, the vote today is on the permanent application of the Hyde amendment, which would ban taxpayer dollars from being used for abortion.

The truth is that taxpayers get up and go to work every day. They work by the sweat of their brow. The majority of them find the practice of abortion to be a serious violation of their personal beliefs. Under that situation and scenario, it is unconscionable that this body would even consider taking the money of those hardworking taxpayers and using their money to fund abortion.

The Hyde amendment has traditionally maintained bipartisan support. It has been signed into law by both Democratic and Republican Presidents since 1976. In addition to that, the Supreme Court has upheld the law, doing so in 1980, ruling that, regardless of the freedom recognized in *Roe v. Wade* to terminate a pregnancy, there is not a constitutional entitlement to use taxpayer money to finance such an act.

The Hyde amendment has saved the lives of roughly 300,000 unborn children annually. It is bipartisan, it has been upheld by the Supreme Court, and it protects taxpayers who have a conscientious objection. So I strongly encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 7 when it comes before the full House for a vote today.

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

Madam Speaker, I just would like to assure my colleague from Wyoming that we are not trying to distract when we bring up the issue of the President's tax returns, but we have no opportunity here to be heard. The bill before us, as I mentioned in my opening statement, is a closed rule. It is a Putin

rule, if you will, where it is their way or the highway and where no debate is allowed on alternative ideas. We had three thoughtful amendments brought before the Rules Committee last night, all germane, all in compliance with the House rules. They rejected all three of them.

On the issue of the Presidential tax returns, yes, we are bringing it up because the American people want to know whether there are conflicts of interest. They don't want the White House to be known for being a place of corruption. They want our Presidents to follow the rules and the laws of the land. So people want to know, but we have been given no opportunity to do that.

So forgive me if we take procedural motions to try to make our point, but my colleagues on the Republican side lock us out of any opportunity to be heard. The Rules Committee has become a place where democracy goes to die, I am sad to say, and I hope that changes.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, like many of us this past Saturday, I marched in Washington with millions of women across the country claiming their human rights and claiming their basic individuals rights. Madam Speaker, the previous speaker on the other side made mention of the fact that the Hyde amendment is the law of the land and that it has been upheld by the United States Supreme Court. We know. We get it. That is not what this is about.

This is about going well beyond that and actually limiting what women can do and what individuals can do with their own money when acquiring health care that includes the reproductive health services that are the subject of this debate.

How many times do we have to come to the floor to make the point that choices about women's health care should be made between a woman and her doctor, not somebody in Washington dictating to women what they can do with their own money and with their own bodies?

Do you know what else is the law of the land? Do you know what else has been upheld by the Supreme Court almost a half a century ago?

That fundamental right that women have over the determinations they make for themselves about their own bodies. That has been upheld by the United States Supreme Court as well.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

Madam Speaker, for the past 30 years, through the Hyde amendment, the U.S. Congress has acted to prevent taxpayer money from being used to pay for abortions. The bipartisan Hyde

amendment has been an annual rider on appropriations bills, but ObamaCare bypassed this abortion funding prohibition leading to the largest expansion of taxpayer funding of abortion in American history since *Roe v. Wade*.

That is why we desperately need to pass H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act to permanently codify the Hyde amendment and apply it across the entire Federal Government. This bill will also ensure that the prohibition is not subject to annual threats and it will close the massive loophole that was created by ObamaCare.

Since 1976, the Hyde amendment has saved the lives of over 2 million babies—roughly the same number of people who live in the city of Houston, Texas, where I serve as a U.S. Representative. For the sake of these 2 million people and the millions more that will be saved, we must permanently codify the Hyde amendment's pro-life protections.

Furthermore, as ObamaCare presented the largest expansion of abortions since the *Roe v. Wade* Supreme Court case, we must ensure that the Hyde amendment covers all areas of the Federal Government. This will ensure that taxpayer dollars are no longer used to subsidize abortions.

H.R. 7 is a critical piece of legislation that is supported by nearly two-thirds of the American people who do not want the government to be in the business of killing unborn babies. Congress must act to preserve the Hyde amendment for posterity and to put an immediate end to the ongoing harm being done with taxpayers' money.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to vote for the passage of this much-needed bill to end taxpayer funding of abortion once and for all.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ), who is the vice chairwoman of the Democratic Caucus.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 7, the misnamed No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Just 2 days ago, our Nation celebrated the 44th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, affirming that a woman has a constitutional right to make the decision of what is best for herself and her family. However, Republicans have been relentless in their pursuit to deny women this constitutional right, and H.R. 7 is just another reckless example.

H.R. 7 will have devastating consequences on every single woman in America. The bill would deny women, families, and small businesses tax credits if they elect an insurance plan that covers abortions. The IRS would be inserted into one of the most important and private decisions a woman can make and one that should be solely between her and her doctor. That is the most egregious and offensive example of government overreach that I can think of.

Madam Speaker, women are responsible. Women are smart. Women know what is best for them, and women can make their own choices. Allow them to do that and vote against H.R. 7.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming. I am so grateful to be here to talk on this important subject.

Madam Speaker, Thomas Jefferson once said: "The care of human life and happiness, and not their destruction, is the first and only object of good government."

It is with Jefferson's words in mind that I rise today as an original cosponsor in support of the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act.

This legislation sustains Mr. Jefferson's vision of good government. It makes permanent the Hyde amendment restricting Federal funding for abortions and thereby ensuring the care of human life and not its destruction. Most Americans oppose the use of their tax dollars to pay for abortions.

Since 1976, the Hyde amendment has saved nearly 2 million unborn children and continues to save more than 60,000 lives in the United States every year. Americans also deserve to know—before they purchase it—if their healthcare plans cover elective abortion.

H.R. 7 addresses the abortion secrecy clause in the Affordable Care Act. It requires qualified plans to disclose to enrollees at the time of enrollment whether a plan covers abortion. Americans should never be forced to pay for someone's abortion. This legislation will restore the status quo on government funding for elective abortions and make this policy permanent and consistent across the Federal Government.

I commend Congressman SMITH and Congressman LIPINSKI for their bipartisan cooperation in introducing this bill, and I am pleased to support it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, let me tell you about Chelsea, a mother of two young children, who was on Medicaid when she was diagnosed with cervical cancer. She never missed her birth control pills, but when she went to the clinic for treatment, she was told that she was pregnant and could not get the surgery she needed because of the pregnancy.

□ 1315

Why is that? Because of the Hyde rule, Medicaid would not cover the abortion care that she needed, and her cancer treatment was delayed, obviously compromising her health.

Instead of discussing ways to make Chelsea's situation better, we are considering a bill that would make the ban on abortion care services under Medicaid permanent.

This is not about women asking for free, federally funded abortions. This is about women like Chelsea being able to receive the medical care they desperately need.

We saw this weekend millions of women took to the streets throughout our country in a historic movement. So let's show them that we are listening by rejecting this bill that makes bad policy permanent.

Madam Speaker, let's leave a woman's medical decision between her and her doctor and reject this far-reaching bill.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I am just heart sick today to hear some of my colleagues talking about how they were celebrating the 44th anniversary of Roe v. Wade. That is 60 million babies—little girls, little boys—who have been aborted and no longer have a chance to live. We could have had perhaps a cure for cancer or Alzheimer's. Who knows what the potential of those 60 million lives could have been.

So it is hard to hear my colleagues talk about a celebration of that and using the terminology that this bill deals with abortion care. Abortion isn't care and abortion isn't services. It is taking a life.

This bill does nothing to change Roe v. Wade, although I wish it could, but it simply says that taxpayers do not have to participate in it. The taxpayers all across this country who believe that every life is precious work hard and send in their money every April 15. They entrust it to us, their elected officials. We have national security issues, we have roads, we have education. They don't want to see it go to something like taking a life through abortion.

So this is what we are doing today, simply making permanent a policy that we have had to put in as an amendment to appropriations every year and fight for. This is just making sure that, here in Washington, in America, the taxpayers invest in women's health care and are not investing in abortion.

We should be about saving lives, not taking them. That is what this bill does. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 7, a dangerous attack on the right of women to make their own decisions about their health and their bodies.

On Saturday, I, too, joined the peaceful march in our Nation's Capital with hundreds of thousands of women and men. Millions more marched in Oregon, across the country, and around the world to demand that our voices be heard.

This legislation, one of the majority's first priorities under the Trump

administration, won't create jobs. It will create barriers to reproductive health care for countless women. It will disproportionately affect low-income women, young women, women of color, women in rural communities, and immigrant women. This bill turns back the clock. It puts women's lives at risk.

Restricting abortion does not make it go away. It makes it unsafe. This bill will drive women back to back alleys.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule and on H.R. 7.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, 44 years ago, the Supreme Court made an important decision. It said that women have a constitutional right to make decisions about their own health care and their own bodies, not the government.

It was just a few days ago that millions of American women marched all across the United States, reaffirming their opposition to efforts to take away their rights. That is what this bill would do.

There has been a lot of discussion about taxpayers funding abortion. That is not currently the law, not only in the Hyde amendment, but the Affordable Care Act requires women who wish to have this coverage to pay for it themselves.

We have heard a lot about alternative facts recently, but the fact is there is no taxpayer money for abortion in the United States—there hasn't ever been for many years—and that was also the accommodation that the Supreme Court made.

Let's make sure that the constitutional rights of women to control their own bodies is not attacked.

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

Madam Speaker, I just want to make a point in terms of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and the constant reference to women, women, women, as though all women believe what they believe.

They have very strongly held views on the other side of the aisle, but the notion that somehow all women can be categorized as being pro-abortion is just simply wrong and, frankly, offensive to those of us who have different views.

Madam Speaker, I would like to say, at this point in time, that we are not making any kind of a dangerous attack on women's rights.

My colleagues have accused us of being relentless. We are relentless. We are relentless, Madam Speaker. We are relentless in defense of the unborn, the most vulnerable among us.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Madam Speaker, I rise to support this rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 7.

For decades, Congress has annually passed the Hyde amendment, which has prevented any government program from funding or subsidizing elective abortion. The Hyde amendment has saved over 2 million unborn children since 1976, including 100,000 lives in Pennsylvania.

For decades, this annual restriction on taxpayer funding of abortion has been referred to as the Hyde amendment because it was the late Congressman Henry Hyde from Illinois who sought to protect as many unborn children as he could during his service in Congress. Recollecting his own work, Congressman Hyde offered this poignant reflection:

“When the time comes as it surely will, when we face that awesome moment, the final judgment, I’ve often thought, as Fulton Sheen wrote, that it is a terrible moment of loneliness. You have no advocates, you are there alone standing before God—and a terror will rip through your soul like nothing you can imagine. But I really think that those in the pro-life movement will not be alone. I think there will be a chorus of voices that have never been heard in this world but are heard beautifully and clearly in the next world—and they will plead for everyone who has been in this movement. They will say to God, ‘Spare him because he loved us’”

Henry Hyde is not forgotten, and this work goes on.

Despite former-President Obama’s promise that no abortion would be covered by his healthcare law, the Affordable Care Act authorized and appropriated funds for healthcare plans with abortion coverage. This must stop.

We must remember, abortion is not health care, and in no way should the government fund or subsidize the violent destruction of unborn children.

It is the overwhelming opinion of Americans, including those who identify as pro-choice, that taxpayer dollars should not be used for abortion. This legislation is absolutely essential to apply the principles of the Hyde amendment consistently across the Federal Government.

As hundreds of thousands march this Friday on the 44th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, a decision Justice White referred to as an exercise in raw judicial power, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from the great State of Massachusetts for his extraordinary leadership on this issue and so many others and for standing up for women. The right to speak is a very special one.

Madam Speaker, the right to choose is meaningless without the access to choose. That is what this bill is about. It is cutting off access to choice. That is why the anti-choice movement is so strongly behind this bill.

H.R. 7 is a cynical attempt to use the Federal Government’s power of the purse to restrict a woman’s access to her constitutionally protected right to an abortion.

I oppose the Hyde amendment and believe that we should be increasing access to comprehensive health care, not reducing it. But this bill makes the Hyde amendment permanent. It goes further. It prohibits the Affordable Care Act tax credits for individuals and employers who choose plans that cover abortion.

H.R. 7 would restrict abortion coverage or make such coverage too burdensome or expensive for many Americans to afford. It is a step back towards a dark and ugly time when anti-abortion laws took a substantial toll on women’s health and, in many cases, cost them their very lives.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting “no” on this rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I will just remind Members that, in order to gain votes of several pro-life Democrats needed for passage of the Affordable Care Act, President Obama issued an executive order on March 24, 2010, and it said:

The Affordable Care Act maintains current Hyde restrictions governing abortion policy and extends those restrictions to newly created health insurance exchanges.

The problem is, it never happened.

There were people who are saying even today that there is no taxpayer funding for abortion. Yes, there is. We finally went to the GAO. We asked them to do a study, an audit. They spent a full year on it and confirmed that the plans that we were subsidizing with taxpayer dollars covered abortion.

I remind my colleagues that, under the Hyde amendment, plans that pay for abortion are precluded from receiving government funding. 1,036 Affordable Care Act exchange plans were found to have abortion on demand being paid for by the taxpayers.

So if the Hyde amendment had been applied as former President Obama had said it would, there would have been zero coverage for abortion, except in cases of rape, incest, and life of the mother.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding.

I stand here in a unique position; first, to oppose this sweeping attack on women’s reproductive health in its entirety, but I also am compelled to discuss the unique provision that singles out the District of Columbia, permanently barring the District of Columbia from spending its own local funds—not a cent of it raised in this Congress—on abortion services for low-income women, thus uniquely denying the Dis-

trict of Columbia government the right that local and State governments exercise throughout the United States using their own local funds.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 7 goes further. It insults the District of Columbia.

Just to make sure everybody understands that the bill means to include the District of Columbia, it tortuously defines or redefines the term “Federal Government” to include a local jurisdiction, the “District of Columbia government.”

The District of Columbia government is thrown in with the Federal Government. We are talking about U.S. citizens, the people I represent, who are number one per capita in taxes raised to support the government of the United States of America.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. NORTON. This bill, of course, is annual, and it is less inclined to become law than to be part of the annual upcoming march.

We do not intend, Madam Speaker, to let our colleagues get away with not supporting democracy, including the right of local governments to spend their own local funds on choice. Everywhere on Earth you can support such a right, except for the 700,000 people who live in your own Nation’s Capital.

□ 1330

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, under the Constitution, all funds for the District of Columbia are appropriated by the United States Congress, so we in the Congress bear a particular and additional responsibility for funds in the District of Columbia.

I would also note, Madam Speaker, that there are no limitations in the District of Columbia on when an abortion can be performed; and therefore, if we were to lift this amendment, if we were not to have this rule in place, you could potentially have the U.S. taxpayers in a situation where they were being forced to fund even late-term abortions in the District of Columbia, which is fundamentally against the Hyde amendment, fundamentally against everything that we have supported and against the majority of the people in this Nation.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming not only for being on the Committee on Rules, but also today for handling her first rule. Welcome to Congress and welcome to the Committee on Rules.

Madam Speaker, the bill that we have before us today is an extension of, really, a bipartisan agreement that we have had for 30-plus years: that we should not have abortions that are paid for by the taxpayer. The bottom line is

that this is a very difficult issue, no matter which side you might be on; but I believe that the right thing to do is to say that, based upon the morality and, really, the right thing, that the Federal Government, the taxpayers, should not be engaged in paying for abortions, killing of babies in this country.

We believe it is morally wrong, and all we are simply doing today is standing up and saying we are going to extend the same privileges that we have had on a bipartisan basis for 30-plus years not only with the Hyde amendment, but placing that across all pieces, parts of appropriations and bills and things that we do here in Congress. This has absolutely nothing to do with taking away a woman's right to choose. It has nothing to do with dealing with the Supreme Court. It has everything to do with using taxpayer dollars.

Yesterday we had a very appropriate and a very timely conversation at the Committee on Rules, and I think both sides handled their arguments and their agreements and disagreements well. It is my hope that we do this here today.

But let me say this, that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) came up as an advocate for women, as an advocate for women who are engaged in the scurrilous trading of women and misconduct with women. I think he was seen for what he is. He is a strong advocate for life and for women who need to feel safe in this country. He stood up yesterday as an advocate for saying we should not use taxpayer money to pay for abortions, and that is really what this bill is.

I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming for allowing me to be here.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, says this bill has nothing to do with taking away a woman's right to choose. I would beg to differ. I think it has everything to do with taking away a woman's right to choose.

But this is the rule. I was hoping that maybe he would address the fact that, again, three thoughtful amendments were brought before the Committee on Rules yesterday by Democrats. They were all germane. They all comply with the House rules. I was hoping he would explain why they were all denied, especially since the bill before us didn't go through regular order; it didn't go through a committee process to be brought to the floor. This was just kind of plopped into the Committee on Rules, and no amendments were made in order. That is not the way a deliberative body should be run. There are disagreements on this issue, but don't be afraid of allowing opposing viewpoints to be heard on this House floor. But apparently he didn't want to talk about that.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA).

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 7, a bill which brings permanency to the Hyde amendment, a bill which attempts to take away low-income women's reproductive rights. Therefore, I submit to you that it is a bill more about divisive politics than decent policy.

This past Saturday, I joined hundreds of my constituents on The National Mall. We demonstrated our support for reproductive rights and for women's health care across our Nation.

In my district, on the central coast of California, we have an organization that administers those types of essential services. Mar Monte Planned Parenthood provides over 60,000 preventive, reproductive, and wellness healthcare visits each year, and for some that is the only health care they can get or they can afford.

Madam Speaker, the Hyde amendment isn't going anywhere, whether we like it or not. So I submit to you that it is these types of bills that do nothing to bring Congress together and everything to drive us apart because it is bills like H.R. 7 that can harm the most vulnerable in my community and across our Nation. That is why I respectfully ask my colleagues to oppose H.R. 7.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 7. Forty-four years ago this week, before I was even born, the Supreme Court recognized that the government has no business coming between a woman and her doctor when it comes to making personal medical decisions. Yet now, decades later, many in Washington seem determined to turn back the clock on progress on women's health and women's rights.

The new administration recently instituted a rule that would limit the ability of women around the world to access accurate information about their bodies and make their own medical decisions. And now the House is considering a radical bill that would not only undermine a woman's right to make her own healthcare decisions, but also her ability to even choose her own health insurance plan. On top of that, the bill would actually raise taxes on small businesses who provide their employees with access to comprehensive health coverage and impose unfair burdens on the women of the United States military. These are the facts.

I will always fight back against efforts to limit choice in women's health, and that is why I strongly oppose this bill. This past weekend we saw millions of women around the country and around the world, including hundreds in my own hometown of Wyckoff, New Jersey, where I was, rally against these backward and dangerous policies.

I urge my colleagues to turn their focus from rolling back women's rights

to actually focusing on getting things done for the people of this country—creating jobs and lowering taxes.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, may I ask the gentlewoman from Wyoming if she has additional speakers.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close.

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

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from 23 faith-based organizations and communities urging Members to reject H.R. 7; a letter from the American Civil Liberties Union urging Members to vote "no" on H.R. 7; a letter from 44 women's health, religious, and other advocacy organizations strongly opposed to H.R. 7; and a letter from the American Association of University Women urging Members to oppose H.R. 7.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, January 28, 2014

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As leaders of faith-based organizations and communities, we urge you to reject H.R. 7, a bill introduced as the so-called "No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act," which would harm a woman's health, economic security, and religious liberty by making coverage of abortion inaccessible in both public and private health plans. Enclosed is a statement of shared principles that compel us, together with 20 of our partner organizations from the faith community, to speak out against legislation like H.R. 7, which seeks to impose a narrowly-defined view of one religious viewpoint on every citizen, threatening the freedom of religion afforded to every individual by the U.S. Constitution.

H.R. 7 is sponsored in the House by Rep. Chris Smith (NJ-4). This bill would raise taxes on women and families, as well as small businesses, who access or offer abortion coverage as part of a comprehensive insurance plan. It would do so by denying women and families a premium assistance tax credit if they choose a plan in the health insurance marketplace that includes abortion, a proposal soundly rejected by Congress in the 2010 health reform debate. This bill would also deny small employers a Small Business Tax Credit for offering their workers comprehensive coverage that includes abortion. Further, as amended in committee, this bill would withhold abortion coverage from women enrolled in a multistate, private insurance plan. Taken together, these provisions would jeopardize coverage of abortion in the full private insurance market, risking coverage that many women and families have today; more than 80 percent of private health plans currently cover abortion care.

Also among its provisions, H.R. 7 would make permanent dangerous restrictions that withhold abortion coverage from women who access coverage or care through federal programs, such as women enrolled in Medicaid, federal employees, Native American women, and others. It would also permanently withhold abortion coverage from low-income women living in the District of Columbia, a federal ban that goes against the wishes of DC elected officials and voters. These provisions would disproportionately harm women struggling to make ends meet, risking their economic security, health and well-being, and ability to make personal decisions in accordance with their own conscience and religious or moral beliefs.

Please see the enclosed statement outlining shared principles of faith that compel us and our partners to speak out against this harmful proposal. As communities and organizations that represent diverse constituencies of faith, we stand united in opposition to H.R. 7 given the danger it poses to women and their families by jeopardizing affordable and accessible insurance coverage of abortion.

We urge you to reject H.R. 7 when it reaches the House floor for a vote.

Sincerely,

NANCY KAUFMAN,
CEO, National Council
of Jewish Women.

REV. HARRY KNOX,
President and CEO,
Religious Coalition
for Reproductive
Choice.

JON O'BRIEN,
President, Catholics
for Choice.

INTERFAITH STATEMENT OPPOSING RESTRICTIONS ON WOMEN'S HEALTH CARE OPTIONS

The undersigned religious, religiously affiliated, and faith-centered organizations and communities represent millions of people of faith committed to women's health and reproductive choices. We are deeply troubled by legislative efforts designed to restrict women's access to comprehensive reproductive health care options, including abortion, contraception, HIV/STD testing, cancer screenings, and other essential health services.

We recognize that issues surrounding women's reproductive choices—and those regarding abortion in particular—are complex. Although we come from diverse faith traditions, we all agree that proposals aimed at restricting access to reproductive healthcare would have devastating consequences for women and their families, particularly low-income women. We call on Congress and the President to reject these intolerable measures.

As people of faith, the following common principles compel us to speak out together against these proposals:

Striving for social justice and equal rights to health care: All too often, legislation is proposed that would create significant barriers to women's access to reproductive health options and make it harder for women to make their own reproductive choices based on their individual beliefs and consciences. We are especially concerned about efforts to de-fund the Title X Family Planning program and those organizations, such as Planned Parenthood, that serve as a key part of our social safety net. Title X health centers and clinics are on the public health front lines, serving low-income individuals and other vulnerable populations. These centers help men and women of limited means prevent unintended pregnancies; they promote prevention of, and treatment for HIV and other STDs; they offer life-saving cancer screenings; and they provide crucial medically-accurate information about sexual health. Title X providers ensure that women who want to have children get the information and care they need to promote a healthy pregnancy. As faith-centered organizations, we are committed to the most marginalized and the most vulnerable of our society, especially those with limited financial means or those who live in areas with limited access to services. Reducing health care options for some, based on their economic strata or geographic location, is profoundly unjust.

Respecting women's moral agency: We affirm women as moral agents who have the capacity, right, and responsibility to make their own decisions about sexuality, repro-

duction, and their families. Legislation that eliminates health coverage for and limits the availability of reproductive health care services through funding restrictions would severely limit a woman's ability to make decisions about her own health care and about how best to care for her family, guided by her own conscience, her personal circumstances, and her own moral or faith tradition.

Valuing compassion and the obligation to protect every woman's health and life: Restrictions on women's health care options endanger women's lives. In particular, we oppose proposals that would allow hospitals and individual health workers to refuse to provide abortion services to a woman, even when such care is necessary to save her life. As people of faith, we strongly believe that a health worker's right to refuse to provide certain services must not infringe on a woman's right to access the health care she needs. Above all, that refusal must not endanger her life. Health professionals and the organizations that support them have an obligation to ensure access to necessary services, whether directly or by referral to an accessible alternative health care provider.

Safeguarding religious liberty: We believe that one person's religious viewpoint must not be imposed on others. Different faiths, and even groups within a single faith community, hold varying views and opinions. Time and again, our nation has answered this diversity of opinions by upholding the founding principle of religious freedom. Reproductive freedoms are integrally bound with religious freedoms—a connection recognized by the Supreme Court's 1973 decision in *Roe v. Wade*. Women have a right to make reproductive health choices based on their own faith tradition, free from constraints imposed by those seeking to legislate one religious viewpoint or another. We oppose legislation that would erode Americans' constitutionally protected right to religious freedom.

As people of faith, we believe in compassion, justice, and the dignity of all women. We understand that those who would restrict women's access to comprehensive reproductive health care are often motivated by their religious beliefs and seek to impose their views on others. However, freedom of choice means that every person is valued as a moral decision-maker, free to make personal decisions about their reproductive lives based on their own religious beliefs and consciences. We cannot presume to tell others how best to inform and listen to their own consciences as they make decisions about whether and when to have children or how best to care for their families. Today, and every day, we stand up as people of faith for women's health and reproductive choices—and we urge our government to do the same.

Signed:

Anti-Defamation League; B'nai B'rith International; Catholics for Choice; Disciples Justice Action Network; Episcopal Women's Caucus; Global Faith and Justice Project, Horizons Foundation; Hadassah, The Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc.; Jewish Council for Public Affairs; Jewish Council on Urban Affairs; Jewish Women International; Metropolitan Community Churches; Muslims for Progressive Values.

National Council of Jewish Women; Reconstructionist Rabbinical College and Jewish Reconstructionist Communities; Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice; Religious Institute; Souforce; The Fellowship of Affirming Ministries; Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations; Unitarian Universalist Ministers Association; Unitarian Universalist Women's Federation; United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries; Women's Alliance for Theology, Ethics and Ritual.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,

Washington, DC, January 23, 2017.

VOTE "NO" ON H.R. 7, THE "NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION AND ABORTION INSURANCE FULL DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2017"

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and our nearly two million members and supporters, we urge Members of the House of Representatives to vote no on H.R. 7, the so-called "No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act of 2017." The ACLU opposes this legislation, which would make harmful, discriminatory abortion coverage restrictions permanent and interfere with private health insurance coverage for abortion.

H.R. 7 would make permanent the Hyde Amendment and its progeny, discriminatory abortion coverage restrictions that single out and exclude abortion from a host of programs that fulfill the government's obligation to provide health care. These restrictions disproportionately impact those who already face significant barriers to care—low-income families, women of color, immigrants, young people, LGBTQ people, and those in rural areas. They discriminate against these women, who rely on the government for health care, by severely restricting their access to a health care service that is readily available to women of means and women with private insurance.

A woman in need of abortion care who does not have independent financial resources must scramble to raise the necessary funds, delay receiving care, and is often left with no choice but to carry to term in circumstances where she is physically, emotionally, or financially unprepared to care for a child. In fact, restricting Medicaid coverage of abortion forces one in four poor women seeking abortion to carry an unwanted pregnancy to term. When a woman seeking an abortion is denied one, she is three times more likely to fall into poverty than a woman who can obtain the care she needs. If a woman chooses to carry to term, Medicaid (and other federal insurance programs) offers her assistance for the necessary medical care. But if she needs to end her pregnancy, the same programs will deny her coverage for her abortion. The government should not interfere with a woman's personal medical decisions by selectively withholding benefits in this way.

H.R. 7 also takes particular aim at low-income women in the District of Columbia. Although the use of federal funds is currently restricted from covering most abortions, states are free to use their own funds to include abortion coverage in their medical assistance programs. The only exception is the District of Columbia. H.R. 7 would make permanent a provision that forbids the District from using its own locally raised non-federal dollars to provide coverage for abortion for its low-income residents. The D.C. abortion ban disenfranchises the District's residents, and allows non-resident Members of Congress who are not accountable to the people of the District to impose their own ideology upon the District's residents with impunity.

H.R. 7 would also impact women's ability to purchase private insurance that includes abortion coverage. It would revive the so-called Stupak Amendment, rejected by the 111th Congress, which would bar anyone receiving a federal premium assistance credit from buying a private insurance policy that includes abortion coverage on the Affordable Care Act's (ACA) insurance exchanges. This is not only an attempt to effectively ban abortion coverage in the exchanges by encouraging insurers to exclude it, but it would have a ripple effect on plans outside the exchanges that jeopardizes abortion coverage for millions of women. Further, the inaccurate disclosure requirements in H.R. 7

would push insurance companies to drop abortion coverage and deter women from purchasing plans that include such coverage by misleading them about the cost of purchasing these plans. These provisions are direct attacks on a woman's ability to make personal medical decisions with complete and accurate information.

Additionally, H.R. 7 rewrites tax law to penalize a single, legal, medical procedure: abortion. It would deny small businesses tax credits if the insurance they provide to their employees includes abortion coverage, effectively coercing employers to offer plans that exclude abortion. The bill would also deny millions of women and families premium tax credits if they purchase a health insurance plan that covers abortion, forcing them to forgo comprehensive health insurance plans in order to get the premium assistance they need. This manipulation of the tax code is simply government interference in taxpayers' private medical decisions and should be rejected.

Abortion is basic, constitutionally-protected health care for women. Yet H.R. 7 attacks women's fundamental right and access to abortion. It first targets women—particularly poor women and women of color who rely on the government for their health care—and seeks to permanently deny them coverage for a benefit to which they are entitled. Then, under the guise of “safeguarding” taxpayer dollars, H.R. 7 advances an aggressive campaign to destabilize the insurance market for abortion coverage. Congress should be eliminating barriers to women's ability to exercise their constitutionally protected right to safe, legal abortion. Instead, H.R. 7 would interfere with women's personal medical decisions by putting even more bathers in the way.

For these reasons, the ACLU opposes H.R. 7 and urges members of the House of Representatives to vote no.

Sincerely,

FAIZ SHAKIR,
*Director, Washington
Legislative Office.*
GEORGEANNE M. USOVA,
Legislative Counsel.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned organizations strongly urge you to oppose the deceptive “No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act” (H.R. 7), a bill designed to fundamentally alter the health insurance market—from a market where abortion coverage is the industry standard to one where abortion coverage is eliminated. H.R. 7 does this by changing the laws that govern both private and public insurance and by twisting the tax code into a tool to take away abortion coverage from women who have it. Ultimately, this bill is designed to deny women the decision whether or not to have an abortion by taking away their insurance coverage.

H.R. 7 twists the tax code into a tool to take away health insurance coverage that women have today. For example, the bill would deny millions of women and families premium tax credits if they purchase a health insurance plan that covers abortion. The bill would force these women—particularly low and moderate income women—to forego a health insurance plan that includes abortion in order to get the premium assistance they need. H.R. 7 would also raise taxes on small businesses by denying the Small Business Health Tax Credit to businesses that offer health insurance that covers abortion. This credit was created to encourage small businesses to offer health insurance to their employees by making it more affordable. This bill would penalize employers for choosing comprehensive coverage for their employees and their families.

H.R. 7 would cause the entire insurance market to drop abortion coverage. The impact of H.R. 7's changes could be that women across the country lose comprehensive health insurance that includes abortion coverage. The elimination of abortion coverage in the Marketplaces is expected to set the industry standard, meaning that all plans, inside and outside the Marketplace, could drop such coverage.

H.R. 7 introduces a new ban on private insurance by forcing all multi-state insurance plans to drop abortion coverage. Currently, the law requires that at least one multi-state health insurance plan in a Marketplace must not provide abortion coverage (except for narrow exceptions). H.R. 7 would replace this requirement with a dramatic restriction banning abortion coverage in all multi-state health insurance plans.

The Rules Committee Print of H.R. 7 includes new provisions that would impose inaccurate and misleading disclosure requirements regarding abortion coverage in plans offered in the Marketplace. This bill overrides existing provisions of the Affordable Care Act that provide consumers with information about their health plans, and instead adds new requirements intended to push insurance companies to drop abortion coverage and deter women from purchasing plans that include such coverage. Moreover, H.R. 7 wrongly asserts that there is a “surcharge” in plans that cover abortion, and would require women to be misled with this falsehood. These new provisions are not about disclosure, but about eliminating abortion coverage, in line with the rest of the bill's dangerous provisions.

H.R. 7 would permanently ban federal health insurance programs such as Medicaid from including abortion coverage. H.R. 7 would codify harmful legislative riders that deny abortion coverage to women who receive health insurance through the federal government. Moreover, H.R. 7 makes permanent a rider that denies the District of Columbia the ability to decide whether to use its own local funds to provide abortion coverage. These bans disproportionately affect women of color and low-income women, denying these women the ability to make their own important health care decisions.

H.R. 7 would endanger women's health by eliminating coverage of abortion even in circumstances where a woman needs an abortion to prevent severe, permanent damage to her health. Because H.R. 7 only makes exceptions in the cases where the woman's life is endangered, or where she is the survivor of rape or incest, it would leave women whose health is seriously threatened by their pregnancies without access to the care their doctors recommend to protect their health. The impact can be especially harmful to women underserved by the health care system and women with serious health problems.

In summary, H.R. 7 would deny millions of women the ability to make their own decision about whether to have an abortion. H.R. 7 is a dangerous bill that jeopardizes women's health by directly banning abortion coverage, by raising taxes on families and small businesses that purchase comprehensive insurance coverage, and by imposing “disclosure” requirements that encourage the elimination of abortion coverage. The intent and impact of H.R. 7 is to forever eliminate coverage of abortion in all insurance markets. We strongly urge you to reject this bill.

Sincerely,

Advocates for Youth; American Association of University Women (AAUW); American Civil Liberties Union, American Nurses Association, American Public Health Association; American Society for Reproductive Medicine; Association of Reproductive Health Professionals (ARHP); Asian & Pa-

cific Islander American Health Forum; Black Women's Health Imperative; Catholics for Choice.

Center for Reproductive Rights; Choice USA; Feminist Majority; Hadassah, The Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc.; Jewish Women International; Joint Action Committee for Political Affairs; Medical Students for Choice; Methodist Federation for Social Action; NARAL Pro-Choice America; National Abortion Federation.

National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum; National Center for Lesbian Rights; National Council of Jewish Women; National Family Planning & Reproductive Health Association; National Health Law Program; National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health; National Organization for Women; National Partnership for Women & Families; National Women's Health Network; National Women's Law Center; People For the American Way.

Physicians for Reproductive Health; Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Population Connection Action Fund; Population Institute; Raising Women's Voices for the Health Care We Need; Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice; Religious Institute; Reproductive Health Technologies Project; Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS); Unitarian Universalist Association; Unitarian Universalist Women's Federation; United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries; WV Citizen Action Group.

AAUW EMPOWERING WOMEN SINCE 1881,

Washington, DC, January 24, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the more than 170,000 bipartisan members and supporters of the American Association of University Women (AAUW), I urge you to oppose H.R. 7, a dangerous limitation on abortion that puts women's health and rights at risk. H.R. 7 would withhold abortion coverage from virtually all women in the U.S. and potentially push insurers into ceasing coverage of abortion care. This bill is a part of a political strategy that seeks to interfere with women's personal decision-making around their reproductive health care.

AAUW supports the right of every woman to access safe, accessible, affordable, and comprehensive family planning and reproductive health services. We believe that all women should be able to make their own decisions with advice and support from those they trust the most. We know that women look to doctors, family members, and other trusted individuals, not politicians, to make important medical decisions about their health.

H.R. 7 would make abortion restrictions that are often built into annual appropriations bills permanent. Such an action would withhold abortion coverage from almost all women—those who rely on Medicaid, federal insurance plans and health programs, as well as those who are Peace Corps Volunteers, Native American women, Washington, D.C. residents, and many others. In addition, by creating burdensome regulations for insurers to cover abortion services, many more women would lose access to the care they need. When policymakers deny women insurance coverage for abortion, women are forced to either carry the pregnancy to term or pay for care out of their own pockets. Consequently, cutting off access to or placing strict limitations on abortion can have profoundly harmful effects on public health, particularly for those who already face significant barriers to receiving care, such as low-income women, immigrant women, LGBTQ people, and women of color.

Again, I urge you to oppose H.R. 7, a dangerous limitation on abortion that puts

women's health and rights at risk. Votes associated with this legislation may be scored in the AAUW Action Fund Congressional Voting Record for the 115th Congress. Please do not hesitate to contact me at 202/785-7720, or Anne Hedgepeth, Senior Government Relations Manager, if you have any questions. Sincerely,

LISA M. MAATZ,
Vice President of Government
Relations and Advocacy.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let me begin my closing by reminding people that we are about to vote on the rule. The rule defines how we are going to consider this legislation. This is a closed rule. This is a Putin rule. This is a rule that allows no opposing viewpoints to be brought before this Chamber to be debated and voted on. It is completely closed. On top of that, it didn't go through regular order.

Now, I know my colleagues will say, well, it went through regular order in the previous Congress. But there are 55 new Members of the House in this Congress, and I think they have a right to expect regular order from the leadership of this House when legislation is brought to the floor. The rule should be rejected because it is closed.

I would urge my colleagues, even those who may be sympathetic to the underlying legislation to, at some point, stand up to your leadership and say, "Enough of this closed process." Open this place up a little bit. This is supposed to be the greatest deliberative body in the world, and yet we do everything but deliberate. At some point, I hope some of my Republican colleagues will be brave enough to stand with us who are calling for a more open process.

I also urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the underlying bill.

I also include in the RECORD an article from Politico entitled, "Study: Abortion Rate Falls to Record Low."

[From Politico, Jan. 17, 2017]

STUDY: ABORTION RATE FALLS TO RECORD
LOW

(By Brianna Ehley)

The U.S. abortion rate dipped to its lowest level on record in 2014, according to a new study by the Guttmacher Institute.

The abortion rate dropped 14 percent between 2011 and 2014 to 14.6 abortions per 1,000 women, researchers said. During the same time period, the number of abortions dropped 12 percent to 926,200 in 2014.

Researchers suggested two main reasons for the decline: a combination of greater access to contraception and less access to abortion services in states that have enacted new restrictions.

The number of clinics providing abortions dipped 6 percent between 2011 and 2014, with the largest declines in access in the Midwest and the South.

"Abortion restrictions and clinic closures mean that patients may need to travel greater distances to access services," Rachel Jones, the study's lead author, said in a statement. "Some of the abortion rate decline is likely attributable to women who were prevented from accessing needed services."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, part of the reason for that is because women are having more access to good

health care. Part of the reason why that number is getting lower is because of organizations like Planned Parenthood, which provide clinics and counseling and contraception to young women so that we can actually avoid more people being in the situation where they have to confront the issue of abortion. And yet my colleagues' next salvo is going to be going after Planned Parenthood. The abortion rate in this country is going down.

The underlying bill is not about making sure that taxpayer money doesn't go to fund abortion. That is what the Hyde amendment does.

The Affordable Care Act, by the way, makes it clear that no portion of the premium tax credits may be used to pay for the portion of comprehensive health coverage that is purchased in the marketplace that relates to abortion services. That is not what this is about.

This is basically the first attempt to really go after the basic constitutional right for a woman to be able to choose when it comes to abortion services. That is what this is about. The leadership of this House—indeed, the President of the United States—has made it clear they want to repeal Roe v. Wade. They want to put Justices on the Supreme Court who will repeal that decision. They want to pass legislation that will do everything to be able to deny women that basic right. That is what is going on here.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I am asking people to vote "no" on the previous question so that we can actually debate and vote on this issue of requiring Presidential candidates and Presidents to release their tax returns. I say to my colleagues in all sincerity, this President's refusal to release his tax returns, all these conflicts of interest that he has, this is a White House on a collision course with corruption. Donald Trump said he wanted to come to Washington to drain the swamp, but by not releasing his tax returns, by allowing all these conflicts of interest to remain, he is bringing the swamp to the White House. Enough.

Let us vote for transparency here. Let us vote in a way that the majority of Americans think we ought to do, and that is to require this President to come clean, to show us what his tax returns are, to show us what he is hiding, to show us where his investments are, to show us if there are any dealings with Russia or Putin or whatever.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so we can have that opportunity to be able to debate that issue, because if you don't vote "no," I can guarantee you that the Committee on Rules will never make it in order. The Committee on Rules never makes anything in order that the leadership of this House doesn't put its rubber stamp on. I think that that is unfortunate. As I said before, the Committee on Rules is becoming a place where democracy goes to die. It is about time that my colleagues on both

sides of the aisle stand up and say, "Enough. Let's open this place up."

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

I am really heartened today, Madam Speaker, to hear so much concern from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle about making sure that patients and individuals have the right to make decisions about their own health care. I would expect, then, to see support from the other side of the aisle when we are in a position where we are putting in place our replacement for ObamaCare. That is one of the main reasons we are repealing ObamaCare, getting the government out of the business of telling people what they can and can't have with respect to their own health care. That is not the issue that we are debating here today, however, Madam Speaker.

I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his tireless work on this issue and for introducing this bipartisan bill. A majority of Americans across the country share the view that we must continue to work to protect the lives of mothers and their unborn children. As you have already heard, Madam Speaker, the Hyde amendment is responsible for saving the lives of at least 2 million babies, the most vulnerable among us.

Codifying a permanent restriction on the use of taxpayer funding for abortions is long overdue. I urge adoption of both the rule and H.R. 7 so we can continue to protect and save lives.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise again in strong opposition to the rule for H.R. 7, the so-called "No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act," and the underlying bill.

I oppose this bill because it is unnecessary, puts the lives of women at risk, interferes with women's constitutionally guaranteed right of privacy, and diverts our attention from the real problems facing the American people.

A more accurate short title for this bill would be the "Violating the Rights of Women Act of 2017!"

Instead of resuming their annual War on Women, our colleagues across the aisle should be working with Democrats to build upon the "Middle-Class Economics" championed by the Obama Administration that have succeeded in ending the economic meltdown it inherited in 2009 and revived the economy to the point where today we have the highest rate of growth and lowest rate of unemployment since the boom years of the Clinton Administration.

We could and should instead be voting to raise the minimum wage to \$15.00 per hour so that people who work hard and play by the rules do not have raise their families in poverty.

A far better use of our time would be to provide help to unemployed job-hunters by making access to community college affordable to every person looking to make a new start in life.

Instead of voting to abridge the constitutional rights of women for the umpteenth time, we should bring to the floor for a first vote comprehensive immigration reform legislation or legislations repairing the harm to the Voting Rights Act of 1965 by the Supreme Court's decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*.

Madam Speaker, the one thing we should not be doing is debating irresponsible "messaging bills" that abridge the rights of women and have absolutely no chance of overriding a presidential veto.

The version of H.R. 7 before us now is as bad today as it was when the House Republican leadership insisted on bringing it to a vote a year ago. The other draconian provisions of that terrible bill are retained in H.R. 7, which would:

1. Prohibit federal funds from being used for any health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion. (Thus making permanent existing federal policies.)

2. Prohibit the inclusion of abortion in any health care service furnished by a federal or District of Columbia health care facility or by any physician or other individual employed by the federal government or the District.

3. Apply such prohibitions to District of Columbia funds.

4. Prohibit individuals from receiving a refundable federal tax credit, or any cost-sharing reductions, for purchasing a qualified health plan that includes coverage for abortions.

5. Prohibit small employers from receiving the small-employer health insurance credit provided by the health care law if the health plans or benefits that are purchased provide abortion coverage.

If H.R. 7 were enacted, millions of families and small businesses with private health insurance plans that offer abortion coverage would be faced with tax increases, making the cost of health care insurance even more expensive.

Under the Affordable Care Act, insurers are able to offer abortion coverage and receive federal offsets for premiums as long as enrollees pay for the abortion coverage from separate, private funds.

If enacted, H.R. 7 would deny federal subsidies or credits to private health insurance plans that offer abortion coverage even if that coverage is paid for from private funds.

This would inevitably lead to private health insurance companies dropping abortion coverage leaving millions of women without access to affordable, comprehensive health care.

Currently, 87% of private insurance health care plans offered through employers cover abortion.

If H.R. 7 were to become law, consumer Options for private health insurance plans would be unnecessarily restricted and the tax burden on these policy holders would increase significantly.

H.R. 7 would also deny tax credits to small businesses that offer their employees insurance plans that cover abortion, which would have a significant impact on millions of families across the nation who would no longer be able to take advantage of existing tax credits and deductions for the cost of their health care.

For example, small businesses that offer health plans that cover abortions would no longer be eligible for the Small Business Health Tax Credit—potentially worth 35%-50% of the cost of their premiums—threatening 4 million small businesses.

Self-employed Americans who are able to deduct the cost of their comprehensive health insurance from their taxable income will also be denied similar tax credits and face higher taxes.

H.R. 7 would also undermine the District of Columbia's home rule by restricting its use of funds for abortion care to low-income women.

The Hyde Amendment stipulates that no taxpayer dollars are to be used for abortion care, and has narrow exceptions for rape, incest, and health complications that arise from pregnancy which put the mother's life in danger.

H.R. 7 would restrict women's access to reproductive health care even further by narrowing the already stringent requirements set forth in the Hyde Amendment.

When the Affordable Care Act was signed into law, the President issued an Executive Order to "ensure that Federal funds are not used for abortion services."

This version of H.R. 7 goes far beyond the safeguards established under the Affordable Care Act, and sets a dangerous precedent for the future of women's reproductive health in this country because it includes two new provisions that were added at the nth hour but have never received a hearing or a mark-up.

These new provisions would (1) ban abortion coverage in multi-state health plans available under the ACA; and (2) mandate that health plans mislead consumers about abortion coverage by requiring all plans in the health-insurance exchanges that include abortion coverage to display that fact prominently in all advertising, marketing materials, or information from the insurer but interestingly, does not require the same disclosure from plans that do not cover abortion.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 7 would also force health plans to mislead consumers about the law's treatment of abortion.

As a concession to anti-choice lawmakers, the ACA requires insurance plans participating in the new health system to segregate monies used for abortion services from all other funds.

In order to aid in identifying these funds and simplify the process of segregating general premium dollars from those used to cover abortion services, the ACA requires that health plans estimate the cost of abortion coverage at no less than \$1 per enrollee per month.

H.R. 7 would require plans covering abortion to misrepresent this practice as an "abortion surcharge," which is to be disclosed and identified as a portion of the consumer's premium.

By describing abortion coverage in this way, H.R.7 makes it look as if 7 though it is an added, extra cost, available only at an additional fee, when in fact it is not.

Taken together, the provisions in H.R. 7 have the effect, and possibly the intent, of arbitrarily infringing women's reproductive freedoms and pose a nationwide threat to the health and wellbeing of American women and a direct challenge to the Supreme Court's ruling in *Roe V. Wade*.

Madam Speaker, one of the most detestable aspects of this bill is that it would curb access to care for women in the most desperate of circumstances.

Women like Danielle Deaver, who was 22 weeks pregnant when her water broke. Tests showed that Danielle had suffered anhydramnios, a premature rupture of the membranes before the fetus has achieved viability.

This condition meant that the fetus likely would be born with a shortening of muscle tissue that results in the inability to move limbs. In addition, Danielle's fetus likely would suffer deformities to the face and head, and the lungs were unlikely to develop beyond the 22-week point.

There was less than a 10% chance that, if born, Danielle's baby would be able to breathe on its own and only a 2% chance the baby would be able to eat on its own.

H.R. 7 hurts women like Vikki Stella, a diabetic, who discovered months into her pregnancy that the fetus she was carrying suffered from several major anomalies and had no chance of survival. Because of Vikki's diabetes, her doctor determined that induced labor and Caesarian section were both riskier procedures for Vikki than an abortion.

Every pregnancy is different. No politician knows, or has the right to assume he knows, what is best for a woman and her family.

These are decisions that properly must be left to women to make, in consultation with their partners, doctors, and their God.

H.R. 7 lacks the necessary exceptions to protect the health and life of the mother.

H.R. 7 is an unconstitutional infringement on the right to privacy, as interpreted by the Supreme Court in a long line of cases going back to *Griswold v. Connecticut* in 1965 and *Roe v. Wade* decided in 1973.

In *Roe v. Wade*, the Court held that a state could not prohibit a woman from exercising her right to terminate a pregnancy in order to protect her health prior to viability.

While many factors go into determining fetal viability, the consensus of the medical community is that viability is acknowledged as not occurring prior to 24 weeks gestation.

Supreme Court precedents make it clear that neither Congress nor a state legislature can declare any one element—"be it weeks of gestation or fetal weight or any other single factor—as the determinant" of viability. *Coloyal v. Franklin*, 439 U.S. 379,388-89 (1979).

The constitutionally protected right to privacy encompasses the right of women to choose to terminate a pregnancy before viability, and even later where continuing to term poses a threat to her health and safety.

This right of privacy was hard won and must be preserved inviolate.

The bill before us threatens this hard won right for women and must be defeated.

I urge all members to join me in opposing the rule and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 55 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 305) to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require the disclosure of certain tax returns by Presidents and certain candidates for the office of the President, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on

Ways and Means and Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 305.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal

to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 187, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

YEAS—233

Abraham	Crawford	Higgins (LA)
Aderholt	Culberson	Hill
Allen	Curbelo (FL)	Holding
Amash	Davidson	Hollingsworth
Amodei	Davis, Rodney	Hudson
Arrington	Denham	Huizenga
Babin	Dent	Hultgren
Bacon	DeSantis	Hunter
Banks (IN)	DesJarlais	Hurd
Barletta	Diaz-Balart	Issa
Barr	Donovan	Jenkins (KS)
Barton	Duffy	Jenkins (WV)
Bergman	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (LA)
Biggs	Duncan (TN)	Johnson (OH)
Bilirakis	Dunn	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (MI)	Emmer	Jordan
Bishop (UT)	Farenthold	Katko
Black	Faso	Kelly (MS)
Blackburn	Ferguson	Kelly (PA)
Blum	Fitzpatrick	King (IA)
Bost	Fleischmann	King (NY)
Brady (TX)	Flores	Kinzinger
Brat	Fortenberry	Knight
Bridenstine	Foxx	Kustoff (TN)
Brooks (AL)	Franks (AZ)	Labrador
Brooks (IN)	Frelinghuysen	LaHood
Buchanan	Gaetz	LaMalfa
Buck	Gallagher	Lamborn
Bucshon	Garrett	Lance
Budd	Gibbs	Latta
Burgess	Gohmert	Lewis (MN)
Byrne	Goodlatte	LoBiondo
Calvert	Gosar	Long
Carter (GA)	Gowdy	Loudermilk
Carter (TX)	Granger	Love
Chabot	Graves (GA)	Lucas
Chaffetz	Graves (LA)	Luetkemeyer
Cheney	Graves (MO)	MacArthur
Cole	Griffith	Marchant
Collins (GA)	Grothman	Marino
Collins (NY)	Guthrie	Marshall
Comer	Harper	Massie
Comstock	Harris	Mast
Conaway	Hartzler	McCarthy
Cook	Hensarling	McCaull
Costello (PA)	Herrera Beutler	McClintock
Cramer	Hice, Jody B.	McHenry

McKinley	Rogers (AL)	Taylor
McMorris	Rogers (KY)	Tenney
Rodgers	Rohrabacher	Thompson (PA)
McSally	Rokita	Thornberry
Meadows	Rooney, Francis	Tiberi
Meehan	Rooney, Thomas	Tipton
Messer	J.	Trott
Mitchell	Ros-Lehtinen	Turner
Moolenaar	Roskam	Upton
Mooney (WV)	Ross	Valadao
Mullin	Rothfus	Wagner
Murphy (PA)	Rouzer	Walberg
Newhouse	Royce (CA)	Walden
Noem	Russell	Walker
Nunes	Rutherford	Walorski
Olson	Sanford	Walters, Mimi
Palazzo	Scalise	Weber (FL)
Palmer	Schweikert	Webster (TX)
Paulsen	Scott, Austin	Wenstrup
Pearce	Sensenbrenner	Westerman
Perry	Sessions	Williams
Pittenger	Shimkus	Wilson (SC)
Poe (TX)	Shuster	Wittman
Poliquin	Simpson	Womack
Posey	Smith (MO)	Woodall
Ratcliffe	Smith (NE)	Yoder
Reed	Smith (NJ)	Yoho
Reichert	Smith (TX)	Young (AK)
Renacci	Smucker	Young (IA)
Rice (SC)	Stefanik	Zeldin
Roby	Stewart	
Roe (TN)	Stivers	

NAYS—187

Adams	Fudge	Napolitano
Aguilar	Gabbard	Neal
Barragan	Gallego	Nolan
Bass	Garamendi	Norcross
Beatty	Gonzalez (TX)	O'Halleran
Bera	Gottheimer	O'Rourke
Beyer	Green, Al	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Panetta
Blunt Rochester	Grijalva	Pascarell
Bonamici	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Boyle, Brendan	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
F.	Hastings	Peters
Brady (PA)	Heck	Peterson
Brown (MD)	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Brownley (CA)	Himes	Pocan
Bustos	Hoyer	Polis
Butterfield	Huffman	Price (NC)
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Carbajal	Jayapal	Raskin
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Cartwright	Kaptur	Rosen
Castor (FL)	Keating	Royal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Chu, Judy	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Ciçilline	Khanna	Ryan (OH)
Clark (MA)	Kihuen	Sánchez
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clay	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kind	Schiff
Clyburn	Krishnamoorthi	Schneider
Cohen	Kuster (NH)	Schrader
Connolly	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Correa	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Costa	Lawson (FL)	Shea-Porter
Courtney	Lee	Sherman
Crist	Levin	Sinema
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Sires
Cuellar	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lipinski	Soto
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Speier
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Suozi
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Lowey	Takano
Delaney	Lujan Grisham,	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	M.	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Lujan, Ben Ray	Titus
Demings	Lynch	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Maloney,	Torres
Deuth	Carolyn B.	Tsongas
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
Doggett	Matsui	Veasey
Doyle, Michael	McCullum	Vela
F.	McEachin	Visclosky
Ellison	McGovern	Walz
Engel	McNerney	Wasserman
Eshoo	Meeks	Schultz
Espallat	Meng	Walters, Maxine
Esty	Moore	Watson Coleman
Evans	Moulton	Welch
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Nadler	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Blumenauer Joyce (OH) Rush
Coffman Mulvaney Slaughter
Johnson, E. B. Payne Velázquez
Jones Price, Tom (GA) Zinke

□ 1404

Mr. VEASEY changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.” So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 183, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

AYES—236

Abraham Duncan (SC) Kustoff (TN)
Aderholt Labrador
Allen Dunn LaHood
Amash Emmer LaMalfa
Amodei Farenthold Lamborn
Arrington Faso Lance
Babin Ferguson Latta
Bacon Fitzpatrick Lewis (MN)
Banks (IN) Fleischmann Lipinski
Barletta Flores LoBiondo
Barr Fortenberry Long
Barton Foxx Loudermill
Bergman Franks (AZ) Love
Biggs Frelinghuysen Lucas
Bilirakis Gaetz Luetkemeyer
Bishop (MI) Gallagher MacArthur
Bishop (UT) Garrett Marchant
Black Gibbs Marino
Blackburn Gohmert Marshall
Blum Goodlatte Massie
Bost Gosar Mast
Brady (TX) Gowdy McCarthy
Brat Granger McCaul
Bridenstine Graves (GA) McClintock
Brooks (AL) Graves (LA) McHenry
Brooks (IN) McKinley
Buchanan Griffith McMorris
Buck Grothman Rodgers
Bucshon Guthrie McSally
Budd Harper Meadows
Burgess Harris Meehan
Byrne Hartzler Messer
Calvert Hensarling Mitchell
Carter (GA) Herrera Beutler Moolenaar
Carter (TX) Hice, Jody B. Mooney (WV)
Chabot Higgins (LA) Mullin
Chaffetz Hill Murphy (PA)
Cheney Holding Newhouse
Cole Hollingsworth Noem
Collins (GA) Hudson Nunes
Collins (NY) Huizenga Olson
Comer Hultgren Palazzo
Comstock Hunter Palmer
Conaway Hurd Paulsen
Cook Issa Pearce
Costello (PA) Jenkins (KS) Perry
Cramer Jenkins (WV) Peterson
Crawford Johnson (LA) Pittenger
Culberson Johnson (OH) Poe (TX)
Curbelo (FL) Johnson, Sam Poliquin
Davidson Jordan Posey
Davis, Rodney Joyce (OH) Ratcliffe
Denham Katko Reed
Dent Kelly (MS) Reichert
DeSantis Kelly (PA) Renacci
DesJarlais King (IA) Rice (SC)
Diaz-Balart King (NY) Roby
Donovan Kinzinger Roe (TN)
Duffy Knight Rogers (AL)

Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus

Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner

Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—183

Adams
Aguilar
Barragan
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Española
Esty
Evans
Foster

Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Loebsock
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler

Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

□ 1411

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “Yea” on roll call No. 62, and “Yea” on roll call No. 63.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Ethics:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, January 24, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: This letter is to inform you that effective today I am resigning as the Ranking Member of the Committee on Ethics, as I have reached the applicable term limit under rules of the Democratic Caucus. It has been a privilege and a high honor to serve on the committee, which serves an essential function for the House and the public.

Sincerely,

LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 56

Resolved, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON ETHICS.—Mr. Deutch, Ms. Clarke of New York, Mr. Polis, and Mr. Brown of Maryland.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1415

NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION AND ABORTION INSURANCE FULL DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2017

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 55, I call up the bill (H.R. 7) to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H. R. 7

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

NOT VOTING—13

Blumenauer
Coffman
Huffman
Johnson, E. B.
Jones

Mulvaney
Payne
Price, Tom (GA)
Rush
Schrader

Slaughter
Veasey
Zinke

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act of 2017”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—PROHIBITING FEDERALLY FUNDED ABORTIONS

Sec. 101. Prohibiting taxpayer funded abortions.

Sec. 102. Amendment to table of chapters.

TITLE II—APPLICATION UNDER THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Sec. 201. Clarifying application of prohibition to premium credits and cost-sharing reductions under ACA.

Sec. 202. Revision of notice requirements regarding disclosure of extent of health plan coverage of abortion and abortion premium surcharges.

TITLE I—PROHIBITING FEDERALLY FUNDED ABORTIONS

SEC. 101. PROHIBITING TAXPAYER FUNDED ABORTIONS.

Title 1, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new chapter:

“CHAPTER 4—PROHIBITING TAXPAYER FUNDED ABORTIONS

“301. Prohibition on funding for abortions.

“302. Prohibition on funding for health benefits plans that cover abortion.

“303. Limitation on Federal facilities and employees.

“304. Construction relating to separate coverage.

“305. Construction relating to the use of non-Federal funds for health coverage.

“306. Non-preemption of other Federal laws.

“307. Construction relating to complications arising from abortion.

“308. Treatment of abortions related to rape, incest, or preserving the life of the mother.

“309. Application to District of Columbia.

“§ 301. Prohibition on funding for abortions

“No funds authorized or appropriated by Federal law, and none of the funds in any trust fund to which funds are authorized or appropriated by Federal law, shall be expended for any abortion.

“§ 302. Prohibition on funding for health benefits plans that cover abortion

“None of the funds authorized or appropriated by Federal law, and none of the funds in any trust fund to which funds are authorized or appropriated by Federal law, shall be expended for health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion.

“§ 303. Limitation on Federal facilities and employees

“No health care service furnished—
“(1) by or in a health care facility owned or operated by the Federal Government; or

“(2) by any physician or other individual employed by the Federal Government to provide health care services within the scope of the physician’s or individual’s employment, may include abortion.

“§ 304. Construction relating to separate coverage

“Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as prohibiting any individual, entity, or State or locality from purchasing separate abortion coverage or health benefits coverage that includes abortion so long as such coverage is paid for entirely using only funds not authorized or appropriated by Federal law and such coverage shall not be purchased using matching funds required for a

federally subsidized program, including a State’s or locality’s contribution of Medicaid matching funds.

“§ 305. Construction relating to the use of non-Federal funds for health coverage

“Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as restricting the ability of any non-Federal health benefits coverage provider from offering abortion coverage, or the ability of a State or locality to contract separately with such a provider for such coverage, so long as only funds not authorized or appropriated by Federal law are used and such coverage shall not be purchased using matching funds required for a federally subsidized program, including a State’s or locality’s contribution of Medicaid matching funds.

“§ 306. Non-preemption of other Federal laws

“Nothing in this chapter shall repeal, amend, or have any effect on any other Federal law to the extent such law imposes any limitation on the use of funds for abortion or for health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion, beyond the limitations set forth in this chapter.

“§ 307. Construction relating to complications arising from abortion

“Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to apply to the treatment of any infection, injury, disease, or disorder that has been caused by or exacerbated by the performance of an abortion. This rule of construction shall be applicable without regard to whether the abortion was performed in accord with Federal or State law, and without regard to whether funding for the abortion is permissible under section 308.

“§ 308. Treatment of abortions related to rape, incest, or preserving the life of the mother

“The limitations established in sections 301, 302, and 303 shall not apply to an abortion—

“(1) if the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest; or

“(2) in the case where a woman suffers from a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness that would, as certified by a physician, place the woman in danger of death unless an abortion is performed, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself.

“§ 309. Application to District of Columbia

“In this chapter:

“(1) Any reference to funds appropriated by Federal law shall be treated as including any amounts within the budget of the District of Columbia that have been approved by an Act of Congress pursuant to section 446 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (or any applicable successor Federal law).

“(2) The term ‘Federal Government’ includes the government of the District of Columbia.”.

SEC. 102. AMENDMENT TO TABLE OF CHAPTERS.

The table of chapters for title 1, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“4. Prohibiting taxpayer funded abortions 301”.

TITLE II—APPLICATION UNDER THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

SEC. 201. CLARIFYING APPLICATION OF PROHIBITION TO PREMIUM CREDITS AND COST-SHARING REDUCTIONS UNDER ACA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) **DISALLOWANCE OF REFUNDABLE CREDIT AND COST-SHARING REDUCTIONS FOR COVERAGE UNDER QUALIFIED HEALTH PLAN WHICH PROVIDES COVERAGE FOR ABORTION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subparagraph (A) of section 36B(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of

1986 is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “or any health plan that includes coverage for abortions (other than any abortion or treatment described in section 307 or 308 of title 1, United States Code)”.

(B) **OPTION TO PURCHASE OR OFFER SEPARATE COVERAGE OR PLAN.**—Paragraph (3) of section 36B(c) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) **SEPARATE ABORTION COVERAGE OR PLAN ALLOWED.**—

“(i) **OPTION TO PURCHASE SEPARATE COVERAGE OR PLAN.**—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed as prohibiting any individual from purchasing separate coverage for abortions described in such subparagraph, or a health plan that includes such abortions, so long as no credit is allowed under this section with respect to the premiums for such coverage or plan.

“(ii) **OPTION TO OFFER COVERAGE OR PLAN.**—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall restrict any non-Federal health insurance issuer offering a health plan from offering separate coverage for abortions described in such subparagraph, or a plan that includes such abortions, so long as premiums for such separate coverage or plan are not paid for with any amount attributable to the credit allowed under this section (or the amount of any advance payment of the credit under section 1412 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act).”.

(2) **DISALLOWANCE OF SMALL EMPLOYER HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSE CREDIT FOR PLAN WHICH INCLUDES COVERAGE FOR ABORTION.**—Subsection (h) of section 45R of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking “Any term” and inserting the following:

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any term”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) **EXCLUSION OF HEALTH PLANS INCLUDING COVERAGE FOR ABORTION.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘qualified health plan’ does not include any health plan that includes coverage for abortions (other than any abortion or treatment described in section 307 or 308 of title 1, United States Code).

“(B) **SEPARATE ABORTION COVERAGE OR PLAN ALLOWED.**—

“(i) **OPTION TO PURCHASE SEPARATE COVERAGE OR PLAN.**—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed as prohibiting any employer from purchasing for its employees separate coverage for abortions described in such subparagraph, or a health plan that includes such abortions, so long as no credit is allowed under this section with respect to the employer contributions for such coverage or plan.

“(ii) **OPTION TO OFFER COVERAGE OR PLAN.**—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall restrict any non-Federal health insurance issuer offering a health plan from offering separate coverage for abortions described in such subparagraph, or a plan that includes such abortions, so long as such separate coverage or plan is not paid for with any employer contribution eligible for the credit allowed under this section.”.

(3) **CONFORMING ACA AMENDMENTS.**—Section 1303(b) of Public Law 111–148 (42 U.S.C. 18023(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (2);

(B) by striking paragraph (3), as amended by section 202(a); and

(C) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (2).

(b) **APPLICATION TO MULTI-STATE PLANS.**—Paragraph (6) of section 1334(a) of Public Law 111–148 (42 U.S.C. 18054(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(6) COVERAGE CONSISTENT WITH FEDERAL ABORTION POLICY.—In entering into contracts under this subsection, the Director shall ensure that no multi-State qualified health plan offered in an Exchange provides health benefits coverage for which the expenditure of Federal funds is prohibited under chapter 4 of title 1, United States Code.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 2017, but only with respect to plan years beginning after such date, and the amendment made by subsection (b) shall apply to plan years beginning after such date.

SEC. 202. REVISION OF NOTICE REQUIREMENTS REGARDING DISCLOSURE OF EXTENT OF HEALTH PLAN COVERAGE OF ABORTION AND ABORTION PREMIUM SURCHARGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 1303(b) of Public Law 111-148 (42 U.S.C. 18023(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) RULES RELATING TO NOTICE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The extent of coverage (if any) of services described in paragraph (1)(B)(i) or (1)(B)(ii) by a qualified health plan shall be disclosed to enrollees at the time of enrollment in the plan and shall be prominently displayed in any marketing or advertising materials, comparison tools, or summary of benefits and coverage explanation made available with respect to such plan by the issuer of the plan, by an Exchange, or by the Secretary, including information made available through an Internet portal or Exchange under sections 1311(c)(5) and 1311(d)(4)(C).

“(B) SEPARATE DISCLOSURE OF ABORTION SURCHARGES.—In the case of a qualified health plan that includes the services described in paragraph (1)(B)(i) and where the premium for the plan is disclosed, including in any marketing or advertising materials or any other information referred to in subparagraph (A), the surcharge described in paragraph (2)(B)(i)(II) that is attributable to such services shall also be disclosed and identified separately.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to materials, tools, or other information made available more than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 55, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on H.R. 7, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act, and I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for his unflinching leadership on this issue.

It was just a week ago that groups of women marched in the streets of D.C. and other cities across the country ap-

parently ready to write off this Presidency as it just began.

There were millions of pro-life women who were explicitly told that they were unwelcome at this event. So today, the people's House is giving them and the more than 60 percent of Americans from all political persuasions who oppose taxpayer funding of abortions a voice.

The legislation before us will protect Americans' conscience rights by ensuring that their hard-earned tax dollars are not used to fund the destruction of innocent life. That is a principle that Members of both parties have supported in this Chamber before.

Every year, Democrats and Republicans alike have come together to support funding bills that maintain the law called the Hyde amendment, which prohibits the direct Federal funding of abortion, with limited exceptions. This 40-year-old law has saved an estimated 2 million lives, but it is not permanent, meaning that this time-honored protection could be taken away on a whim. What is more, the law, in its current form, has clear loopholes.

A 2014 GAO study found that taxpayer-funded insurance subsidies could be used to pay for abortions on over 1,000 ObamaCare plans nationwide. That is why today we have the opportunity to make this life-affirming law permanent and governmentwide.

As a mother, a grandmother, and a nurse for more than 40 years, this measure is especially meaningful to me. During my years in the healthcare industry, I saw the joy in young parents' eyes when they met their newborn for the very first time. I held the hands of grieving spouses and children as they said good-bye to their loved ones. And, sadly, I witnessed a young woman lose her life due to the effects of a botched abortion.

These experiences informed my view that all life is a precious gift from God. I pray that in time this truth will be reflected in our Nation's laws. Until then, can't we at least do this much.

I urge a “yes” vote on the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Speaker, our constituents are looking to this Congress to address the economy, jobs, our crumbling infrastructure, and so many other issues. But despite these pressing needs, the only substantive bill this House is considering this week is a bill restricting a woman's ability to get a full range of healthcare services and a bill, which passed before in this House and that we know is going nowhere in the other body.

Its title alone must be part of the majority's new plan to redefine facts. As we heard the other day, we now apparently have in our discourse “alternative facts.”

This bill takes that to a whole new level, and let me tell you why. The bill

is called the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act. But under current law, under the Hyde amendment—which I hate, which I will do everything to repeal—we have no taxpayer funding for abortion. Taxpayer funds are currently prohibited from use for abortions. Instead, what this bill does is it takes that concept and it uses it to far expand a restriction on a woman's ability to get the full health care that she needs.

Let me talk about what this bill does exactly. First of all, it codifies the Hyde amendment into statute, which has never been done in this Nation's history.

Secondly, it codifies a ban on abortions in D.C., even when they are done with D.C.'s taxpayer money and not with Federal money.

Number three, it codifies the Helms amendment, which denies women abroad access to safe abortion care by severely restricting the use of U.S. funds to pay for healthcare services in developing countries.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself an additional 1 minute.

It severely restricts abortion coverage in the ACA's exchanges by forbidding people who have plans where they get subsidies from paying for plans with their own money. This is a far expansion of a restriction on a woman's right to get her own health insurance with her own money.

It denies insurance-related tax credits to small businesses that choose plans that offer abortion services. It permanently bans abortion services for Federal employees and it codifies a ban on abortion coverage for women in military services overseas.

The fact that we are debating this today, just 1 day after President Trump issued an executive order reinstating the global gag rule, is a slap in the face to the over 3 million women who marched last weekend.

Let's vote “no” on this bill and let's go to the business that the American public really cares about.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), who is the chair of the Judiciary Committee and a longstanding supporter of pro-life.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her ardent work on this important cause.

However stark Americans' differences of opinion can be on the matter of abortion generally, there has been long, bipartisan agreement that Federal taxpayer funds should not be used to destroy innocent life.

The Hyde amendment, named for its chief sponsor, former House Judiciary Committee Chairman Henry Hyde, has prohibited the Federal funding of abortions since 1976 when it passed the House and Senate that was composed overwhelmingly of Democratic members. It has been renewed each appropriations cycle with few changes for

over 40 years, supported by Congresses controlled by both parties and Presidents from both parties. It is probably the most bipartisan, pro-life proposal sustained over a longer period of time than any other. It is time the Hyde amendment was codified in the U.S. Code.

H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act, sponsored by Representative CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey, would do just that. It would codify the two core principles of the Hyde amendment throughout the operations of the Federal Government; namely, a ban on Federal funding for abortions and a ban on the use of Federal funds for health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion.

As hundreds of thousands of people from across the country come to Washington to express their love of unborn children at the annual March for Life and as we now have a President who supports this legislation, let's reflect on what could be accomplished if the bill we consider today were signed into law.

During the time the Hyde amendment has been in place, the most reliable estimates—and those of the Congressional Budget Office—are that millions of innocent children and their mothers have been spared the horrors of abortion. Millions of lives have been saved. And of those millions of lives saved, many more have grown up to bear their own children and to raise them in happy, loving families.

This bill is more than a proposed law. It is a celebration of the lives of those millions of Americans—boys and girls, men and women of all races—who give joy and feel love and create and contribute all because of the policies this bill contains. And even more than that, this bill is a welcome sign for millions and millions more Americans to come.

I congratulate the President for already reinstating the Mexico City policy, which prohibits the Federal funding of abortions overseas. And I look forward to his signing this bill into law to codify the same policy here in America.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 7.

We are only 10 days into this 115th Congress, and already Republicans are bringing legislation to the floor to harm women's health. It is clear that House Republicans do not respect women and our ability to make our own decisions.

Millions of women peacefully marched in cities around the country and around the world, yet here we are, once again, voting legislation to give politicians more control over women's bodies than they have of their own.

Let's be clear: the ultimate goal of this bill is to effectively eliminate access to abortions, even when women pay for it themselves. Seven in ten

Americans believe that abortions should be safe and legal. And just as we have seen in Texas, when women lose access to abortion, they will take drastic action to seek back-alley abortions or to self-abort.

Let's remember that *Roe v. Wade* was not the beginning of women having abortions. It was the end of women dying from abortions.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mrs. NOEM. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act.

Specifically, this bill says directly that Federal taxpayer dollars could not be used to provide abortions. It does not do more than that. What it does is it puts into statute a permanency to legislation that has annually been renewed.

Becoming a parent was something that my husband and I always dreamed about. And when we did realize that we were having our first child, we prayed for her and we prayed for our future children, recognizing that they were a gift from God and that that life was to be protected even from the moment of conception.

That is the belief that I have, and my hope and my dream for everyone here in America is that we would recognize that those children are a gift from God to us to protect, to keep, and to make sure that they are brought into this world safely and helped from thereon. My perspective and my profound commitment to protecting unborn children is why I am standing here today.

Time and again, Congress has risen with bipartisan support to oppose taxpayer-funded abortions. Annual provisions, including the Hyde amendment, have been passed repeatedly; and they have been estimated to save over 2 million innocent lives. Our goal here is to save even more. We need to make these provisions permanent.

ObamaCare has allowed the tax dollars of hardworking Americans to flow to over 1,000 abortion-covering health plans. This has made today's bipartisan legislation more important than ever.

H.R. 7 would create a permanent governmentwide prohibition against Federal dollars to fund abortive procedures. It would also ensure the Affordable Care Act complies with the Hyde amendment until it is repealed and replaced. That is the right thing to do.

□ 1430

Today we stand to make sure that every single life is valued, not just the ones that we pick and choose for political reasons; that every single one that God has created has an opportunity to live out their dreams here in the United States of America.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding

and for her tireless work and leadership on behalf of women's health.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 7. This discriminatory bill would undermine a woman's access to abortion care, which is a constitutional right as affirmed by *Roe v. Wade*, 44 years ago, by making the Hyde amendment permanent. This bill would restrict access to reproductive health care for millions of women and disproportionately harm low-income women and women of color.

As if this isn't enough, H.R. 7 comes on the heels of a dramatic expansion of the global gag rule which denies life-saving health care to women around the world; not to mention continuous Republican attacks on contraceptive access, comprehensive sex education, and Planned Parenthood.

Madam Speaker, when I was a staffer on Capitol Hill when the Hyde amendment was passed, I remember the days very clearly of back-alley abortions.

Clearly, Republicans are trying to take us back to the days when women died from unsafe abortions in this country.

That is why I offered an amendment that would have recognized that women—not employers or politicians—have the right to make their own reproductive health choices.

Shamefully, the Rules Committee refused to make it in order and allow for a debate.

Madam Speaker, women should be able to make their own decisions about reproductive health care, including abortions, without Members of Congress or employers interfering.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I referenced in my opening remarks that there has been bipartisan support for this measure, the Hyde amendment, on a yearly basis. I just want to make mention that the former gentlewoman from California who just spoke did vote for this measure in the fiscal year 2016 omnibus bill.

Madam Speaker, it is my honor to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who is the sponsor of the bill and is a champion for the unborn. It is really an honor for me to have served with him on this particular issue.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I want to first thank the distinguished gentlewoman, my good friend DIANE BLACK, for her extraordinary leadership. I also want to say to my colleagues—and I hope this really is accepted for the profound change that it underscores—the Hyde amendment has saved 2 million lives; 2 million survivors who would have died had Medicaid funding for abortion not been available.

This is over the course of 40 years, but 2 million lives, some of whom are 39, 38. It is about 60,000 children every year. And if you look at where this comes from, much of the mega-analysis comes from a peer review done by the Guttmacher Institute in 2009. They have found that there is a 25 percent

reduction in Medicaid abortions when Medicaid money is not available to effectuate the dismemberment and the chemical poisoning of an unborn child.

Defense of the unborn child is a human rights issue of our time, Madam Speaker. We talk about the unborn child, we degrade them, we treat them as if they are tumors or warts to be excised rather than children growing, developing, and maturing.

Ultrasound imaging, as we all know, has shattered the myth that somehow an unborn child is anything but human and alive. And I hope that the science, which is very readily available, catches up with the policy.

This makes Hyde and all of the other amendments permanent. We know that every year we have an annual battle over several of those amendments. It also, finally, title II, takes out of ObamaCare the facilitation and the funding of abortion.

When President Obama did his executive order in December of 2010, he said that the Hyde amendment would be applied to the ObamaCare exchanges. For months and years after that in-House debate, people have said that has happened. It did not. We know beyond any reasonable doubt—and we enlisted GAO to look at that—well over 1,000 plans pay for abortion on demand in the ObamaCare exchanges.

So that got the votes the pro-life Democrats needed to effectuate the passage of the Affordable Care Act. But, frankly, it hasn't happened. Title II of this bill says the Hyde amendment will be applied to the ObamaCare exchanges. Had that been done faithfully by the President, there would be no need for title II of this bill.

I remember when the President stood right there in September of 2009 and said: Under our plan, no taxpayer funding will be used to pay for abortion. Absolutely untrue. This language in H.R. 7 makes that true. We don't want to be complicit in the killing and the maiming of unborn children. As we know now, beyond any reasonable doubt, post-abortive women increasingly are coming forward and speaking out, those especially who found peace and reconciliation to say abortion also hurts women.

There are two victims in every abortion: mother and baby. Two million lives saved. That is what we should be all about, life affirming and the saving of human rights.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), one of our new Members.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. This weekend, millions of women made it clear that they demand respect.

Instead, for their efforts, they have received a trip to 1984 where, once again, a paternalistic White House signed executive orders infringing on a woman's right to choose.

H.R. 7, the bill we are considering here today, is the next notch in the Re-

publican belt that will take away our control over our own bodies.

I have years of experience working in family planning, and I can tell you that this bill takes away our ability to plan our families properly and to make decisions about our own bodies, a decision that should be left to a woman and her physician.

Make no mistake, this isn't a healthcare issue. It is part of an extreme rightwing political agenda that puts women's rights on the chopping block.

H.R. 7 tells millions of women that their voices don't matter and their rights don't count. Passing this bill will create even more barriers for women, including women of color, trying to access quality health care.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided and heavy-handed bill.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Chair, it is my honor to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), one of my Ways and Means colleagues and a long-time supporter of pro-life.

Mr. ROSKAM. Madam Speaker, I have got a prediction to make, and here is my prediction: In the course of this debate, the opponents of H.R. 7 will not acknowledge nor give voice to Congressman SMITH's claim of saving 2 million lives. Why? Because to acknowledge 2 million lives that are saved is to acknowledge the weakness of an argument; that is, those people are to be dismissed.

Madam Speaker, how do you dismiss 2 million people? How do you dismiss 2 million people, over 60,000 people every year?

If you can imagine what it would be like if someone came in here and with certainty, absolute confidence, said unambiguously, if you pass this law you are going to save 2 million lives, we would line up. We would be voting on that over and over and over again.

And yet, my prediction is, during the remainder of this debate—because we have not heard about it so far—the opponents will be silent about those 2 million lives.

We need to vote for this and save lives in the future.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I want to answer his question with a question.

Do you care about the 4 million children today that live off of less than \$2 a day and live in extreme poverty and they are alive? No, you don't.

Let me quote our Founding Father Samuel Adams. "... freedom of thought and the right of private judgment in matters of conscience direct their course to this happy country. ..."

The First Amendment, the Fourth Amendment, the 14th Amendment, all sort of convene to this notion of rights of privacy in this country, except when it comes to women and their bodies.

Republicans continue to wreak havoc for women's health, operating as if

they have some sort of moral imperative to tell us. Get your laws off our bodies.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS), who has been a longstanding supporter of life.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Congresswoman BLACK for this bill. It seems like whenever we talk about this issue, we always talk past each other. But the real question before us is: Does abortion kill a little baby?

If it doesn't, I am ready to quit talking about it. But if it does, then those of us sitting in the seat of freedom are also standing in the midst of the greatest human genocide in the history of humanity. And although we may not agree on all of the vicissitudes of abortion, one thing is certain: Some day, we, as a society, will look back, we will recognize the humanity of these little children of God and the inhumanity of what was being done to them, and we will regret these days.

Until then, at least can't we get together and say that we shouldn't force taxpayers to pay for the killing of innocent little human beings?

I pray that we can open our eyes to that truth.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, on Saturday, millions of people took a stand against the assault on women's rights. Today, I stand with them once again to say we have had enough.

Only 2 days after these historic marches, Republicans in Congress have introduced H.R. 7 to silence women by limiting their constitutional right to make personal choices about their reproductive health, without undue government interference.

H.R. 7 is a woman's health catastrophe. Not only would it codify the discriminatory Hyde amendment, it would penalize employers who offer healthcare plans with comprehensive coverage and prevent the 80 percent of ACA enrollees who receive subsidies from purchasing plans that cover abortion services. In effect, it makes abortion an option only for the wealthy.

The law of the land does not say that only some women have the right to choose; it says that all women have the right to choose.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this reckless legislation.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I want to once again mention that there has been longstanding bipartisan support for the support of the Hyde amendment.

As a matter of fact, the gentlewoman from California who just spoke voted for this on three different occasions;

most recently in the MACRA that was passed in 2015; the omnibus, which was passed in December of 2015 and also in December of 2016; and in the fiscal year 2017 CR.

It is now my honor to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY), a member of the Appropriations Committee and a strong supporter of pro-life.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for yielding me this time. Opponents of this bill are suggesting that we are against women's health care. What we are vehemently opposed to is the killing of innocent lives, innocent babies.

□ 1445

So let's call abortion abortion and be reminded that the one voice, Madam Speaker, not heard today is that of the baby. So it is my privilege, alongside my colleagues, to speak on behalf of those who are not here today to speak for themselves. No taxpayer dollars should ever go to fund abortions. This is a commonsense truth that even the most ardent pro-abortion activists have a hard time arguing.

I am unapologetically pro-life, and it is no secret that I believe in stronger protections for unborn children under the law, but I also believe that we must assign greater respect for life within our society. That is why it is so important for Congress to make a statement, once and for all, that there is no place in the Federal budget for abortion funding.

As an appropriator, I can tell you that the Hyde amendment has been indispensable to stopping funding for abortion throughout our government healthcare agencies. Now it is time to apply the same longstanding provision across the entire Federal Government.

Madam Speaker, for my pro-life colleagues and me, fighting on behalf of the unborn has been an uphill battle these last several years. The abortion industry's fierce allies in the Senate and the Obama administration have made sure that many worthy pro-life measures were defeated. However, with a unified Republican government, our hope is that our prospects have changed for the better. On just the second day of his Presidency, President Trump issued an executive order blocking Federal funding for international groups to provide or promote abortions. For the pro-life community, this long-overdue action was a welcome sign that the Trump administration will be a powerful ally in the fight for life.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, there are many policy improvements to pursue: reasonable limits on abortions after 5 months of pregnancy, stopping the shell game of title X funding at Planned Parenthood, improving access

to adoption services, and more. But a great place to start is passing H.R. 7. It is our enduring responsibility to defend the unborn, and it is imperative we get this right.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the gentlewoman from Tennessee has attempted to imply that several of our speakers today support the Hyde amendment because they voted for very large omnibus spending bills that included the Hyde amendment. I would like to be really clear that none of the speakers on this side today do support the Hyde amendment, and, in fact, in the last Congress we had a bill, the EACH Woman Act, sponsored by a number of us, 129 cosponsors, which would repeal the Hyde amendment. Sometimes people vote for large pieces of legislation because they do things like keep our government open and build highways and roads. But we will do everything in our power to repeal this poorly thought-out and regressive amendment, and we will do everything we can to defeat this bill today.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership.

Madam Speaker, President Trump once said his favorite book is the Bible. I think he is writing a new book for the Bible called the "Apocalypse of Women." It is a reverse Genesis.

In the beginning, he divided the country in half with rightwing dog whistles in his inaugural address. On the second day, he ignored millions of people who marched across America and the world. On the third day, he pondered changes to NAFTA and which women's rights to trade away. On the fourth day, he reinstated and expanded the global gag rule, risking women's lives worldwide. Today he and his House mouthpieces are blocking access to domestic reproductive health coverage trumpeting alternative facts about legal abortions that have been somehow prevented, some 2 million of them.

Well, prove it.

I shudder to think what will happen tomorrow, and I doubt on the seventh day it will be devoted to rest.

Madam Speaker, we must fight this madness and oppose H.R. 7.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, my distinguished colleague said "prove it" about the 2 million. Well, there is a very extensive study done by Michael J. New. The Review of Literature done in June of 2009 by the Guttmacher Institute found: "Approximately one-fourth of women who would have had Medicaid-funded abortions instead gave birth when this funding was unavailable."

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), who is the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. This bill is pro-life, it is pro-family, and it is pro-taxpayer. I want to thank Representatives CHRIS SMITH and DIANE BLACK for their unwavering leadership in bringing this bill forward.

Among other important actions, what I am excited about is this bill finally makes the Hyde amendment permanent. This important and long-standing policy prohibits taxpayer dollars from being used to fund abortions through Federal programs. For many years, it was the policy of America that, whether you were pro-choice or, as I am, strongly pro-life, your taxpayer dollars would not be used for the controversial act of abortion.

Taking this action now is especially important given that, under the Affordable Care Act, taxpayer-funded health insurance subsidies have been funneled toward health plans that do cover abortion services. The bill before us today will ensure that taxpayer dollars aren't used in any form to cover elective abortions. This policy will be permanent, and it will apply governmentwide, including to the Affordable Care Act.

Right now, House Republicans are working to repeal this failed law and put in place a 21st century healthcare system Americans deserve. By passing this bill, we can also take immediate action to protect life and taxpayer dollars from the law's harmful impacts.

For me, this is a family issue. My wife and I are proud parents of two adopted children. We have a family only because two women in two very difficult situations chose life. It is important that our government and the laws that represent us encourage those choices and encourage and protect innocent lives. This bill today takes such an important step forward.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank, again, Congressman SMITH and Representative DIANE BLACK for their leadership. I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting its passage.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Madam Speaker, for women to thrive in the economic and social opportunities of our Nation, we must have the ability to control our own reproductive lives with full access to real healthcare choices.

Republican unrelenting efforts to force unwanted pregnancies and eradicate affordable, safe abortion will not save lives. Repealing the Affordable Care Act, defunding Planned Parenthood, and now driving insurance coverage for abortion into extinction will

return women to the days of coat hanger medicine. Allowing women to be killed and maimed in back alleys is not pro-life. It will not make America great again.

Women of America are on the march, and, Madam Speaker, we will not retreat.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, once again, I want to talk about the longstanding bipartisan support for the Hyde amendment. The gentlewoman from Florida has supported this measure in the omnibus bill and also the CR of 2017.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), who is a member of the Financial Services Committee. She and her family have been fighting for pro-life issues for many, many, many years.

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Tennessee, DIANE BLACK, for her wonderful leadership on this issue along with Congressman SMITH, also, for his wonderful leadership.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. The Hyde amendment has received bipartisan support for 40 years because it is a testimony to the freedom of conscience for all Americans and the dignity of the unborn.

I am heartbroken that opposition to the amendment has become a political gimmick. All human beings—the born, the unborn, the young, the old, the sick, and the healthy—are entitled to a government that promotes their dignity, their conscience, and their gift of life.

This bill spells out Congress' commitment to all people—including children—across our Nation that the profits of Big Abortion should not be pilfered off the hard work of the American citizen. No tax dollar should be spent on the destruction of human life.

In passing this bill and making the Hyde language permanent, we affirm that protecting children and mothers is our most precious duty as Members of Congress. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for life.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman DEGETTE for yielding the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 7 and urge the Republican-led Congress to hear the voices of the millions who marched on Saturday who proclaimed that women's rights must be respected, including a woman's right to choose her own health care.

I was part of that march, with many of my neighbors from Florida, to send a message to this Congress that our rights—our constitutional rights—must be preserved. Americans have a right to privacy, as we are reminded on

this anniversary week of *Roe v. Wade*, but this Republican bill tramples on that right to privacy.

Women, their families, and their doctors have the right to make their personal healthcare decisions, not the mostly male politicians in Washington. It is especially appalling that the Republicans have targeted female veterans and those that serve in the military for reduction in care.

So, Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this unconstitutional bill and encourage Americans to continue to lift their voices.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, once again, I want to say that there has been longstanding bipartisan support for the Hyde amendment, and the gentlewoman from Florida supported this measure back in 2015 on the H.R. 2 MACRA bill and the 2015 omnibus bill, H.R. 2029.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE).

Mrs. LOVE. Madam Speaker, let's talk about what this is really about. This is about the loss of human lives.

Each child potentially brings with him or her unique gifts and talents that can be used for the betterment of our society. An unborn child may be the doctor that cures cancer or Alzheimer's, may be the astronaut that lands us on Mars or the future leader that solves the problems of today. The list of our children's potential is infinite in value.

Any time a child's life is lost, there is something more that is lost. It is a loss for us, it is a loss for our society, and it is a loss for our Nation. If you want to invest in our future, in the words of Henry Hyde: "We cannot in logic or in conscience help fund the execution of these innocent, defenseless human lives."

A strong majority of Americans and a bipartisan majority in Congress opposes taxpayer-funded abortions. Because of this, there exists, currently, over 40 years of laws that prevent this practice. These laws have been deemed constitutional by the United States Supreme Court.

So this is not about women's health. I want you to know very clearly that I support women's health. I support a healthy, organic, and open healthcare system that gives women more care than they currently receive today. What this bill does is codifies something that we already have. It ends the patchwork and establishes permanent protections for our children and the future of our society.

I want you to know, Madam Speaker, that when I stand up and I meet with my Maker, I want you to know that I am not going to be ashamed. I am going to know that I stood up for the lives of these innocent children.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of our future, in favor of our unborn potential, and in favor of H.R. 7.

□ 1500

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, this weekend we saw millions of Americans march in cities and towns across the country and around the world—far more than attended the inauguration the day before.

I joined the march in Chicago, where one of the most visible concerns was women's reproductive freedom. Today, House Republicans, roughly 90 percent of them White males, responded by showing the women of America exactly how little they respect those rights.

Madam Speaker, a party that lost the popular vote by almost 3 million votes does not have a mandate to deny women the right to make their own healthcare decisions.

Perhaps I should remind my Republican colleagues that unless you are their doctor, they don't need your opinion. Women in the Federal workforce, low-income women, women in the military, women employed by small businesses are all perfectly capable of having a conversation with their doctor about their health.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the bill and "no" to disrespecting the women of America.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, life begins at conception. I believe it is our responsibility to protect the millions of unborn children whose voices go unheard.

As a Christian and a father of three, I believe the lives of all children, including the unborn, are just as important as yours or mine. That is why I stand here today in support of H.R. 7. This bill safeguards the lives of unborn children who are robbed of their opportunity to experience the marvels of life.

H.R. 7 closes loopholes that have permitted the subsidization of abortions by taxpayers who are morally opposed to the practice. Additionally, this bill also requires insurance providers who receive Federal subsidies through participation in the healthcare exchanges to report to consumers whether or not they will be subject to a surcharge that covers abortion services at the time of purchase.

It boggles the mind that our Federal Government had the arrogance to skirt longstanding laws in order to trick the American taxpayer into unknowingly contributing to abortions in the first place.

This bill has passed the House numerous times. The merits of the bill are clear. I urge my colleagues to support swift passage of H.R. 7.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, on Saturday, millions of Americans around the Nation

spoke with a collective voice, opposing President Trump's plans to trample women's rights. Yet here we are, the first week of the new administration, voting on a bill to scale back women's health benefits.

Let's be clear: this bill is not about preventing Federal funds from going to abortions. Sadly, current law already prevents that. In reality, this bill would affect millions of women who purchase coverage with their own money. It will make it nearly impossible for insurance providers to offer plans fully covering women's reproductive health. It would harm low-income women who need access to an abortion, turning back the clock on women's reproductive rights.

It is day five of the Trump Presidency and women are already being attacked at every corner. I promise my colleagues this: the American people are watching. They will remember this vote.

Vote "no" on this bill.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I want to remind everyone of the longstanding bipartisan support for the Hyde amendment. The gentlewoman from New York voted for this measure in the omnibus bill, H.R. 2029, in 2015, and then on the MACRA bill, also in 2015.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL).

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam Speaker, the carving up and commercial sale of dismembered unborn children ranks as one of the most horrific and barbaric acts in American and human history.

As an adoptive father, I speak today on behalf of the 55 million Americans that have had their lives brutally ended with the scalpel, the suction hose, and the callousness of the murderous culture that allows it to perpetuate.

These Americans had a right to choose life that they did not want to lose. We have the ability to restore to future Americans that choice. Until that day, no American should be forced to end the life of an innocent human being with their tax dollars.

We can carve up a child and call it a choice. We can destroy human life and call it health care. We can make the killing of children legal and pretend it is beneficial. We can cover acts of barbarity with the veneer of civility. But we cannot escape our accountability before the Creator of life.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee keeps saying over and over that different people voted for H.R. 2029 and, therefore, they must be for the Hyde amendment. I would like to point out that she herself voted against H.R. 2029. I guess maybe that means she is against the Hyde amendment since she voted against that bill.

The point I am making is that all of us oppose the Hyde amendment. We are all cosponsoring the EACH Woman Act.

Simply because you vote for or against a large omnibus bill does not mean you are necessarily in favor of or against the Hyde amendment.

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

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

H.R. 7 will make permanent the harmful and discriminatory Hyde amendment, penalizing small businesses who want to provide comprehensive health coverage to their employees and, once again, trampling on the District of Columbia by prohibiting the District from spending its own local funds for abortion coverage.

Yet again, the GOP has put our bodies and the choices we should get to make about them in the middle of a political firestorm. With every exhaustingly repetitive argument about when, how, and where a woman should be able to make those decisions, our country suffers.

If my Republican colleagues are so concerned about the life of a child, why isn't there priority to put forth a plan for public education? Why haven't we seen a comprehensive plan to continue the job growth that President Barack Obama started?

Their motives are transparent and I refuse to let this White House or any elected official play politics with women's bodies. As we continue down this dangerous road, today, tomorrow, and every day thereafter will be a day of resistance.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL) one of our newest Members.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act, which I proudly cosponsored.

Four years ago, my wife and I adopted a young child from an orphanage. People say it changed his life. It changed ours.

This year, the theme of the March for Life is "The Power of One," meaning that every single person can change the course of history if given the chance to live. Every year, 1 million unborn babies are stripped of the right to life, which our Declaration of Independence calls unalienable.

Moreover, those opposed to abortion have been forced to violate their consciences through taxpayer-funded abortions. This legislation will reinforce a culture of life by making current prohibitions against taxpayer-funded abortions permanent.

Madam Speaker, I stand in the spirit of "The Power of One" to give voice to the voiceless, rights back to the unborn, and I urge passage of this legislation.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Colorado has 14½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 3½ minutes remaining.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, with H.R. 7, Republicans are again targeting American women's health care.

This bill limits financial assistance in order to restrict women's choices in the health insurance marketplaces, forcing women and their families to select only certain plans. The goal is to restrict the ability of a woman to make her own choices.

This bill comes up 1 day after President Trump reinstated the Mexico rule. It prohibits U.S. foreign assistance to any organization which uses not those funds, but those from any other source for any activity related to abortion services.

When I was Assistant Administrator of the AID in the late seventies, I led the highly organized effort that established a strict process for cordoning off any U.S. funds from any activity related to abortions, in violation of the Hyde amendment.

What the Mexico rule means is that if any organization uses funds from any source related to abortion, it cannot receive any U.S. assistance, even if 99 percent of its activities related to women's health are totally unrelated to abortions and even programs in a nation where abortion is illegal.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LEVIN. The result will be the absence of health care for millions of women in our Nation, as H.R. 7 will result for millions of women in our Nation. We are seeing 48 hours of reckless disregard for women's health.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act.

Unfortunately, in our Nation, the most vulnerable and the most helpless lives amongst us have had their lives ended unceremoniously and tragically through abortion. Since 1973, 57 million lives have been lost to abortion. Even more disheartening, taxpayer dollars have been funding these abortions, despite the fact that polls show that 60 percent of Americans believe that abortions should not be directly paid for with tax dollars.

Since 1976, the Hyde amendment has saved 2 million lives by prohibiting tax dollars from funding abortions. It is time to make this lifesaving amendment permanent and governmentwide. If signed by our new President, this

measure would do just that. Supporting comprehensive, life-affirming care is a better and more effective way to invest in women's health.

I am thankful to all those who will come to Washington, D.C., this week to March for Life on behalf of the unborn. As a practicing Catholic and the father of three, I am proud to be the voice for the unborn here in Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7 and stand up for life.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, this weekend, millions of women marched across the country to send a clear signal to Congress and President Trump: Hear our voices and protect our rights.

Yet here we are, just 2 days later, voting on the same extremist policies that House leaders have been pushing for years.

Women will not be fooled. We know H.R. 7 is another direct attack on our health and our families. It creates sweeping new restrictions on abortion care for women who purchase coverage under the Affordable Care Act, with no meaningful exceptions to protect a woman's health.

That means women like Stephanie, from my district, who faced heart-breaking complications during her wanted pregnancy, would be left without coverage for the doctor-recommended care she needed.

We should not be injecting ideology into a woman's personal medical decisions. This bill is an insult to the millions of women who marched this weekend, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTEMBERG).

Mr. PITTEMBERG. Madam Speaker, just a few weeks ago, my family was blessed with the arrival of a beautiful baby girl, our 10th grandchild. If you have ever held a newborn, so defenseless and completely dependent on you, you will understand why the idea that some people advocate for the murder of little babies is unconscionable.

Since 1975, the Hyde amendment has saved an estimated 2 million innocent babies by prohibiting taxpayer dollars from being used for abortions. Unfortunately, ObamaCare ignores the Hyde amendment and uses your tax dollars as subsidies for insurance policies which offer abortion services.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act, which will make the Hyde amendment government-wide policy and ensure future government programs don't support abortion with your tax dollars.

God tells us that He knew us in our mother's womb. His gift of life is precious, unalienable, and must be protected.

□ 1515

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from

Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), another one of our excellent new Members.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 7.

A few days ago, millions of Americans made history by marching for freedom and equality against an administration that keeps threatening to grab women by their privacy rights. H.R. 7 now tries to make it impossible for millions of women, like my constituents in Maryland, to have an abortion, even when their health is at stake and even to the point of manipulating the tax laws to force private insurers in the ACA not to offer complete coverage.

Here in Washington, D.C., the only capital of a democracy on Earth where residents are denied voting representation in their national legislature, this extreme legislation constitutes a special assault on liberty. The hundreds of thousands of taxpaying citizens living in D.C. have decided, like the people of Maryland, to offer Medicaid funding for poor women to have complete coverage. This legislation strips this modicum of democracy away in the District of Columbia, combining a cavalier attack on democracy with a vicious attack on health care.

If a foreign repressive power like Russia tried to deny women in our Capital City complete medical coverage, we would consider it an act of aggression against the United States. As a Representative from Maryland, the Free State, I reject this outrageous attempt to deprive women of their constitutionally protected choices, and as the next-door neighbor of the good people of Washington, D.C., I reject this brutal attack on democracy and health care.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), a gentleman who has been a champion of life.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank my dear colleague and friend, DIANE BLACK, for her leadership on this most essential issue.

Madam Speaker, if you look behind us on this dais right here, it says, "Peace, Liberty, Justice." We inscribe these words all around our Nation's Capitol and on our monuments, but in truth, we cannot find peace in a society that does not protect its most vulnerable members. We cannot find liberty when we are indifferent to one another, and we cannot claim justice when we throw away innocent life.

Madam Speaker, I find it very interesting that the early feminist movement was pro-life. They saw abortion for what it is: the abandonment of women. Once an abortion occurs, as Maddie Brinckerhoff, an early feminist lecturer, once said:

It is evidence by either a lack of education or resources, she has been greatly wronged.

At the very least, I think, Madam Speaker, we can stand with the vast majority of Americans and not use our taxpayer dollars to subsidize the abor-

tion industry and the violence against women.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Colorado has 11 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 30 seconds remaining.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, what this bill is about is taking women who can't afford to get an abortion and not allowing them to use taxpayer-funded money to get it. The assumption on the other side is they won't have money, because people who are in dire straits won't have money to get it, and therefore they will have these 2 million children they are talking about.

What we are talking about—let's make it clear—is they are talking about poor women who they think can't afford to get to a doctor or to an abortion provider and force them to have children that they can't have because of economics.

So women, poor women, do not forgive them for they know what they do. They are trying to put you at their mercy and make you have children because you are poor. If they get their ultimate desire—and that is the repeal of Roe v. Wade—then poor women will not be able to get an abortion, but wealthy women will.

Trump said, yes, if they outlaw abortion, go to another State. Easy to say when you are a billionaire, but not a thing to say to the middle class and poor women of this country whom they want to force, through their economic disparities, to bear children.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I know our time is short. I just want to say that this bill signifies our staunch support for life, and in spite of what has all been said, it just simply prevents taxpayer funds from being used to pay for abortions.

For years our government has had a patchwork approach to this issue. However, this bill, H.R. 7, would create a clear and unified policy across all Federal agencies.

Our Founding Fathers set forth in the Declaration of Independence "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights." One of those unalienable rights is life. Therefore, it follows that the right to life of each human being should be preserved and protected.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), an activist on this issue.

(Mr. NADLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, there is obviously a difference of opinion in this country on the morality of abortion. I am appalled by the moral arrogance of the Republicans who would use political power to impose their views on the millions of women who disagree with them and want to make their own decisions.

Though the Supreme Court has determined that neither Congress nor a State may place an undue burden on a woman's right to terminate a pregnancy, the Hyde amendment makes abortion access virtually impossible for low-income women.

As unjust and despicable as the Hyde amendment is, this bill goes beyond it. For the first time, Republicans are attempting to restrict the right of women to use their own money to pay for abortions by denying normal tax deductions for medical expenses if those medical expenses include an abortion, by denying normal tax credits for health insurance if that insurance covers abortion, and by denying use of tax-free money from an FSA or an HSA for an abortion.

The intent of this bill is obvious: to end insurance coverage for all abortions, thereby making it nearly impossible for women to exercise their constitutional rights.

Republicans should pay heed to the millions of women who marched to protect their rights this weekend and are watching how we vote today.

Madam Speaker, there is obviously a difference of opinion in this country on the morality of abortion. I am appalled at the moral arrogance of the Republicans who would use political power to impose their views on the millions of women who disagree with them and want to make their own decisions.

If Saturday's protests are any indication, the women of America and the world are watching us. They are not going to stand silently by while Republicans in Congress and the White House take away their rights, their health care, their families, and their livelihoods. They sent this message loud and clear, but it seems my Republican colleagues have not heard it. Yesterday morning, President Trump signed an executive order reinstating the Global Gag Rule, which will deny thousands of women around the world access to reproductive health care, which will lead to a dramatic decline in maternal and infant health around the world.

Today, Republicans are bringing up a bill that will deny women the right to access comprehensive reproductive health care, a right protected by the Constitution.

The right of a woman to decide whether to become pregnant, to decide to continue her pregnancy, or to make the decision to terminate her pregnancy is protected by the Constitution. The Supreme Court has determined that neither Congress nor a state may place an "undue burden" on that right. Denial of Medicaid or other government funding that would be available for other medical procedures should be considered an "undue burden." For decades, Congress has imposed the Hyde Amendment on every appropriations bill. This language disproportionately impacts poor women and women of color, effectively deny-

ing them their constitutional right to access abortion. Yet today, Republicans want to make that language permanent.

As unjust and despicable as the Hyde Amendment is, this bill goes beyond it. For the first time, Republicans are restricting the right of women to use their own money to pay for abortions. This bill will deny normal tax deductions for medical expenses if those expenses include abortion, normal tax credits for health insurance if that insurance includes abortion, and denying the ability to use tax-free money from an FSA or HSA for an abortion.

The bill does include an exception in cases of rape, incest, or the life of the mother. You may ask, how the IRS will know a woman's reason for getting an abortion. Well, under this bill, women will have to prove they are a victim of rape or incest or will have to provide detailed medical records to determine just how at risk their life was. Women will not only have to suffer the trauma of a sexual assault or the loss of a pregnancy because of life-threatening complications, they will now also have to face an IRS inquisition to get their own money back. So much for Republicans' pledge to get "big government" out of people's lives.

The intent of this bill is obvious: to end insurance coverage for all abortions thereby making it nearly impossible for women to exercise their constitutional rights. Republicans are clearly out of step with the millions of women who marched to protect their rights this weekend. Those women, and the millions more who stand with them, are watching and ready to fight back. I am proud to vote against this bill and to join their fight.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, these are the faces of innocent and wonderful women like Dakota and Chenoa, who indicate that, if they did not have Planned Parenthood, they would not be able to be where they are today, or Chenoa, who indicated, without Planned Parenthood and the Affordable Care Act, they wouldn't have access to health care.

That is what H.R. 7 intends to do, to deny these young, beautiful women an opportunity. But more importantly, my colleagues on the other side want to suggest they only—they only—have religion and faith. But as a mother, let me say that every child I have loved and every woman who has had a decision to make I have loved and respected for her choice of a faith, her God, and her doctor.

Rather than having this war on women by Republicans, we need to be dealing with the voting rights law. Rather than prohibiting individuals from receiving a refundable tax credit on cost-sharing reductions for purchasing a qualified health plan that encourages coverage for abortions or denying the District of Columbia their rights, we should be standing for rights. This is a constitutional right. It is also a choice by a woman of her God, her doctor, and her family.

Vote against H.R. 7. It is violence against women. It is not helping women or the unborn child.

Madam Speaker, I rise again in strong opposition to H.R. 7, the so-called "No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act."

I oppose this bill because it is unnecessary, puts the lives of women at risk, interferes with women's constitutionally guaranteed right of privacy, and diverts our attention from the real problems facing the American people.

A more accurate short title for this bill would be the "Violating the Rights of Women Act of 2017."

Instead of resuming their annual War on Women, our colleagues across the aisle should be working with Democrats to build upon the "Middle-Class Economics" championed by the Obama Administration that have succeeded in ending the economic meltdown it inherited in 2009 and revived the economy to the point where today we have the highest rate of growth and lowest rate of unemployment since the boom years of the Clinton Administration.

We could and should instead be voting to raise the minimum wage to \$15.00 per hour so that people who work hard and play by the rules do not have to raise their families in poverty.

A far better use of our time would be to provide help to unemployed job-hunters by making access to community college affordable to every person looking to make a new start in life.

Instead of voting to abridge the constitutional rights of women for the umpteenth time, we should bring to the floor for a first vote comprehensive immigration reform legislation or legislations repairing the harm to the Voting Rights Act of 1965 by the Supreme Court's decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*.

Madam Speaker, the one thing we should not be doing is debating irresponsible "messaging bills" that abridge the rights of women and have absolutely no chance of overriding a presidential veto.

The version of H.R. 7 before us now is as bad today as it was when the House Republican leadership insisted on bringing it to a vote a year ago.

The other draconian provisions of that terrible bill are retained in H.R. 7, which would:

1. Prohibit federal funds from being used for any health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion. (Thus making permanent existing federal policies.)

2. Prohibit the inclusion of abortion in any health care service furnished by a federal or District of Columbia health care facility or by any physician or other individual employed by the federal government or the District.

3. Apply such prohibitions to District of Columbia funds.

4. Prohibit individuals from receiving a refundable federal tax credit, or any cost-sharing reductions, for purchasing a qualified health plan that includes coverage for abortions.

5. Prohibit small employers from receiving the small-employer health insurance credit provided by the health care law if the health plans or benefits that are purchased provide abortion coverage.

If H.R. 7 were enacted, millions of families and small businesses with private health insurance plans that offer abortion coverage would be faced with tax increases, making the cost of health care insurance even more expensive.

Under the Affordable Care Act, insurers are able to offer abortion coverage and receive

federal offsets for premiums as long as enrollees pay for the abortion coverage from separate, private funds.

If enacted, H.R. 7 would deny federal subsidies or credits to private health insurance plans that offer abortion coverage even if that coverage is paid for from private funds.

This would inevitably lead to private health insurance companies dropping abortion coverage leaving millions of women without access to affordable, comprehensive health care.

Currently, 87% of private insurance health care plans offered through employers cover abortion.

If H.R. 7 were to become law, consumer options for private health insurance plans would be unnecessarily restricted and the tax burden on these policy holders would increase significantly.

H.R. 7 would also deny tax credits to small businesses that offer their employees insurance plans that cover abortion, which would have a significant impact on millions of families across the nation who would no longer be able to take advantage of existing tax credits and deductions for the cost of their health care.

For example, small businesses that offer health plans that cover abortions would no longer be eligible for the Small Business Health Tax Credit—potentially worth 35%–50% of the cost of their premiums—threatening 4 million small businesses.

Self-employed Americans who are able to deduct the cost of their comprehensive health insurance from their taxable income will also be denied similar tax credits and face higher taxes.

H.R. 7 would also undermine the District of Columbia's home rule by restricting its use of funds for abortion care to low-income women.

The Hyde Amendment stipulates that no taxpayer dollars are to be used for abortion care, and has narrow exceptions for rape, incest, and health complications that arise from pregnancy which put the mother's life in danger.

H.R. 7 would restrict women's access to reproductive health care even further by narrowing the already stringent requirements set forth in the Hyde Amendment.

When the Affordable Care Act was signed into law, the President issued an Executive Order to "ensure that Federal funds are not used for abortion services."

This version of H.R. 7 goes far beyond the safeguards established under the Affordable Care Act, and sets a dangerous precedent for the future of women's reproductive health in this country because it includes two new provisions that were added at the 11th hour but have never received a hearing or a mark-up.

These new provisions would (1) ban abortion coverage in multi-state health plans available under the ACA; and (2) mandate that health plans mislead consumers about abortion coverage by requiring all plans in the health-insurance exchanges that include abortion coverage to display that fact prominently in all advertising, marketing materials, or information from the insurer but interestingly, does not require the same disclosure from plans that do not cover abortion.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 7 would also force health plans to mislead consumers about the law's treatment of abortion.

As a concession to anti-choice lawmakers, the ACA requires insurance plans participating

in the new health system to segregate monies used for abortion services from all other funds.

In order to aid in identifying these funds and simplify the process of segregating general premium dollars from those used to cover abortion services, the ACA requires that health plans estimate the cost of abortion coverage at no less than \$1 per enrollee per month.

H.R. 7 would require plans covering abortion to misrepresent this practice as an "abortion surcharge," which is to be disclosed and identified as a portion of the consumer's premium.

By describing abortion coverage in this way, H.R. 7 makes it look as though it is an added, extra cost, available only at an additional fee, when in fact it is not.

Taken together, the provisions in H.R. 7 have the effect, and possibly the intent, of arbitrarily infringing women's reproductive freedoms and pose a nationwide threat to the health and wellbeing of American women and a direct challenge to the Supreme Court's ruling in *Roe v. Wade*.

Madam Speaker, one of the most detestable aspects of this bill is that it would curb access to care for women in the most desperate of circumstances.

Women like Danielle Deaver, who was 22 weeks pregnant when her water broke. Tests showed that Danielle had suffered anhydramnios, a premature rupture of the membranes before the fetus has achieved viability.

This condition meant that the fetus likely would be born with a shortening of muscle tissue that results in the inability to move limbs. In addition, Danielle's fetus likely would suffer deformities to the face and head, and the lungs were unlikely to develop beyond the 22-week point.

There was less than a 10% chance that, if born, Danielle's baby would be able to breathe on its own and only a 2% chance the baby would be able to eat on its own.

H.R. 7 hurts women like Vikki Stella, a diabetic, who discovered months into her pregnancy that the fetus she was carrying suffered from several major anomalies and had no chance of survival. Because of Vikki's diabetes, her doctor determined that induced labor and Caesarian section were both riskier procedures for Vikki than an abortion.

Every pregnancy is different. No politician knows, or has the right to assume he knows, what is best for a woman and her family.

These are decisions that properly must be left to women to make, in consultation with their partners, doctors, and their God.

H.R. 7 lacks the necessary exceptions to protect the health and life of the mother.

H.R. 7 is an unconstitutional infringement on the right to privacy, as interpreted by the Supreme Court in a long line of cases going back to *Griswold v. Connecticut* in 1965 and *Roe v. Wade* decided in 1973.

In *Roe v. Wade*, the Court held that a state could not prohibit a woman from exercising her right to terminate a pregnancy in order to protect her health prior to viability.

While many factors go into determining fetal viability, the consensus of the medical community is that viability is acknowledged as not occurring prior to 24 weeks gestation.

Supreme Court precedents make it clear that neither Congress nor a state legislature can declare any one element—"be it weeks of gestation or fetal weight or any other single

factor—as the determinant" of viability. *Colautti v. Franklin*, 439 U.S. 379, 388–89 (1979).

The constitutionally protected right to privacy encompasses the right of women to choose to terminate a pregnancy before viability, and even later where continuing to term poses a threat to her health and safety.

This right of privacy was hard won and must be preserved inviolate.

The bill before us threatens this hard won right for women and must be defeated.

I urge all members to join me in opposing the bill.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL).

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Speaker, I stand with women and men across our country in opposition to H.R. 7, the latest effort from Republican leaders to take the opportunity for women to make choices about their own healthcare decisions.

This weekend, my colleagues and I marched arm in arm with our constituents in women's marches across the country. I heard these Americans, and if you were listening, you would have heard them say, "my body, my choice"; "her body, her choice." This bill ignores the voices of women and male feminists in the United States.

Particularly disturbing, H.R. 7 prevents small businesses that use ACA tax credits from using them to pay for comprehensive health coverage for their employees that includes abortion services. Passage of this bill means the government, whom my colleagues claim is too big, will dramatically expand its role in a woman's healthcare decision.

As we have seen time and time again, restrictions like these disproportionately affect low-income women, younger women, and women of color. All women deserve the ability to make their own healthcare decisions without government interference. It is her body. It is her choice.

I urge my colleagues to recognize the intrusive, unfair, and unequal consequences of H.R. 7.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN), another one of our new, wonderful Members.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Madam Speaker, women's reproductive rights are under attack. We have heard today H.R. 7 disproportionately affects women of color and low-income women, like my family.

Growing up in Carson, California, my two older sisters got pregnant as teenagers—one at 15 and one at 16—so I know from my own family experience and personal experience the importance of being able to make your own choices for your own body and your own beliefs. As a teenager without health insurance, I, like many women in my community, relied on services like Planned Parenthood to access contraception, which I would not have been able to afford otherwise.

Despite what the other side claims, taxpayer dollars do not fund abortion except in cases of rape, incest, or to preserve the life of a mother. Like millions of other women, I am grateful for these services and the opportunity to make decisions that are right for me. I oppose the attack on women's reproductive rights.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, on Saturday, I proudly stood shoulder to shoulder with thousands of strong women and their allies in south Florida. It was one of hundreds of demonstrations across the country and the globe, millions of people in the streets sending a loud message that rang out all across the world.

But the GOP majority has chosen to ignore the calls for women to be able to control their own bodies and their own health care. This bill says to American women: your bodies, Washington's rules.

The majority uses talking points about getting Washington out of health care when they are fighting to kick 32 million people off their insurance, but when it comes to women's bodies, House Republicans are happy to step between a woman and her doctor.

As a man, I have never had to drive across State lines to find a doctor. I have never had my doctor silenced about a medical procedure. As a man, I have never had to endure an invasive and unnecessary procedure to satisfy someone else's twisted political desires. These experiences are all too common for women in America today.

While I and my male colleagues in Congress get to have an open and honest relationship with our doctors, this bill will deepen the ugly fight against women's control of their own bodies. Reproductive rights are women's rights and must be respected. Show that respect by voting "no" on H.R. 7.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, the fad, apparently, this week, is the idea of alternative facts. In other words, if politicians don't like the facts that they have been given or the reality of the situation, then what we should do is we should just come up with new facts; and apparently, the facts in this bill are that, apparently, the other side is worried about taxpayer funding for abortions.

As we have said repeatedly, we don't like this on this side of the aisle, but right now, because of the annual Hyde amendment, there is no taxpayer funding for abortion. We aim to change that because it is probably the most regressive legislation that we have for women's health.

□ 1530

It says that rich women can get the full range of healthcare services they

need, including abortion; but poor women, the women least equipped to be able to raise unwanted children, and certainly not with help from this Congress, are the ones who cannot get those services that they needed.

So I just want to say one more time because I keep hearing the alternative facts over and over, there are right now no taxpayer funding for abortions, something that we need to fix. But this bill takes us the opposite direction. What this bill does is it codifies the Hyde amendment in statute once and for all, and that would bar low-income women from receiving these much-needed services. It codifies the D.C. abortion ban, which would rob the D.C. City Council of giving the healthcare services D.C. women need, even with D.C. tax revenues. It codifies the Helms amendment, which is the same thing as the Hyde amendment for international programs. And perhaps the biggest ban here is it restricts people's ability to buy insurance policies on the healthcare exchanges with their own money that will cover abortion.

I heard from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle over and over again that there are a thousand policies. The lady from South Dakota said that government dollars were supporting abortive procedures. That is just simply not the case. There is no Federal money in the exchanges paying for abortive procedures.

What this bill does is it greatly expands restrictions on women's ability with their own money to buy insurance policies with legal healthcare coverage that they feel that they need. And it says that if you get a subsidy, then you can't get a policy with your own money. That is a vast expansion, and it is well beyond the pale.

It is also, by the way, beyond what the American public says. Because the American public, by 86 percent, says that if you are poor, then politicians should not put their personal views on you and you should be able to get the healthcare coverage that you need. We saw this with the millions of American women and men in Washington and around the country who marched this last weekend. But we see it in the polling. People say, if you are poor, you should be able to get the healthcare coverage you need, not what some politician in Washington tells you.

I have an idea. Every year, around the anniversary of Roe v. Wade and the time that the protestors come to Washington, I don't think that we should debate this futile exercise year after year. I think we should come together across the aisle, Democrats and Republicans, to figure out how we can prevent unwanted pregnancies.

I am getting ready to introduce a bill. I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, including the Republican side, to cosponsor this bill. This bill will expand contraception and family planning services and long-range contraception for all American women so that we can prevent unwanted pregnancies.

In Colorado, we have a program that is called LARC. And what it is is a program where the State helps teen and young women get long-acting contraception so they can prevent unwanted pregnancies. And here is what happened in Colorado when we enacted this very robust and helpful program. According to the data from the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, both the birth rate and abortion rate for women ages 15 to 19 fell 48 percent from 2009 to 2014 because of long-acting contraception, and the same was true for women of the next age group up.

We can do this. We can do this together. Let's start talking about a way to improve women's health instead of to restrict their choices. Vote "no" on this ill-conceived bill.

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

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Madam Speaker, I will vote No on Roll Call No. 65, on H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act of 2017.

Today, just two days after the 44th anniversary of the Roe v. Wade Supreme Court ruling that protects the rights of women to control their own bodies, House Republicans have once again taken up a vote attacking the constitutionally-protected reproductive rights of women all across the nation.

As if this past weekend's Women's March on Washington (which was far more attended than President Trump's own inauguration) didn't signal anything to our elected leaders, President Trump took the GOP's war on women's rights and health a step further by signing an executive order reinstating the 'global gag rule' and blocking foreign aid for international non-governmental organizations that provide basic reproductive health services globally. This decision not only increases abortion rates, it will cause more maternal complications, injuries, and unintended pregnancies and provide less information on HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment programs worldwide.

Republicans continue their shameful, radical assault on women's reproductive health with today's vote on H.R. 7, a discriminatory bill that among other things would prohibit the use of federal funds to pay for any abortion services. Despite the fact that current law already requires that federal funds not be spent on abortions, this bill would prohibit individuals and small businesses from claiming tax credits for any private insurance plans obtained through the ACA Marketplace that include abortion coverage. Families buying their insurance in the Marketplace would also be ineligible to receive a premium tax credits if they enrolled in a health plan that covers abortion, likely resulting in no abortion coverage policies being offered in the Marketplaces. Furthermore, it undermines the District of Columbia's home rule, which allows D.C. to use its own Medicaid funds to offer abortion services. This is despite the fact that 17 states, including California, are currently allowed to do so.

Women should be able to make their own decisions about reproductive health care with dignity and respect, without the interference of politicians or their employers. We should not be in the business of telling women what they can and cannot do with their own bodies. Today's vote is just another step forward in the

Republican party's plan to Make America Sick Again and take away the comprehensive care women deserve.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule. This is about a woman's fundamental right to make her own family planning decisions. The courts have spoken: *Roe v. Wade* is settled law, and a majority of Americans support it. But the Majority would rather roll back the clock by decades, forcing women back into a reality when women could not make their own health care decisions, by restricting insurance coverage. Enough is enough.

We must promote and protect the rights of every woman, every family, every American to make their own family planning decisions, and to have access to a full range of healthcare services.

What we are facing now is not just an attack on the right to abortion. It is not just an attack on women's health. It is an assault on the health and wellbeing of millions of Americans. On Saturday, millions of people across the country marched in support of an agenda that puts women's health decisions in the hands of women and their families—and that ensures safe and affordable access to women's healthcare. This bill flies in the face of the mandate demonstrated this weekend, and I oppose it.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 7, the so-called "No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act of 2017."

The Majority marks the 44th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade* this week with its latest attempt to undo that decision's unequivocal recognition of a woman's constitutionally protected right to choose to terminate a pregnancy.

We must recognize this bill for what it really is. H.R. 7 is yet another attack by the Majority on women's health, a goal it accomplishes in several respects.

To begin with, H.R. 7 would make it virtually impossible for a woman to obtain abortion services even when paid for with purely private, non-Federal funds.

It achieves this end by denying Affordable Care Act tax credits to income-eligible women and small business employers who choose insurance coverage that includes abortion.

Through its novel tax penalty provisions, H.R. 7 departs radically from existing law, taking away women's existing health care and placing their health and lives at risk.

Despite the claims of its sponsors, H.R. 7 does not merely codify current law, but, rather, goes well beyond it to deny women basic health care services.

Moreover, to the extent it bans federal funding of abortion services, H.R. 7 is unnecessary, because such funding is already banned by the Hyde Amendment, and the Affordable Care Act maintains that ban.

For more than 30 years, Congress has prohibited federal funding of abortion, except in cases of rape, incest, or to save the life of the mother, through the Hyde Amendment and similar measures in annual appropriations bills.

Nothing in the Affordable Care Act changes this. That Act does not permit federal funding of abortion, and ensures that only private funds can be used to purchase abortion insurance coverage.

There is absolutely no risk that public money will be used to pay for abortion services.

So what is H.R. 7 really about? Plain and simple, it is part of the Majority's relentless war against women's health and constitutional freedoms.

Members should understand that a vote for H.R. 7 is not a vote to codify existing law. It is, instead, a vote to attack women's health and equality.

Finally, we should reject H.R. 7's permanent restriction on the District of Columbia's use of local funds that Congress has approved.

H.R. 7 not only infringes women's constitutional rights, but also intrudes deeply into local government decision-making by the District.

Women and families who live in the District should not be singled out for additional harm simply because of where they live.

Last Congress, the Obama Administration "strongly oppose[d]" a substantially similar bill, saying the legislation "would intrude on women's reproductive freedom and access to health care; increase the financial burden on many Americans; [and] unnecessarily restrict the private insurance choices that consumers have today."

I agree wholeheartedly with that analysis and, accordingly, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this dangerous bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 7—another radical attempt by House Republicans to attack women's health and limit women's access to comprehensive care.

The real purpose of this bill is to effectively eliminate insurance coverage for abortion services, not only for federally funded coverage, but also for private health insurance by raising taxes on women, their families, and small businesses.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim that this bill just codifies the Hyde Amendment, which already prohibits federal funding for abortion except in limited cases of rape, incest, or to save the life of the mother, and it is already enacted each year in appropriations.

But in reality, this bill goes much further than that. Instead of just limiting the Hyde Amendment's reach to federal funds, this bill would place sweeping restrictions on how women with private insurance can spend their own private dollars when obtaining insurance coverage.

Women and their families who have insurance through the health insurance marketplaces would no longer be entitled to premium tax credits if the plan in which they are enrolled includes abortion coverage. Small business employers would be prohibited from receiving small business tax credits if the insurance provided to employees includes abortion services.

This would mean that women would likely forgo comprehensive coverage in order to retain the premium tax credits they need, and small businesses may limit coverage to ensure they receive small business tax credits. But this is the true goal for proponents of this bill: to effectively eliminate insurance coverage for abortion.

As we speak, Republicans are actively working to dismantle the Affordable Care Act, to restrict access to contraception, and to defund the life-saving health care services provided by Planned Parenthood. It seems that this bill is another page in their playbook to attack women's health. Let me be clear: this bill isn't about ensuring federal funds are not

used for abortion—this bill is about denying women access to coverage Republicans disagree with.

Bringing this bill to the floor only days after millions of women throughout the country marched on behalf of issues like reproductive rights just shows how tone-deaf House Republicans continue to be.

We should be working to protect and expand women's access to comprehensive health care, not considering ways to deny it.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Longstanding federal policy explicitly prohibits the use of federal funds for abortions, except for certain narrow circumstances of rape, incest, or severe health complications that threaten the life of the mother.

The Affordable Care Act (ACA) maintains this ban and a federal appeals court confirmed that no federal dollars may be used to pay for abortion services under the law.

Far more sweeping in scope than the title implies, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act goes well beyond codifying the Hyde Amendment and protecting public funds.

This bill intrudes on women's reproductive autonomy and access to health care, manipulates the tax code to put additional financial burdens on many women and small businesses, and unnecessarily restricts the private insurance choices available to consumers today.

The House of Representatives should be spending our time working to improve access to health care for all Americans, instead of deceptive legislation that interferes with a woman's ability to make personal, private medical decisions.

I urge my colleagues to stop the relentless attacks on women's health and vote against this damaging, unnecessary legislation.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I was proud to join thousands of women in the Women's March, both here in DC and in my home state of Rhode Island.

We marched to demand that women's rights be respected and that women should be trusted to make their own decisions.

However, a mere three days later, the GOP seeks to trample on women's rights by considering H.R. 7, a bill that will deny access to basic healthcare to millions of women.

This bill is also just another pathetic attempt by some politicians in this town to get between a woman and her doctor.

Under current law, no federal money can be used to fund abortion. And it's been that way since 1976.

This bill is a Trojan horse that effectively bans abortion coverage even for women who use their own money to pay for health insurance.

It penalizes small business owners who offer their employees health care coverage for abortion.

And it tells doctors who are employed by the federal government that they can't provide the care that is in the best interests of their patients.

Madam Speaker, the women of this country do not need Congress telling them how to make their health care decisions.

Having an abortion is a decision that should be left between a woman and her doctor.

None of us has a license to legislate our own personal morality in this chamber.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 7. The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 55, the previous question is ordered on the bill. 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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Yes, I am opposed to the bill.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Schakowsky moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end of title I the following new section (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 103. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act may be construed to permit any health plan to charge women higher premiums than men for coverage under such health plan.

Mrs. BLACK (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise to offer the motion to recommit on H.R. 7, the so-called No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act.

The motion to recommit is very simple. It would amend H.R. 7 to say that nothing in this legislation would allow an insurance company to charge women higher premiums than men just because they are women.

In the first few days of the Trump Presidency, we have seen one action after another to discriminate against women, restrict access to health services, and make their care more expensive. We also know that Republicans are determined to repeal the Affordable Care Act, which would, once again, allow insurance companies to discriminate against women.

Repealing the ACA would be a triple whammy for women. Not only would they have to pay more for their insurance, but their insurance would be less likely to cover the services they need. And these higher costs will take a bigger chunk out of their budget.

Before the ACA, insurers were able to exclude services critical to women's health. And we are not just talking about preexisting conditions, which, by the way, often included having a baby or being the victim of domestic violence.

The benefit package itself left out medical care critical to women. Only 12

percent of plans in the individual market offered maternity coverage. And some insurance plans that offered that coverage imposed waiting periods of a year or charges of up to \$10,000 just for maternity care. And even when maternity care was excluded from any insurance plan, insurers still used gender rating to discriminate against women, charging women more just because they were women, regardless of their benefits. Being a woman was a pre-existing condition.

Thankfully, the ACA prohibits gender rating. Before the ACA, women were forced to pay between 10 to 57 percent more than men for essentially the same insurance. In my home State of Illinois, women were charged 55 percent more than men for the same coverage. In fact, a 2012 National Women's Law Center study found that 92 percent of best-selling insurance plans were gender rated.

A 25-year-old woman in Arkansas was charged 81 percent more than a man for similar coverage. A 40-year-old woman in South Dakota was charged over \$1,200 more a year than a 40-year-old man for the same coverage. In Kentucky, women were charged 57 percent more than men for the same coverage. In Texas, they were charged 56 percent more. In Indiana, they were charged 54 percent more. And the list goes on.

This study even found that over half of all insurance plans charged women who didn't smoke significantly higher premiums than men of the same age who did smoke. Overall, gender rating cost American women about \$1 billion a year. It also harmed businesses with predominantly female employees who were routinely charged more for their insurance coverage.

Finally, charging women more for health care is even more devastating when you take into account that women still make only 77 cents to the dollar compared to men. We cannot go back to the days when insurance companies were free to discriminate against women. But that is exactly what Republicans want to do. They want women to pay more for insurance coverage that doesn't include the services they need.

So I am asking my colleagues to support the motion to recommit and protect women from discrimination by insurance companies.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, today I am simply asking my colleagues across the aisle not to flip-flop on this issue. This legislation isn't just the right thing to do; it also has broad support.

Polling shows that 6 in 10 Americans agree that taxpayer dollars should not fund abortions. Despite this fact, a nonpartisan government study found that abortions could be funded with taxpayer dollars through ObamaCare, and this demands a response.

Today we have an opportunity to invest in women's health over abortion by passing H.R. 7 and making the Hyde amendment permanent and governmentwide.

I urge my colleagues to reject this motion to recommit and to vote "yes" on H.R. 7.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY RESEARCH AND INNOVATION ACT

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 589) to establish Department of Energy policy for science and energy research and development programs, and reform National Laboratory management and technology transfer programs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 589

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Department of Energy Research and Innovation Act".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—LABORATORY MODERNIZATION AND TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. Inclusion of early stage technology demonstration in authorized technology transfer activities.

Sec. 103. Sense of Congress on accelerating energy innovation.

Sec. 104. Restoration of laboratory directed research and development program.

Sec. 105. Research grants database.

Sec. 106. Technology transfer and transitions assessment.

Sec. 107. Agreements for commercializing technology pilot program.

Sec. 108. Short-term cost-share pilot program.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY RESEARCH COORDINATION

Sec. 201. Short title.

Sec. 202. Protection of information.
 Sec. 203. Crosscutting research and development.
 Sec. 204. Strategic research portfolio analysis and coordination plan.
 Sec. 205. Strategy for facilities and infrastructure.
 Sec. 206. Energy Innovation Hubs.

**TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
 OFFICE OF SCIENCE POLICY**

Sec. 301. Short title.
 Sec. 302. Mission.
 Sec. 303. Basic energy sciences.
 Sec. 304. Advanced scientific computing research.
 Sec. 305. High-energy physics.
 Sec. 306. Biological and environmental research.
 Sec. 307. Fusion energy.
 Sec. 308. Nuclear physics.
 Sec. 309. Science laboratories infrastructure program.

**TITLE IV—NUCLEAR ENERGY
 INNOVATION CAPABILITIES**

Sec. 401. Short title.
 Sec. 402. Nuclear energy innovation capabilities.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **DEPARTMENT.**—The term “Department” means the Department of Energy.

(2) **DIRECTOR.**—The term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Science of the Department, except as otherwise indicated.

(3) **NATIONAL LABORATORY.**—The term “National Laboratory” has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801).

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Energy.

**TITLE I—LABORATORY MODERNIZATION
 AND TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER**

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act”.

SEC. 102. INCLUSION OF EARLY STAGE TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION IN AUTHORIZED TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER ACTIVITIES.

Section 1001 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16391) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g) **EARLY STAGE TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION.**—The Secretary shall permit the directors of the National Laboratories to use funds authorized to support technology transfer within the Department to carry out early stage and precommercial technology demonstration activities to remove technology barriers that limit private sector interest and demonstrate potential commercial applications of any research and technologies arising from National Laboratory activities.”.

SEC. 103. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ACCELERATING ENERGY INNOVATION.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) although important progress has been made in cost reduction and deployment of clean energy technologies, accelerating clean energy innovation will help meet critical competitiveness, energy security, and environmental goals;

(2) accelerating the pace of clean energy innovation in the United States calls for—

(A) supporting existing research and development programs at the Department and the world-class National Laboratories;

(B) exploring and developing new pathways for innovators, investors, and decision-makers to leverage the resources of the Department for addressing the challenges and comparative strengths of geographic regions; and

(C) recognizing the financial constraints of the Department, regularly reviewing clean energy programs to ensure that taxpayer investments are maximized;

(3) the energy supply, demand, policies, markets, and resource options of the United States vary by geographic region;

(4) a regional approach to innovation can bridge the gaps between local talent, institutions, and industries to identify opportunities and convert United States investment into domestic companies; and

(5) Congress, the Secretary, and energy industry participants should advance efforts that promote international, domestic, and regional cooperation on the research and development of energy innovations that—

(A) provide clean, affordable, and reliable energy for everyone;

(B) promote economic growth;

(C) are critical for energy security; and

(D) are sustainable without government support.

SEC. 104. RESTORATION OF LABORATORY DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary shall ensure that laboratory operating contractors do not allocate costs of general and administrative overhead to laboratory directed research and development.

(b) **EXCEPTION FOR NATIONAL SECURITY LABORATORIES.**—This section shall not apply to the national security laboratories with respect to which section 3119 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328) applies.

SEC. 105. RESEARCH GRANTS DATABASE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall establish and maintain a public database, accessible on the website of the Department, that contains a searchable listing of each unclassified research and development project contract, grant, cooperative agreement, task order for a federally funded research and development center, or other transaction administered by the Department.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Each listing described in subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, for each listed project, the Department office carrying out the project, the project name, an abstract or summary of the project, funding levels, project duration, contractor or grantee name (including the names of any subcontractors), and expected objectives and milestones.

(c) **RELEVANT LITERATURE AND PATENTS.**—The Secretary shall provide information through the public database established under subsection (a) on relevant literature and patents that are associated with each research and development project contract, grant, or cooperative agreement, or other transaction, of the Department.

SEC. 106. TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER AND TRANSITIONS ASSESSMENT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and as often as the Secretary determines to be necessary thereafter, the Secretary shall transmit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that includes recommended changes to the policy of the Department and legislative changes to section 1001 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16391) to improve the ability of the Department to successfully transfer new energy technologies to the private sector.

SEC. 107. AGREEMENTS FOR COMMERCIALIZING TECHNOLOGY PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out the Agreements for Commercializing Technology pilot program of the Department, as announced by the Secretary on December 8, 2011, in accordance with this section.

(b) **TERMS.**—Each agreement entered into pursuant to the pilot program referred to in

subsection (a) shall provide to the contractor of the applicable National Laboratory, to the maximum extent determined to be appropriate by the Secretary, increased authority to negotiate contract terms, such as intellectual property rights, payment structures, performance guarantees, and multiparty collaborations.

(c) **ELIGIBILITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any director of a National Laboratory may enter into an agreement pursuant to the pilot program referred to in subsection (a).

(2) **AGREEMENTS WITH NON-FEDERAL ENTITIES.**—To carry out paragraph (1) and subject to paragraph (3), the Secretary shall permit the directors of the National Laboratories to execute agreements with a non-Federal entity, including a non-Federal entity already receiving Federal funding that will be used to support activities under agreements executed pursuant to paragraph (1), provided that such funding is solely used to carry out the purposes of the Federal award.

(3) **RESTRICTION.**—The requirements of chapter 18 of title 35, United States Code (commonly known as the “Bayh-Dole Act”) shall apply if—

(A) the agreement is a funding agreement (as that term is defined in section 201 of that title); and

(B) at least one of the parties to the funding agreement is eligible to receive rights under that chapter.

(d) **SUBMISSION TO SECRETARY.**—Each affected director of a National Laboratory shall submit to the Secretary, with respect to each agreement entered into under this section—

(1) a summary of information relating to the relevant project;

(2) the total estimated costs of the project;

(3) estimated commencement and completion dates of the project; and

(4) other documentation determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.

(e) **CERTIFICATION.**—The Secretary shall require the contractor of the affected National Laboratory to certify that each activity carried out under a project for which an agreement is entered into under this section—

(1) is not in direct competition with the private sector; and

(2) does not present, or minimizes, any apparent conflict of interest, and avoids or neutralizes any actual conflict of interest, as a result of the agreement under this section.

(f) **EXTENSION.**—The pilot program referred to in subsection (a) shall be extended until September 30, 2019.

(g) **REPORTS.**—

(1) **OVERALL ASSESSMENT.**—Not later than 60 days after the date described in subsection (f), the Secretary, in coordination with directors of the National Laboratories, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that—

(A) assesses the overall effectiveness of the pilot program referred to in subsection (a);

(B) identifies opportunities to improve the effectiveness of the pilot program;

(C) assesses the potential for program activities to interfere with the responsibilities of the National Laboratories to the Department; and

(D) provides a recommendation regarding the future of the pilot program.

(2) **TRANSPARENCY.**—The Secretary, in coordination with directors of the National Laboratories, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an annual report that accounts for all incidences of, and provides a justification for, non-Federal entities using funds derived from a Federal contract or award to carry out agreements pursuant to this section.

SEC. 108. SHORT-TERM COST-SHARE PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 988(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16352(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3)” and inserting “Except as provided in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) EXEMPTION FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND OTHER NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a research or development activity performed by an institution of higher education or nonprofit institution (as defined in section 4 of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3703)).

“(B) TERMINATION DATE.—The exemption under subparagraph (A) shall apply during the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this paragraph.”.

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) INITIAL REPORT.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that describes the use of cost-sharing waivers by the Department under section 988(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16352(b)) during the 2-year period ending on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Annually during the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that describes the use of cost-sharing waivers by the Department under section 988(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16352(b)) during the period covered by the report.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY RESEARCH COORDINATION

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Department of Energy Research Coordination Act”.

SEC. 202. PROTECTION OF INFORMATION.

Section 5012 of the America Competes Act (42 U.S.C. 16538) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3), by striking “subsection (n)(1)” and inserting “subsection (o)(1)”; and

(2) by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (o); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (m) the following:

“(n) PROTECTION OF INFORMATION.—The following types of information collected by ARPA-E from recipients of financial assistance awards shall be considered commercial and financial information obtained from a person and privileged or confidential and not subject to disclosure under section 552(b)(4) of title 5, United States Code:

“(1) Plans for commercialization of technologies developed under the award, including business plans, technology-to-market plans, market studies, and cost and performance models.

“(2) Investments provided to an awardee from third parties (such as venture capital firms, hedge funds, and private equity firms), including amounts and the percentage of ownership of the awardee provided in return for the investments.

“(3) Additional financial support that the awardee—

“(A) plans to or has invested into the technology developed under the award; or

“(B) is seeking from third parties.

“(4) Revenue from the licensing or sale of new products or services resulting from research conducted under the award.”.

SEC. 203. CROSSCUTTING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall use the capabilities of the Department to identify strategic opportunities for collaborative research, development, demonstration, and commercial application of innovative science and technologies.

(b) EXISTING PROGRAMS; COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall seek—

(1) to leverage existing programs of the Department; and

(2) to consolidate and coordinate activities throughout the Department to promote collaboration and crosscutting approaches within programs of the Department.

(c) ADDITIONAL ACTIONS.—The Secretary shall—

(1) prioritize activities that use all affordable domestic resources;

(2) develop a planning, evaluation, and technical assessment framework for setting objective long-term strategic goals and evaluating progress that—

(A) ensures integrity and independence; and

(B) provides the flexibility to adapt to market dynamics;

(3) ensure that activities shall be undertaken in a manner that does not duplicate other activities within the Department or other Federal Government activities; and

(4) identify programs that may be more effectively left to the States, industry, non-governmental organizations, institutions of higher education, or other stakeholders.

SEC. 204. STRATEGIC RESEARCH PORTFOLIO ANALYSIS AND COORDINATION PLAN.

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 is amended by striking section 994 (42 U.S.C. 16358) and inserting the following:

“SEC. 994. STRATEGIC RESEARCH PORTFOLIO ANALYSIS AND COORDINATION PLAN.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall periodically review all of the science and technology activities of the Department in a strategic framework that takes into account—

“(1) the frontiers of science to which the Department can contribute;

“(2) the national needs relevant to the statutory missions of the Department; and

“(3) global energy dynamics.

“(b) COORDINATION ANALYSIS AND PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As part of the review under subsection (a), the Secretary shall develop a plan to improve coordination and collaboration in research, development, demonstration, and commercial application activities across organizational boundaries of the Department.

(2) PLAN CONTENTS.—The plan developed under paragraph (1) shall describe—

“(A) crosscutting scientific and technical issues and research questions that span more than 1 program or major office of the Department;

“(B) ways in which the applied technology programs of the Department are coordinating activities and addressing the questions referred to in subparagraph (A);

“(C) ways in which the technical interchange within the Department, particularly between the Office of Science and the applied technology programs, could be enhanced, including ways in which the research agendas of the Office of Science and the applied programs could better interact and assist each other;

“(D) ways in which the Secretary would ensure that the overall research agenda of the Department includes, in addition to fundamental, curiosity-driven research, fundamental research related to topics of concern to the applied programs, and applications in

Departmental technology programs of research results generated by fundamental, curiosity-driven research;

“(E) critical assessments of any ongoing programs that have experienced subpar performance or cost overruns of 10 percent or more over 1 or more years;

“(F) any activities that may be more effectively left to the States, industry, non-governmental organizations, institutions of higher education, or other stakeholders; and

“(G) detailed evaluations and proposals for innovation hubs, institutes, and research centers of the Department, including—

“(i) an affirmation that the hubs, institutes, and research centers will—

“(I) advance the mission of the Department; and

“(II) prioritize research, development, and demonstration; and

“(ii) an affirmation that any hubs, institutes, or research centers that are established or renewed within the Office of Science are consistent with the mission of the Office of Science described in subsection (c) of section 209 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7139).

“(c) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Every 4 years, the Secretary shall submit to Congress—

“(1) the results of the review under subsection (a); and

“(2) the coordination plan under subsection (b).”.

SEC. 205. STRATEGY FOR FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Section 993 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16357) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and inserting the following: “strategy for facilities and infrastructure”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “2008” and inserting “2018”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 is amended by striking the item relating to section 993 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 993. Strategy for facilities and infrastructure.”.

SEC. 206. ENERGY INNOVATION HUBS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADVANCED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY.—The term “advanced energy technology” means—

(A) an innovative technology—

(i) that produces energy from solar, wind, geothermal, biomass, tidal, wave, ocean, or other renewable energy resources;

(ii) that produces nuclear energy;

(iii) for carbon capture and sequestration;

(iv) that enables advanced vehicles, vehicle components, and related technologies that result in significant energy savings;

(v) that generates, transmits, distributes, uses, or stores energy more efficiently than conventional technologies, including through Smart Grid technologies; or

(vi) that enhances the energy independence and security of the United States by enabling improved or expanded supply and production of domestic energy resources, including coal, oil, and natural gas;

(B) a research, development, demonstration, or commercial application activity necessary to ensure the long-term, secure, and sustainable supply of an energy-critical element; or

(C) any other innovative energy technology area identified by the Secretary.

(2) HUB.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “Hub” means an Energy Innovation Hub established under this section.

(B) INCLUSION.—The term “Hub” includes any Energy Innovation Hub in existence on the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) **QUALIFYING ENTITY.**—The term “qualifying entity” means—

- (A) an institution of higher education;
- (B) an appropriate State or Federal entity, including a federally funded research and development center of the Department;
- (C) a nongovernmental organization with expertise in advanced energy technology research, development, demonstration, or commercial application; or
- (D) any other relevant entity the Secretary determines appropriate.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out a program to enhance the economic, environmental, and energy security of the United States by making awards to consortia for establishing and operating hubs, to be known as “Energy Innovation Hubs”, to conduct and support, at, if practicable, 1 centralized location, multidisciplinary, collaborative research, development, demonstration, and commercial application of advanced energy technologies.

(2) **TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT FOCUS.**—The Secretary shall designate for each Hub a unique advanced energy technology or basic research focus.

(3) **COORDINATION.**—The Secretary shall ensure the coordination of, and avoid unnecessary duplication of, the activities of each Hub with the activities of—

(A) other research entities of the Department, including the National Laboratories, the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy, and Energy Frontier Research Centers; and

(B) industry.

(c) **APPLICATION PROCESS.**—

(1) **ELIGIBILITY.**—To be eligible to receive an award for the establishment and operation of a Hub under subsection (b)(1), a consortium shall—

(A) be composed of not fewer than 2 qualifying entities;

(B) operate subject to a binding agreement, entered into by each member of the consortium, that documents—

(i) the proposed partnership agreement, including the governance and management structure of the Hub;

(ii) measures the consortium will undertake to enable cost-effective implementation of activities under the program described in subsection (b)(1); and

(iii) a proposed budget, including financial contributions from non-Federal sources; and

(C) operate as a nonprofit organization.

(2) **APPLICATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A consortium seeking to establish and operate a Hub under subsection (b)(1) shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including a detailed description of each element of the consortium agreement required under paragraph (1)(B).

(B) **REQUIREMENT.**—If the consortium members will not be located at 1 centralized location, the application under subparagraph (A) shall include a communications plan that ensures close coordination and integration of Hub activities.

(3) **SELECTION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall select consortia for awards for the establishment and operation of Hubs through a competitive selection process.

(B) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In selecting consortia under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall consider—

(i) the information disclosed by the consortium under this subsection; and

(ii) any existing facilities a consortium will provide for Hub activities.

(d) **TERM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An award made to a Hub under this section shall be for a period of not

more than 5 years, subject to the availability of appropriations, after which the award may be renewed, subject to a rigorous merit review.

(2) **EXISTING HUBS.**—A Hub already in existence on, or undergoing a renewal process on, the date of enactment of this Act—

(A) may continue to receive support during the 5-year period beginning on the date of establishment of that Hub; and

(B) shall be eligible for renewal of that support at the end of that 5-year period.

(e) **HUB OPERATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each Hub shall conduct or provide for multidisciplinary, collaborative research, development, demonstration, and commercial application of advanced energy technologies within the technology development focus designated under subsection (b)(2).

(2) **ACTIVITIES.**—Each Hub shall—

(A) encourage collaboration and communication among the member qualifying entities of the consortium and awardees;

(B) develop and publish proposed plans and programs on a publicly accessible website;

(C) submit an annual report to the Department summarizing the activities of the Hub, including—

(i) detailing organizational expenditures; and

(ii) describing each project undertaken by the Hub; and

(D) monitor project implementation and coordination.

(3) **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.**—Each Hub shall maintain conflict of interest procedures, consistent with the conflict of interest procedures of the Department.

(4) **PROHIBITION ON CONSTRUCTION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B)—

(i) no funds provided under this section may be used for construction of new buildings or facilities for Hubs; and

(ii) construction of new buildings or facilities shall not be considered as part of the non-Federal share of a Hub cost-sharing agreement.

(B) **TEST BED AND RENOVATION EXCEPTION.**—Nothing in this paragraph prohibits the use of funds provided under this section or non-Federal cost share funds for the construction of a test bed or renovations to existing buildings or facilities for the purposes of research if the Secretary determines that the test bed or renovations are limited to a scope and scale necessary for the research to be conducted.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY OFFICE OF SCIENCE POLICY

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Department of Energy Office of Science Policy Act”.

SEC. 302. MISSION.

Section 209 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7139) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **MISSION.**—The mission of the Office of Science shall be the delivery of scientific discoveries, capabilities, and major scientific tools to transform the understanding of nature and to advance the energy, economic, and national security of the United States.”.

SEC. 303. BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES.

(a) **ENERGY FRONTIER RESEARCH CENTERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall carry out a program to provide awards, on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis, to multi-institutional collaborations or other appropriate entities to conduct fundamental and use-inspired energy research to accelerate scientific breakthroughs.

(2) **COLLABORATIONS.**—A collaboration receiving an award under this subsection may include multiple types of institutions and private sector entities.

(3) **SELECTION AND DURATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A collaboration under this subsection shall be selected for a period of 4 years.

(B) **EXISTING CENTERS.**—An Energy Frontier Research Center in existence and supported by the Director on the date of enactment of this Act may continue to receive support for a period of 4 years beginning on the date of establishment of that center.

(C) **REAPPLICATION.**—After the end of the period described in subparagraph (A) or (B), as applicable, a recipient of an award may reapply for selection on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis.

(D) **TERMINATION.**—Consistent with the existing authorities of the Department, the Director may terminate an underperforming center for cause during the performance period.

(4) **NO FUNDING FOR CONSTRUCTION.**—No funding provided pursuant to this subsection may be used for the construction of new buildings or facilities.

(b) **BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES USER FACILITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall carry out a program for the development, construction, operation, and maintenance of national user facilities.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—To the maximum extent practicable, the national user facilities developed, constructed, operated, or maintained under paragraph (1) shall serve the needs of the Department, industry, the academic community, and other relevant entities to create and examine materials and chemical processes for the purpose of improving the competitiveness of the United States.

(3) **INCLUDED FACILITIES.**—The national user facilities developed, constructed, operated, or maintained under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) x-ray light sources;

(B) neutron sources;

(C) nanoscale science research centers; and

(D) such other facilities as the Director considers appropriate, consistent with section 209 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7139).

(c) **ACCELERATOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**—The Director shall carry out research and development on advanced accelerator and storage ring technologies relevant to the development of basic energy sciences user facilities, in consultation with the High Energy Physics and Nuclear Physics programs of the Office of Science.

(d) **SOLAR FUELS RESEARCH INITIATIVE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 973 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16313) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 973. SOLAR FUELS RESEARCH INITIATIVE.

“(a) **INITIATIVE.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out a research initiative, to be known as the ‘Solar Fuels Research Initiative’ (referred to in this section as the ‘Initiative’) to expand theoretical and fundamental knowledge of photochemistry, electrochemistry, biochemistry, and materials science useful for the practical development of experimental systems to convert solar energy to chemical energy.

“(2) **LEVERAGING.**—In carrying out programs and activities under the Initiative, the Secretary shall leverage expertise and resources from—

“(A) the Basic Energy Sciences Program and the Biological and Environmental Research Program of the Office of Science; and

“(B) the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

“(3) **TEAMS.**—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the Initiative, the Secretary shall organize activities among multidisciplinary teams to leverage, to the maximum extent practicable, expertise from the National Laboratories, institutions of higher education, and the private sector.

“(B) GOALS.—The multidisciplinary teams described in subparagraph (A) shall pursue aggressive, milestone-driven, basic research goals.

“(C) RESOURCES.—The Secretary shall provide sufficient resources to the multidisciplinary teams described in subparagraph (A) to achieve the goals described in subparagraph (B) over a period of time to be determined by the Secretary.

“(4) ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary may organize additional activities under this subsection through Energy Frontier Research Centers, Energy Innovation Hubs, or other organizational structures.

“(b) ARTIFICIAL PHOTOSYNTHESIS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out under the Initiative a program to support research needed to bridge scientific barriers to, and discover knowledge relevant to, artificial photosynthetic systems.

“(2) ACTIVITIES.—As part of the program described in paragraph (1)—

“(A) the Director of the Office of Basic Energy Sciences shall support basic research to pursue distinct lines of scientific inquiry, including—

“(i) photoinduced production of hydrogen and oxygen from water; and

“(ii) the sustainable photoinduced reduction of carbon dioxide to fuel products including hydrocarbons, alcohols, carbon monoxide, and natural gas; and

“(B) the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy shall support translational research, development, and validation of physical concepts developed under the program.

“(3) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—The Secretary shall review activities carried out under the program described in paragraph (1) to determine the achievement of technical milestones.

“(4) PROHIBITION.—No funds allocated to the program described in paragraph (1) may be obligated or expended for commercial application of energy technology.

“(c) BIOCHEMISTRY, REPLICATION OF NATURAL PHOTOSYNTHESIS, AND RELATED PROCESSES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out under the Initiative a program to support research needed to replicate natural photosynthetic processes by use of artificial photosynthetic components and materials.

“(2) ACTIVITIES.—As part of the program described in paragraph (1)—

“(A) the Director of the Office of Basic Energy Sciences shall support basic research to expand fundamental knowledge to replicate natural synthesis processes, including—

“(i) the photoinduced reduction of dinitrogen to ammonia;

“(ii) the absorption of carbon dioxide from ambient air;

“(iii) molecular-based charge separation and storage;

“(iv) photoinitiated electron transfer; and

“(v) catalysis in biological or biomimetic systems;

“(B) the Associate Director of Biological and Environmental Research shall support systems biology and genomics approaches to understand genetic and physiological pathways connected to photosynthetic mechanisms; and

“(C) the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy shall support translational research, development, and validation of physical concepts developed under the program.

“(3) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—The Secretary shall review activities carried out under the program described in paragraph (1) to determine the achievement of technical milestones.

“(4) PROHIBITION.—No funds allocated to the program described in paragraph (1) may be obligated or expended for commercial application of energy technology.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Energy Policy Act of 2005 is amended by striking the item relating to section 973 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 973. Solar fuels research initiative.”

(e) ELECTRICITY STORAGE RESEARCH INITIATIVE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 975 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16315) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 975. ELECTRICITY STORAGE RESEARCH INITIATIVE.

“(a) INITIATIVE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a research initiative, to be known as the ‘Electricity Storage Research Initiative’ (referred to in this section as the ‘Initiative’)—

“(A) to expand theoretical and fundamental knowledge to control, store, and convert—

“(i) electrical energy to chemical energy; and

“(ii) chemical energy to electrical energy; and

“(B) to support scientific inquiry into the practical understanding of chemical and physical processes that occur within systems involving crystalline and amorphous solids, polymers, and organic and aqueous liquids.

“(2) LEVERAGING.—In carrying out programs and activities under the Initiative, the Secretary shall leverage expertise and resources from—

“(A) the Basic Energy Sciences Program, the Advanced Scientific Computing Research Program, and the Biological and Environmental Research Program of the Office of Science; and

“(B) the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

“(3) TEAMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the Initiative, the Secretary shall organize activities among multidisciplinary teams to leverage, to the maximum extent practicable, expertise from the National Laboratories, institutions of higher education, and the private sector.

“(B) GOALS.—The multidisciplinary teams described in subparagraph (A) shall pursue aggressive, milestone-driven, basic research goals.

“(C) RESOURCES.—The Secretary shall provide sufficient resources to the multidisciplinary teams described in subparagraph (A) to achieve the goals described in subparagraph (B) over a period of time to be determined by the Secretary.

“(4) ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary may organize additional activities under this subsection through Energy Frontier Research Centers, Energy Innovation Hubs, or other organizational structures.

“(b) MULTIVALENT SYSTEMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out under the Initiative a program to support research needed to bridge scientific barriers to, and discover knowledge relevant to, multivalent ion materials in electric energy storage systems.

“(2) ACTIVITIES.—As part of the program described in paragraph (1)—

“(A) the Director of the Office of Basic Energy Sciences shall investigate electrochemical properties and the dynamics of materials, including charge transfer phenomena and mass transport in materials; and

“(B) the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy shall support translational research, development, and validation of physical concepts developed under the program.

“(3) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—The Secretary shall review activities carried out under the program described in paragraph (1) to determine the achievement of technical milestones.

“(4) PROHIBITION.—No funds allocated to the program described in paragraph (1) may be obligated or expended for commercial application of energy technology.

“(c) ELECTROCHEMISTRY MODELING AND SIMULATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out under the Initiative a program to support research to model and simulate organic electrolytes, including the static and dynamic electrochemical behavior and phenomena of organic electrolytes at the molecular and atomic level in monovalent and multivalent systems.

“(2) ACTIVITIES.—As part of the program described in paragraph (1)—

“(A) the Director of the Office of Basic Energy Sciences, in coordination with the Associate Director of Advanced Scientific Computing Research, shall support the development of high performance computational tools through a joint development process to maximize the effectiveness of current and projected high performance computing systems; and

“(B) the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy shall support translational research, development, and validation of physical concepts developed under the program.

“(3) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—The Secretary shall review activities carried out under the program described in paragraph (1) to determine the achievement of technical milestones.

“(4) PROHIBITION.—No funds allocated to the program described in paragraph (1) may be obligated or expended for commercial application of energy technology.

“(d) MESOSCALE ELECTROCHEMISTRY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out under the Initiative a program to support research needed to reveal electrochemistry in confined mesoscale spaces, including scientific discoveries relevant to—

“(A) bio-electrochemistry and electrochemical energy conversion and storage in confined spaces; and

“(B) the dynamics of the phenomena described in subparagraph (A).

“(2) ACTIVITIES.—As part of the program described in paragraph (1)—

“(A) the Director of the Office of Basic Energy Sciences and the Associate Director of Biological and Environmental Research shall investigate phenomena of mesoscale electrochemical confinement for the purpose of replicating and controlling new electrochemical behavior; and

“(B) the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy shall support translational research, development, and validation of physical concepts developed under the program.

“(3) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—The Secretary shall review activities carried out under the program described in paragraph (1) to determine the achievement of technical milestones.

“(4) PROHIBITION.—No funds allocated to the program described in paragraph (1) may be obligated or expended for commercial application of energy technology.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Energy Policy Act of 2005 is amended by striking the item relating to section 975 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 975. Electricity storage research initiative.”.

SEC. 304. ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING RESEARCH.

(a) AMERICAN SUPER COMPUTING LEADERSHIP.—

(1) RENAMING OF ACT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 1 of the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 5501 note; Public Law 108-423) is amended by striking “Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004” and inserting “American Super Computing Leadership Act of 2017”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 976(a)(1) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16316(1)) is amended by striking “Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004” and inserting “American Super Computing Leadership Act of 2017”.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2 of the American Super Computing Leadership Act of 2017 (15 U.S.C. 5541) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (5) as paragraphs (3) through (6), respectively;

(B) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) DEPARTMENT.—The term ‘Department’ means the Department of Energy.

“(2) EXASCALE COMPUTING.—The term ‘exascale computing’ means computing through the use of a computing machine that performs near or above 10 to the 18th power operations per second.”; and

(C) in paragraph (6) (as redesignated by subparagraph (A)), by striking “, acting through the Director of the Office of Science of the Department of Energy”.

(3) DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY HIGH-END COMPUTING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.—Section 3 of the American Super Computing Leadership Act of 2017 (15 U.S.C. 5542) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “program” and inserting “coordinated program across the Department”;

(B) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “, which may” and all that follows through “architectures”; and

(C) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

“(d) EXASCALE COMPUTING PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a research program (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Program’) for exascale computing, including the development of 2 or more exascale computing machine architectures, to promote the missions of the Department.

“(2) EXECUTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the Program, the Secretary shall—

“(i) establish 2 or more National Laboratory partnerships with industry partners and institutions of higher education for the research and development of 2 or more exascale computing architectures across all applicable organizations of the Department;

“(ii) conduct mission-related codesign activities in developing the exascale computing architectures under clause (i);

“(iii) develop such advancements in hardware and software technology as are required to fully realize the potential of an exascale production system in addressing Department target applications and solving scientific problems involving predictive modeling and simulation and large scale data analytics and management;

“(iv) explore the use of exascale computing technologies to advance a broad range of science and engineering; and

“(v) provide, as appropriate, on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis, access for researchers in industries in the United States,

institutions of higher education, National Laboratories, and other Federal agencies to the exascale computing systems developed pursuant to clause (i).

“(B) SELECTION OF PARTNERS.—The Secretary shall select the partnerships with the computing facilities of the Department under subparagraph (A) through a competitive, peer-review process.

“(3) CODESIGN AND APPLICATION DEVELOPMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

“(i) carry out the Program through an integration of applications, computer science, applied mathematics, and computer hardware architecture using the partnerships established pursuant to paragraph (2) to ensure that, to the maximum extent practicable, 2 or more exascale computing machine architectures are capable of solving Department target applications and broader scientific problems, including predictive modeling and simulation and large scale data analytics and management; and

“(ii) conduct outreach programs to increase the readiness for the use of such platforms by domestic industries, including manufacturers.

“(B) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing—

“(i) how the integration under subparagraph (A) is furthering application science data and computational workloads across application interests, including national security, material science, physical science, cybersecurity, biological science, the Materials Genome and BRAIN Initiatives of the President, advanced manufacturing, and the national electric grid; and

“(ii) the roles and responsibilities of National Laboratories and industry, including the definition of the roles and responsibilities within the Department to ensure an integrated program across the Department.

“(4) PROJECT REVIEW.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The exascale architectures developed pursuant to partnerships established pursuant to paragraph (2) shall be reviewed through a project review process.

“(B) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on—

“(i) the results of the review conducted under subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) the coordination and management of the Program to ensure an integrated research program across the Department.

“(5) ANNUAL REPORTS.—At the time of the budget submission of the Department for each fiscal year, the Secretary, in consultation with the members of the partnerships established pursuant to paragraph (2), shall submit to Congress a report that describes funding for the Program as a whole by functional element of the Department and critical milestones.”.

(b) HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTING AND NETWORKING RESEARCH.—The Director shall support research in high-performance computing and networking relevant to energy applications, including modeling, simulation, and advanced data analytics for basic and applied energy research programs carried out by the Secretary.

(c) APPLIED MATHEMATICS AND SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT FOR HIGH-END COMPUTING SYSTEMS.—The Director shall carry out activities to develop, test, and support—

(1) mathematics, models, and algorithms for complex systems and programming environments; and

(2) tools, languages, and operating systems for high-end computing systems (as defined in section 2 of the American Super Computing Leadership Act of 2017 (15 U.S.C. 5541)).

SEC. 305. HIGH-ENERGY PHYSICS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Director should incorporate the findings and recommendations of the report of the Particle Physics Project Prioritization Panel entitled “Building for Discovery: Strategic Plan for U.S. Particle Physics in the Global Context” into the planning process of the Department; and

(2) the nations that lead in particle physics by hosting international teams dedicated to a common scientific goal attract the world’s best talent and inspire future generations of physicists and technologists.

(b) INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION.—The Director, as practicable and in coordination with other appropriate Federal agencies as necessary, shall ensure the access of United States researchers to the most advanced accelerator facilities and research capabilities in the world, including the Large Hadron Collider.

(c) NEUTRINO RESEARCH.—The Director shall carry out research activities on rare decay processes and the nature of the neutrino, which may include collaborations with the National Science Foundation or international collaborations.

(d) DARK ENERGY AND DARK MATTER RESEARCH.—The Director shall carry out research activities on the nature of dark energy and dark matter, which may include collaborations with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration or the National Science Foundation; or international collaborations.

SEC. 306. BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH.

(a) BIOLOGICAL SYSTEMS.—The Director shall carry out research and development activities in fundamental, structural, computational, and systems biology to increase systems-level understanding of the complex biological systems, which may include activities—

(1) to accelerate breakthroughs and new knowledge that would enable the cost-effective, sustainable production of—

(A) biomass-based liquid transportation fuels;

(B) bioenergy; and

(C) biobased materials;

(2) to improve understanding of the global carbon cycle, including processes for removing carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, through photosynthesis and other biological processes, for sequestration and storage; and

(3) to understand the biological mechanisms used to transform, immobilize, or remove contaminants from subsurface environments.

(b) LIMITATION FOR RESEARCH FUNDS.—The Director shall not approve new climate science-related initiatives without making a determination that such work is well-coordinated with any relevant work carried out by other Federal agencies.

(c) LOW-DOSE RADIATION RESEARCH PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall carry out a research program on low-dose radiation.

(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the program is to enhance the scientific understanding of, and reduce uncertainties associated with, the effects of exposure to low-dose radiation to inform improved risk-management methods.

SEC. 307. FUSION ENERGY.

(a) FUSION MATERIALS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—As part of the activities authorized in section 978 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16318)—

(1) the Director, in coordination with the Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy of the Department, shall carry out research and

development activities to identify, characterize, and demonstrate materials that can endure the neutron, plasma, and heat fluxes expected in a fusion power system; and

(2) the Director shall provide an assessment of—

(A) the need for 1 or more facilities that can examine and test potential fusion and next generation fission materials and other enabling technologies relevant to the development of fusion power; and

(B) whether a single new facility that substantially addresses magnetic fusion and next generation fission materials research needs is feasible, in conjunction with the expected capabilities of facilities operational as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) TOKAMAK RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—The Director shall support research and development activities and facility operations to optimize the tokamak approach to fusion energy.

(c) INERTIAL FUSION ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—The Director shall support research and development activities for inertial fusion for energy applications.

(d) ALTERNATIVE AND ENABLING CONCEPTS.—The Director shall support research and development activities and facility operations at institutions of higher education, National Laboratories, and private facilities in the United States for a portfolio of alternative and enabling fusion energy concepts that may provide solutions to significant challenges to the establishment of a commercial magnetic fusion power plant, prioritized based on the ability of the United States to play a leadership role in the international fusion research community.

(e) COORDINATION WITH ARPA-E.—The Director shall coordinate with the Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy (referred to in this subsection as “ARPA-E”) to—

(1) assess the potential for any fusion energy project supported by ARPA-E to represent a promising approach to a commercially viable fusion power plant;

(2) determine whether the results of any fusion energy project supported by ARPA-E merit the support of follow-on research activities carried out by the Office of Science; and

(3) avoid the unintentional duplication of activities.

(f) FAIRNESS IN COMPETITION FOR SOLICITATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL PROJECT ACTIVITIES.—Section 33 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2053) is amended by inserting before the first sentence the following: “In this section, with respect to international research projects, the term ‘private facilities or laboratories’ means facilities or laboratories located in the United States.”

(g) IDENTIFICATION OF PRIORITIES.—

(1) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the fusion energy research and development activities that the Department proposes to carry out over the 10-year period following the date of the report under not fewer than 3 realistic budget scenarios, including a scenario based on 3-percent annual growth in the non-ITER portion of the budget for fusion energy research and development activities.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The report required under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) identify specific areas of fusion energy research and enabling technology development in which the United States can and should establish or solidify a lead in the global fusion energy development effort;

(ii) identify priorities for initiation of facility construction and facility decommissioning under each of the 3 budget scenarios described in subparagraph (A); and

(iii) assess the ability of the fusion workforce of the United States to carry out the activities identified under clauses (i) and (ii), including the adequacy of programs at institutions of higher education in the United States to train the leaders and workers of the next generation of fusion energy researchers.

(2) PROCESS.—In order to develop the report required under paragraph (1)(A), the Secretary shall leverage best practices and lessons learned from the process used to develop the most recent report of the Particle Physics Project Prioritization Panel of the High Energy Physics Advisory Panel.

(3) REQUIREMENT.—No member of the Fusion Energy Sciences Advisory Committee shall be excluded from participating in developing or voting on final approval of the report required under paragraph (1)(A).

SEC. 308. NUCLEAR PHYSICS.

(a) ISOTOPE DEVELOPMENT AND PRODUCTION FOR RESEARCH APPLICATIONS.—The Director—

(1) may carry out a program for the production of isotopes, including the development of techniques to produce isotopes, that the Secretary determines are needed for research, medical, industrial, or related purposes; and

(2) shall ensure that isotope production activities carried out under the program under this paragraph do not compete with private industry unless the Director determines that critical national interests require the involvement of the Federal Government.

(b) RENAMING OF THE RARE ISOTOPE ACCELERATOR.—Section 981 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16321) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “RARE ISOTOPE ACCELERATOR” and inserting “FACILITY FOR RARE ISOTOPE BEAMS”; and

(2) by striking “Rare Isotope Accelerator” each place it appears and inserting “Facility for Rare Isotope Beams”.

SEC. 309. SCIENCE LABORATORIES INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall carry out a program to improve the safety, efficiency, and mission readiness of infrastructure at laboratories of the Office of Science.

(b) INCLUSIONS.—The program under subsection (a) shall include projects—

(1) to renovate or replace space that does not meet research needs;

(2) to replace facilities that are no longer cost effective to renovate or operate;

(3) to modernize utility systems to prevent failures and ensure efficiency;

(4) to remove excess facilities to allow safe and efficient operations; and

(5) to construct modern facilities to conduct advanced research in controlled environmental conditions.

TITLE IV—NUCLEAR ENERGY INNOVATION CAPABILITIES

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act”.

SEC. 402. NUCLEAR ENERGY INNOVATION CAPABILITIES.

(a) NUCLEAR ENERGY.—Section 951 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16271) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 951. NUCLEAR ENERGY.

“(a) MISSION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out programs of civilian nuclear research, development, demonstration, and commercial application, including activities under this subtitle.

“(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—The programs carried out under paragraph (1) shall take into consideration the following objectives:

“(A) Providing research infrastructure to promote scientific progress and enable users

from academia, the National Laboratories, and the private sector to make scientific discoveries relevant for nuclear, chemical, and materials science engineering.

“(B) Maintaining nuclear energy research and development programs at the National Laboratories and institutions of higher education, including infrastructure at the National Laboratories and institutions of higher education.

“(C) Providing the technical means to reduce the likelihood of nuclear proliferation.

“(D) Increasing confidence margins for public safety of nuclear energy systems.

“(E) Reducing the environmental impact of activities relating to nuclear energy.

“(F) Supporting technology transfer from the National Laboratories to the private sector.

“(G) Enabling the private sector to partner with the National Laboratories to demonstrate novel reactor concepts for the purpose of resolving technical uncertainty associated with the objectives described in subparagraphs (A) through (F).

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this subtitle:

“(1) ADVANCED NUCLEAR REACTOR.—The term ‘advanced nuclear reactor’ means—

“(A) a nuclear fission reactor with significant improvements over the most recent generation of nuclear fission reactors, which may include—

“(i) inherent safety features;

“(ii) lower waste yields;

“(iii) greater fuel utilization;

“(iv) superior reliability;

“(v) resistance to proliferation;

“(vi) increased thermal efficiency; and

“(vii) the ability to integrate into electric and nonelectric applications; or

“(B) a nuclear fusion reactor.

“(2) COMMISSION.—The term ‘Commission’ means the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

“(3) FAST NEUTRON.—The term ‘fast neutron’ means a neutron with kinetic energy above 100 kiloelectron volts.

“(4) NATIONAL LABORATORY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term ‘National Laboratory’ has the meaning given the term in section 2.

“(B) LIMITATION.—With respect to the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, the Los Alamos National Laboratory, and the Sandia National Laboratories, the term ‘National Laboratory’ means only the civilian activities of the laboratory.

“(5) NEUTRON FLUX.—The term ‘neutron flux’ means the intensity of neutron radiation measured as a rate of flow of neutrons applied over an area.

“(6) NEUTRON SOURCE.—The term ‘neutron source’ means a research machine that provides neutron irradiation services for—

“(A) research on materials sciences and nuclear physics; and

“(B) testing of advanced materials, nuclear fuels, and other related components for reactor systems.”

(b) NUCLEAR ENERGY RESEARCH PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 952 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16272) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (c); and

(B) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 641(b)(1) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16021(b)(1)) is amended by striking “section 942(d)” and inserting “section 952(c)”.

(c) ADVANCED FUEL CYCLE INITIATIVE.—Section 953(a) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16273(a)) is amended by striking “, acting through the Director of the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology.”

(d) UNIVERSITY NUCLEAR SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING SUPPORT.—Section 954(d)(4) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16274(d)(4)) is amended by striking “as part of a taking into consideration effort that emphasizes” and inserting “that emphasize”.

(e) DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY CIVILIAN NUCLEAR INFRASTRUCTURE AND FACILITIES.—Section 955 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16275) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (c) and (d); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) VERSATILE NEUTRON SOURCE.—

“(1) MISSION NEED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31, 2017, the Secretary shall determine the mission need for a versatile reactor-based fast neutron source, which shall operate as a national user facility.

“(B) CONSULTATIONS REQUIRED.—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall consult with the private sector, institutions of higher education, the National Laboratories, and relevant Federal agencies to ensure that the user facility described in subparagraph (A) will meet the research needs of the largest practicable majority of prospective users.

“(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—As soon as practicable after determining the mission need under paragraph (1)(A), the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a detailed plan for the establishment of the user facility.

“(3) FACILITY REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) CAPABILITIES.—The Secretary shall ensure that the user facility will provide, at a minimum, the following capabilities:

“(i) Fast neutron spectrum irradiation capability.

“(ii) Capacity for upgrades to accommodate new or expanded research needs.

“(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out the plan submitted under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall consider the following:

“(i) Capabilities that support experimental high-temperature testing.

“(ii) Providing a source of fast neutrons at a neutron flux, higher than that at which current research facilities operate, sufficient to enable research for an optimal base of prospective users.

“(iii) Maximizing irradiation flexibility and irradiation volume to accommodate as many concurrent users as possible.

“(iv) Capabilities for irradiation with neutrons of a lower energy spectrum.

“(v) Multiple loops for fuels and materials testing in different coolants.

“(vi) Additional pre-irradiation and post-irradiation examination capabilities.

“(vii) Lifetime operating costs and lifecycle costs.

“(4) DEADLINE FOR ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, complete construction of, and approve the start of operations for, the user facility by not later than December 31, 2025.

“(5) REPORTING.—The Secretary shall include in the annual budget request of the Department an explanation for any delay in the progress of the Department in completing the user facility by the deadline described in paragraph (4).

“(6) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall leverage the best practices for management, construction, and operation of national user facilities from the Office of Science.”

(f) SECURITY OF NUCLEAR FACILITIES.—Section 956 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16276) is amended by striking “, acting through the Director of the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology.”

(g) HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTATION AND SUPPORTIVE RESEARCH.—Section 957 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16277) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 957. HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTATION AND SUPPORTIVE RESEARCH.

“(a) MODELING AND SIMULATION.—The Secretary shall carry out a program to enhance the capabilities of the United States to develop new reactor technologies through high-performance computation modeling and simulation techniques.

“(b) COORDINATION.—In carrying out the program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall coordinate with relevant Federal agencies as described by the National Strategic Computing Initiative established by Executive Order 13702 (80 Fed. Reg. 46177 (July 29, 2015)), while taking into account the following objectives:

“(1) Using expertise from the private sector, institutions of higher education, and the National Laboratories to develop computational software and capabilities that prospective users may access to accelerate research and development of advanced nuclear reactor systems and reactor systems for space exploration.

“(2) Developing computational tools to simulate and predict nuclear phenomena that may be validated through physical experimentation.

“(3) Increasing the utility of the research infrastructure of the Department by coordinating with the Advanced Scientific Computing Research program within the Office of Science.

“(4) Leveraging experience from the Energy Innovation Hub for Modeling and Simulation.

“(5) Ensuring that new experimental and computational tools are accessible to relevant research communities, including private sector entities engaged in nuclear energy technology development.

“(c) SUPPORTIVE RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary shall consider support for additional research activities to maximize the utility of the research facilities of the Department, including physical processes—

“(1) to simulate degradation of materials and behavior of fuel forms; and

“(2) for validation of computational tools.”

(h) ENABLING NUCLEAR ENERGY INNOVATION.—Subtitle E of title IX of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16271 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 958. ENABLING NUCLEAR ENERGY INNOVATION.

“(a) NATIONAL REACTOR INNOVATION CENTER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized a program to enable the testing and demonstration of reactor concepts to be proposed and funded by the private sector.

“(2) PARTICIPATION.—Nothing in this section shall prevent a private sector entity that has received Federal grants from participating in this program.

“(b) TECHNICAL EXPERTISE.—In carrying out the program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall leverage the technical expertise of relevant Federal agencies and the National Laboratories in order to minimize the time required to enable construction and operation of privately funded experimental reactors at National Laboratories or other Department-owned sites.

“(c) OBJECTIVES.—The reactors described in subsection (b) shall operate to meet the following objectives:

“(1) Enabling physical validation of advanced nuclear reactor concepts.

“(2) Resolving technical uncertainty and increasing practical knowledge relevant to safety, resilience, security, and functionality of advanced nuclear reactor concepts.

“(3) General research and development to improve nascent technologies.

“(d) SHARING TECHNICAL EXPERTISE.—In carrying out the program under subsection

(a), the Secretary may enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Chairman of the Commission in order to share technical expertise and knowledge through—

“(1) enabling the testing and demonstration of advanced nuclear reactor concepts to be proposed and funded by the private sector;

“(2) operating a database to store and share data and knowledge relevant to nuclear science and engineering between Federal agencies and the private sector;

“(3) developing and testing electric and nonelectric integration and energy conversion systems relevant to advanced nuclear reactors;

“(4) leveraging expertise from the Commission with respect to safety analysis; and

“(5) enabling technical staff of the Commission to actively observe and learn about technologies developed under the program.

“(e) AGENCY COORDINATION.—The Chairman of the Commission and the Secretary shall enter into a memorandum of understanding regarding the following:

“(1) Ensuring that—

“(A) the Department has sufficient technical expertise to support the timely research, development, demonstration, and commercial application by the civilian nuclear industry of safe and innovative advanced nuclear reactor technology; and

“(B) the Commission has sufficient technical expertise to support the evaluation of applications for licenses, permits, and design certifications and other requests for regulatory approval for advanced nuclear reactors.

“(2) The use of computers and software codes to calculate the behavior and performance of advanced nuclear reactors based on mathematical models of the physical behavior of advanced nuclear reactors.

“(3) Ensuring that—

“(A) the Department maintains and develops the facilities necessary to enable the timely research, development, demonstration, and commercial application by the civilian nuclear industry of safe and innovative reactor technology; and

“(B) the Commission has access to the facilities described in subparagraph (A), as needed.

“(f) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act of 2017, the Secretary, in consultation with the National Laboratories, relevant Federal agencies, and other stakeholders, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report assessing the capabilities of the Department to authorize, host, and oversee privately funded experimental advanced nuclear reactors as described in subsection (b).

“(2) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall address—

“(A) the safety review and oversight capabilities of the Department, including options to leverage expertise from the Commission and the National Laboratories;

“(B) options to regulate privately proposed and funded experimental reactors hosted by the Department;

“(C) potential sites capable of hosting privately funded experimental advanced nuclear reactors;

“(D) the efficacy of the available contractual mechanisms of the Department to partner with the private sector and Federal agencies, including cooperative research and development agreements, strategic partnership projects, and agreements for commercializing technology;

“(E) the liability of the Federal Government with respect to the disposal of low-level radioactive waste, spent nuclear fuel, or high-level radioactive waste (as those

terms are defined in section 2 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101));

“(F) the impact on the aggregate inventory in the United States of low-level radioactive waste, spent nuclear fuel, or high-level radioactive waste (as those terms are defined in section 2 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101));

“(G) potential cost structures relating to physical security, decommissioning, liability, and other long-term project costs; and

“(H) other challenges or considerations identified by the Secretary.

“(3) UPDATES.—Once every 2 years, the Secretary shall update relevant provisions of the report submitted under paragraph (1) and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress the update.

“(g) SAVINGS CLAUSES.—

“(1) LICENSING REQUIREMENT.—Nothing in this section authorizes the Secretary or any person to construct or operate a nuclear reactor for the purpose of demonstrating the suitability for commercial application of the nuclear reactor unless licensed by the Commission in accordance with section 202 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5842).

“(2) FINANCIAL PROTECTION.—Any activity carried out under this section that involves the risk of public liability shall be subject to the financial protection or indemnification requirements of section 170 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2210) (commonly known as the ‘Price-Anderson Act’).”

(i) BUDGET PLAN.—Subtitle E of title IX of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16271 et seq.) (as amended by subsection (h)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “SEC. 959. BUDGET PLAN.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act of 2017, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives 2 alternative 10-year budget plans for civilian nuclear energy research and development by the Secretary, as described in subsections (b) through (d).

“(b) BUDGET PLAN ALTERNATIVE 1.—One of the budget plans submitted under subsection (a) shall assume constant annual funding for 10 years at the appropriated level for the civilian nuclear energy research and development of the Department for fiscal year 2016.

“(c) BUDGET PLAN ALTERNATIVE 2.—One of the budget plans submitted under subsection (a) shall be an unconstrained budget.

“(d) INCLUSIONS.—Each alternative budget plan submitted under subsection (a) shall include—

“(1) a prioritized list of the programs, projects, and activities of the Department to best support the development of advanced nuclear reactor technologies;

“(2) realistic budget requirements for the Department to implement sections 955(c), 957, and 958; and

“(3) the justification of the Department for continuing or terminating existing civilian nuclear energy research and development programs.”

(j) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents for the Energy Policy Act of 2005 is amended by striking the item relating to section 957 and inserting the following:

“957. High-performance computation and supportive research.

“958. Enabling nuclear energy innovation.

“959. Budget plan.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 589, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 589, Department of Energy Research and Innovation Act, is the product of over 3 years of work by the Science, Space, and Technology Committee to advance basic research and set clear science priorities for the Department of Energy.

I thank my colleagues on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee who cosponsored this legislation, particularly Ranking Member EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON.

The Department of Energy Research and Innovation Act prioritizes basic research and science at the DOE national labs. This legislation also requires DOE to coordinate research across the Department and provides private industry with more access to the national labs so they can develop next generation technology.

Title I of H.R. 589 enables DOE to partner with the private sector and cuts red tape and bureaucracy in the DOE technology transfer process. The innovative early stage research performed at the labs can have great value to the private sector.

Because of a communication gap between the labs and the private sector, ideas and technology created in the national labs are often slow to reach the market. And Federal Government bureaucracy further discourages the private sector from using the unique state-of-the-art facilities at the national labs.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois, Representative RANDY HULTGREN, and the gentleman from Colorado, Representative ED PERLMUTTER, for their initiative on this issue and for sponsoring similar legislation in the last Congress to advance these important reforms for our national labs.

□ 1545

Title II of the legislation requires the DOE to better manage and coordinate research efforts at the Department of Energy. This title also requires the DOE to provide a regular strategic analysis of science and technology activities within the Department. This will help identify key areas for collaboration across science and applied research programs. This review allows the Secretary to pinpoint programs that cost too much and that could be better accomplished by the private sector.

Title III of the bill provides statutory direction and priorities for the basic

research programs within the DOE's Office of Science. This includes research and basic energy sciences, biological and environmental research, high performance computing, nuclear physics, high energy physics, and fusion energy. These basic research programs are the core mission of the Department and lead to scientific discovery that can provide benefits across the economy. This title specifically authorizes basic research programs in solar fuels, electricity storage, exascale computing, and low-dose radiation.

In the last Congress, the House separately passed Science, Space, and Technology Committee legislation to authorize these four key basic research programs. I again thank Representative HULTGREN, as well as the gentlemen from California—Representative STEVE KNIGHT and Representative ERIC SWALWELL—and the gentleman from Illinois, Representative DAN LIPINSKI, for sponsoring legislation authorizing these programs in the last Congress.

Finally, title IV of the legislation is the Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act. I thank my Texas colleagues, Representative RANDY WEBER and committee Ranking Member JOHNSON, for advancing this bipartisan, bicameral legislation both in this Congress and in the last.

This title authorizes nuclear R&D activities at the DOE and harnesses and combines the strengths of the national labs, universities, and the private sector in a joint innovation initiative. Advanced nuclear reactor technology provides a great opportunity to make reliable, emission-free electricity available throughout the industrialized and developing world. The nuclear energy innovation language also provides a clear timeline for the DOE to complete a research reactor user facility within 10 years. This research reactor will enable proprietary and academic research to develop supercomputing models and also design next generation nuclear energy technology.

In summary, H.R. 589 represents a bipartisan, bicameral agreement to modernize and increase the productivity of the DOE national lab system, streamline DOE research programs, prioritize basic scientific research, and enable the development of next generation nuclear technology.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank the chairman and the ranking member, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, for bringing this bill to the floor today. It has been a long time in coming.

I rise in support of H.R. 589, the Department of Energy Research and Innovation Act. This bill would authorize important research and development at the Department of Energy to push the frontiers of science and find new ways to innovate and power our economy.

This bill would authorize comprehensive policy guidance for the DOE's Office of Science for the first time in its history. The Office of Science manages a portfolio, including research in supercomputing, materials science, nuclear physics, advanced biofuels, fusion energy, climate modeling, high energy physics, and a number of other areas across the spectrum of fundamental and applied research.

Additionally, the Office of Science is home to world-class user facilities used by private industry to collaborate with our national laboratories and provide our scientists with access to tools and resources to test the most pressing research questions in a variety of fields. The neutron sources, particle accelerators, and light sources, among many other Office of Science user facilities, are home to some of the most important scientific work conducted in America and represent some of the best partnerships our labs have with private industry. These activities and capabilities have never been given the proper statutory authority by this Congress, so this bill represents a landmark bipartisan effort.

H.R. 589 also includes the Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act, which I cosponsored again this year. By providing the tools and resources to nuclear scientists and engineers, this bill lays the groundwork for a future where reliable, clean nuclear energy is a major source of our electricity generation. This research could lead to advanced and safer nuclear reactors with the potential to use less nuclear fuel and produce far less waste.

H.R. 589 is not only bipartisan, but, as the chairman said, it represents a bicameral agreement that was reached last year during conference negotiations with the Senate on the comprehensive energy package. Given the urgent challenge of climate change and the growing competition around the world in many of these key research areas, we must keep working together with the Senate to get this bill signed into law this year.

I thank Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON for working together to get this bipartisan legislation before us today, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. PERLMUTTER for his comments and again thank him for his work on this legislation.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT), who is the vice chairman of the Energy Subcommittee of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. KNIGHT. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership on this.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 589, the Department of Energy Research and Innovation Act, sets congressional priorities for basic science research and nuclear energy R&D.

This legislation also includes text from my bill from the last Congress, H.R. 5638, the Solar Fuels Innovation Act. This language directs the Department of Energy to establish a basic research initiative in solar fuels. The solar fuel process, also known as artificial photosynthesis, harnesses energy from sunlight to create a range of storable chemical fuels, overcoming the biggest obstacle to maximizing the benefits of renewable technologies.

Researchers up and down the coast of California are undertaking this research from universities in southern California to the Berkeley lab in the Bay area. The research authorized in this legislation could solve this key scientific challenge and open the door for American entrepreneurs to develop the next generation of solar technology and train the next generation of researchers in chemistry, physics, and materials science.

H.R. 589 reaffirms the Federal Government's key role in research and development. My home State of California has long been a world leader in advanced science and high tech and is home to millions of entrepreneurs who are eager to engage and take advantage of the latest breakthroughs. Today we hear a lot of enthusiasm for clean energy, but the focus is on today's technology, not on fundamentally new approaches to energy technology that we make possible through early-stage research. In Congress, it is our responsibility to take the long-term view and be patient and make smart investments in basic research that can lead to the next big discovery. H.R. 589 establishes those long-term priorities.

This bill makes other important adjustments to the flexibility and utilization of DOE assets to give the U.S.' private sector a stronger edge, from the national laboratory partnerships with research groups to allowing the nuclear energy businesses to do their early-stage work on DOE sites, giving a huge boost to an industry that is about to take off.

I encourage my colleagues to support this very bipartisan, very supported piece of legislation.

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

I thank Mr. KNIGHT and especially my cosponsor, Mr. HULTGREN, for the work that they have done on this bill generally, but particularly on title I of the bill, the Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act.

As Mr. KNIGHT said, on this committee, we find places where there is common ground and where there is an ability to advance the interests of the United States of America. Sometimes we argue, sometimes we debate, sometimes we don't agree, but often we do. I appreciate their work as well as the chairman's work on a number of subjects that face us. I was proud to work with my friend Mr. HULTGREN of Illinois to introduce this bill, the Modernization and Technology Transfer Act, in the last Congress.

Title I provides important tools to accelerate the commercialization of new technologies that are developed at our national labs. It extends the Agreement for Commercializing Technology pilot program while expanding the range of companies that are eligible to participate. We also allow labs to use their technology transfer funds as an incubator investment for projects that are developed in-house which demonstrate potential commercial opportunities.

Additionally, the bill encourages the further collaboration between university researchers and our national labs by creating a pilot program to reduce the financial burdens on our universities. I hope this pilot program unleashes the talent at our universities, like the Colorado School of Mines, the University of Colorado, and Colorado State University, to discover the next successful technology.

Madam Speaker, one may remember I represent Golden, Colorado, and the National Renewable Energy Laboratory. NREL is the premier energy efficiency and renewable energy lab in the world, and title I of this bill provides labs like NREL more tools to bring life-changing innovations to consumers by partnering with private industry.

When revolutionary research is harnessed by our entrepreneurs and business leaders, startups with one or two employees can grow into companies that can create hundreds of quality jobs. I am proud to support this legislation, and I am proud to have worked with Mr. HULTGREN in giving scientists and researchers in both the public and private sectors the tools and the freedom they need to unlock a new wave of innovation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), an active member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Speaker, I want to give a sincere thank-you to our distinguished chairman, Mr. SMITH—the chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology—for his work in this Congress and in past Congresses in bringing this bipartisan package of legislation to the floor.

I also thank my good friend and colleague Congressman PERLMUTTER from Colorado, who has been just an active joint member in moving this forward. I am so grateful for his efforts and his work.

Madam Speaker, the DOE Research and Innovation Act contains a number of bipartisan provisions that put in place clear research and development priorities so that Americans can maintain their leadership position on the world stage and continue attracting the best and the brightest to the only place they can do their work.

While I have the pleasure of representing Fermilab, our Nation's only dedicated high energy physics laboratory, I have also had the opportunity

to visit with and to meet researchers from across the Nation who rely on our national laboratory system to do their work. More than 30,000 researchers a year visit the DOE user facilities, such as the Advanced Photon Source at Argonne National Laboratory, just outside my district. These facilities are normally operating 24/7, with researchers blocking off time—sometimes just minutes—to use equipment that no one university or business could build and maintain on its own. This is why our national labs are truly the crown jewel in our research ecosystem.

The DOE Research and Innovation Act includes key provisions from my prior legislation of improving technology transfer and helping get research from the “valley of death” to a point at which the private sector can pick it up and run with it. This legislation also frees up the labs to be more nimble and work more easily with outside entities, such as with nonprofits and universities.

Another provision in this legislation should, hopefully, be a key priority for the incoming administration. Right now, China not only has the fastest computer in the world, but the two fastest computers in the world. Legislation which this body previously passed and is included in this bill would call on the DOE to carry out a program to build an exascale computer, which is close to the speed of the human brain. The United States’ computing capabilities have a wide-ranging use and applications, and the DOE has led the way in developing this technology.

One of the primary missions at the DOE is the maintenance of our current nuclear stockpile. This is largely carried out through complex simulations which require these increasingly powerful machines, but the crosscutting benefits of this research may have the greatest impact.

When the NIH began its work on sequencing the human genome, it was only a moonshot mission that many thought was not yet feasible. Computing facilities at the DOE basically proved the concept and allowed this work to be completed. In the era of precision medicine and with the recent passage of the 21st Century Cures, our computing facilities must be tapped to realize the benefits of targeted treatments and cures.

Among other research priorities, this legislation also calls on the DOE to resume its low dose radiation research program. This is something I supported in the last Congress, working off recommendations from the scientific community to fill the gaps in our knowledge of the human health impacts from low dose radiation.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this important bill. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their bipartisan work to begin this Congress by passing pro-growth, pro-science legislation.

□ 1600

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, so I am going to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH OF Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER), who is the chairman of the Energy Subcommittee of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 589, the Department of Energy Research and Innovation Act.

H.R. 589 provides policy direction to the Department of Energy on basic science research, nuclear energy R&D, research coordination and priorities, as well as important additional reforms to streamline national labs management.

I want to particularly highlight title IV, which is the Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act. I introduced the same legislation in the 114th and 115th Congress, and it does a lot of good things. It lays out a clear timeline and parameters for DOE to complete a research reactor, which is a crucial part for us.

Right now, we are behind, Mr. Speaker. The Russians are outpacing us on the next design of nuclear reactors. That is simply unacceptable.

We need a versatile neutron source, and title IV of this will produce a situation where we will have the ability for the national labs to partner with private industry and be able to do that so that they don’t get built overseas, which is totally unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, the Science, Space, and Technology Committee has spent a long time developing this. There is lots of bipartisan buy-in, I might add, and I appreciate that.

So it is time, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, for us to get this bill passed and make sure that we remain on the cutting edge. It helps us with economics, and it helps us actually with nuclear proliferation as far as that goes.

So I encourage all of my colleagues to join in supporting H.R. 589.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill. It is the product of a lot of hard work over the last 3 years. It helps our laboratories and our private industry stay at the forefront of science. I thank Chairman SMITH of Texas for bringing this bill to the floor.

I urge passage of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH OF Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 589 provides basic research direction and good government reforms to ongoing DOE programs. This legislation establishes congressional priorities for the Department, and I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate to quickly send this bill to the President’s desk.

I thank the members of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee who provided valuable input into this legis-

lation. This includes the cosponsors of the bill, Ranking Member JOHNSON, and Representatives RANDY WEBER, STEVE KNIGHT, RANDY HULTGREN, FRANK LUCAS, DAN LIPINSKI, DANA ROHRBACHER, ELIZABETH ESTY, BRIAN BABIN, MARC VEASEY, BARBARA COMSTOCK, ED PERLMUTTER, MO BROOKS, PAUL TONKO, JIM BANKS, ERIC SWALWELL, ANDY BIGGS, ZOE LOFGREN, NEAL DUNN, and CLAY HIGGINS, Republicans and Democrats alike.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of H.R. 589.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 589, the Department of Energy Research and Innovation Act, which I am very pleased to co-sponsor.

This bill comprises a significant set of provisions that resulted from constructive negotiations with our Majority and with the Senate as part of the energy conference last year. I am also proud to note that many of these provisions were actually first proposed in the version of the American Competes Reauthorization Act that was sponsored by every Democratic Member of the Committee in the last Congress.

The bill includes what would be the first comprehensive authorization of the DOE Office of Science, which is the largest supporter of physical sciences research in the country. This is a nearly \$6 billion office that manages 10 of our national laboratories, often called the crown jewels of our national research infrastructure. Yet thus far, unlike NSF, NASA, and nearly every other major scientific research agency stewarded by the federal government, the Office of Science has not received the statutory guidance and support that its capabilities and mission warrant. So passing this portion of the bill into law alone would be a big step in the right direction.

The bill also includes a number of important technology transfer provisions that previously passed the House as part of a bipartisan bill that I and many of my colleagues on the Committee co-sponsored. In addition, it would provide the first authorization of the promising Innovation Hub model for energy research, and it would enable greater private sector engagement with ARPA-E. Finally, this bill includes an updated and improved version of the Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act, which I was happy to co-sponsor with my friend Mr. WEBER in the last Congress.

I would like to thank Chairman SMITH and his staff for working closely with us and our Senate counterparts to move beyond what began as, frankly, a rather contentious process to find common ground on a wide range of areas that will be critical to ensuring our nation’s competitiveness and our clean energy future.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 589, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIGITAL GLOBAL ACCESS POLICY
ACT OF 2017

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 600) to promote Internet access in developing countries and update foreign policy toward the Internet, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 600

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 “Digital Global Access Policy Act of 2017” or the “Digital GAP Act”.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to—

(1) encourage the efforts of developing countries to improve mobile and fixed access to the Internet in order to catalyze innovation, spur economic growth and job creation, improve health, education, and financial services, reduce poverty and gender inequality, mitigate disasters, promote democracy and good governance, and strengthen cybersecurity;

(2) promote build once policies and approaches and the multi-stakeholder approach to Internet governance; and

(3) ensure the effective use of United States foreign assistance resources toward this end.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The number of Internet users worldwide has more than tripled from 1 billion to 3.2 billion since 2005, yet the growth rate of Internet access is slowing: An estimated 4.2 billion people, or 60 percent of the world’s population, remain offline, an estimated 75 percent of the offline population lives in just 20 countries, and rural, female, elderly, illiterate, and low-income populations are being left behind.

(2) Studies suggest that women across the developing world are disproportionately affected by a digital gap, and that bringing an additional 600 million women online would contribute \$13 billion to \$18 billion to annual GDP across 144 developing countries.

(3) Internet access in developing countries is most often hampered by a lack of infrastructure and a poor regulatory environment for investment.

(4) Build once policies and approaches, which seek to coordinate public and private sector investments in roads and other critical infrastructure, can minimize the number and scale of excavation and construction activities when installing telecommunications infrastructure in rights-of-way, thereby reducing installation costs for high-speed Internet networks and serving as a development best practice.

SEC. 4. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States to consult, partner, and coordinate with the governments of foreign countries, international organizations, regional economic communities, businesses, civil society, and other stakeholders in a concerted effort to close the digital gap by promoting—

(1) first-time Internet access to mobile or broadband Internet for at least 1.5 billion people in developing countries by 2020 in both urban and rural areas;

(2) Internet deployment and related coordination, capacity building, and build once policies and approaches in developing countries, including actions to encourage—

(A) standardization of build once policies and approaches for the inclusion of

broadband conduit in rights-of-way projects that are funded, co-funded, or partially financed by the United States or any international organization that includes the United States as a member, in consultation with telecommunications providers, unless a cost-benefit analysis determines that the cost of such approach outweighs the benefits;

(B) adoption and integration of build once policies and approaches into the development and investment strategies of national and local government agencies of developing countries and donor governments and organizations that will enhance coordination with the private sector for road building, pipe laying, and other major infrastructure projects; and

(C) provision of increased financial support by international organizations, including through grants, loans, and technical assistance, to expand information and communications access and Internet connectivity;

(3) policy changes that encourage first-time affordable access to the Internet in developing countries, including actions to encourage—

(A) integration of universal and gender-equitable Internet access goals, to be informed by the collection of related gender disaggregated data, and Internet tools into national development plans and United States Government country-level development strategies;

(B) reforms of competition laws and spectrum allocation processes that may impede the ability of companies to provide Internet services; and

(C) efforts to improve procurement processes to help attract and incentivize investment in Internet infrastructure;

(4) the removal of tax and regulatory barriers to Internet access;

(5) the use of the Internet to increase economic growth and trade, including—

(A) policies and strategies to remove restrictions to e-commerce, cross-border information flows, and competitive marketplaces; and

(B) entrepreneurship and distance learning enabled by access to technology;

(6) use of the Internet to bolster democracy, government accountability, transparency, and human rights, including through the establishments of policies, initiatives, and investments that—

(A) support the development of national Internet plans that are consistent with United States human rights goals, including freedom of expression, religion, assembly, and association;

(B) expand online access to government information and services to enhance government accountability and service delivery, including for areas in which government may have limited presence;

(C) advance the principles of responsible Internet governance, including commitments to maintain open and equitable access; and

(D) support programs, research, and technologies that safeguard human rights and fundamental freedoms online, and enable political organizing and activism, free speech, and religious expression that are in compliance with international human rights standards;

(7) Internet access and inclusion into Internet policymaking for women, people with disabilities, minorities, low-income and marginalized groups, and underserved populations;

(8) cybersecurity and data protection, including international use of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity, that are industry- and globally recognized cybersecurity standards and best practices; and

(9) inter-agency coordination and cooperation across all executive branch agencies regarding the construction and promotion of Internet initiatives as a greater part of United States foreign policy.

SEC. 5. LEVERAGING INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT.

In pursuing the policy described in section 4, the President should direct United States representatives to appropriate international bodies to use the influence of the United States, consistent with the broad development goals of the United States, to advocate that each such body—

(1) commit to increase efforts and coordination to promote affordable and gender-equitable Internet access, in partnership with stakeholders and consistent with host countries’ absorptive capacity;

(2) integrate affordable and gender-equitable Internet access data into existing economic and business assessments, evaluations, and indexes such as the Millennium Challenge Corporation constraints analysis, the Doing Business Report, International Monetary Fund Article IV assessments and country reports, the Open Data Barometer, and the Affordability Drivers Index;

(3) standardize inclusion of broadband conduit as part of highway or comparable construction projects in developing countries, in consultation with telecommunications providers, unless such inclusion would create an undue burden, is not necessary based on the availability of existing broadband infrastructure, or a cost-benefit analysis determines that the cost outweighs the benefits;

(4) provide technical assistance to the regulatory authorities in developing countries to remove unnecessary barriers to investment in otherwise commercially viable projects and strengthen weak regulations or develop new regulations to support market growth and development;

(5) utilize clear, accountable, and metric-based targets, including targets with gender-disaggregated data, to measure the effectiveness of efforts to promote Internet access; and

(6) promote and protect human rights online, such as the freedoms of expression, religion, assembly, and association, through resolutions, public statements, projects, and initiatives, and advocate that other member states of such bodies are held accountable when major violations are uncovered.

SEC. 6. DEPARTMENT OF STATE ORGANIZATION.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of State should seek to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of United States foreign assistance efforts to carry out the policies and objectives established by this Act, including by redesignating an existing Assistant Secretary position in the Department of State to be the Assistant Secretary for Cyberspace to lead the Department’s diplomatic cyberspace policy generally, including for cybersecurity, Internet access, Internet freedom, and to promote an open, secure, and reliable information and communications technology infrastructure.

(b) ACTIVITIES.—In recognition of the added value of technical knowledge and expertise in the policymaking and diplomatic channels, the Secretary of State shall—

(1) update existing training programs relevant to policy discussions;

(2) promote the recruitment of candidates with technical expertise into the Civil Service and the Foreign Service; and

(3) work to improve inter-agency coordination and cooperation on cybersecurity and Internet initiatives.

(c) OFFSET.—To offset any costs incurred by the Department of State to carry out the designation of an Assistant Secretary for Cyberspace in accordance with subsection (a), the Secretary of State shall eliminate

such positions within the Department of State, unless otherwise authorized or required by law, as the Secretary determines to be necessary to fully offset such costs.

(d) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—The redesignation of the Assistant Secretary position in the Department of State described in subsection (a) may not be construed as increasing the number of Assistant Secretary positions at the Department above the current level of 24 as authorized in section 1(c)(1) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a(c)(1)).

SEC. 7. USAID.

It is the sense of Congress that the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development should—

(1) integrate efforts to expand Internet access, develop appropriate technologies, and enhance digital literacy into the education, development, and economic growth programs of the agency, where appropriate;

(2) expand the utilization of information and communications technologies in humanitarian aid and disaster relief responses and United States operations involving stabilization and security to improve donor coordination, reduce duplication and waste, capture and share lessons learned, and augment disaster preparedness and risk mitigation strategies; and

(3) establish and promote guidelines for the protection of personal information of individuals served by humanitarian, disaster, and development programs implemented directly through the United States Government, through contracts funded by the United States Government, and by international organizations.

SEC. 8. PEACE CORPS.

Section 3 of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2502) is amended by—

(1) redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (e); and

(2) adding at the end the following new subsections:

“(f) It is the sense of Congress that access to technology can transform agriculture, community economic development, education, environment, health, and youth development which are the sectors in which Peace Corps currently develops positions for Volunteers.

“(g) In giving attention to the programs, projects, training, and other activities referred to in subsection (f), the Peace Corps should develop positions for Volunteers that are focused on leveraging technology for development, education, and social and economic mobility.”.

SEC. 9. PARTNERSHIP FRAMEWORK.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate plans to promote partnerships by United States development agencies, including the United States Agency for International Development and the Millennium Challenge Corporation, and international agencies funded by the United States Government with the private sector and other stakeholders to expand affordable and gender equitable access to the Internet in developing countries, including the following elements:

(1) Methods for stakeholders to partner with such agencies in order to provide Internet access or Internet infrastructure in developing countries.

(2) Methods of outreach to stakeholders to explore partnership opportunities for expanding Internet access or Internet infrastructure, including coordination with the private sector, when financing roads and telecommunications infrastructure.

(3) Methods for early consultation with stakeholders concerning projects in telecommunications and road construction to provide Internet access or Internet infrastructure.

SEC. 10. REPORTING REQUIREMENT ON IMPLEMENTATION EFFORTS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report on efforts to implement the policies specified in this Act and a discussion of the plans and existing efforts by the United States Government in developing countries to accomplish the following:

(1) Developing a technical and regulatory road map for promoting Internet access in developing countries and a path to implementing such road map.

(2) Identifying the regulatory barriers that may unduly impede Internet access, including regulation of wireline broadband deployment or the infrastructure to augment wireless broadband deployment.

(3) Strengthening and supporting development of regulations that incentivize market growth and sector development.

(4) Encouraging further public and private investment in Internet infrastructure, including broadband networks and services.

(5) Increasing gender-equitable Internet access and otherwise encourage or support Internet deployment, competition, and adoption.

(6) Improving the affordability of Internet access.

(7) Promoting technology and cybersecurity capacity building efforts and consult technical experts for advice regarding options to accelerate the advancement of Internet deployment, adoption, and usage.

(8) Promoting Internet freedom globally and include civil society and the private sector in the formulation of policies, projects, and advocacy efforts to protect human rights online.

(9) Promoting and strengthening the multi-stakeholder model of Internet governance and actively participate in multi-stakeholder international fora, such as the Internet Governance Forum.

(10) Advancing a strategy to promote—

(A) global cybersecurity policy consistent with the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity;

(B) global Internet freedom principles, such as the freedoms of expression, religion, assembly, and association, while combating efforts to impose restrictions on such freedoms; and

(C) improved inter-agency coordination and cooperation on cybersecurity and Internet initiatives.

SEC. 11. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **BROADBAND.**—The term “broadband” means an Internet Protocol-based transmission service that enables users to send and receive voice, video, data, graphics, or a combination thereof.

(2) **BROADBAND CONDUIT.**—The term “broadband conduit” means a conduit for fiber optic cables that support broadband or wireless facilities for broadband service.

(3) **BUILD ONCE POLICIES AND APPROACHES.**—The term “build once policies and approaches” means policies or practices that minimize the number and scale of excavation and construction activities when installing telecommunications infrastructure in rights-of-way.

(4) **CYBERSPACE.**—The term “cyberspace” means the interdependent network of information technology infrastructures, and in-

cludes the Internet, telecommunications networks, computer systems, and embedded processors and controllers in critical industries, and includes the virtual environment of information and interactions between people.

(5) **STAKEHOLDERS.**—The term “stakeholders” means the private sector, the public sector, cooperatives, civil society, the technical community that develops Internet technologies, standards, implementation, operations, and applications, and other groups that are working to increase Internet access or are impacted by the lack of Internet access in their communities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous materials in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, more than 60 percent of the world's population lacks access to broadband, lacks access to the Internet. That means 3 billion people have been left out of the biggest technological revolution of our time. Three billion people are being denied the benefits of the free flow of information and game-changing innovations in health, education, and commerce; and 3 billion consumers remain out of the reach of American goods and services.

Women and girls are disproportionately affected by this digital gap, despite serving as the principal consumers, caregivers, educators, peace-makers, and income earners across the developing world. Bringing women online is going to deepen the benefit of existing investments in governance and global health, and it is going to accelerate economic growth.

So this bill closes that digital gap. It promotes efforts by developing countries to accelerate Internet deployment through the standardization of cost-effective, build-once policies. It partners with the private sector, and it creates a favorable investment climate.

At the same time, it reduces duplication of effort among U.S. Government agencies by demanding improved inter-agency coordination and collaboration with the private sector. And it calls on the State Department to consolidate the responsibilities held by three separate coordinators for cyber policy, technology, and information under a single Assistant Secretary for Cyberspace.

So let me explain something here, Mr. Speaker, if the U.S. Agency for International Development is helping

to finance the construction of a rural road in Ghana, the private sector should be invited to lay down broadband conduit before the concrete is poured, obviously. Why dig the same road twice? The bottom line is that, as this infrastructure expansion is going on right now, we have the ability to get the private sector in to lay that broadband, and that is what this bill does. It is smart economics, smart development. It advances key U.S. values. And, frankly, it is good for American industry as well.

So I thank my cosponsors—Representatives CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS, ELIOT ENGEL, and GRACE MENG—for their efforts on this bill, which, by the way, the predecessor bill passed unanimously last September here.

I strongly urge Members to support the Digital GAP Act here again this year so we can get it to the President's desk without delay.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise in support of this bill.

I want to thank Chairman ED ROYCE, and I am pleased to cosponsor this bill that he has introduced to make it easier for people around the world to harness the power of the Internet. This bill passed in the last Congress but didn't make it through the Senate, so I am glad we are taking it up again.

Mr. Speaker, we know the way this incredible tool has shaped the world in the last generation. The Internet can instantaneously connect people across the world from each other who a few years ago would never cross paths in a lifetime. It allows citizens and journalists living under oppressive regimes or in war zones to get information out to the world. It allows entrepreneurs in emerging markets to sell their products in global markets.

To be sure, the power of the Internet can cut both way. ISIS has proved all too adept at using social media to recruit fighters and spread its hateful message. But put to its highest purpose, the Internet can help drive economic growth and spread stability and prosperity.

Unfortunately, too few people around the world have access to this tool. Roughly 60 percent of the world's population is not online, and the growth rate of Internet access is slowing. If you live in a poor community or a rural area, sometimes just because you are a woman, it is harder to take advantage of the Internet.

We know where that lack of access is holding populations back. Three-quarters of those who are offline live in just 20 countries. If we could close that gap, think of what it might mean for all of those people struggling to make ends meet, and that is exactly what this bill aims to do.

Chairman ROYCE's legislation calls on the administration to ramp up efforts around the world to expand access to the Internet. It encourages the State Department, USAID, and the

Peace Corps to focus on Internet access as a diplomatic and development priority. And it states clearly that expanding Internet access, especially in the developing world, is an American foreign policy priority.

So I am glad to support this measure. I thank the chairman for all his hard work.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS).

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5537, the Digital Global Access Policy Act or the Digital GAP Act. I commend Chairman ROYCE's timely piece of legislation, which aims to facilitate greater coordination between the U.S. and foreign governments, international organizations, regional economic communities, businesses, and civil society regarding the promotion of information technology and cybersecurity in developing economies.

The focus of the critical IT sector, particularly in developing countries, is the goal of not only Chairman ROYCE's Digital GAP bill but also of a possible companion bill in the Senate sponsored last year by Senator MARKEY.

I understand that Senator MARKEY plans to reintroduce his bill in the Senate, and it is my hope that we can work with the Senate in support of this legislation. Both bills address the critical issue of the U.S. working with developing economies on the core issue of information technology and cybersecurity.

In many countries in Sub-Saharan Africa, the information technology sector has literally taken off and enabled young, innovative, and talented entrepreneurs to develop IT-related solutions to everyday problems.

Last summer, I traveled with Senator MARKEY and Representative MALONEY to Nigeria and Senegal where we met with a number of local IT experts. What was clear from our in-depth discussions is that Internet access has quickly become a critical component of economies and economic growth throughout the developing world.

Many developing economies, which have traditionally had to navigate institutional or infrastructural impediments, are able to utilize information technology to resolve everyday problems. Case in point, telephone land lines in some developing economies are often in need of constant repair and maintenance. As a result, over the years, land lines became the preserve of the middle class and affluent sectors of capital cities.

This is no longer the case because astute entrepreneurs have found a way to circumvent this impediment by buying and/or renting out cell phones for public use. Today, in just about any country you visit in Sub-Saharan Africa, you will see countless men, women, and children using cell phones.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. BASS. On our codel, our visit to Senegal included a meeting with the CEO of Wari, an 8-year-old company providing an innovative platform offering convenient service and an aggregation of products and services of various partners. Wari has over 220 million users of the platform throughout 40 countries.

We also met with the director of Millennium Connect Africa. Formerly with Hughes Satellite Systems, Mr. Diop was educated at Wharton and UCLA and worked in the U.S. for 20 years. His company is a subsidiary of Wari.

In Kenya, IT entrepreneurs have excelled in the development of a host of innovative apps. For example, a young Kenyan innovator developed an app called iCow to better enable dairy farmers to keep current with market prices.

Throughout Sub-Saharan Africa, there are many examples of IT expertise. The importance of an IT-literate population complements the ongoing push for capability training.

To the degree the U.S. Government can actively participate in this important process is to the mutual benefit of this country and a spectrum of developing countries worldwide.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, when we talk about the world becoming more interconnected, one of the main drivers of that trend is the Internet. Our enemies have taken advantage of this tool for destructive purposes. As we push back against that threat, our foreign policy should also help as many people as possible to use this tool in a positive way.

So this bill, again, helps move us in the right direction. I want to, again, say I am grateful to Chairman ROYCE for bringing it forward.

I am glad to support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1615

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say, as the author of this bill, it does take a lot of work, a lot of research, to put together legislation like this. And I did want to thank Joan Condon of the staff, and I wanted to thank Jessica Kelch, certainly Margot Sullivan, and Taylor Clausen for their efforts here.

I think that as you get involved in this legislation and you see some of the lost opportunities in the past—I would just give one example. NetHope, an NGO, made a compelling case for this build-once policy that this puts in place.

It was several years ago, as they explained, and ELIOT ENGEL and I have been out to Liberia. There was a \$100 million project for a road where there is no Internet use, and there is very little across Liberia. Had the donors had the foresight to just invite the private sector to lay the fiber-optic cable under that road while it was being constructed—and, as you know, you do that at a fraction of the cost. That is when they want to lay the cable—the cost would have been 1 percent of the total investment. It would have been \$1 million.

But what is the consequence of that lack of foresight?

You fast forward to 2014. I will tell you the consequences. Ebola ravaged Liberia, 10,000 people over the course of a single year; it crossed international borders, finally included the United States. There was a reason why the information did not get out, and that reason was because there was not Internet access in this region across Liberia, which was the same region where they would have put the Internet access. That is what physicians tell us.

It is not a surprise that experts agree that the lack of Internet infrastructure hampered Ebola response efforts, according to the physicians, as donors and community health centers struggled to track the disease. They could not even coordinate their efforts, for those of you who remember that struggle.

Now, all of a sudden there is renewed interest in improving the Internet architecture in Liberia, and now we find that the cost is so many, many, many multiples of what it had been had this bill been law, and that we had simply let those know in industry that that opportunity was there to lay that cable back when the road was originally being built.

So we need this build-once strategy. We have got to have smart development. We can do better. We will. And I urge the Members to support this bill.

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, as the House considers this legislation, I stand in support of expanding Internet access around the globe. In this fast growing and ever changing world, the gap between those who have and have not will be made even more dramatic for those without internet access. Internet access is a valuable commodity that helps millions of lives, and everyone should have access to it.

In the 21st century, one thing is crystal clear: Access to the internet is critical. 4.2 billion people worldwide don't have access to the internet. This includes children starting school, young women starting businesses, and communities looking for ways to compete in the global market.

Women are particularly impacted and left behind, something that shouldn't go unnoticed by this body. UNICEF reports that nearly 90% of the income women bring in is reinvested into their family, more than double what men reinvest. Women build up their communities, and we must do whatever we can to ensure they have the resources necessary to succeed.

Not only will this bill reach those women who live in the dark without web services, it will promote the rights and values that make America exceptional. The freedoms of expression and assembly are fundamental rights, and the Internet can be a critical medium for promoting democracy. A report by the McKinsey Global Institute put it best when it said "The Internet has fundamentally empowered the consumer [. . .] It saves the consumer time and gives customers access to products." In this great body, I hope we continue to stand for democracy, its values, and support those who wish to stand up for their rights.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 600.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motion to recommit on H.R. 7, by the yeas and nays, and passage of H.R. 7, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION AND ABORTION INSURANCE FULL DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 7) to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions, offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), 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 187, nays 235, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]

YEAS—187

Adams	Barragán	Beatty
Aguilar	Bass	Bera

Beyer	Green, Al	O'Halleran
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Blunt Rochester	Grijalva	Pallone
Bonamici	Gutiérrez	Panetta
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hanabusa	Pascarell
Brady (PA)	Hastings	Payne
Brown (MD)	Heck	Pelosi
Brownley (CA)	Higgins (NY)	Perlmutter
Bustos	Himes	Peters
Butterfield	Hoyer	Peterson
Capuano	Huffman	Pingree
Carbajal	Jackson Lee	Pocan
Cárdenas	Jayapal	Polis
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Price (NC)
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Raskin
Castro (TX)	Keating	Rice (NY)
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Richmond
Cicilline	Kennedy	Rosen
Clark (MA)	Khanna	Roybal-Allard
Clarke (NY)	Kihuen	Ruiz
Clay	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Cleaver	Kilmer	Ryan (OH)
Clyburn	Kind	Sánchez
Cohen	Krishnamoorthi	Sarbanes
Connolly	Kuster (NH)	Schakowsky
Conyers	Langevin	Schiff
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Schneider
Correa	Larson (CT)	Schrader
Courtney	Lawrence	Scott (VA)
Crist	Lawson (FL)	Scott, David
Crowley	Lee	Serrano
Cuellar	Levin	Sewell (AL)
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Shea-Porter
Davis (CA)	Lieu, Ted	Sherman
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Sinema
DeFazio	Loeback	Sires
DeGette	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Delaney	Lowenthal	Soto
DeLauro	Lowey	Speier
DelBene	Lujan Grisham, M.	Suozi
Demings	Luján, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Takano
Deutch	Maloney	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Carolyn B. Maloney	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Doyle, Michael F.	Matsui	Tonko
Ellison	McCollum	Torres
Engel	McEachin	Tsongas
Eshoo	McGovern	Vargas
Espallat	McNerney	Veasey
Esty	Meeks	Vela
Evans	Meng	Velázquez
Foster	Moore	Visclosky
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	Walz
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Wasserman
Gallego	Nadler	Schultz
Garamendi	Napolitano	Waters, Maxine
Gonzalez (TX)	Neal	Watson Coleman
Gottheimer	Nolan	Welch
	Norcross	Wilson (FL)
		Yarmuth

NAYS—235

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

Jenkins (KS)	Messer	Scott, Austin	Brooks (AL)	Higgins (LA)	Poe (TX)	Himes	McCollum	Schakowsky
Jenkins (WV)	Mitchell	Sensenbrenner	Brooks (IN)	Hill	Poliquin	Hoyer	McEachin	Schiff
Johnson (LA)	Moolenaar	Sessions	Buchanan	Holding	Posey	Huffman	McGovern	Schneider
Johnson (OH)	Mooney (WV)	Shimkus	Buck	Hollingsworth	Ratcliffe	Jackson Lee	McNerney	Schrader
Johnson, Sam	Mullin	Shuster	Bucshon	Hudson	Reed	Jayapal	Meeks	Scott (VA)
Jordan	Murphy (PA)	Simpson	Budd	Huizenga	Reichert	Jeffries	Meng	Scott, David
Joyce (OH)	Newhouse	Smith (MO)	Burgess	Hultgren	Renacci	Johnson (GA)	Moore	Serrano
Katko	Noem	Smith (NE)	Byrne	Hunter	Rice (SC)	Kaptur	Moulton	Sewell (AL)
Kelly (MS)	Nunes	Smith (NJ)	Calvert	Hurd	Roby	Keating	Murphy (FL)	Shea-Porter
Kelly (PA)	Olson	Smith (TX)	Carter (GA)	Issa	Roe (TN)	Kelly (IL)	Nadler	Sherman
King (IA)	Palazzo	Smucker	Carter (TX)	Jenkins (KS)	Rogers (AL)	Kennedy	Napolitano	Sinema
King (NY)	Palmer	Stefanik	Chabot	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (KY)	Khanna	Neal	Sires
Kinzinger	Paulsen	Stewart	Chaffetz	Johnson (LA)	Rohrabacher	Kihuen	Nolan	Smith (WA)
Knight	Pearce	Cheney	Cheney	Johnson (OH)	Rokita	Kildee	Norcross	Soto
Kustoff (TN)	Perry	Coffman	Coffman	Johnson, Sam	Rooney, Francis	Kilmer	O'Halleran	Speier
Labrador	Pittenger	Cole	Cole	Jordan	Rooney, Thomas J.	Kind	O'Rourke	Suozi
LaHood	Poe (TX)	Collins (GA)	Collins (GA)	Joyce (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen	Krishnamoorthi	Pallone	Swalwell (CA)
LaMalfa	Poliquin	Collins (NY)	Collins (NY)	Katko	Roskam	Kuster (NH)	Panetta	Takano
Lamborn	Posey	Comer	Comer	Kelly (MS)	Ross	Langevin	Pascrell	Thompson (CA)
Lance	Ratcliffe	Comstock	Comstock	Kelly (PA)	Rothfus	Larsen (WA)	Payne	Thompson (MS)
Latta	Reed	Conaway	Conaway	King (IA)	Rouzer	Larson (CT)	Pelosi	Titus
Lewis (MN)	Reichert	Cook	Cook	King (NY)	Royce (CA)	Lawrence	Perlmutter	Tonko
LoBiondo	Renacci	Costello (PA)	Costello (PA)	Kinzinger	Russell	Lawson (FL)	Peters	Torres
Long	Rice (SC)	Cramer	Cramer	Kustoff (TN)	Rutherford	Lee	Pingree	Tsongas
Loudermilk	Roby	Crawford	Crawford	Labrador	Sanford	Levin	Pocan	Vargas
Love	Roe (TN)	Cuellar	Cuellar	LaHood	Scalise	Lewis (GA)	Polis	Veasey
Lucas	Rogers (AL)	Walden	Walden	LaMalfa	Schweikert	Loeb sack	Price (NC)	Vela
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (KY)	Walker	Walker	Lamborn	Scott, Austin	Lofgren	Quigley	Velázquez
MacArthur	Rohrabacher	Walorski	Walorski	Lance	Sensenbrenner	Lowenthal	Raskin	Visclosky
Marchant	Rokita	Walters, Mimi	Walters, Mimi	Latta	Sessions	Lujan Grisham,	Rice (NY)	Walz
Marino	Rooney, Francis	Weber (TX)	Denham	Lewis (MN)	Shimkus	M.	Richmond	Wasserman
Marshall	Rooney, Thomas	Webster (FL)	Dent	Lipinski	Shuster	Luján, Ben Ray	Rosen	Schultz
Massie	J.	Wenstrup	DeSantis	LoBiondo	Simpson	Lynch	Roybal-Allard	Waters, Maxine
Mast	Ros-Lehtinen	Westerman	DesJarlais	Long	Smith (MO)	Maloney,	Ruiz	Watson Coleman
McCarthy	Roskam	Williams	Diaz-Balart	Loudermilk	Smith (NE)	Carolyn B.	Ruppersberger	Welch
McCaul	Ross	Wilson (SC)	Novovan	Love	Smith (NJ)	Maloney, Sean	Ryan (OH)	Wilson (FL)
McClintock	Rothfus	Wittman	Duffy	Lucas	Smith (TX)	Matsui	Sánchez	Yarmuth
McHenry	Rouzer	Womack	Duncan (SC)	Luetkemeyer	Smucker		Sarbanes	
McKinley	Royce (CA)	Woodall	Duncan (TN)	MacArthur	Stefanik			
McMorris	Russell	Yoder	Dunn	Marchant	Stewart			
Rodgers	Rutherford	Yoho	Emmer	Marino	Stivers			
McSally	Sanford	Young (AK)	Farenthold	Marshall	Taylor			
Meadows	Scalise	Young (IA)	Faso	Massie	Tenney			
Meehan	Schweikert	Zeldin	Ferguson	Mast	Thompson (PA)			
			Fitzpatrick	McCarthy	Thornberry			
			Fleischmann	Flores	Tiberi			
			Flores	Fortenberry	Tipton			
			Fox	Fox	Trott			
			Franks (AZ)	Franks (AZ)	Turner			
			Frelinghuysen	Frelinghuysen	Upton			
			Gaetz	Gaetz	Valadao			
			Gallagher	Gallagher	Wagner			
			Garrett	Garrett	Walberg			
			Gibbs	Gibbs	Walden			
			Gohmert	Gohmert	Walker			
			Goodlatte	Goodlatte	Walorski			
			Gosar	Gosar	Walters, Mimi			
			Gowdy	Gowdy	Weber (TX)			
			Granger	Granger	Webster (FL)			
			Graves (GA)	Graves (GA)	Wenstrup			
			Graves (LA)	Graves (LA)	Westerman			
			Graves (MO)	Graves (MO)	Williams			
			Griffith	Griffith	Wilson (SC)			
			Grothman	Grothman	Wittman			
			Guthrie	Guthrie	Womack			
			Harper	Harper	Woodall			
			Harris	Harris	Yoder			
			Hartzler	Hartzler	Yoho			
			Hensarling	Hensarling	Young (AK)			
			Herrera Beutler	Herrera Beutler	Young (IA)			
			Hice, Jody B.	Hice, Jody B.	Zeldin			

NOT VOTING—10

Blumenauer	Jones	Slaughter
Costa	Mulvaney	Zinke
Gabbard	Price, Tom (GA)	
Johnson, E. B.	Rush	

□ 1640

Messrs. TURNER, MOONEY of West Virginia, SANFORD, BRADY of Texas, YOUNG of Alaska, BILIRAKIS, SHIMKUS, CHABOT, and WALDEN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. CONNOLLY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WAGNER). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 183, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

AYES—238

Abraham	Banks (IN)	Bishop (UT)
Aderholt	Barletta	Black
Allen	Barr	Blackburn
Amash	Barton	Blum
Amodei	Bergman	Bost
Arrington	Biggs	Brady (TX)
Babin	Bilirakis	Brat
Bacon	Bishop (MI)	Bridenstine

NOES—183

Adams	Cicilline	Dingell
Aguiar	Clark (MA)	Doggett
Barragán	Clarke (NY)	Doyle, Michael
Bass	Clay	F.
Beatty	Cleaver	Ellison
Bera	Clyburn	Engel
Beyer	Cohen	Eshoo
Bishop (GA)	Connolly	Espallat
Blunt Rochester	Conyers	Esty
Bonamici	Cooper	Evans
Boyle, Brendan	Correa	Foster
F.	Courtney	Frankel (FL)
Brady (PA)	Crist	Fudge
Brown (MD)	Crowley	Gallego
Brownley (CA)	Cummings	Garamendi
Bustos	Davis (CA)	Gonzalez (TX)
Butterfield	Davis, Danny	Gottheimer
Capuano	DeFazio	Green, Al
Carbajal	DeGette	Green, Gene
Cárdenas	Delaney	Grijalva
Carson (IN)	DeLauro	Gutiérrez
Cartwright	DelBene	Hanabusa
Castor (FL)	Demings	Hastings
Castro (TX)	DeSaulnier	Heck
Chu, Judy	Deutch	Higgins (NY)

NOT VOTING—11

Blumenauer	Jones	Rush
Costa	Lieu, Ted	Slaughter
Gabbard	Mulvaney	Zinke
Johnson, E. B.	Price, Tom (GA)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1648

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote numbers 62, 63, 64, and 65. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on vote numbers 62, 63, and 65. I would have voted "aye" on vote number 64.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I was unable to vote during the following rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted: "No" on rollcall 62, Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 7. "No" on rollcall 63, Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 7—No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act of 2017. "Yea" on rollcall 64, on Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 7. "No" on rollcall 65, Passage of H.R. 7—No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act of 2017.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 59

Resolved, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—Ms. Shea-Porter and Mr. Espallat.

(2) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—Mr. Lawson of Florida.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT FROM TUESDAY, JANUARY 24, 2017, TO FRIDAY, JANUARY 27, 2017; AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JANUARY 27, 2017, TO MONDAY, JANUARY 30, 2017

Mr. ROYCE of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Friday, January 27, 2017; and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Monday, January 30, 2017, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

REINFORCING EDUCATION ACCOUNTABILITY IN DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 601) to enhance the transparency and accelerate the impact of assistance provided under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to promote quality basic education in developing countries, to better enable such countries to achieve universal access to quality basic education and improved learning outcomes, to eliminate duplication and waste, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 601

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Reinforcing Education Accountability in Development Act” or the “READ Act”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

Sec. 3. Assistance to promote sustainable, quality basic education.

Sec. 4. Comprehensive integrated United States strategy to promote basic education.

Sec. 5. Improving coordination and oversight.

Sec. 6. Monitoring and evaluation of programs.

Sec. 7. Transparency and reporting to Congress.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

(a) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In this Act, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(4) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(b) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—In this Act, the terms “basic education”, “marginalized children and vulnerable groups”, “national education plan”, “partner country”, and “relevant Executive branch agencies and officials” have the meanings given such terms in section 105(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as added by section 3.

SEC. 3. ASSISTANCE TO PROMOTE SUSTAINABLE, QUALITY BASIC EDUCATION.

Section 105 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151c) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) ASSISTANCE TO PROMOTE SUSTAINABLE, QUALITY BASIC EDUCATION.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) BASIC EDUCATION.—The term ‘basic education’ includes—

“(i) measurable improvements in literacy, numeracy, and other basic skills development that prepare an individual to be an active, productive member of society and the workforce;

“(ii) workforce development, vocational training, and digital literacy informed by real market needs and opportunities and that results in measurable improvements in employment;

“(iii) programs and activities designed to demonstrably improve—

“(I) early childhood, preprimary education, primary education, and secondary education, which can be delivered in formal or non-formal education settings; and

“(II) learning for out-of-school youth and adults; and

“(iv) capacity building for teachers, administrators, counselors, and youth workers that results in measurable improvements in student literacy, numeracy, or employment.

“(B) COMMUNITIES OF LEARNING.—The term ‘communities of learning’ means a holistic approach to education and community engagement in which schools act as the primary resource center for delivery of a service to the community at large, leveraging and maximizing the impact of other development efforts and reducing duplication and waste.

“(C) GENDER PARITY IN BASIC EDUCATION.—The term ‘gender parity in basic education’ means that girls and boys have equal access to quality basic education.

“(D) MARGINALIZED CHILDREN AND VULNERABLE GROUPS.—The term ‘marginalized children and vulnerable groups’ includes girls, children affected by or emerging from armed conflict or humanitarian crises, children with disabilities, children in remote or rural areas (including those who lack access to safe water and sanitation), religious or ethnic minorities, indigenous peoples, orphans

and children affected by HIV/AIDS, child laborers, married adolescents, and victims of trafficking.

“(E) NATIONAL EDUCATION PLAN.—The term ‘national education plan’ means a comprehensive national education plan developed by partner country governments in consultation with other stakeholders as a means for wide-scale improvement of the country’s education system, including explicit, credible strategies informed by effective practices and standards to achieve quality universal basic education.

“(F) NONFORMAL EDUCATION.—The term ‘nonformal education’ means organized educational activities outside the established formal system, whether operating separately or as an important feature of a broader activity, that are intended to provide students with measurable improvements in literacy, numeracy, and other basic skills development that prepare an individual to be an active, productive member of society and the workforce.

“(G) PARTNER COUNTRY.—The term ‘partner country’ means a developing country that participates in or benefits from basic education programs under this subsection pursuant to the prioritization criteria described in paragraph (4), including level of need, opportunity for impact, and the availability of resources.

“(H) RELEVANT EXECUTIVE BRANCH AGENCIES AND OFFICIALS.—The term ‘relevant Executive branch agencies and officials’ means the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Labor, the Department of Education, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Defense, the Chief Executive Officer of the Millennium Challenge Corporation, the National Security Advisor, and the Director of the Peace Corps.

“(I) SUSTAINABILITY.—The term ‘sustainability’ means, with respect to any basic education program that receives funding pursuant to this section, the ability of a service delivery system, community, partner, or beneficiary to maintain, over time, such basic education program without the use of foreign assistance.

“(2) POLICY.—In carrying out this section, it shall be the policy of the United States to work with partner countries, as appropriate, other donors, multilateral institutions, the private sector, and nongovernmental and civil society organizations, including faith-based organizations and organizations that represent teachers, students, and parents, to promote sustainable, quality basic education through programs and activities that—

“(A) take into consideration and help respond to the needs, capacities, and commitment of developing countries to achieve measurable improvements in literacy, numeracy, and other basic skills development that prepare an individual to be an active, productive member of society and the workforce;

“(B) strengthen educational systems, promote communities of learning, as appropriate, expand access to safe learning environments, including by breaking down specific barriers to basic education for women and girls, ensure continuity of education, including in conflict settings, measurably improve teacher skills and learning outcomes, and support the engagement of parents in the education of their children to help partner countries ensure that all children, including marginalized children and other vulnerable groups, have access to and benefit from quality basic education;

“(C) promote education as a foundation for sustained economic growth and development within a comprehensive assistance strategy that places partner countries on a trajectory

toward graduation from assistance provided under this section with clearly defined benchmarks of success that are used as requirements for related procurement vehicles, such as grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements; and

“(D) monitor and evaluate the effectiveness and quality of basic education programs in partner countries.

“(3) PRINCIPLES.—In carrying out the policy referred to in paragraph (2), the United States shall be guided by the following principles of aid effectiveness:

“(A) ALIGNMENT.—Assistance provided under this section to support programs and activities under this subsection shall be aligned with and advance United States foreign policy and economic interests.

“(B) COUNTRY OWNERSHIP.—To the greatest extent practicable, assistance provided under this section to support programs and activities under this subsection should be aligned with and support the national education plans and country development strategies of partner countries, including activities that are appropriate for and meet the needs of local and indigenous cultures.

“(C) COORDINATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Assistance provided under this section to support programs and activities under this subsection should be coordinated with and leverage the unique capabilities and resources of local and national governments in partner countries, other donors, multilateral institutions, the private sector, and nongovernmental and civil society organizations, including faith-based organizations and organizations that represent teachers, students, and parents.

“(ii) MULTILATERAL PROGRAMS AND INITIATIVES.—Assistance provided under this section to support programs and activities under this subsection should be coordinated with and support proven multilateral education programs and financing mechanisms, which may include the Global Partnership for Education, that demonstrate commitment to efficiency, effectiveness, transparency, and accountability.

“(D) EFFICIENCY.—The President shall seek to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of assistance provided under this section to support programs and activities under this subsection by coordinating the related efforts of relevant Executive branch agencies and officials.

“(E) EFFECTIVENESS.—Programs and activities supported under this subsection—

“(i) shall be consistent with the policies and principles set forth in this subsection;

“(ii) shall be designed to achieve specific, measurable goals and objectives that are directly related to the provision of basic education (as defined in this section); and

“(iii) shall include appropriate targets, metrics, and indicators that—

“(I) move a country along the path to graduation from assistance provided under this subsection; and

“(II) can be applied with reasonable consistency across such programs and activities to measure progress and outcomes.

“(F) TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—Programs and activities supported under this subsection shall be subject to rigorous monitoring and evaluation, which may include impact evaluations, the results of which shall be made publically available in a fully searchable, electronic format.

“(4) PRIORITY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—The President shall ensure that assistance provided under this section to support programs and activities under this subsection is aligned with the foreign policy and economic interests of the United States and, subject to such alignment, priority is given to developing countries in which—

“(A) there is the greatest need and opportunity to expand access to basic education and to improve learning outcomes, including for marginalized and vulnerable groups, particularly women and girls to ensure gender parity in basic education, or populations affected by conflict or crisis; and

“(B) such assistance can produce a substantial, measurable impact on children and educational systems.”

SEC. 4. COMPREHENSIVE INTEGRATED UNITED STATES STRATEGY TO PROMOTE BASIC EDUCATION.

(a) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—Not later than October 1, 2017, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a comprehensive United States strategy to be carried out during fiscal years 2018 through 2022 to promote quality basic education in partner countries by—

(1) seeking to equitably expand access to basic education for all children, particularly marginalized children and vulnerable groups; and

(2) measurably improving the quality of basic education and learning outcomes.

(b) REQUIREMENT TO CONSULT.—In developing the strategy required under subsection (a), the President shall consult with—

(1) the appropriate congressional committees;

(2) relevant Executive branch agencies and officials;

(3) partner country governments; and

(4) local and international nongovernmental organizations, including faith-based organizations and organizations representing students, teachers, and parents, and other development partners engaged in basic education assistance programs in developing countries.

(c) PUBLIC COMMENT.—The President shall provide an opportunity for public comment on the strategy required under subsection (a).

(d) ELEMENTS.—The strategy required under subsection (a)—

(1) shall be developed and implemented consistent with the principles set forth in section 105(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as added by section 3; and

(2) shall seek—

(A) to prioritize assistance provided under this subsection to countries that are partners of the United States and whose populations are most in need of improved basic education, as determined by indicators such as literacy and numeracy rates;

(B) to build the capacity of relevant actors in partner countries, including in government and in civil society, to develop and implement national education plans that measurably improve basic education;

(C) to identify and replicate successful interventions that improve access to and quality of basic education in conflict settings and in partner countries;

(D) to project general levels of resources needed to achieve stated program objectives;

(E) to develop means to track implementation in partner countries and ensure that such countries are expending appropriate domestic resources and instituting any relevant legal, regulatory, or institutional reforms needed to achieve stated program objectives;

(F) to leverage United States capabilities, including through technical assistance, training, and research; and

(G) to improve coordination and reduce duplication among relevant Executive branch agencies and officials, other donors, multilateral institutions, nongovernmental organizations, and governments in partner countries.

SEC. 5. IMPROVING COORDINATION AND OVERSIGHT.

(a) SENIOR COORDINATOR OF UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL BASIC EDUCATION ASSIST-

ANCE.—There is established within the United States Agency for International Development a Senior Coordinator of United States International Basic Education Assistance (referred to in this section as the “Senior Coordinator”). The Senior Coordinator shall be appointed by the President, shall be a current USAID employee serving in a career or noncareer position in the Senior Executive Service or at the level of a Deputy Assistant Administrator or higher, and shall serve concurrently as the Senior Coordinator.

(b) DUTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Senior Coordinator shall have primary responsibility for the oversight and coordination of all resources and activities of the United States Government relating to the promotion of international basic education programs and activities.

(2) SPECIFIC DUTIES.—The Senior Coordinator shall—

(A) facilitate program and policy coordination of international basic education programs and activities among relevant Executive branch agencies and officials, partner governments, multilateral institutions, the private sector, and nongovernmental and civil society organizations;

(B) develop and revise the strategy required under section 4;

(C) monitor, evaluate, and report on activities undertaken pursuant to the strategy required under section 4; and

(D) establish due diligence criteria for all recipients of funds provided by the United States to carry out activities under this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(c) OFFSET.—In order to eliminate duplication of effort and activities and to offset any costs incurred by the United States Agency for International Development in appointing the Senior Coordinator under subsection (a), the President shall, after consulting with appropriate congressional committees, eliminate a position within the United States Agency for International Development (unless otherwise authorized or required by law) that the President determines to be necessary to fully offset such costs and eliminate duplication.

SEC. 6. MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS.

The President shall seek to ensure that programs carried out under the strategy required under section 4 shall—

(1) apply rigorous monitoring and evaluation methodologies to determine if programs and activities provided under this subsection accomplish measurable improvements in literacy, numeracy, or other basic skills development that prepare an individual to be an active, productive member of society and the workforce;

(2) include methodological guidance in the implementation plan and support systemic data collection using internationally comparable indicators, norms, and methodologies, to the extent practicable and appropriate;

(3) disaggregate all data collected and reported by age, gender, marital status, disability, and location, to the extent practicable and appropriate;

(4) include funding for both short- and long-term monitoring and evaluation to enable assessment of the sustainability and scalability of assistance programs; and

(5) support the increased use and public availability of education data for improved decision making, program effectiveness, and monitoring of global progress.

SEC. 7. TRANSPARENCY AND REPORTING TO CONGRESS.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGY.—Not later than each

March 31 immediately following a fiscal year during which the strategy developed pursuant to section 4(a) was carried out, the President shall—

(1) submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes the implementation of such strategy; and

(2) make the report described in paragraph (1) available to the public.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of the efforts made by relevant Executive branch agencies and officials to implement the strategy developed pursuant to section 4, with a particular focus on the activities carried out under the strategy;

(2) a description of the extent to which each partner country selected to receive assistance for basic education meets the priority criteria specified in section 105(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act, as added by section 3; and

(3) a description of the progress achieved over the reporting period toward meeting the goals, objectives, benchmarks, and timeframes specified in the strategy developed pursuant to section 4 at the program level, as developed pursuant to monitoring and evaluation specified in section 6, with particular emphasis on whether there are demonstrable student improvements in literacy, numeracy, or other basic skills development that prepare an individual to be an active, productive member of society and the workforce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 601, the Reinforcing Education Accountability and Development Act, or the READ Act. This bill passed the House at the end of the last Congress in essentially the same form as H.R. 4481. I am pleased the House has moved to take it up again today.

We all recognize the importance of education as a driver of economic growth, social mobility, and overall stability. Education is what increases the productivity of the workforce. This is what empowers men and women to better care for themselves and their families. It increases civic participation.

Even 1 extra year of schooling significantly increases a worker's earnings over her or his lifespan. For women in particular, a primary school education is directly correlated very strongly with improved maternal-child health and improved survival rates.

Yet, around the world, as we know here, there are 120 million children

that are not in school. More than one-third of these children, as NITA LOWEY can testify, come from countries that are embroiled in war, embroiled in conflict, and many of these recent conflicts have lasted for over a decade.

We are now seeing entire generations of these young children who are failing to receive even the most basic education.

You want to talk about a humanitarian crisis?

This is it. There are clear implications for global stability and for our security.

When children remain out of school, what do they face?

Well, certainly great increased risk of abuse at the hands of traffickers, forced marriage or marriage as a child bride, and recruitment by criminal or terrorist organizations.

Nowhere is this harsh reality more clear than in Syria, where 4 million Syrian children are currently out of school. We have had the opportunity to talk to many of these children on the border and see what their circumstances are like.

Inside Syria, these children are being shaped by violence and by a lack of alternatives that place them at high risk of exploitation and radicalization. As refugees—if you talk to our friends and allies in the region—they are placing tremendous strain on the education system in Lebanon, Jordan, and Turkey.

Despite these growing challenges, it has been decades since Congress reviewed and updated the authorities on which U.S. international basic education efforts are based.

This bill, the READ Act, introduces the new guidelines and the increased accountability for existing U.S. efforts to improve access to basic education in developing and conflict-torn countries. It requires strategic planning. It requires the prioritization of resources relative to needs on the ground in these countries and relative to the potential for impact. It requires alignment with U.S. diplomatic development and security interests.

Particular emphasis is given to those areas in crisis and those countries that are partners of the United States that face this critical challenge, whose populations are most in need, who have committed their own resources to ensure the success and sustainability of these efforts, but need our assistance.

It also requires increased attention to what is most important here, and that is to the specific barriers to education that are faced by women and girls.

The bill formalizes a senior coordinator position within USAID to oversee the development and implementation of a strategic plan across Federal agencies to ensure coordination and eliminate duplication and waste.

I thank Representative LOWEY for her continued bipartisan leadership on this issue, as well as my committee's ranking member, Mr. ENGEL, and the

chair of our Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, Mr. SMITH, for their work on this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

Again, I thank our chairman, ED ROYCE, for his leadership and working together.

I want to acknowledge my good friend from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), who authored this bill. For years and years, she has been a champion for access to education here in the United States and around the world.

Like the other bills before us today, we passed this legislation in the last Congress. I am glad we are taking it up so early this year so that, hopefully, the Senate can act.

Mr. Speaker, research tells us that more than a quarter billion young people around the world are not in school. For millions more, the educational opportunities are substandard. This lack of access puts so many young people at a tremendous disadvantage. Children should be in classrooms. They should be aspiring to their highest potential, thinking about what they want to be when they grow up.

□ 1700

The payoff of a few years of quality education is huge. Every year of primary school increases an individual's earning potential by 5 to 15 percent. It is not just those students who reap the benefits, it is really all of us.

Consider public health and economics. More educated populations are healthier and more productive. Consider threats to our security. In places like Afghanistan and South Sudan, where roughly half of children are not in school, we know that violent extremists and others are ready to fill the vacuum, leading these vulnerable young people down a dark, dark path. Research has also told us that in high-risk places like Somalia, where young people can learn about certain issues like nonviolent civic engagement, participation in violence drops by 14 percent and support for violence drops by 20 percent.

That is why education needs to be a foreign policy priority and why we need to be very careful as a new administration urges to make major changes in America's foreign assistance. This legislation calls for a 5-year strategy for expanding opportunities for kids to go to school all over the world, especially where children are most vulnerable. It would put a new point person in charge of making sure that our efforts across government are coordinated and effective, and it would place a special emphasis on monitoring and evaluation so that we know we are getting the best bang for the buck when it comes to our investments in basic education.

This bill would help to put children in classrooms around the world. It would give more young people a better shot at a full and successful life. I am proud to support it. I commend Mrs. LOWEY.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the author of this bill.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of bipartisan legislation that would increase transparency and congressional oversight of U.S. basic education programs around the world.

H.R. 601, the Reinforcing Education Accountability in Development—READ—Act, which I introduced with my colleague, Representative David Reichert, would elevate the importance of education while improving USAID's efforts and ensuring that taxpayer dollars are well spent.

The challenge is clear. Nearly 60 million primary school-age children and 65 million adolescents are out of school around the world. Millions more are expected to never enroll. Women and girls are disproportionately out of school. The United States has a clear moral, economic, and security interest in promoting universal basic education as a fundamental human right.

The bill before us today enhances Congress' oversight of USAID's work with foreign governments, NGOs, and multilateral organizations to help nations develop and implement quality programs, address key barriers to school attendance, and increase completion rates for the poorest and most vulnerable children worldwide. It calls on USAID to develop a comprehensive strategy and appoint a senior coordinator tasked with ensuring that our programs expand access to millions of children who are not in school and improve the quality of education for millions who are.

These efforts will not only help students read and write, they will ultimately help protect vulnerable children from poverty, disease, hunger, and even extremism.

There is no greater force multiplier than education. An education is the fundamental tool with which girls and boys are empowered to increase their economic potential, improve their health outcomes, provide for their families, address cultural biases, participate in their communities, and contribute to democratic societies.

First introduced in 2004 and passed by the House last year, the bill before us today represents many years of hard work to elevate the importance of global education, bipartisan compromise, and the support of over 30 nonprofit and advocacy organizations, including RESULTS, the ONE Campaign, the Basic Education Coalition, the Global Campaign for Education,

Global Citizen, the Malala Fund, and many other vital partners.

In closing, I thank Chairman ROYCE, Ranking Member ENGEL, their hard-working staff—Joan, Jessica, Janice, and Mark, and, of course, Marin Stein, who has been working around the clock on this bill.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank them all. We have been working on this bill a very long time. I, again, thank Chairman ROYCE for his leadership and Ranking Member ENGEL. Their diligent efforts to bring the READ Act before the House today is so vital, and I urge immediate passage. In closing, thanks again to Marin Stein.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, I read a few weeks ago that the new administration was planning to retool the State Department to focus more on terrorism. The article suggested that the State Department might do away with some of our smart power efforts. That would be a mistake. I look at an effort like this one, expanding access to education, and I know that it isn't taking away from our ability to combat terrorism. In fact, it is critical to that fight.

When we help more young people get access to a good education, we are giving them the tools to think critically and resist those who mean us harm. We are helping give people an alternative, a path forward for their lives.

When kids don't have these skills, who do you think shows up? When children are told from a young age, with no competing message, that America is their enemy, how does that shape their lives?

So I hope that this bill gets to the new President's desk and that he sees the value not just in expanding access to education, but in the wide range of foreign policy priorities that help to project stability and make communities stronger, that show the world that the United States is a friend and a partner, and not an enemy.

Again, I thank Congresswoman LOWEY for her hard work. I thank Chairman ROYCE for his hard work and collegiality, as always. I support this bill. I urge all Members to do the same.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I concur with those arguments that Mr. ENGEL just made. Congresswoman NITA LOWEY and I have talked about this, and if my colleagues will think on this for a minute, the reality today is that we face a situation where there are 65 million men, women, and children around the globe who have been displaced by conflict. I would just like the Members to think about the fact that this is more people than were dis-

placed during World War II. This is the highest level, highest on record of human beings who have been displaced by conflict. Think about what that means to the children who are those most victimized.

The United States is doing important work around the world, trying to help our allies, trying to help organizations—and there are many good NGOs working on this—to address this massive education deficit that so many of these children face. But Congress, I think, has to demand a greater degree, yes, of transparency and accountability for these activities to ensure our investments are as effective as possible in line with our strategic interests.

There is one more thing that we have to ask of our partners in this, and that is equal access to every young girl for education. That has got to be up there at the top of that priority list.

This Reinforcing Education Accountability in Development Act outlines clear priorities for this work with that emphasis that I talked about and asking those partners to carry out their end of this bargain. This bill also requires aggressive monitoring and evaluation and an annual report that justifies the investment on a country-by-country basis, but holds with it the accountability for the education of girls and for the rest of this work.

I urge Members to support this measure. Again, I thank Representative LOWEY. I thank the rest of the Members who worked on this for working on such a bipartisan basis on its provisions.

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 601. As a parent who was very involved in my children's education and served as President of the Southfield Public Schools Board of Education, I firmly believe the importance of promoting education to all regions of the world. Education is a universal human right that should be obtained by every young mind of the world.

Access to basic education is a human right that must be guaranteed to all children. In my role as the Vice Chair of the Bipartisan Congressional Women's Caucus during the 115th Congress, I will work with my colleagues in a bipartisan manner to highlight barriers to basic education, specifically focusing on girls' education in the developing world. Providing girls with an education helps break the cycle of poverty. Educated women are less likely to get married, more likely to have healthy babies, and are more likely to understand the value of education.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation would ensure that aid is prioritized for the most vulnerable populations, particularly those living in conflict zones. We must take the necessary steps to see that these children are provided with the rights to develop their full potential in order to be contributing members of their societies.

The enforcement of this bill will help bridge the gap with some global issues that we still see today with marginalized groups seeking education. Young children, regardless of gender have the right to gain a quality education.

Children with disabilities or illnesses should not be shunned away from trying to learn because they are considered different.

I am grateful that our Chamber has taken this important step to ensure that the United States dedicates our time and resources to helping the future of the world gain an education. I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their continued support of universal education for all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 601.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BENEFITS OF RENEWABLE FUELS

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

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about an issue of great importance to my district and the State of Iowa, renewable fuels.

On January 31, a renewable fuels summit will allow Iowans to gather together and highlight the essential role Iowa plays when it comes to our energy needs.

The renewable fuels industry boasts good-paying jobs for our economy, not only in my State of Iowa, but across the country. Renewable fuels increase choice for consumers and lower prices at the pump. A U.S. Department of Agriculture report also showed how the renewable fuels contribute to reducing emissions and our Nation's reliance on foreign fuels.

This new Congress provides a lot of opportunity to both renewable fuels advocates and opponents. I look forward to engaging in meaningful discussions with my colleagues to inform them of the benefits of renewable fuels: energy independence, good-paying jobs, enhancing national security, environmental benefits, consumer choice with lower prices, and ensuring the strength and history of the family farm.

I will also work with the Trump administration and anyone else to help protect the Renewable Fuels Standard and consumer access to conventional and advanced biofuels. The renewable fuels industry plays such a key role in so many of our Nation's needs.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge our new President to drain the swamp, to address his own myriad conflicts of interest. President Trump's financial disclosure stated he had a holding of at least \$15,000 in En-

ergy Transfer Partners, the lead developer on the Dakota Access Pipeline. We also know he has at least \$100,000 invested in Phillips 66, which has a 25 percent stake in the same project. His spokesperson claims he has sold his stake, but how do we know? We still don't have his tax returns.

Additionally, news stories indicate he has a holding in TransCanada, the developer of the Keystone XL pipeline. With the White House's action to push these pipelines forward, I fear that today we have the first of many indications of impropriety and conflict of interest. Without disclosure of his tax returns, Mr. Trump's personal financial interests are a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma. They appear to compromise honorable governance with insider deals.

The President should know the American people are watching, and they do care. The peaceful protests he saw on Saturday are only the beginning if he cannot live up to the ethical requirements of his new office and the legitimate expectations of the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

□ 1715

CONGRATULATING CLEMSON UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL TEAM

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

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Clemson University football team on their 2017 national championship.

In a nail-biting rematch of the 2016 national championship game between the Clemson Tigers and the Alabama Crimson Tide, the Tigers came back with something to prove—and boy did they, with their 35-31 win.

While every member of the team played their hearts out, I would like to recognize a very special player who hails from the Seventh District of South Carolina, wide receiver Hunter Renfrow. A native of Horry County and graduate of Socastee High School, Mr. Renfrow has had an outstanding season, catching 44 passes, including 6 touchdowns, for a total of 495 yards this season. He joined the Tigers as a walk-on, earned a scholarship, and last week, with 1 second left, caught the game-winning touchdown in the championship game.

I would also like to extend special congratulations to two of Clemson's finest alumni: my wife, Wrenzie, and my friend, Congressman JEFF DUNCAN. I know few people who take more pride in their alma mater and enjoyed this win as much as they did.

This national title is a win for all of the great State of South Carolina. In fact, two national titles currently re-

side in South Carolina: the NCAA football championship in Clemson and the NCAA College World Series at Coastal Carolina University.

Congratulations Clemson, and go Tigers.

LET'S WORK TOGETHER TO IMPROVE THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT, NOT END IT

(Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, in the House Budget Committee, we heard testimony that, if the repeal mission that our Republican colleagues have been on now for the past 7 years is successful, 29.8 million Americans would lose their health insurance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, keep in mind that, for all of the rhetoric, here are the facts:

Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, we have more people with health insurance today in our country than at any time in our Nation's history. What was once a 16 percent uninsured rate has been cut in half. It is now 8 percent.

Why in the world would we want to throw away that progress?

Now, we hear from the other side repeal and replace, repeal and replace. Well, we have now had 65 votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act, and how many votes have we had on their replace plan? Zero. Not one.

It would be criminal to throw away the progress that has been made through the Affordable Care Act. It is not perfect. No law is. No piece of legislation is. Let's work together to improve it, not end it.

AMERICANS' TAX DOLLARS SHOULD NEVER BE USED TO END THE LIFE OF A CHILD

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

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, today, the House voted to end taxpayer support for abortion.

A majority of Americans believe abortion is wrong, and they do not wish to see their tax dollars pay for this gruesome procedure that ends the life of another human being. This legislation permanently puts into law a long-standing policy that has been renewed by Congress every year. It will reassure Americans that the hard-earned money they pay to the government will never be used to fund abortions.

This is necessary because the Affordable Care Act, a law that has been unaffordable for so many Americans, actually paid subsidies for healthcare plans that include abortion. This is unacceptable. A child in a mother's womb is a blessing. Americans expect their tax dollars will never be used to pay to end the life of an innocent child.

Today's legislation will protect taxpayers and, most importantly, our society's most vulnerable—the unborn.

**SUPPORT FOR IMMIGRANTS
ACROSS OUR COUNTRY**

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of immigrants across our country.

As an immigrant myself, I understand the sacrifices and hardships that immigrants experience. My parents sacrificed their very small life savings to send me to the United States at the age of 16 by myself to pursue college. That is why I stayed in my district last Friday to host an immigration roundtable with directly impacted constituents.

Like many of us, Mr. Speaker, they have heard reports that this new administration intends to deport millions of people across our country rather than working towards a comprehensive reform of our immigration system, similar to the one that was passed in the other Chamber with 68 bipartisan votes, unfortunately, never brought to the floor of this Chamber.

I heard from children, Mr. Speaker, afraid to go to school out of fear that their parents will be taken away while they are at school. I heard from people whose lives are still in limbo because they have no idea what is going to happen next.

But despite their fear, they still are ready to stand together and fight for their futures, and their courage and resilience is truly inspiring. We owe it to them to fight alongside them.

**TAKE YOUR CRIMINAL ALIENS
BACK OR LOSE VISAS**

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, illegal Haitian immigrant Jean Jacques spent 17 years in a U.S. prison for attempted murder. After his release, ICE officials tried to deport him, but Haiti would not take him back, so he was let go. Five months later, he murdered Casey Chadwick of Connecticut, brutally stabbing her in the face and neck 15 times.

U.S. law says that illegals who have committed serious crimes will be deported. But if the country of origin won't take their citizen back, they are released back on the streets of America. There are thousands of criminal aliens who have been turned loose on our streets because their home country won't take them back.

I have introduced legislation to fix this. My bill codifies number seven of President Trump's immigration plan, which states that we should "ensure that other countries take their people back when we order them deported."

My legislation would prohibit visas for these countries that refuse to take their crooks back. No more American lives like Casey's should be lost be-

cause foreign criminals just won't go home.

And that is just the way it is.

DEFENDING CHOICE

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, 44 years ago this week, the Supreme Court ruled in *Roe v. Wade* in favor of a woman's right to make her own decisions about her own body. It is outrageous that today, more than four decades later, President Trump and my Republican colleagues have made restricting choice their first order of business.

Yesterday, President Trump signed an executive order banning health organizations that receive U.S. funding from even mentioning abortion as a medical option for their patients. And today, this House is launching a radical assault on women's health care that penalizes women and small businesses that choose private health insurance plans that cover abortion services.

The effect of these unprecedented restrictions is clear: restricting the comprehensive health coverage available for women.

Terminating a pregnancy is a personal choice that should be a woman's alone, made in consultation with her family and her physician. Politicians have no role in this process.

I urge my colleagues to end this backward attack on women's rights and start tackling the real challenges voters sent us here to address.

**44TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROE V.
WADE**

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give voice to the millions of lives that have been lost in the aftermath of *Roe v. Wade*.

In the 44 years since that disgraceful decision, an unconscionable 58 million abortions have been performed. That represents 58 million children who will never grow up, never make their own decisions, and never influence the world around them, but whose lives are cut short.

The House took a vital step today with the passage of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill that permanently prohibits taxpayers from funding abortion through the Hyde amendment.

Since its original passage, this amendment has saved over 2 million babies. Congress must make permanent these protections to honor the conscience rights of a strong majority of Americans who do not want their taxpayer dollars paying for abortions.

This week, we gather to mourn the tragic loss of life and to seek God's forgiveness for the stain of abortion on our Nation's conscience.

May God have mercy on our country.

**HONORING ROLETTE COUNTY
SHERIFF'S DEPUTY, COLT ALLERY**

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with a heavy heart to honor the life of Rolette County Sheriff's Deputy Colt Allery. On January 18, Deputy Allery made the ultimate sacrifice when he was shot and killed in the line of duty following a high-speed pursuit of a stolen vehicle near Belcourt, North Dakota. He was only 29 years old.

Mr. Speaker, people from across North Dakota and the country gathered today in Belcourt to pay tribute to Deputy Allery, who has been described by his friends and his colleagues as someone "full of spunk, cheerful, and always smiling."

He grew up and lived in St. John, North Dakota, where he dedicated his adult life to selflessly serving and defending his community through a career in law enforcement. In 2011, he became a correctional officer for Rolette County, and later served with the Rolla Police Department and Turtle Mountain Tribal Police Department before joining the Rolette County Sheriff's Office as a deputy, just 3 months ago.

Our State is heartbroken over the loss of another hero taken from us way too soon, and we will never forget Deputy Allery's service and sacrifice in defense of the citizens of North Dakota. My wife, Kris, and I offer our prayers on behalf of Deputy Allery's family, and express our condolences and our profound gratefulness to all police officers who put their lives on the line every day to protect our communities and country.

God bless them, and God bless the memory of Deputy Colt Allery.

SUPPORTING HEAD START

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Head Start, a program which serves many Kansas families and children to be prepared for modern education.

Many supporters of Head Start came to Capitol Hill today to spread a message, which I believe wholeheartedly: everyone should have the opportunity to pursue the American Dream. For so many, that starts with quality education and Head Start.

We know the importance of getting kids exposed to learning at young ages, but many disadvantaged families lack the resources to do this for their own children. Without Head Start, these

children are at risk of falling behind and never catching up.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this issue should unite this Congress. It goes without saying that this is a time of deep divisions in our country. My district encompasses all aspects of American society, from urban to suburban to rural. My constituents have a wide range of beliefs and ideals. Head Start is something that can bridge these divides, and it can help children and communities no matter where they live.

Mr. Speaker, let's build that bridge and let's bring lawmakers from all across the country together in support of these children, in support of Head Start.

MAKE A CHOICE FOR LIFE

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, 44 years ago, because of *Roe v. Wade*, over 58 million children were taken from the chance to utter the words of the psalmist in Psalm 139 when he said:

For you formed my inward parts; you wove me in my mother's womb. I will give thanks to you, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made; wonderful are your works, and my soul knows it very well. My frame was not hidden from you, when I was made in secret, and skillfully, wrought in the depths of the Earth; your eyes have seen my unformed substance; and in your book were all written the days that were ordained for me, when as yet there was not one of them.

Mr. Speaker, those lives were lives of children that were created, uniquely formed with a purpose that God only intended. Our Nation did wrong. We can turn from that. We can ask Him to heal our land. And even as the psalmist said:

Behold, children are a gift of the Lord, the fruit of the womb is a reward.

We can again affirm that and say that they should be given a choice—that little girl, that little boy—making a choice for life, and who knows what that would do to impact our world for the good.

□ 1730

WOMEN'S MARCH MESSAGE OF RESPECT AND RESISTANCE

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

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today wearing this pink scarf in solidarity with so many millions of Americans who rose up this past Saturday, whether it be in D.C., on the West Coast, East Coast, so many cities in the Midwest, as well as those around the world.

It is interesting. My wife and I awoke to chanting of thousands of people. It almost felt like the protest was in our living room. And when we got out on

the balcony, we saw thousands of people who were wearing pink hats and carrying signs and so boisterous with hope.

Amanda and I decided we would go down to join them. When we got to the street, it was an amazing scene, with the Capitol ahead of us, and so many folks just gathered together—like-minded—with a message of respect and of resistance. As we tried to get towards the stage as we got to The Mall and about a mile away, we couldn't even get past a wall of bodies of so many people who were there to cheer on the message of so many great speakers.

But we found our way through, eventually, and made it onto the stage. And what I can tell you was just sheerly unimaginable: 17 blocks of Americans, of all States, of all creeds, of all colors, of all backgrounds, who were there with a message.

We had some wonderful speakers that day. We had folks from labor. We had folks from criminal justice reform groups. We had folks who were fighting for reproductive rights. We had many celebrities there, of course, and we also had folks who cared about everything from our economy to agriculture, to equality, to anything you could imagine, so many values that we fought for over the last 8 years.

There is a sense that there is going to be common ground among many of these issues as we go forward.

American jobs, obviously, everybody in this Chamber wants to make sure that we protect Americans and make sure that we have employment for everyone.

We are also going to fight for common infrastructure among all of the 50 States, and that is something that we saw in the Senate the other day that was presented.

We may also have some common ground on tax reform, particularly if it means bringing back from overseas a lot of corporate money that certainly would be important to go through the same process as profits derived here.

But there is certainly, as we saw at the speech of so many people, there will be areas of resistance.

We care about workers' rights. We care about making sure that we have a Department of Labor that will stand on the side of working American families.

We care about having an inclusive economy, one that will respect a higher minimum wage; one that will fight for more high-tech, higher paying jobs; one that will fight for our manufacturing base; one that will be based upon tax cuts for the middle class, tax cuts for folks who are working, everyday Americans, as opposed to trickle-down economics and tax cuts for the wealthy.

It was also about health care and about saving ACA or, at the very least, replacing it with something that is still going to make sure that we don't have 18 million Americans, according to the CBO, losing their health insurance.

It is about making sure that we have a Medicare system that is not going to be block-vented out to the States as a creative way to cut Medicaid for our seniors and for our poor.

It is also about protecting Medicare for our seniors who paid into it through their whole lives and making sure it is not privatized, as well as Social Security, making sure that not only those who are receiving it today, but up to those who are millennials and beyond, will be able to receive that benefit. We all paid into it, and we all expect it to be there.

But it was also about equality. Many of our LGBT community are worried: Are these executive orders in place that are protecting equality in our Federal workforce going to be continued? Is this advance, this progression, this success in the Supreme Court and in so many other areas of society to have equality for the LGBT community going to be continued onward? There is a big doubt about that.

It is also about women's reproductive rights. We saw so many, including Planned Parenthood and so many other groups, who fought not only to protect health care, but to protect women's choice, stand up and say that they don't want to revert back, that they don't want our society to revert back on equal rights for women.

And we saw that today with the reinstatement of the gag rule across the Nation and the world, to encourage nations to prohibit reproductive rights, prohibit the ability to have birth control, prohibit the right to be able to exercise the right to choose.

So many of my fellow Hispanics are worried about immigration. A simple executive order can assure that our DREAMers go from law-abiding students and members of our military and those who are applying in part of this program to being undocumented and being potentially even hunted down by their government. It is about long-term comprehensive immigration policy and reform.

So many from my district, whether it be those who are also Hispanic or those who are from the Caribbean in my district, they care deeply about this. So does our agriculture community, so does our tourism community, so does business in general. These are going to be things that people are going to stand up for, and they certainly stood up for them during the march, along with women's rights, along with equality in general.

Then there is the concern about climate change and how there was a push forward over the last 8 years and there will be an attempt to backtrack.

I don't have to tell everybody, from the way the weather has been working over the last 10 to 15 to 20 years, that this is going to be one of the greatest challenges of our time—and for our kids and for our grandchildren. We do have to do it the right way, but we stood up to make sure that everybody knows we cannot go back.

In addition, Dodd-Frank and financial reform, so critical to preventing another Great Recession. Many of us remember in 2008, in October, when President George W. Bush got on TV and told everyone that we were in for a Great Recession and one that President Obama described as the greatest recession since the Great Depression. There will be an attempt to chip back on those reforms and an attempt to try to get away from the lessons we learned to try to prevent another global meltdown.

And of course criminal justice was critical. So many of our youth, so many Hispanics, so many African Americans, so many people who find themselves in greater proportion than other Americans in jail from a system that sometimes discriminates against them.

All of these folks stood up, millions of Americans stood up, and, yes, we had hats and, yes, we had pink scarfs and, yes, we spoke about the progress that we made in the fight. But in one word, this was about respect. It was about respect for all women across the Nation, all minorities across the Nation, regardless of ethnicity and religion, all Americans, all of our Americans with disabilities, all of our working class folks who are fighting every day to try to make a good living.

The message is clear. The message is clear from the millions of Americans who marched on Saturday that we will be watching, that we will speak up when we see things we disagree with, and when we have to, we will resist.

Those who marched on Saturday, we welcome you to the resistance, and we thank you for your support. It is going to be a long 2 years.

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

ROE V. WADE ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, JIM BANKS, as our first speaker tonight, a former State senator in Indiana. He served since 2010, a new Member of the House. He served as chairman of the senate Veterans Affairs and The Military Committee with great distinction, and now he has actually joined the Veterans' Affairs Committee as well as other committees here in the House.

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the innocent lives lost as a result of Roe v. Wade.

It has now been 44 years since the Supreme Court made this unconstitutional ruling, and over that period of time, more than 58 million—I repeat, over 58 million—children have had their God-given right to life denied. Every single one of these lives was im-

portant and unique, and we grieve this loss.

At the same time, we celebrate the fact that, increasingly, our culture recognizes the value of human life. A poll released last year found that a majority of young Americans support increasing restrictions that protect the unborn. Another recent poll found that 61 percent of Americans oppose using tax dollars to fund abortions in the United States.

I agree with them, and that is why I support the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act that we voted on earlier today. I am pleased that it passed the House, and I urge my colleagues in the Senate to quickly consider this important bill.

But we must not stop there. We must work to ensure that taxpayer dollars do not continue to support the abortion industry, including Planned Parenthood, our Nation's largest abortion provider.

Additionally, we must encourage the new administration to nominate a Justice to the Supreme Court who follows the Constitution and respects the most basic and fundamental right of every human being born and unborn: the right to life.

As a father of three young daughters, these issues are personal for me. During my time in Congress, I will stand up for those who cannot stand up for themselves. I will protect and defend human life and advance these deep- and long-held values upon which our Nation was founded.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend for his remarks.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the chairwoman of the Education and the Workforce Committee, who has been outspoken for years on behalf of the innocent and inconvenient unborn children.

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague from New Jersey for his unflagging leadership on the issue of pro-life as well as on other issues related to human rights.

Mr. Speaker, since 1973, as my colleague before me said, at least 58 million children's lives have been tragically taken by abortion in the United States. Over these last 44 years, science has made the facts increasingly clear: the unborn child in his or her mother's womb is a member of the human family, fully alive and simply awaiting the right conditions before joining the rest of us in the world.

Our laws should recognize and uphold the dignity of these unborn children. And thankfully, we have made significant progress in this endeavor since the decision of Roe v. Wade. The Hyde amendment has saved over 2 million lives since 1976, and just earlier today, we passed H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. This bipartisan legislation makes the Hyde amendment permanent, ensuring that unborn children are better protected and that taxpayers are not forced to fund thousands of abortions each year.

The American people overwhelmingly agree that we should protect innocent lives and that taxpayer dollars should not be used to finance abortions. This Friday, hundreds of thousands of Americans will pour into D.C. from across the country to voice their vision of a world where every human life is valued and protected. As we mourn the lives already lost to abortion, we should continue to strive for better legal protections for the unborn so that one day every unborn child will be able to join us in exercising their rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Once again, thanks to Congressman SMITH for this Special Order.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I want to thank the distinguished chairwoman of the Education and the Workforce Committee for her kind remarks and again thank her for her leadership for so many years.

I now yield to the gentleman from Arizona, Congressman ANDY BIGGS. While a new Member of the House, he is a very experienced lawmaker, having served 14 years in the Arizona Legislature.

□ 1745

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I have a deep sense of gratitude that I expressed to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for his effort in promulgating the bill that we passed today, H.R. 7, and allowing me to speak tonight.

On Sunday, we recognized the 44th anniversary of Roe v. Wade. Sadly, almost 60 million American babies have lost their lives because of this ignominious Supreme Court decision. The tide is turning, though.

On Friday, I will have the pleasure of participating in the March for Life rally to stand with the millions of people who are defending life across this country.

I am immensely proud to live in Arizona, a State that prioritizes the protection of the unborn. Since 2009, Arizona has passed 34 provisions to restrict or regulate abortions, and Arizona's abortion rate has concomitantly decreased 12 percent in those same 4 years. I appreciate the efforts of pro-life advocates across my district who have worked tirelessly to help countless women choose life for their unborn babies.

I look forward to working with President Trump and his administration on advancing pro-life legislation like H.R. 7, which we passed out of the House today, and ensuring pro-life candidates for all Supreme Court vacancies and ultimately reversing that ignominious ruling, Roe v. Wade.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his leadership in the legislature before. As the gentleman so aptly pointed out, the numbers of abortion come down when even modest restrictions are passed. The law is a great teacher. We are so happy to have the gentleman from Arizona here in

the House, and I know I speak for many of us on the Pro-Life Caucus.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today and thank the gentleman from New Jersey because nobody has fought longer or harder for the cause of life than this man. I am pleased to be up here because I know we both believe that we represent and rise on behalf of the hundreds of thousands of Americans who are going to come to Washington, D.C., and march here this coming Friday because we believe that giving even one more life, one more person, the right to change the world is worth it.

For the last 6 years, I have come to the well of the House with the gentleman from New Jersey and my colleagues on the bipartisan Pro-Life Caucus to celebrate life and fight for the unborn. On this seventh occasion, I rise with a renewed sense of hope and optimism for our children's future.

I commend President Trump for making one of his very first actions protecting unborn children around the world by preventing U.S. taxpayer dollars being used for foreign aid from being used to fund groups that promote abortion under the guise of family planning.

We can't stop here, however. That is just one step. Now is the time for action. When President Bush restored these protections in 2001, he wrote:

"It is my conviction that taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for abortions or advocate or actively promote abortion, either here or abroad."

We took step two earlier today when a bipartisan majority of us here in the House voted to extend the Hyde amendment across all government programs and to ensure that no tax dollars from hardworking Americans are used to fund abortions here in the United States.

Let's take additional steps to fight for the ones who don't have a voice. This Congress should protect unborn children from the violence of late-term abortion, protect medical professionals from being coerced to participate in abortions, and protect women from an industry that has put its financial interests first above women's health.

Mr. Speaker, the government does not give us our rights. No. In fact, the government exists to protect our God-given rights that were given to us by our Creator and to protect the next generation. All you have to do is look at those original founding documents and it is easy to see.

Well, we are here tonight for the same reason: that hundreds of thousands will march on Washington this Friday and fight for the rights of that next generation. I am pleased and proud to be able to be a part of that.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his eloquence, for his commitment, his passion, and for that steadfastness that will one day yield

the result when the unborn are protected in our laws against the violence of abortion. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for participating, but most importantly for his years of service on behalf of his constituents and the unborn.

I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege to address you and the privilege to address the House here, and I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for recognizing me to say a few words here.

This week, when we go down to the Mall to March for Life, we will see the tens of thousands of faces, many of them young people, especially young ladies that are there to stand up and defend life.

I hear the debate here on the floor of the House of Representatives, and I have listened to the gentleman who spoke on the Democrat side of this aisle who lamented that there would be 18 million people pushed off of their healthcare if we repeal the Affordable Care Act. If you want to use the technical term, it is named the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and it is not the right name for it.

It won't be 18 million. It won't be half of that. But to listen to the lament that some people might go without—not health care, that is another misnomer—health insurance for a little while, that is their concern?

Well, we are here talking about more than 58 million little babies—little babies that are created in God's image and formed in the womb, as we heard TIM WALBERG speak a little earlier. They are the love of our lives. I have never known anyone who had a baby in their arms and felt that little baby—that little baby is forming, that little baby cooing, that special little baby smell, to witness the miracle of that little baby, I have never known a mother or a father that said: I wish this child had never been born. But that is what has happened to more than 58 million little miracles.

We are here; we are a moral standard. People say you can't legislate morality. Well, a reflection of morality is in the Federal code, and it is in the State laws all across this land.

The question that doesn't seem to be answered generally by people on the other side of the aisle—and I am grateful for the pro-life Democrats that we have who have joined us year after year.

I would pose the question to those who oppose the pro-life movement: Do you believe that human life is sacred in all of its forms? Is there anybody over there that would deny that, that human life is sacred in all of its forms? Not one of you. Not one of you will stand up and wave your arm and say: let me yield to you and say why that is not true.

It is true. We know. Human life is sacred in all of its forms. Once we understand that—now, you can stipulate

that. You have by your silence—that human life is sacred in all of its forms, there is only one other question: Since we have to protect human life in all of its forms then at what moment does life begin? At what moment, ladies and gentlemen?

Well, we know that we can only identify a single moment. As much as we know about biology—and we know plenty—one single moment is the moment of conception. From that moment, it is a unique life with the chromosomes matched up and the DNA that will never change for a lifetime, that unique individual.

Did you ever think that God's creation of us—there are over 7 billion human beings on the planet. Each one of us is created in his image, each one of us is unique. Think of 7 billion faces and no two of them are alike. Every face on the planet is distinct and unique, and it matches up with none of the faces that are in the grave today. And nobody's face matches up with any of the faces that will be born in future years or millennia.

Each face of God's creation is unique. What is the best way we can tell each other apart? Look at the visage of our faces. It is a uniqueness that God created within us that is part of how we interact with each other. It is how we should love each other and appreciate each other and draw those distinctions so that we can respect everyone as having their own unique life.

So you have stipulated that human life is sacred in all of its forms. So the next question I have to ask you is: Well, at what moment does life begin? What moment, what instant does life begin?

If you can pose another instant, another moment, other than conception, I would listen to that. But I am not seeing anybody who wants to step down and say that there is a distinct moment that life begins, other than conception.

So I will make this case again: human life is sacred in all of its forms; you stipulated that. The second is that it begins at the moment of conception. Your silence has stipulated that.

So we have the whole argument wrapped up here, packaged in this today. We need to defend human life in all of its forms. It is God's gift to his creation. It is our obligation to defend it, and we can defend it. We can defend it through legislation as we did today.

We should honor and respect the life of Henry Hyde, who contributed a great deal to this Congress in his lifetime. We are working on the foundation that he has laid down for us, and Representative CHRIS SMITH has assumed much of the role that Henry Hyde played here in this Congress. We each had the privilege to serve with Henry Hyde. His legacy remains, and we have the unique privilege and opportunity to build on it. I suggest we continue to do so in every piece of legislation that we can pass.

We anticipate appointments to the Supreme Court that will honor life and

recognize, also, as our Founding Fathers did when they drafted the Declaration of Independence, that we have a right to life, to liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Don't try to package that up as three equal values. They are not. They are prioritized rights. The right to life supercedes the right to liberty, and the right to liberty supercedes the right to the pursuit of happiness. No one in the pursuit of their happiness can trample on someone's liberties. And no one can claim they have the liberty to take the life of a baby because life is paramount. That is the package. That is the argument that is here. We need young people to grow up with that understanding and those values.

As we stand here tonight, Mr. Speaker, and as we work together in the coming days and months—and I pray it is not years—one day we will see this Nation that respects life from the moment of conception until natural death.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Iowa's leadership, which has been over many decades. I want to thank him for his eloquence and his steadfastness. The day will come when the unborn are protected, and he will be a major part of that.

I would also concur with the gentleman from Iowa fully in how much we miss the great Henry Hyde. He was extraordinary. He was irreplaceable. And the fact that his amendment has saved 2 million lives, at least—some estimates put it even higher—is a testimony to his vision, which we now carry on with.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT). I again thank him for his outspokenness on behalf of the weakest and most vulnerable.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I am so grateful that Representative CHRIS SMITH is a Member of the United States Congress because of his leadership, because of his enormous heart, and his enormous caring.

It is amazing—those of us who believe in God—the way our lives develop. I was a guy that grew up; I never liked to hug anybody. But when we had three beautiful incredible girls added to my wife's and my life, I became a hugger. Fox has a show named "Outnumbered," but that has been my life for years now.

I know there are so many people that say you are a man and you have no right to speak about this. I guess, when I was a judge, there were those who thought, since I was not a person that had been on both sides of a civil lawsuit or had been a defendant in a case, maybe I should not be able to say anything about or pass sentence. But we have laws, and laws are there to protect people.

I do believe, as our Founders did, in nature's God, that we have a Creator who provided us inalienable rights. But in this world, you have to fight for any inheritance, including your inalienable rights.

It does appear that nature gave a greater percentage of women a nurturing greater sense of loving and caring than most men. That gets changed for some of us when you have a house full of girls.

□ 1800

But I could identify with the doctor who had performed, I think he said, over 1,000 abortions, who came before our Judiciary Committee and testified about how it was just a procedure, how it was nothing to him, and how he would go into the uterus.

Of course, the pregnant mom was not dilated and not going to be able to deliver a baby that had begun forming, had a heartbeat. But that is why he would go in with his instrument, feel around with his clamps for something that felt long, and when he found it, he knew that it was either a leg or an arm, and he would grab it and pull it out from the baby's body, and continue till he did that four times, and then reach in and find something that felt bulbous, and he would—he knew the head could not come out in a bulbous form, and so he would crush it and pull out the baby's head. And that was the way he went about beginning the abortion of a child that had begun developing like that.

He never thought a thing about it until his daughter died, and then he became nauseated, and he was never able to do another abortion like that, and it became such a burden that he had done what he had done.

I know from my years on the bench as a judge, I know from my years as an attorney helping people, if something is built on a lie, the chances are that the outcome will not be good for a majority of people. I also know that if someone encourages and perpetuates a lie within some other person's life, they are not that person's friend.

So I would like to quickly reference an article published by WND called "The Real 'Jane Roe'" and just hit some of the highlights about the real Jane Roe, the woman.

I was talking with my friend, CHRIS SMITH, about Norma McCorvey. He is quite familiar with her, and I believe he said he had talked to her and had come to know her. Being the Christian that CHRIS SMITH is, he cares deeply about people, and that included Norma McCorvey.

But this article says: "At the age of 21, McCorvey was pregnant with her third child. She had given her other two children up for adoption and McCorvey did not want to say good-bye to her offspring a third time. So she decided to have an illegal abortion, but the Dallas clinic she went to had been recently raided and shut down. So McCorvey made up a story—she had been raped, she told her doctor and two lawyers. She signed an affidavit on condition of anonymity, and the lawsuit began."

And she told WorldNetDaily: "I considered abortion and, because of this, I

was put in touch with two attorneys, Sarah Weddington and Linda Coffee. They had just recently graduated from law school and were interested in challenging the Texas abortion statute."

She says: "'Plain and simple, I was used.'" This is Norma McCorvey. "'I was a nobody to them. They only needed a pregnant woman to use for their case, and that's it. They cared, not about me, but only about legalizing abortion. Even after the case, I was never respected—probably because I was not an ivy-league educated, liberal feminist like they were.'"

But she goes on and says—well, this was from a New York Times interview: "McCorvey describes her meeting the two young attorneys. . . .

"Sarah Weddington sat right across the table from me at Columbo's pizza parlor, and I didn't know then that she had had an abortion herself. When I told her then how desperately I needed one, she could have told me where to go for it. But she wouldn't because she needed me to be pregnant for her case. I set Sarah Weddington up on a pedestal like a rose petal. But when it came to my turn, well, Sarah saw these cuts on my wrists, my swollen eyes from crying, the miserable person sitting across from her, and she knew she had a patsy. She knew I wouldn't go outside of the realm of her and Linda. I was too scared. It was one of the most hideous times of my life.'"

She says: "'My experience with pro-abortion leaders is that they are snobs. They claim they care about women and their rights but, in my experience, they care for nothing, not even themselves in a way,'" McCorvey said.

"McCorvey said in a 1990 New York Times interview that the rape lie caused her to be 'terribly depressed.'"

"I was brought up not to lie and, because of this story, I had to lie all the time. And the depression periods got deeper and longer until the night I cut my wrists.'"

Well, it is one of the difficulties that attorneys have: when you represent someone and you are sworn to do the best job you can, it should be more than simply about getting the legal result that a lawyer wants. It ought to be about helping the client. You can't always do that.

But it is rather tragic that Jane Roe, Norma McCorvey, now looks back on that as the most hideous time of her life, and that she was taken advantage of by people that didn't care about her. They had an agenda.

I heard someone here on the floor talking about the Women's March and how that was for all women, except the hypocrisy of that march was it was not about all women because there were pro-life women that tried to march. It was about women that think exactly like they do, and nobody else gets to participate.

It is the same kind of mentality that would—when in the majority here in this body say: We want everybody to participate in debate, except we are

going to have a record-setting number of closed rules so nobody can debate. We don't want your input on ObamaCare. We don't care that you support what we do on preexisting conditions and on kids living with their parents.

Heck, some of us said 30 would be a better number than 26. They didn't care. They could pass it without our votes. They didn't want our input.

So then to hear people who treated us like that say we care about open debate, knowing that some of those same people came down here and grabbed microphones and, for the first time we can find in congressional hearing, prevented the majority from starting into session; and then they want to lecture us on openness and kindness and open debate? Really?

Let's go back to the Norma McCorveys of the world. Let's minister to them individually, as my church, as a number of ministries with which I am greatly familiar do. Let's help the real person. Let's help that child so that that little boy or that little girl doesn't have its arms and legs jerked out of the uterus. Let's help that child have a life that will be so full they will never think about slitting their wrists, as Norma McCorvey did. Let's vote for life.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for his very passionate and incisive remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure, the Agriculture, and the Natural Resources Committees. I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), my colleague, for his continued leadership on this very important topic, a moral one, I think, that reflects truly an important part of the fiber of our country.

Which way are we going to go on this? What are our values going to be?

The gentleman has been a consistent leader way before my time during Congress as well.

As we reflect on this week, landmark legislation again passed tonight, H.R. 7, that would prohibit funding for abortion in this country, on the heels of the Mexico City solution that President Trump just signed today as well.

We are seeing that hearts are turning in this country on this issue. And when you look at it in the categories of people across the country, about half and half, rough numbers. Half the country might label itself pro-life, and the other half that favors Roe v. Wade being the law of the land, that might label themselves as pro-choice or pro-abortion.

When we get down to H.R. 7, we find that the half that is pro-life can be joined by many additional people on the other side of that argument that don't think it is appropriate to have government funding, their taxpayer dollars, used for abortion as a birth control tool in a lot of cases.

So this shows that we do have the tide going in this direction on that, as people become more and more informed on this and understand and don't listen to the rhetoric and don't listen to misinformation on what this really is. This is a baby you are talking about. It doesn't form into something else. Each pregnancy will result in a human baby.

So when we fight this battle, we find it is those that would speak on this side of the issue come under a lot of persecution. Many, many people will be joining together in this town later this week in the March for Life. You will be persecuted to some extent or another. You will be called things. But, you know, we know from the Bible that those that speak the truth are often persecuted as well, and we all need to be strong and firm in that.

God is watching what we do here. God will be watching later this week and at all times on those that are marching for life. So be strong.

Also, put your arms around those folks that might be strongly opposed, because there are a lot of people hurting on that. We understand. People that have had to make a difficult abortion choice and chosen to do so, they need healing as well. They need understanding and compassion on that. If we can show them that, and if we can show that those that are contemplating abortion, there are alternatives out there. There are many alternatives. If we can just come alongside them and show them that there is more than one way to do this, and there are people willing to help and willing to counsel you in that, because that is really what it comes down to.

When you talk about a choice, show that woman in crisis, in that situation that she has many choices, informed choices to make; and, by and large, maybe she will make the right one. In a lot of cases I believe she will.

So God bless those that are going to come for this march later this week and stand for this, put up with the level of persecution that comes with any of these types of issues, including the one on being pro-life.

Again, God bless you, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, for being a consistent leader on this.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman so very much for his kind remarks, but also his very eloquent concern for post-abortive women and those who may be contemplating abortion. You know, the Pregnancy Care Network, 4,000 strong throughout the United States, is there as a front line to say: We love you both, mother and baby.

So I thank the gentleman for bringing attention to that as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE), a member of the Oversight and Government Reform, and the Natural Resources Committees.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my good friend, CHRIS SMITH, for his lead-

ership for so many years on this issue of life. He is deeply loved and appreciated, and I am grateful to be able to share this time with him as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure it has been said this evening already many times over that since the Roe v. Wade decision of 1973, we have lost over 50 million lives. That is such a staggering number, but within that number, of course, are mothers, daughters, fathers, sons, all of them lost to abortion.

This decision of Roe v. Wade, at the crux of the matter, is one that has the question: When does life begin?

And with that question, I was reminded of the opinion of the Supreme Court Justice Blackmun. During that period of time when Roe v. Wade came into law, Blackmun made the decision and wrote in his opinion. He said: "We, the Court, need not resolve the difficult question of when life begins. When those trained in the respective disciplines of medicine, philosophy, and theology are unable to arrive at any consensus, the judiciary," he said, "at this point in the development of man's knowledge, is not in a position to speculate as to the answer."

What a startling statement that was made. But here we are at this time, this body, at this point of our Nation's history, we have no need as to speculate on this question any longer. There is clear science that, without question, tells us when life begins. And life begins at conception. There is no question about this.

We know inside the womb is a human life. And we know with that life, based on what we know of God and what we in our own country know from our own Declaration of Independence, the very first inalienable right protected is that of life.

□ 1815

So I just believe it is time that we correct this wrongheaded decision that was made by the Court some 44 years ago. Even just recently, a couple of days ago, I introduced H.R. 586, the Sanctity of Human Life Act, which makes clear that life begins at conception. I certainly would ask my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this bill.

I just dream of the time, 44 years from now, that we could be celebrating the right to life rather than 44 years from now looking back and mourning over yet another 50 million American babies who have been lost to the horrible stain of abortion. So, again, I thank you for your leadership, and I deeply appreciate the opportunity to join you in this Special Order.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much for your eloquence and reminding us all that the Supreme Court itself said that we need not resolve the difficult question of when human life begins; then they went on to say that any child, at any point until birth, could be killed by way of an abortion. They resolved it, but they

resolved it in the negative without science, without the information. Ultrasound certainly has shattered that myth, and I thank you for reminding all of us about that.

I also would remind my colleagues that Jean Garton—a great leader—ran Lutherans for Life for years. She was preparing a presentation on abortion that included some actual pictures of aborted babies. It was late at night, but her young child walked in while she was doing this and said: Mommy, who broke the baby?

So even a small child could recognize—and did recognize—that abortion destroys the life of a baby. Sadly, the Court has not been able to. With all of their much-vaunted intelligence capacity, they missed it by a mile. So thank you for reminding us of that.

Mr. Speaker, how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARSHALL). The gentleman has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, ex-President Barack Obama, the abortion President, has done serious harm. No human rights abuse, however, need be forever. Today, we have an extraordinary opportunity. We have, I would submit, a duty to protect the weakest and most vulnerable and to reassert protections that have been sadly lacking for the last 44 years. Protecting unborn children and their mothers is the most important human rights cause on Earth. And this week, on Friday, thousands are expected to march for life, to march for this fundamental human right—the right to live.

Now, as never before, we must work, pray, and fast for that day when every life is cherished as a gift; every life loved, despite one's disability, race, sex, color, religion, or condition of dependency; and every life welcomed, no matter the inconvenience. Earlier in this Special Order, STEVE KING talked about caring for people at every stage of development—every stage—including the unborn. Birth is an event that happens to each and every one of us. It is not the beginning of life.

Again, ultrasound imaging of the unborn child has just opened up everyone's eyes to the little child—twins if there are two—that resides within.

He also talked about, and I would agree with him, children with disabilities need to be welcomed. A prenatal diagnosis of disability should mean empathy and concern for the child, not exclusion or a death sentence, because every life is a gift.

Mr. Speaker, it is very encouraging as to how many young people are stepping up to protect and lead in this human rights cause. Increasingly, the young people on college campuses, Students for Life, and so many young people in their 20s, the millennials—and the polling shows the millennials are pro-life—are stepping up.

Tom Brokaw often talked about the Greatest Generation. They are stepping

up as the next Greatest Generation who by their compassion, faith, and determination will transform America into a culture of life.

All of us in the pro-life movement are especially thankful for the growing number of courageous women who are silent no more. Some of the groups are called the Silent No More Awareness campaign. For example, women, all of whom have had abortions, have suffered psychological and emotional harm, and yet they, thank God, have found reconciliation and peace, often through faith. But now they blaze a hope-filled path for other post-abortive women to find healing, reconciliation, and inner peace. They admonish society not to offer the false solution of killing an unborn child.

There are two victims in every abortion: the baby, the most obvious, but equally the mother. Women deserve better than the false solution of dismembering or chemically poisoning unborn children. The other side of the issue seldom talks about the child, if ever, don't even use the word abortion much anymore, just choice or reproductive rights, and just refuses to accept or to acknowledge or to debate what the deed actually does.

Children have their arms and legs torn off their bodies by the abortionist as well as decapitation. Chemicals literally starve the child to death. RU-486 is euphemistically called medical abortion like the other pills that are provided. First, the child starves in the womb, and then another chemical brings on labor.

For the pro-life movement, we all acknowledge that the way forward is fraught with obstacles that must be overcome. The promotion of human rights is never easy. The promotion of human rights is never obstacle free. If past is prologue, the history of the pro-life movement, however, shows that we will never quit.

Earlier today, the House voted on the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act, H.R. 7, to end taxpayer complicity and funding of abortion. I especially want to thank our very principled leadership, great people like the Speaker, PAUL RYAN; KEVIN MCCARTHY, our majority leader; STEVE SCALISE, our whip; and CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS; and so many others who take a principled stand for the unborn and equally for their mothers.

No matter what The Washington Post or The New York Times might say, they are willing to stand into the wind rather than to go along with it because the sanctity of life—the preciousness of those children and equally of their mothers—demands it. I want to thank them for their extraordinary leadership. As we all know, the bill passed 238-183.

The extraordinary news is about the Hyde amendment and its consequences. It has saved the lives of over 2 million children, and that is a conservative estimate. There may be many more.

Other funding bans at State levels, as well as our funding bans in our Federal policies, including the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program, have also saved lives because the money was not there to facilitate the demise—the violent demise—of those children.

Even the Guttmacher Institute, the former research arm of Planned Parenthood, acknowledges that about 25 percent of the Medicaid abortions that otherwise would have occurred do not occur. Those children go on to be born, and that is where the 2 million figure, about 60,000 per year—children who evade the scalpel or the chemical poisoning of abortion.

Forty years ago, Congress enacted the Hyde amendment. It has been continued every year, and now it will be made permanent if this bill were to become law. We know, as was said during the debate by my friends on the other side of this issue, that they are determined to eviscerate the Hyde amendment, and those 2 million children, had they had their way over the last 40 years, would have been killed.

We also want to take abortion out of ObamaCare. The President stood right at that podium, Mr. Speaker, in September of 2009, and said: “Under our plan, no federal dollars will be used to fund abortions. . . .”

We know that it is absolutely untrue. He also signed an executive order where he said that the Hyde amendment would be applied to the plans in the exchanges. So we went to the Government Accountability Office and asked for a study. It took about a year, and they came back and said that 1,036 insurance plans across the country paid for abortion on demand with taxpayer funding. H.R. 7, title II, would end that complicity of the taxpayer with the procurement of abortion.

Let me also say that we hope to bring up in this House a bill that was sponsored last Congress and is again today by TRENT FRANKS of Arizona, a great champion of life. It is called the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act to legally protect most babies at 20 weeks postfertilization. Of course, many of those kids die of dismemberment. Again, we need a national debate on abortion because the methods have been hidden by the facade of the abortion industry. They have been very good at cloaking, concealing, and diminishing any focus on what happens to the baby. Even when abortion is through ultrasound-guided abortions and the mother is there, semi-sedated, they turn the screen away from her so she doesn't see the dismemberment of the child, because, obviously, as Dr. Nathanson, the founder of NARAL and an abortionist, once said—he came to the conclusion after having killed 60,000 children and then became a pro-lifer—he said that if wombs had windows, if everyone, including the woman, could see the child, she would run out of that abortion mill.

So, again, I want to say thank you to TRENT FRANKS. I know he is here, and

I hope that he will join us tonight. He has led on born-alive legislation, which is also transformative.

Imagine that the former President of the United States, Barack Obama, said that he would veto a bill that would provide a standard of care, including a right to private action, when the child is born alive from a later term abortion. We can't even help that child? Yet Obama, the abortion President, said: No, we can't. TRENT FRANKS, again, has been the leader on that as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) who is a good friend and colleague, and then to close, Congressman TRENT FRANKS.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey, for more than three decades, has raised these issues in this very Chamber, speaking for those who are defenseless and voiceless. He speaks because he speaks truth and is motivated by his conscience to discuss these truths.

Every year since 1973, we have had a March for Life here in Washington. This year, we have the 44th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*. It is one of the gravest examples of judicial activism in our Nation's history. Seven black-robed Justices decided that the lives of unborn children are not protected under the Constitution in what Justice White referred to as an exercise in raw judicial power. In the last 44 years, 60 million children have died in abortion.

The March for Life draws thousands of people, young and old, Democrat and Republican, from across the Nation year after year from near and far, on buses, on planes, in cars, on trains, in snow, in rain, in sunshine, and overcast skies. Why? Why do they continue to come?

They come because they are motivated by the transcendent truth that was captured in our Declaration of Independence that everyone is endowed by a Creator with an inalienable right to life—a right that no one can take away.

□ 1830

Everyone in this Chamber has that right. Everybody listening to this Special Order debate has that right. You have it today, you had it yesterday, you had it before you were born. No one has the right to take that right away.

The right does not depend on your ability to see, your ability to hear, your ability to walk, your ability to talk. That right exists because you are human. It is as simple as that. No one can take away that right.

Those coming to the March for Life this year are coming to share that witness, but they have also been witnessing back home the countless acts of service they do for women in crisis pregnancies and to continue with the help that they provide.

It is a good thing for them to come to Washington. I look forward to wel-

coming my constituents from western Pennsylvania, and I encourage them to come and stand and continue to witness until one day we recognize the right to life for everyone in our country.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman so much for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I came to this building some 30 years ago. Christopher Smith was here fighting the battle for these little babies, as he is tonight. I hold him to be a grand hero of humanity. Words fail me to express to him the honor, the respect, and the affection that is due him for his relentless, faithful commitment to these little babies that could never vote for him.

All I can say to Mr. SMITH is that one day he will step over the threshold of eternity and God will say: Welcome home, Chris. You did a good job. You protected those who couldn't protect themselves.

I can't think of anything that I think points to a greater manhood, a greater honor, a greater stewardship of life than protecting those who cannot protect themselves. I just want to express that in the deepest way possible.

Certainly, KEITH ROTHFUS, I love him. He is a wonderful man. We have so many here. But Chris has been here forever and he has stayed with it. He is getting to be an old guy, but he is not quitting. I am so honored just to be in the same room with him.

Mr. Speaker, as I often do around the 22nd of January to commemorate and to remember the tragic *Roe v. Wade* decision, I come with a sunset memorial because another legislative day has come and gone in Washington, D.C., and sunset approaches fast. So I stand here in this House with what I call a sunset memorial.

You see, Mr. Speaker, before the sun sets today in America, over 3,000 more unborn children will be killed by abortion on demand in the land of the free and the home of the brave. That is more than the number of innocent lives lost on September 11th in this country. It happens every day.

As much hope as there is in the day in which we stand in this place, in this new moment in American history, for these 3,000, hope will never come in time. I mourn that, Mr. Speaker, because it wasn't necessary.

It has now been 44 years since the tragedy called *Roe v. Wade* was first handed down. Since then, the very foundation of this Nation has been stained by the blood of almost 60 million of our own unborn children. So many of them, Mr. Speaker, cried and screamed as they died, but because it was amniotic fluid going over the vocal cords instead of air, we couldn't hear them.

All of them had at least four things in common, Mr. Speaker. First, they were just little babies who had done

nothing wrong to anyone. Each one of them died a nameless and lonely death and each one of their mothers was wounded. Whether she realizes it or not, she will never quite be the same.

All the gifts that these children might have brought to humanity are now lost forever, Mr. Speaker, and that is worth mourning. Yet, even the glare of such tragedy brings a ray of hope because this generation, even though it still clings sometimes to a blind, invincible ignorance while history repeats itself over and over again, there is, again, a new beacon of hope breaking over the horizon.

Mr. Speaker, not so long ago I heard Barack Obama speak some very noble but poignant words that, whether he realizes it or not, applies so profoundly to this subject. So I am going to quote some excerpted portions of his comments.

Let me just say at the outset that I agreed with the words that he spoke. I am going to say that upfront. No one was a greater critic of the policies of Barack Obama than myself because I thought he missed the moment. I thought he missed his moment in history. He could have been a great and powerful friend to the helpless, yet he chose to be the one to oppose their chance to walk in the light of life.

He said: "This is our first task—caring for our children. It's our first job. If we don't get that right, we don't get anything right. That's how, as a society, we will be judged."

I agree, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Obama asked: "Are we really prepared to say that we're powerless in the face of such carnage, that the politics are too hard? Are we prepared to say that such violence that is visited on our children year after year after year is somehow the price of freedom?"

The President also said: "Our journey is not complete until all our children . . ." are "cared for and cherished and always safe from harm."

"That is our generation's task," he said, "to make these words, these rights, these values of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness real for every American."

Mr. Speaker, never have I so deeply agreed with any words ever spoken by President Barack Obama as those I have just quoted. Yet, when he was President, in the most merciless distortion of logic and reason and humanity itself, he refused to apply his incontrovertible words to the helpless unborn babies in this Nation.

How I wish, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Obama could have somehow opened his heart and his ears to his own words and asked himself in the core of his own soul why his words that should apply to all children could not have included the most helpless and vulnerable of all children. Nine million American unborn children died under the policies that Mr. Obama relentlessly supported.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that moment when President Barack Obama could have heard and responded to the silent

cries of these little forgotten souls has passed forever. Mr. Obama takes his place as the undisputed abortion President.

While I mourn that reality, Mr. Speaker, I take great hope in a new reality that Donald Trump is now President of the United States and that the winds of change are beginning to blow. I believe Mr. Trump will be a protector of these little babies that have waited so very long for someone to come along and help them.

So now I pray that the Members of this body and those in the United States Senate will remember the words of Thomas Jefferson when he said: "The care of human life and its happiness, and not its destruction, is the chief and only object of good government."

That phrase in the 14th Amendment that capsulizes our entire Constitution says: "No State shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law."

Mr. Speaker, protecting the lives of all Americans and their constitutional rights is why we are all here.

Mr. Speaker, there is hope now. We wait for that new day that has come to manifest and the sun to break through the clouds and shine once again on the faces of these little babies.

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

PROTECTING THE UNBORN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is a new day in America. I am very gratified that we now have a President that looks differently upon the innocent unborn than did the last one.

Mr. Speaker, protecting the lives of all Americans and their constitutional rights is why we are all here in this place. The bedrock foundation of this Republic is that clarion declaration of the self-evident truth that all human beings are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights: the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Every conflict and every battle our Nation has ever faced can be traced to this core commitment to this self-evident truth. It has made us the beacon of hope for the entire world, Mr. Speaker. It is who we are. Yet, today, another day has passed and we in this body have still failed to honor that foundational commitment.

While we move in the right direction, we have still failed our sworn oath and our God-given responsibility, as more than 3,000 additional American babies died today without the protection we should have already given them.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me just say, in the hopes that we will finally embrace

the truth that abortion really does kill little babies, that it is time we looked up together again and looked to the Declaration of Independence and that we remember that we are the same America that rejected human slavery and that marched into Europe to arrest the Nazi Holocaust and that we are the courageous and compassionate nation that can find a better way for mothers and their unborn children than abortion on demand.

It is a new day in America, Mr. Speaker, and we all have a glorious new opportunity to make a better world and for America to be the one that leads the rest of the planet, just as we did in the days of slavery, from this tragic genocide of murdering more than 3,000 of our own children every day.

So now, Mr. Speaker, as we consider the plight of the unborn after 44 years under *Roe v. Wade*, may we each remind ourselves that our own days in this sunshine of life are all numbered and that all too soon each one of us will also walk from this Chamber for the very last time.

But if it should be that we are allowed to convene again on yet another day, may that be the day, Mr. Speaker, when we finally hear the cries of these little babies. May that be the day when we find the humanity, the courage, and the will to embrace together our human and our constitutional duty to protect these, the least of our tiny little brothers and sisters, from this murderous scourge called abortion on demand.

It has been 44 years, Mr. Speaker, since *Roe v. Wade* first stained the foundation of this Nation with the blood of its own children. But, thankfully, it is a new day in the land of the free and home of the brave. By the grace of God, help is finally on the way.

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

□ 1845

FIXING OUR HEALTHCARE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise in support of describing to each of my colleagues some important attributes of a big issue that we are all working on, and that is about health care. I rise today to talk about not just the current state of health care, but also a direction about where this body has an opportunity and a chance to go to make America's healthcare system even better so that it is the greatest healthcare system in the world.

President Obama signed what is known as ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act, into law on March 23, 2010. This was an attempt then by the President and his party, receiving no votes

from the Republicans in the House or the Senate, to offer a brand-new vision to the American people of their idea of health care.

It took several years for the American people really to comprehend and understand this undertaking, but we are now in the sixth year of ObamaCare, and it has turned out that it not only is not sustainable, but it has provided millions of people who have lost coverage, higher premiums. It is not uncommon to see where some healthcare providers are raising their rates by 60 percent, and in 2013 alone, 4.7 million Americans had their preferred healthcare system canceled.

So the plan began with the high accolades of President Obama and Democrats, only to see, in its sixth year, it has become a concrete life preserver to many who are not only on the plan, but those who would wish to have their own healthcare coverage and cannot because of this law.

Tonight what I would like to describe to my colleagues is a chance for them to begin understanding that the American people have elected Donald J. Trump, Republicans, back into the majority, and Republicans back again into the majority in the United States Senate. This was done because there were a number of ideas that were made well aware to the voting public that Republicans would have an answer not only to repeal, but to replace the Affordable Care Act.

Republicans, in fact, now that we are in our second or third week of being in the majority, with President Trump taking office last Friday, Republicans have begun working not only with themselves, but with this administration on ideas that will make the replacement of ObamaCare even better for each and every person in this country.

The ability to make this transition, I believe, will require a deliberate and disciplined approach by Members of Congress and the American people for us to listen to each other, for, you see, Republicans do have better ideas to fix health care for all Americans. The basis of the understanding about where Republicans will come from, I believe, is embodied in the law as it exists today.

In 1943, employer-sponsored insurance exemption was given. It was during World War II. It was at a time when there were wages that were frozen but opportunities for benefits to be given to employees that would not be taxed. And so back in 1942, this benefits system arose. Sure, it became an opportunity as a result of being employed. It became an employer benefit. And that is what has taken place today with about 150 million Americans who receive the benefits of pretax contributions not only by their employer, but also by the employee to their healthcare system.

Well, just last December, under the 21st Century Cures Act, Congress made a new change, updating, allowing more

people in the system, this time small business, allowing small business the opportunity to deduct up to \$4,500 per employee, a chance for them to receive their health care on a pretax basis.

What this has established now is a different, unfair system that Mr. Trump was speaking about when he was on the campaign trail. He referred to it as a rigged system. Now, he was not just speaking about the healthcare system. He actually was speaking about much of the way America operates, systems that are not fair for the average American not only to have a shot at making their life better, but in this case, a healthcare system where about 150 million Americans get their health care on a pretax basis and others do not. This is the basis of where I believe Republicans have an opportunity to help make the tax advantage for all Americans available.

So the question is: Who is insured and who is uninsured? Well, we can go to the chart that we see here. About 49 percent of all the people in this country who are insured, health care would be provided by an employer, meaning that an employer most likely is able to offer, as a benefit, a healthcare package on a pretax basis, and the employee is able to receive that, allowing them to make their own contributions on a pretax basis.

As an example, as a Member of Congress, I have this opportunity. My employer, being in the House of Representatives, provides about 70 percent, which is standard for the operations of almost any business in this country, 70 percent, and the employee would provide 30 percent. In this case, I provide the premiums of about \$13,000 for my health care.

Then I have a \$3,600 deduction under my ObamaCare health insurance that I receive. I am required by law, as a result of being a Member of Congress, to receive, to buy into health care that would be ObamaCare, and then I have a \$3,600 deductible that is a pretax contribution. So I make about a \$17,000 contribution to my health care every year. Not unusual for employer-provided contributions on a pretax basis.

Medicaid is about 20 percent of all the people who are insured, and then, as you see here, Medicare is about 14 percent.

As you look at Medicaid, Medicaid is what is commonly known as insurance for those people who are at or below the poverty level to gain coverage. But it comes with strict requirements. Many of those requirements work against the opportunity to go and get a job for fear that they will lose their contribution that comes from the government because they might not have an opportunity to receive other help.

Then, as you see, we have got exchanges, and those that just buy their own insurance. And then about 9 percent, or about 30 million Americans, are uninsured.

This is the current status of where we are in America today.

When I say these things to people back in Dallas, Texas, I receive a lot of feedback, and one of them that I have selected comes from a man who is self-employed. He falls under the what might be off exchange, meaning he pays for his own health care without it being on a pretax basis. He said: I am being penalized for being an entrepreneur—penalized.

This is true of the 20 percent who are on Medicaid. They are in a system that essentially keeps them there and keeps them from going to gain the opportunity to receive full-time employment because it might not be an employment that provides health care.

So Republicans have a daunting challenge. We have a challenge to understand that there are about 12 to 20 million people who presently are on ObamaCare, including Members of Congress, and it is a very expensive—not only to the country, but also to individuals—insurance plan.

The biggest problem with ObamaCare is not its expense. The problem is that people are not on the system, as we were told would happen. We were told there would be upwards of 40 million people, providing an opportunity for more people to pay into the system, to sustain the system, and for it to be, what I would say, structured in such a way to where it had young people, middle-aged people, and perhaps older people up to Medicare age who would be paying in or be a part of a system—and it didn't work that way.

Younger people are not in ObamaCare because it is tremendously expensive, and they have found that to meet their deductible, it takes thousands and thousands of dollars. It does not meet their needs. It does not meet my needs with my family. It would not be a preferred healthcare choice that I or my family would make.

So we now have a choice, a chance as a result of the American people saying: Okay, Republicans, let's see what you can do. Bring us your ideas to make health care better.

Here is one of the facts that we know. We know that of the family working status of uninsured, 74 percent of people who are uninsured go to work. Now, this is a staggering fact because we were told by President Obama and Democrats that they were going to make sure that people got health care, the working poor, as we were told, people who needed coverage. But, in fact, 74 percent of 30 million people get up and go to work.

What we find is that they have lost, many times, their full-time status because of ObamaCare rules and regulations, mandates on employers to where employers cut their full-time status to part-time workers. Because we have so many part-time workers, they cannot afford to get the payments that are necessary, even though they were above the Medicaid line.

So Republicans now have a choice to be able to say, if we are going to out-think ObamaCare, if we are going to

make sure that we believe—as President Trump has said just in the last few weeks and on the trail as he was running, he believes we should have a system that is not rigged. We should have a system that helps cover every single American and creates an opportunity that is sustainable and does not mean that we have 60 percent or even double-digit increases every year in health care because of the inequities that exist in the system.

□ 1900

This is the system that exists today. So what might be one of those options or alternatives?

One of those options or alternatives might be a bill that I have worked on for 2 years, with over 500 physicians from across this country, known as the National Physicians' Council for Healthcare Policy. The National Physicians' Council for Healthcare Policy has formally met with hundreds of doctors nine times. They are co-chaired by Dr. Marcy S. Zwelling from Los Angeles, California, and Dr. John T. Gill from Dallas, Texas.

We have worked diligently with economists also to put together a plan that matches what President Trump is speaking about, but probably has not had time to fill in all of the rest of the activities.

This is what I would like to tell you. We believe that we should first allow every single American to be a part of a pre-tax credit, an advanceable credit that can be given to every single American to allow them to buy into a non-government healthcare system. That means, yes, people who are on Medicaid today can receive their health care and go out and get a job without fear of losing their healthcare coverage. It means that you no longer would have to go to the Federal Government and the IRS and to tell them how much work or how much money you think you will do this next year, and if you guess wrong, to pay differently. It creates a well-understood system, and can be done for the same amount of money that is presently in the system today.

It means that a person, a family, would be able to, effective this next November, go online and go to a database and fill it in. I am from Dallas, Texas. I would put my name in, I would put my wife's name, our social security numbers, and our children, and it would allow this pre-tax credit that is advanceable, assignable, and refundable, not coming to me, but going to a healthcare plan that I could then purchase. I could co-purchase, I could put my own money in on a pre-tax basis.

But what it would mean to me, PETE SESSIONS, is that I would be out of ObamaCare. I would choose to be in what is called a health savings account, an HSA. A health savings account requires that you have a major medical component with any coverage that you get.

What is major medical?

Major medical is hospitalization, the chance, the risk that you would have of

needing hospitalization. It could be a car wreck, it could be cancer, it could be something really unexpected. But I would then purchase this major medical policy that is well known in the marketplace today, and then have a choice of deciding the type of coverage where I would pay the first \$5,000 that is required. And then after that, based upon the risk that I would choose.

If I were younger, I would choose probably a plan that would be 90/10. That means that I would pay 10 percent beyond what happened after I paid my \$5,000. Perhaps I couldn't afford that and would want to move to a 70/30 where I accept more of the risk.

The other component that I would then choose is a health savings account. That is I would take the \$17,000 that I contribute to my health care every year, cash, and I would take that to a pre-tax cash account that would be available for me to go to the doctor. Instead of showing up with a card, I would shop the doctor that I choose, only buying the things that I and my family needed, choosing my doctor, and asking my doctor and the marketplace what services would be available for a cash price.

Generally speaking, cash prices are about 18 percent less. Because a doctor would receive that money directly in, rather than having to file a claim, or wait time to get back their money. It would allow my family a chance to receive virtually an 18 percent opportunity upfront savings. It would allow me to manage the things which I needed to and not worry about paying for the things I didn't use. It would save my local doctor, who would then look at me as a preferred customer as opposed to me shopping around, perhaps with others in the marketplace, based upon a model of ObamaCare, which today you can't always count on who your doctor would be. A far better idea. Every single American that would qualify would receive this opportunity, but not required.

Now, how do we make it better, because there is more?

We would, under every single one of these circumstances, take away the mandate on an individual and the mandate on the business. We would do away with the Cadillac tax, because I don't think health care should be taxed. I think everybody should have an opportunity, and the world's greatest healthcare plan would allow that. Every single person would have a chance to have their health care provided, just as I have mine, too.

So what I want to say to the Members today is Republicans are going to be sharing ideas. We are going to be presenting our ideas at the Energy and Commerce Committee, at the Ways and Means Committee, and we believe we have an opportunity under three scenarios to make sure that health care is available and ready for every single American.

First, we need to establish a Republican alternative that can be imple-

mented this year. Not waiting. Our better idea is ready in a bill ready to go.

Would we do hearings? Yes.
Would we want to scrub that and maybe add some things? Yes.

We should be ready to do it and make the transition this year. We should use reconciliation to repeal the most onerous parts of mandates. Yes, we should. And I believe we are doing that.

Should we make sure that we replace before we repeal? Absolutely.

And we should allow HHS, under what is today becoming Dr. TOM PRICE, a proud Member of this body, a chairman of the Budget Committee, who is in hearings over in the Senate to be the secretary of Health and Human Services, he should use everything that is available in law today to manage a system and to make it better. But my bet is that he will count on real people, not government, to make these decisions. And in doing so, he will empower a better opportunity.

So what Republicans want to do is to establish a tax benefit system while allowing a continuation of an employer-sponsored system. Those people that are on a system today that is provided by your employer, that would continue. But we would do away with the mandates on the individual and the business and the Cadillac tax. And we would encourage each of these companies to continue that system and work with their employees on a benefit system to make it better.

We would make HSAs available to every single person, not just Members of Congress, to where they would have an opportunity to have a system that would help their health care and their families and not be use it or lose it. It would make no sense that I would have to spend \$43,000 a year simply to start over next year when I could actually benefit from saving and being efficient with my money. Maybe I am 30 years old and want to save for the future. Maybe I am 50 and cannot save, but I would roll over the system and make it work for me.

It will allow private physicians to endure. And what this does is empowers the private physician.

But there is more. And that is we will also keep—I believe we should, and the world's greatest healthcare system would, keep what are known as consumer protections that today exist in law: dependent coverage through age 26, no lifetime or annual limits, modified guaranteed availability and renewability, prohibition on preexisting condition exclusions, prohibition on discrimination based on your health status, and nondiscrimination in healthcare coverage.

I would like to tell the Members that back in Dallas, Texas, I am proud to also represent the disability community. I believe I can look at every single person back in Dallas, Texas, in the 32nd Congressional District of Texas, and say this: If you like your health care, you can keep it. If you like your own doctor, you can keep your own doctor.

But, more importantly, I believe that we will give equal to or better than opportunities for every single American. We will end the discriminatory services that ObamaCare is today. Because virtually every single doctor and virtually every single hospital will begin taking coverage, where today only about 24 percent of doctors take ObamaCare because it does not reimburse properly. And hospitals all over Dallas that do not take ObamaCare, leading edge hospitals in Dallas, Texas, and across this country, will begin taking this new health care because it reimburses based upon actual cost and marketplace availability.

So to my colleagues who want to go back home and talk to their constituents about Republican ideas, I don't know which one we will end up with. What I do know is that Senator BILL CASSIDY and I have worked with hundreds of physicians for 2 years, and we have a bill, the world's greatest healthcare plan. The world's greatest healthcare plan is a bill that you can understand that is guaranteed to provide people a better opportunity without guessing about their healthcare coverage, and it is not use it or lose it.

So it is my hope that my colleagues that saw this this evening and took part in this will understand that there is an opportunity to go back home and sell the world's greatest healthcare plan for their people back home, too.

I thank my colleagues for being here tonight.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

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

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES FOR THE 115TH CONGRESS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(2) of rule XI, the Committee on Rules' rules of procedure for the 115th Congress are transmitted herewith. They were adopted on January 4, 2017 by a nonrecord vote.

RULE 1.—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The Rules of the House are the rules of the Committee and its subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are non-debatable privileged motions in the Committee. A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to the members of the Committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such day).

(b) Each subcommittee is a part of the Committee, and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules so far as applicable.

(c) The provisions of clause 2 of rule XI of the Rules of the House are incorporated by

reference as the rules of the Committee to the extent applicable.

(d) The Committee's rules shall be published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Committee is elected in each odd-numbered year.

RULE 2.—REGULAR, ADDITIONAL, AND SPECIAL MEETINGS

Regular Meetings

(a)(1) The Committee shall regularly meet at 5:00 p.m. on the first day on which votes are scheduled of each week when the House is in session.

(2) A regular meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with if, in the judgment of the Chair, there is no need for the meeting.

(3) Additional regular meetings and hearings of the Committee may be called by the Chair.

Notice for Regular Meetings

(b) The Chair shall notify in electronic form each member of the Committee of the agenda of each regular meeting of the Committee at least 48 hours before the time of the meeting and shall provide to each member of the Committee, at least 24 hours before the time of each regular meeting:

(1) for each bill or resolution scheduled on the agenda for consideration of a rule, a copy of—

- (A) the bill or resolution;
- (B) any committee reports thereon; and
- (C) any available letter requesting a rule for the bill or resolution; and

(2) for each other bill, resolution, report, or other matter on the agenda a copy of—

(A) the bill, resolution, report, or materials relating to the other matter in question; and

(B) any report on the bill, resolution, report, or any other matter made by any subcommittee of the Committee.

Emergency Meetings

(c)(1) The Chair may call an emergency meeting of the Committee at any time on any measure or matter which the Chair determines to be of an emergency nature; provided, however, that the Chair has made an effort to consult the ranking minority member, or, in such member's absence, the next ranking minority party member of the Committee.

(2) As soon as possible after calling an emergency meeting of the Committee, the Chair shall notify each member of the Committee of the time and location of the meeting.

(3) To the extent feasible, the notice provided under paragraph (2) shall include the agenda for the emergency meeting and copies of available materials which would otherwise have been provided under subsection (b) if the emergency meeting was a regular meeting.

Special Meetings

(d) Special meetings shall be called and convened as provided in clause 2(c)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House.

RULE 3.—MEETING AND HEARING PROCEDURES IN GENERAL

(a)(1) Meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be called to order and presided over by the Chair or, in the Chair's absence, by the member designated by the Chair as the Vice Chair of the Committee, or by the ranking majority member of the Committee present as Acting Chair.

(2) Meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be open to the public unless closed in accordance with clause 2(g) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(3) Any meeting or hearing of the Committee that is open to the public shall be open to coverage by television, radio, and

still photography in accordance with the provisions of clause 4 of rule XI of the Rules of the House (which are incorporated by reference as part of these rules).

(4) Before a motion to report a rule is offered, a copy of the language recommended shall be furnished to each member of the Committee.

Quorum

(b)(1) For the purpose of hearing testimony on requests for rules, five members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

(2) For the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence on measures or matters of original jurisdiction before the Committee, three members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

(3) A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for the purposes of: reporting any measure or matter; authorizing a subpoena; closing a meeting or hearing pursuant to clause 21(g) of rule XI of the Rules of the House (except as provided in clause 2(g)(2)(A) and (B)); or taking any other action.

Voting

(c)(1) No vote may be conducted on any measure or motion pending before the Committee unless a majority of the members of the Committee is actually present for such purpose.

(2) A record vote of the Committee shall be provided on any question before the Committee upon the request of any member.

(3) No vote by any member of the Committee on any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

(4) A record of the vote of each member of the Committee on each record vote on any measure or matter before the Committee shall be made publicly available in electronic form within 48 hours, and with respect to any record vote on any motion to amend or report, shall be included in the report of the Committee showing the total number of votes cast for and against and the names of those members voting for and against.

Hearing Procedures

(d)(1) With regard to hearings on matters of original jurisdiction, to the greatest extent practicable:

(A) each witness who is to appear before the Committee shall file with the Committee at least 24 hours in advance of the appearance a statement of proposed testimony in written and electronic form and shall limit the oral presentation to the Committee to a brief summary thereof; and

(B) In the case of a witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity, a written statement of proposed testimony shall include a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of any Federal grants or contracts, or contracts or payments originating with a foreign government, received during the current calendar year or either of the two previous calendar years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness and related to the subject matter of the hearing.

(C) The disclosure referred to in subdivision (B) shall include—

(i) the amount and country of origin of any payment or contract related to the subject matter of the hearing originating with a foreign government.

(ii) the amount and country of origin of any payment or contract related to the subject matter of the hearing originating with a foreign government.

(D) Such statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy or security of the witness, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

(2) The five-minute rule shall be observed in the interrogation of each witness before

the Committee until each member of the Committee has had an opportunity to question the witness.

(3) The provisions of clause 2(k) of rule XI of the Rules of the House shall apply to any hearing conducted by the Committee.

Subpoenas and Oaths

(e)(1) Pursuant to clause 2(m) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, a subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or a subcommittee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present.

(2) The Chair may authorize and issue subpoenas under such clause during any period in which the House has adjourned for a period of longer than three days.

(3) Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chair or by any member designated by the Committee, and may be served by any person designated by the Chair or such member.

(4) The Chair, or any member of the Committee designated by the Chair, may administer oaths to witnesses before the Committee.

RULE 4.—GENERAL OVERSIGHT RESPONSIBILITIES

The Committee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within its jurisdiction.

RULE 5.—SUBCOMMITTEES

Establishment and Responsibilities of Subcommittees

(a)(1) There shall be two subcommittees of the Committee as follows:

(A) Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process, which shall have general responsibility for measures or matters related to relations between the Congress and the Executive Branch.

(B) Subcommittee on Rules and Organization of the House, which shall have general responsibility for measures or matters related to process and procedures of the House, relations between the two Houses of Congress, relations between the Congress and the Judiciary, and internal operations of the House.

(2) In addition, each such subcommittee shall have specific responsibility for such other measures or matters as the Chair refers to it.

(3) Each subcommittee of the Committee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within its general responsibility.

Referral of Measures and Matters to Subcommittees

(b)(1) No special order providing for the consideration of any bill or resolution shall be referred to a subcommittee of the Committee.

(2) The Chair shall refer to a subcommittee such measures or matters of original jurisdiction as the Chair deems appropriate given its jurisdiction and responsibilities.

(3) All other measures or matters of original jurisdiction shall be subject to consideration by the full Committee.

(4) In referring any measure or matter of original jurisdiction to a subcommittee, the Chair may specify a date by which the subcommittee shall report thereon to the Committee.

(5) The Committee by motion may discharge a subcommittee from consideration of any measure or matter referred to a subcommittee of the Committee.

Composition of Subcommittees

(c) The size and ratio of each subcommittee shall be determined by the Committee and members shall be elected to each subcommittee, and to the positions of chair and ranking minority member thereof, in accordance with the rules of the respective party caucuses. The Chair of the full committee may designate a member of the majority party on each subcommittee as its vice chair.

Subcommittee Meetings and Hearings

(d)(1) Each subcommittee of the Committee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive testimony, mark up legislation, and report to the full Committee on any measure or matter referred to it.

(2) No subcommittee of the Committee may meet or hold a hearing at the same time as a meeting or hearing of the full Committee is being held.

(3) The chair of each subcommittee shall schedule meetings and hearings of the subcommittee only after consultation with the Chair.

Quorum

(e)(1) For the purpose of taking testimony, two members of the subcommittee shall constitute a quorum.

(2) For all other purposes, a quorum shall consist of a majority of the members of a subcommittee.

Effect of a Vacancy

(f) Any vacancy in the membership of a subcommittee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the subcommittee.

Records

(g) Each subcommittee of the Committee shall provide the full Committee with copies of such records of votes taken in the subcommittee and such other records with respect to the subcommittee necessary for the Committee to comply with all rules and regulations of the House.

RULE 6—STAFF

In General

(a)(1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), the professional and other staff of the Committee shall be appointed, by the Chair, and shall work under the general supervision and direction of the Chair.

(2) All professional, and other staff provided to the minority party members of the Committee shall be appointed, by the ranking minority member of the Committee, and shall work under the general supervision and direction of such member.

(3) The appointment of all professional staff shall be subject to the approval of the Committee as provided by, and subject to the provisions of, clause 9 of rule X of the Rules of the House.

Associate Staff

(b) Associate staff for members of the Committee may be appointed only at the discretion of the Chair (in consultation with the ranking minority member regarding any minority party associate staff), after taking into account any staff ceilings and budgetary constraints in effect at the time, and any terms, limits, or conditions established by the Committee on House Administration under clause 9 of rule X of the Rules of the House.

Subcommittee Staff

(c) From funds made available for the appointment of staff, the Chair of the Committee shall, pursuant to clause 6(d) of rule X of the Rules of the House, ensure that sufficient staff is made available to each subcommittee to carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the Committee, and, after consultation with the ranking minority

member of the Committee, that the minority party of the Committee is treated fairly in the appointment of such staff.

Compensation of Staff

(d) The Chair shall fix the compensation of all professional and other staff of the Committee, after consultation with the ranking minority member regarding any minority party staff.

Certification of Staff

(e)(1) To the extent any staff member of the Committee or any of its subcommittees does not work under the direct supervision and direction of the Chair, the member of the Committee who supervises and directs the staff member's work shall file with the Chief of Staff of the Committee (not later than the tenth day of each month) a certification regarding the staff member's work for that member for the preceding calendar month.

(2) The certification required by paragraph (1) shall be in such form as the Chair may prescribe, shall identify each staff member by name, and shall state that the work engaged in by the staff member and the duties assigned to the staff member for the member of the Committee with respect to the month in question met the requirements of clause 9 of rule X of the rules of the House.

(3) Any certification of staff of the Committee, or any of its subcommittees, made by the Chair in compliance with any provision of law or regulation shall be made—

(A) on the basis of the certifications filed under paragraph (1) to the extent the staff is not under the Chair's supervision and direction, and

(B) on his own responsibility to the extent the staff is under the Chair's direct supervision and direction.

RULE 7.—BUDGET, TRAVEL, PAY OF WITNESSES

Budget

(a) The Chair, in consultation with other members of the Committee, shall prepare for each Congress a budget providing amounts for staff, necessary travel, investigation, and other expenses of the Committee and its subcommittees.

Travel

(b)(1) The Chair may authorize travel for any member and any staff member of the Committee in connection with activities or subject matters under the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is granted, there shall be submitted to the Chair in writing the following:

(A) The purpose of the travel.

(B) The dates during which the travel is to occur.

(C) The names of the States or countries to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each.

(D) The names of members and staff of the Committee for whom the authorization is sought.

(2) Members and staff of the Committee shall make a written report to the Chair on any travel they have conducted under this subsection, including a description of their itinerary, expenses, and activities, and of pertinent information gained as a result of such travel.

(3) Members and staff of the Committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, and regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration.

Pay of Witnesses

(c) Witnesses may be paid from funds made available to the Committee in its expense resolution subject to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XI of the Rules of the House.

RULE 8.—COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATION
REPORTING

(a) Whenever the Committee authorizes the favorable reporting of a bill or resolution from the Committee—

(1) The Chair or acting Chair shall report it to the House or designate a member of the Committee to do so.

(2) In the case of a bill or resolution in which the Committee has original jurisdiction, the Chair shall allow, to the extent that the anticipated floor schedule permits, any member of the Committee a reasonable amount of time to submit views for inclusion in the Committee report on the bill or resolution. Any such report shall contain all matters required by the Rules of the House of Representatives (or by any provision of law enacted as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House) and such other information as the Chair deems appropriate.

(3) In the case of a resolution providing for consideration of a measure, the Committee report accompanying such resolution shall include an accurate explanation of any waivers of points of order, including a detailed explanation of all points of order.

Records

(b)(1) There shall be a transcript made of each regular meeting and hearing of the Committee, and the transcript may be printed if the Chair decides it is appropriate or if a majority of the members of the Committee requests such printing. Any such transcripts shall be a substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings, subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to require that all such transcripts be subject to correction and publication.

(2) The Committee shall keep a record of all actions of the Committee and of its subcommittees. The record shall contain all information required by clause 2(e)(1) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall be available for public inspection at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee.

(3) All Committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Chair, shall be the property of the House, and all Members of the House shall have access thereto as provided in clause 2(e)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House.

(4) The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with rule VII of the Rules of the House. The Chair shall notify the ranking minority member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on written request of any member of the Committee.

Audio and Video Coverage

(c) The Chair shall provide, to the maximum extent practicable—

(1) complete and unedited audio and video broadcasts of all committee hearings and meetings; and

(2) for distribution of such broadcasts and unedited recordings thereof to the public and for the storage of audio and video recordings of the proceedings. Proceedings shall be broadcast live on the Majority Committee website and recordings shall be made available on such website within one calendar day of the proceeding.

Committee Publications on the Internet

(d) To the maximum extent feasible, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form.

Journal

(e)(1) The Committee shall maintain a Committee Journal, which shall include all bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to or reported by the Committee and all bills, resolutions, and other matters reported by any other committee on which a rule has been granted or formally requested, and such other matters as the Chair shall direct. The Journal shall be published periodically, but in no case less often than once in each session of Congress.

(2) A rule is considered as formally requested when the Chairman of a committee of primary jurisdiction which has reported a bill or resolution (or a member of such committee authorized to act on the Chairman's behalf):

(A) has requested, in writing to the Chair, that a hearing be scheduled on a rule for the consideration of the bill or resolution; and

(B) has supplied the Committee with the bill or resolution, as reported, together with the final committee report thereon.

Other Procedures

(f) The Chair may establish such other Committee procedures and take such actions

as may be necessary to carry out these rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the Committee and its subcommittees in a manner consistent with these rules.

RULE 9.—AMENDMENTS TO COMMITTEE RULES

The rules of the Committee may be modified, amended or repealed, in the same manner and method as prescribed for the adoption of committee rules in clause 2 of rule XI of the Rules of the House, but only if written notice of the proposed change has been provided to each Member at least 48 hours before the time of the meeting at which the vote on the change occurs. Any such change in the rules of the Committee shall be published in the Congressional Record within 30 calendar days after their approval.

United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 39. To amend title 5, United States Code, to codify the Presidential Innovation Fellows Program, and for other purposes.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, further reported that on January 23, 2017, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 72. To ensure the Government Accountability Office has adequate access to information.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, January 27, 2017, at 2 p.m.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on January 20, 2017, she presented to the President of the

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the fourth quarter of 2016, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. LAMAR SMITH, Chairman, Jan. 5, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Mark Sanford, Jr.	10/1	10/2	Italy		475.00						475.00
	10/3	10/4	Zambia		425.00						425.00
	10/4	10/6	Mozambique		660.00						660.00
	10/6	10/7	South Africa		273.00		6,810.76				7,083.76
Committee total					1,833.00		6,810.76				8,643.76

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. BILL SHUSTER, Chairman, Jan. 9, 2017.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

323. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Walnuts Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-16-0062; SC16-984-2 FR] received January 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

324. A letter from the Program Specialist (Paperwork Reduction Act), LRAD, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's Joint final rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations [Docket ID: OCC-2016-0031] (RIN: 1557-AE11) received January 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

325. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Assistance to States for the Education of Children with Disabilities and the Preschool Grants for Children with Disabilities Program; Early Intervention Program for Infants and Tod-

dlers with Disabilities (RIN: 1820-AB74) received January 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

326. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2015, as required by the Older Americans Act of 1965, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3018(a); Public Law 89-73, Sec. 207(a) (as amended by Public Law 106-501, Sec. 205); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

327. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report to Congress titled "2016 Actuarial Report on the Financial Outlook for Medicaid", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1396 note; Public Law 111-3, Sec. 506(c); (123 Stat. 95); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

328. A letter from the General Counsel, Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Standards for Accessible Medical Diagnostic Equipment (RIN: 3014-AA40) received January 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

329. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the report to Congress entitled "Fiscal Year 2016 Annual Report on the Food and Drug Administration Advisory Committee Vacancies and Public Disclosures", pursuant to Sec. 712(e) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

330. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Administration's Fiscal Year 2016 Performance Report to Congress for the Biosimilar User Fee Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

331. A letter from the Chair, Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission, transmitting the Commission's recommendations concerning the future of the State Children's Health Insurance Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

332. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Direct Investment Surveys: BE-13, Survey of New Foreign Direct Investment in the United States, and Changes to Private Fund Reporting on Direct Investment Surveys [Docket No.: 160531475-6465-01] (RIN: 0691-AA85) received January 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

333. A letter from the Director, Office of Information Policy, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Revision of Department of Justice Freedom of Information Act Regulations [Docket No.: OAG 155] (RIN: 1105-AB51; A.G. Order No.: 3803-2016) received January 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

334. A letter from the Staff Attorney, National Indian Gaming Commission, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Privacy Act Procedures (RIN: 3141-AA65) received January 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

335. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of Amended Offer to donate Lands Acquired Adjacent to the Sabinoso Wilderness for Inclusion in the Wilderness through Section Six of The Wilderness Act of 1964 and to create public access to the Sabinoso Wilderness, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1135(a); Public Law 88-577, Sec. 6(a); (78 Stat. 896); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

336. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report titled "Indian Health Prescription Drug Monitoring", pursuant to Sec. 827, 25 U.S.C. 1680q; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

337. A letter from the U.S. Special Representative and CNMI Special Representative, transmitting a report on the 902 Consultations from the Special Representatives of the United States and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) focusing on Immigration and Labor Issues and Proposed Military Activities in the CNMI, pursuant to 48 U.S.C. 1801; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

338. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition filed on behalf of workers from the Pantex Plant in Amarillo, Texas, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 7384q(c)(2); Public Law 106-398, Sec. 1 (as amended by Public Law 108-375, Sec. 3166(b)(1)); (118 Stat. 2188); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

339. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Ninth Annual Government-to-Government Violence Against Women Tribal Consultation, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 14045d(c); Public Law 109-162, Sec. 903(c) (as added by Public Law 113-4, Sec. 903(3)); (127 Stat. 120); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

340. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the 2015 Annual Report of the National Institute of Justice, pursuant to Title 1 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 and the Homeland Security Act of 2002; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

341. A letter from the General Counsel, Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — American With Disabilities Act (ADA) Accessibility Guidelines for Transportation Vehicles [Docket No.: ATBCB 2010-0004] (RIN: 3014-AA38) received January 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

342. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rules — Revisions to Rules Regarding the Evaluation of Medical Evidence [Docket No.: SSA-2012-0035] (RIN: 0960-AH51) received January 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. AGUILAR, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr.

ESPAILLAT, Ms. ESTY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK, Mr. HIMES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOGGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SCHAROWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SIREs, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. JONES, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 20. A bill to reform the financing of Congressional elections by broadening participation by small dollar donors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 617. A bill to restore the application of the Federal antitrust laws to the business of health insurance to protect competition and consumers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. TIPTON):

H.R. 618. A bill to authorize, direct, expedite, and facilitate a land exchange in El Paso and Teller Counties, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BLUM, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 619. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to exempt old vessels that only operate within inland waterways from the fire-retardant materials requirement if the

owners of such vessels make annual structural alterations to at least 10 percent of the areas of the vessels that are not constructed of fire-retardant materials and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BERA, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. CONAWAY):

H.R. 620. A bill to amend the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 to promote compliance through education, to clarify the requirements for demand letters, to provide for a notice and cure period before the commencement of a private civil action, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 621. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain Federal lands in Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, and Wyoming, previously identified as suitable for disposal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. McCLINTOCK, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 622. A bill to terminate the law enforcement functions of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management and to provide block grants to States for the enforcement of Federal law on Federal land under the jurisdiction of these agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. JONES, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 623. A bill to promote competition and help consumers save money by giving them the freedom to choose where they buy prescription pet medications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VALADAO (for himself, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. RENACCI, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. NUNES, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 624. A bill to restrict the inclusion of social security account numbers on documents sent by mail by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. AGUILAR (for himself and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 625. A bill to provide for joint reports by relevant Federal agencies to Congress regarding incidents of terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 626. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include recreational therapy among the therapy modalities that constitute an intensive rehabilitation therapy program in an inpatient rehabilitation hospital or unit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. LANCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STEWART, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WELCH, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 627. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide for the dissemination of information regarding available Federal programs relating to energy efficiency projects for schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mr. COFFMAN):

H.R. 628. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit application of pre-existing condition exclusions and to guarantee availability of health insurance coverage in the individual and group market, contingent on the enactment of legislation repealing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONAWAY (for himself and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 629. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the conditions under which certain persons may be treated as adjudicated mentally incompetent for certain purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico):

H.R. 630. A bill to require the Attorney General to issue rules pertaining to the collection and compilation of data on the use of deadly force by law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. DAVIDSON, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 631. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. HECK, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 632. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the treatment of veterans who participated in the cleanup of Enewetak Atoll as radiation exposed veterans for purposes of the presumption of service-connection of certain disabilities by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 633. A bill to authorize health insurance issuers to continue to offer for sale health insurance coverage offered in the in-

dividual market before the enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act in satisfaction of the minimum essential health insurance coverage requirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 634. A bill to terminate the Election Assistance Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 635. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a public health insurance option, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. LEE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. POCAN, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 636. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose increased rates of tax with respect to taxpayers with more than \$1,000,000 taxable income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PALMER (for himself, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WEBSTERMAN, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. BRAT, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. NUNES, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BARTON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. AMASH, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. BUCK, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. WALKER, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PERRY, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. YOHO, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. COLE, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. MARINO, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. JONES, and Mr. DAVIDSON):

H.R. 637. A bill to prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from exceeding its statutory authority in ways that were

not contemplated by the Congress; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. COOK, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. ISSA, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KNIGHT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 638. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 24930 Washington Avenue in Murrieta, California, as the "Riverside County Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans Memorial Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ABRAHAM:

H.R. 639. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for electronic notification of H-2A and H-2B visa petitioners upon receipt of the petitions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 640. A bill to amend title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to require that a State awarded a Federal grant to establish an Exchange and that terminates the State operation of such an Exchange provide for an audit of the use of grant funds and return funds to the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. BOST, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina):

H.R. 641. A bill to reform the H-2A program for nonimmigrant agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 642. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enhance the partnership between the Department of Homeland Security and the National Network of Fusion Centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 643. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to penalize aliens who overstay their visas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. LATTA, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. STEWART, Ms. FOX, Mr. JONES, Mr. HULTGREN, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. YODER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. LUETKE-

MEYER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. OLSON, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. YOHO, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. BRAT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. PERRY, Mr. HILL, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Mr. HARRIS):

H.R. 644. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit governmental discrimination against providers of health services that are not involved in abortion; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BOST (for himself, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 645. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the inspection of kitchens and food service areas at medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs to ensure that the same standards for kitchens and food service areas at hospitals in the private sector are being met at kitchens and food service areas at medical facilities of the Department; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 646. A bill to provide that rates of pay for Members of Congress shall not be adjusted under section 601(a)(2) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 in the year following any fiscal year in which outlays of the United States exceeded receipts of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 647. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to award grants to eligible entities to establish, expand, or support school-based mentoring programs to assist at-risk middle school students with the transition from middle school to high school; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. CHENEY:

H.R. 648. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to amend the Definite Plan Report for the Seedeckadee Project to enable the use of the active capacity of the Fontenelle Reservoir; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York (for himself, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 649. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that new wind turbines located near certain military installations are ineligible for the renewable electricity production credit and the energy credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 650. A bill to provide for the development of a United States strategy for greater human space exploration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Ms. MENG, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 651. A bill to protect unpaid interns from workplace harassment and discrimina-

tion; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Ms. MENG, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 652. A bill to amend the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 to protect unpaid interns in the legislative branch from workplace harassment and discrimination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Ms. MENG, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 653. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to protect unpaid interns in the Federal Government from workplace harassment and discrimination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 654. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to carry out a plan for the purchase and installation of an earthquake early warning system for the Cascadia Subduction Zone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DONOVAN (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 655. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Securing the Cities program to enhance the ability of the United States to detect and prevent terrorist attacks and other high consequence events utilizing nuclear or other radiological materials that pose a high risk to homeland security in high-risk urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. LATTA):

H.R. 656. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow for greater State flexibility with respect to excluding providers who are involved in abortions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEADOWS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. COLE, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. GROTHMAN):

H.R. 657. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend certain protections against prohibited personnel practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H.R. 658. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit criminal corporations from making disbursements of funds in connection with a campaign for election for Federal, State, or local office; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MARINO, Mr. BUCHSON, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. MESSER):

H.R. 659. A bill to amend the Clayton Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide that the Federal Trade Commission shall exercise authority with respect to mergers only under the Clayton Act and only in the same procedural manner as the Attorney General exercises such authority; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. COSTA, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. PEARCE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mrs. BLACK):

H.R. 660. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to submit to Congress a report on the efforts of the Bureau of Reclamation to manage its infrastructure assets; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 661. A bill to authorize health insurance issuers to offer for sale previously available health insurance coverage in the small group market in satisfaction of the minimum essential health insurance coverage requirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas (for herself, Mr. KIND, Mr. TURNER, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. KINZINGER):

H.R. 662. A bill to enable hospital-based nursing programs that are affiliated with a hospital to maintain payments under the Medicare program to hospitals for the costs of such programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia (for himself, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 663. A bill to establish a grant program to assist dislocated miners in receiving additional training and education to enable them to find and secure new jobs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Ms. STEFANIK, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 664. A bill to prevent the abuse of opiates, to improve response and treatment for the abuse of opiates and related overdoses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. KATKO, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 665. A bill to modernize and enhance airport perimeter and access control security by requiring updated risk assessments and the development of security strategies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. McCAUL, and Mr. DONOVAN):

H.R. 666. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Insider Threat Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. ZELDIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 667. A bill to award a Congressional gold medal to the 5307th Composite Unit (Provisional), commonly known as "Merrill's Marauders", in recognition of their bravery and outstanding service in the jungles of Burma during World War II; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 668. A bill to eliminate automatic pay adjustments for Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. POCAN, Ms. LEE, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 669. A bill to prohibit the conduct of a first-use nuclear strike absent a declaration of war by Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 670. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reform the H-1B visa program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Ms. LEE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HECK, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. BERRA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. KEATING, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BEYER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. RUSH, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. MENG, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. ESTY, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. WALZ, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SOTO, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. EVANS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. BASS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs.

DEMINGS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. HIMES, and Mrs. BEATTY):

H.R. 671. A bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. GRANGER):

H.R. 672. A bill to require continued and enhanced annual reporting to Congress in the Annual Report on International Religious Freedom on anti-Semitic incidents in Europe, the safety and security of European Jewish communities, and the efforts of the United States to partner with European governments, the European Union, and civil society groups, to combat anti-Semitism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 673. A bill to prohibit United States contributions to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, and the Green Climate Fund; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCAUL (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BRAT, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 674. A bill to require each agency to repeal or revise 1 or more existing regulations before issuing a new regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. McHENRY:

H.R. 675. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the coverage of qualified tuition programs and increase the limitation on contributions to Coverdell education savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. LEE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TONKO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. NADLER, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 676. A bill to provide for comprehensive health insurance coverage for all United States residents, improved health care delivery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Natural Resources, for a period

to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 677. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear intelligence and information sharing functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security and to require dissemination of information analyzed by the Department to entities with responsibilities relating to homeland security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 678. A bill to require an assessment of fusion center personnel needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. RUSSELL):

H.R. 679. A bill to amend title 41, United States Code, to improve the manner in which Federal contracts for design and construction services are awarded, to prohibit the use of reverse auctions for design and construction services procurements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 680. A bill to prohibit accessing pornographic web sites from Federal computers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia (for himself, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. PALMER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. PITTENGER, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. LONG, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. YOHO, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. MARINO, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LUTKEMEYER, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. JONES, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 681. A bill to implement equal protection under the 14th article of amendment to the Constitution for the right to life of each born and preborn human person; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 682. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to eliminate the CHIP maintenance of effort requirement and to eliminate DSH cuts for States not implementing the ACA Medicaid expansion; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 683. A bill to require pipelines regulated by the Secretary of Transportation to

be made of steel that is produced in the United States and originates from iron ore and taconite mined and processed in the United States, for safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALAZZO (for himself, Mr. PALMER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. HARPER):

H.R. 684. A bill to prohibit recovery of damages in certain wrongful birth and wrongful life civil actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KIND, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 685. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage domestic insourcing and discourage foreign outsourcing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 686. A bill to ensure appropriate spectrum planning and interagency coordination to support the Internet of Things; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. DONOVAN):

H.R. 687. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a process to review applications for certain grants to purchase equipment or systems that do not meet or exceed any applicable national voluntary consensus standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 688. A bill to adjust the boundary of the Arapaho National Forest, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 689. A bill to insure adequate use and access to the existing Bolts Ditch headgate and ditch segment within the Holy Cross Wilderness in Eagle County, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 690. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enhance certain duties of the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. ROKITA (for himself, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. GOWDY):

H.R. 691. A bill to expand opportunity through greater choice in education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. JONES, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Ms. FOXX, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. YOHO,

Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. LATTA, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MESSER, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. AMASH):

H.R. 692. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 693. A bill to amend the Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988 to provide an exemption from the protections of that Act with regard to certain prospective employees whose job would include caring for or interacting with children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROUZER (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. LATTA):

H.R. 694. A bill to repeal the Environmental Protection Agency's most recent rule for new residential wood heaters; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELCH, Mr. TROTT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. VELA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. SOTO, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 695. A bill to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself and Mr. MOULTON):

H.R. 696. A bill to prohibit any hiring freeze from affecting the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 697. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve the management and administration of the security clearance processes throughout the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 698. A bill to require a land conveyance involving the Elkhorn Ranch and the White River National Forest in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WALDEN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 699. A bill to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to modify provisions relating to certain land exchanges in the Mt. Hood Wilderness in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 700. A bill to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code, to apply the requirements of the Freedom of Information Act to the National Security Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. TED LIEU of California):

H.R. 701. A bill to direct the Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to conduct a study to determine appropriate cybersecurity standards for motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIMES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KIHUEN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SIREN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SVOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. WALZ, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.J. Res. 31. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS):

H.J. Res. 32. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to give States the authority to repeal Federal rules and regulations when the repeal is agreed to by the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. DENT, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. KIND, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. WALZ, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. GRI-

JALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. REED, Mr. LANCE, Mr. HOYER, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. MENG, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. KEATING, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. LEE, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SIREN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. POCAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. COHEN):

H.J. Res. 33. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BISHOP of Michigan (for himself, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. TROTT, and Mr. MITCHELL):

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution supporting the designation of the week of September 11 to September 17 as "Patriot Week"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CONAWAY (for himself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. COOK, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. YODER, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. LONG, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MESSER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. HILL, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KINZINGER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. COMER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. TURNER, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BARR, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BLUM, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BABIN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BOST, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. WALZ, Mr. LANCE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. FOX, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. KIL-

MER, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. EMMER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. AMODEI, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. KEATING, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. STEWART, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. COLE, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution establishing the Joint Ad Hoc Committee on Trade Responsibilities to develop a plan under which the functions and responsibilities of the Office of the United States Trade Representative shall be moved to the legislative branch in accordance with article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H. Res. 56. A resolution electing Members to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. EMMER, Mr. FASO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SABLON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. SOTO):

H. Res. 57. A resolution supporting the contributions of Catholic schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DEUTCH, and Ms. GRANGER):

H. Res. 58. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding unanswered questions into the fate of Raoul Wallenberg; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H. Res. 59. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. WALKER, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HUDSON, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BLUM, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. COLE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. KING of New York):

H. Res. 60. A resolution expressing continued support for the special relationship between the United States and the United Kingdom and urging commencement of negotiations for the development of a North Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (NATIP) between the United States and the United Kingdom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be

subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H. Res. 61. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of a Juan Pablo Duarte Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H. Res. 62. A resolution prohibiting the placement of “Members Only” signs in the House of Representatives wing of the United States Capitol or in office buildings of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. ROYCE of California, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PETERS, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H. Res. 63. A resolution recognizing the cultural and historical significance of Lunar New Year in 2017; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 20.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 617.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 618.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 619.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is enacted by Congressional Authority expressed in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 620.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 621.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 622.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 623.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes

By Mr. VALADAO:

H.R. 624.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 625.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 626.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and including but not solely limited to Article I, Section 8, Clause 14.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 627.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 628.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 629.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 630.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 631.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises . . .

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 632.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 633.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 634.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4 of the U.S. Constitution granting Congress the authority to

make laws governing the time, place, and manner of holding federal elections.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 635.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United State

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 636.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7 of the Constitution

By Mr. PALMER:

H.R. 637.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 638.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 and clause 18.

By Mr. ABRAHAM:

H.R. 639.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with Indian tribes.

By Mr. ALLEN:

H.R. 640.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congressman Rick W. Allen (GA-12) states that Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Consistent with the original understanding of the commerce clause, the authority to enact this legislation is found in Clause 3 of Section 8, Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. ALLEN:

H.R. 641.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Consistent with the original understanding of the commerce clause, the authority to enact this legislation is found in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 642.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 643.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 644.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill makes specific changes to existing law in a manner that provides conscience protections in accord with the 1st Amendment of the United States Constitution. Further, this bill creates a private right of action in federal court in accord with Clause 9

of Section 8 of Article I, of the United States Constitution. Similarly, this bill provides for preventing disbursement of all or a portion of certain Federal financial assistance in accord with Clause 1, Section 8 Article 1.

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 645.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 646.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 647.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution, Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, and clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. CHENEY:

H.R. 648.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 649.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 650.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 granting Congress the power to "promote the Progress of Science."

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 651.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 [Page H5590]

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 652.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 [Page H5590]

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 653.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 [Page H5590]

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 654.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H.R. 655.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 656.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 657.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 658.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3 and Clause 18.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 659.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 660.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 (the Spending Clause). The Supreme Court, in *South Dakota v. Dole* (1987), reasoned that conditions and limitations on funds were constitutional and within the power of Congress under the Spending Clause.

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 3 (Commerce Clause) If the matter in question is not a purely local matter (intra-state) or if it has an impact on inter-state commerce, it falls within Congress' power to "regulate commerce among the several states."

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 18 (the Necessary and Proper Clause) which grants Congress the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 661.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8:

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:

H.R. 662.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 9:

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law.

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia:

H.R. 663.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—Commerce Clause

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio:

H.R. 664.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts, and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 665.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 666.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 667.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 of the Constitution

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 668.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 6

The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 669.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, which grants Congress the power to declare war.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 670.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 671.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 672.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 673.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority on which this bill is based is Congress's power under the Spending Clause in Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 674.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 675.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 676.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 677.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 1—The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Article 1, section 8, clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United

States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 678.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 679.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 680.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

“The Congress shall have the Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or Department or Officer thereof”—Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia:

H.R. 681.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation makes clear that human life begins at the moment of conception and, therefore, the unborn are entitled to the same rights and protections afforded to all American citizens under the U.S. Constitution. In affirming human life begins at conception, the unborn are granted the right to due process under Section 1 of the 14th Amendment which explicitly states, “No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”

The Life at Conception Act allows for constitutional protection for the unborn that they not “be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law” afforded under the 5th Amendment.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 682.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 683.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.R. 684.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 685.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 686.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 687.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 688.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 689.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 690.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Mr. ROKITA:

H.R. 691.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I “Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 692.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 693.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 694.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Consistent with the understating and interpretation of Commerce Clause, Congress has the authority to enact this legislation in accordance with Clause 3 of Section 8, Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 695.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact the Child Protection Improvements Act of 2017 pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. The Necessary and Proper Clause supports the expansion of congressional authority beyond the explicit authorities that are directly discernible from the text. Additionally, the Preamble to the Constitution provides support of the authority to enact legislation to promote the General Welfare.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 696.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII of the Constitution

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 697.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 698.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2:

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 699.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 700.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution. “To provide for the common defense,” “to raise and support Armies,” “to provide and maintain a Navy,” and “to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.”

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 701.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the power to “make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof “ This legislation requires a study to determine regulations appropriate for the safety and security of automobiles in the United States. Nothing in this legislation shall be construed to restrict due process of the law as defined in Section 1, Amendment XIV of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.J. Res. 31.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution: The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several states or by conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other

mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and no state, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.J. Res. 32.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.J. Res. 33.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V—Amendment. The Congress,

whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 24: Mr. SOTO, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 36: Mr. TURNER, Mr. YOHO, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 37: Mr. YOHO, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 38: Mr. FASO, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, and Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 80: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. DUNN.

H.R. 82: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 147: Mr. YOHO, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 161: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 184: Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 217: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 233: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 246: Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. COMER, Mr. REICHERT, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. LOVE, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. SANFORD, and Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 256: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 257: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. BACON, and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 275: Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 299: Ms. MOORE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. KEATING, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BABIN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. FASO, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 301: Ms. PINGREE, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 305: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. BARRAGAN.

H.R. 308: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 351: Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 354: Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 360: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 367: Mr. DUNN, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 371: Ms. Barragan, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 372: Mr. BIGGS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 373: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 377: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 379: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 380: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 387: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. AMASH, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. EMMER, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HIMES, Mr. JONES, Mr. KILMER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLSON, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SANFORD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. YOHO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. SOTO, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. BARTON, Mr. KATKO, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 390: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 392: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 399: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 400: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 406: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 409: Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 411: Mr. ENGEL, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 463: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SIREN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 464: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 475: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 476: Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 482: Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 483: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 490: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BACON, and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 502: Mr. FASO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KATKO, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HECK, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. POCAN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. BEYER, Ms. LEE, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. PALONE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. Ted Lieu of California, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. ESTY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 505: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 508: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 512: Mr. LAUDERMILK, Mr. KNIGHT, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 520: Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 523: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 534: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 539: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 547: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 548: Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 559: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 564: Mr. BARR, Mr. BUDD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TURNER, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 580: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 585: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 589: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 592: Mr. BARR, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 598: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 601: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. DENT, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 606: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. CUELLAR.

H. Res. 15: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. PANNETTA, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. TONKO, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H. Res. 28: Mr. LATTA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. KATKO, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TONKO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H. Res. 30: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. Bordello, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. SOTO, Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. TIPTON.

H. Res. 31: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LOWEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. LATTA.