



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 13, 2011

No. 153

House of Representatives

The House met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PALAZZO).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 13, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVEN M. PALAZZO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2011, 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 each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:20 a.m.

AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I'm back on the floor again to talk about bringing our troops home from Afghanistan.

I had the privilege and the honor to be at Walter Reed in Bethesda on Tuesday, and I talked to so many of our young men and women who have lost legs and other parts of their body and just continue to wonder why in the world the leadership of the House does not join together and call on Mr.

Obama to bring our troops home before 2014-2015.

Mr. Speaker, I'm holding up right now from The Wall Street Journal a rather lengthy article that says, "Afghan Opium Output Surges." That is real encouraging; our young men and women walking the roads of Afghanistan, getting their legs blown off, and yet the drugs in Afghanistan are surging. That's great news, I guess, for the dealers.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to that, on October 5 in a poll, it says one in three vets see Iraq-Afghanistan wars as a waste. And I read: "A new opinion survey says one in three U.S. veterans of the post-9/11 military believe the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan are not worth fighting. Most of the vets polled by the Pew Research Center also think that after 10 years of combat, America should be focusing less on foreign affairs and more on its own problems."

I'm pleased to see Ms. WOOLSEY from California on the floor because she has joined many of us in the Republican Party and her Democratic Party in continuing to grow the opposition to staying in Afghanistan until 2014-2015.

Well, you might say, You keep saying 2014-2015. So I want to make reference to testimony of former Defense Secretary Gates. This was on February 16, 2011, and it reads: "By the end of this calendar year, we expect there to be less than 100,000 troops to be deployed in both of the major post-9/11 combat theatres, virtually all of those forces in Afghanistan.

"That is why we believe that beginning in fiscal year 2015"—Mr. Speaker, I'm going to read that one more time: "That is why we believe that beginning in fiscal year 2015, the United States can, with minimal risk, begin reducing Army active-duty end strength by 27,000 and the Marine Corps by somewhere between 15,000 and 20,000. These projections assume that the number of troops in Afghanistan will be signifi-

cantly reduced by the end of 2014, in accordance with the President's strategy. If our assumptions prove incorrect, there's plenty of time to adjust the time and schedule of this change."

Mr. Speaker, what that means is the end of 2014 becomes 2015; 2015 becomes 2016.

I have a poster here that ran in the Greensboro paper in a Sunday edition. They had put in their paper a letter from JIM MCGOVERN and me calling on the President to bring our troops home before 2014. The title says, Mr. Speaker, "Get Out." And the soldiers are bringing a flag-draped coffin off a plane.

I don't know how much longer we have to continue to spend \$10 billion a month to prop up a crook named Karzai. I just made reference to a Wall Street Journal article that opium surges. It's a corrupt country. It's never going to change. We might as well just face the fact that we won, bin Laden is dead, al Qaeda has been dispersed all over the world, and it's time to bring them home.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I'm going to be handing out to anyone that comes to my office a picture of marines carrying a flag-draped coffin, and I say call on the leadership all the way to the White House, to the House, to the Senate, and ask them to bring our people home.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will ask God to please bless our men and woman in uniform. God, please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. God, in Your loving arms, hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

And I will close by asking God to please bless the House and Senate. I will ask God to give wisdom, strength, and courage to the President. And three times I will ask, God please, God please, God please bless America.

□ 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.

H6857

[From the Associated Press, Oct. 5, 2011]

POLL: 1 IN 3 VETS SEES IRAQ, AFGHAN WARS AS WASTES

WASHINGTON.—A new opinion survey says one in three U.S. veterans of the post-9/11 military believes the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan are not worth fighting. Most of the vets polled by the Pew Research Center also think that after 10 years of combat America should be focusing less on foreign affairs and more on its own problems.

SYSTEMATIC TORTURE IN AFGHAN PRISONS

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. "One interrogator kept banging my head against the wall. "After 2 days, he tied my hands behind my back and started beating me with an electric wire. The interrogation and beating lasted for 3 to 4 hours into the night.

"For the next 2 days, I was tied up from both wrists to the bars of an iron door. From morning until lunchtime they put a hood on my head and hung me by my wrists."

Mr. Speaker, these are the direct quotes from detainees apprehended in Afghanistan and subjected to torture at the hands of Afghan intelligence officials and police forces. It's all documented in a report issued by the United Nations this week. What they found was systematic abuse that followed a pattern—not random or isolated incidents—a pattern at several different facilities, involving at least 300 prisoners.

There's more. Kicks to the head; beatings with electric cables, rubber hoses, and wooden sticks; electric shocks to the thumbs; threats of sexual abuse, some of them against children. And there are some even more graphic, gruesome details that I know we've read about that I'll spare my colleagues for now.

No Americans have been directly implicated in this. But as long as we're continuing a military occupation of Afghanistan and as long as we've taken on the task of training Afghan security forces, I don't see how we avoid the responsibility for these shameful acts of abuse and ritual humiliation. At the very, very least, Mr. Speaker, we're guilty of shoddy oversight and failure to instruct Afghan officials in humane interrogation techniques.

Of course, this kind of brutality is a gross violation of international human rights standards. But it's also well-documented that torture doesn't work. Torture, at the very most for a normal human being, will force that human being to confess to anything under such duress, and it's a complete failure as an intelligence-gathering strategy.

The war in Afghanistan has been going on for 10 years now. It's costing American taxpayers \$10 billion a month. How can we justify spending all this money, money that we need to invest in job creation right here at home,

on a policy and a mission that is leading to such barbaric acts. How can we continue to sacrifice blood and treasure on this war, a war that is being waged in such gross violation of our very American values?

I have never been more convinced it's time to bring our troops home.

□ 0940

IRANIAN CONNECTION WITH ZETAS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 days, we have been learning some disturbing information about the Nation of Iran and its dictator, Ahmadinejad. It seems as though, with the consultation with Iran and the drug cartels in Mexico, it was the idea that the Iranian Government, through one of its operatives, would commit a crime against the United States. We're learning more and more about this, but it's my opinion that the Iranian Government was in the middle of this attempted assault on American soil.

The idea that the Embassy down the street that belongs to the Saudi Arabians would be attacked, that the Saudi Arabian Ambassador would be murdered somewhere in a restaurant in Washington, DC, with a possible attack on the Israeli Ambassador, with a possible attack on the Israeli Ambassador and the Saudi Arabian Ambassador in Argentina, was being plotted by the Iranian Government against us is something that we should be aware of and conscious of and be very concerned about.

Thanks to good law enforcement, this terror plot was thwarted. But what if it had occurred? What if the will of this terrorist would-be to go to Mexico and meet with what he thought was a Zeta cartel member to smuggle explosives into the United States from Mexico that would be used in an attack in Washington, DC, what if that had actually occurred? Certainly, if the Iranian Government was involved in it, we would consider that an act of aggression against the United States.

And it's interesting to me that the Iranian Government was so bold that they thought they could do something like this and get away with it. Did they believe that the United States would not do anything about it? Did they perceive us to be so weak that we would not have shown them consequences for this action against this Nation? We don't know. But the truth is we should show the Iranian Government that there are consequences for an attempted attack such as this by the Iranian Government.

There are a couple of things that I think are important for us to realize. One, we should hold the Iranian Government accountable for this attempted attack on American soil, to show them that you must leave us alone no matter what your political

philosophy is. But just as equally disturbing is the fact that this operative—that I believe was dispatched by the Iranian Government—had the wherewithal to go to Mexico, our neighbors, and try to work with the drug cartels down there, and working in unison to come into the United States to commit a crime. Now, granted, the person that he was working with was not a Zeta cartel member. It was one of our own law enforcement officers. But the person thought he was working with the drug cartels. And the reason he was working with the drug cartels is because they, too, are at war with the United States, and they have easy access into the United States.

On a daily basis, the Zeta drug cartel—which I think is the worst of the worst in Mexico—comes into the United States and brings drugs and people, traffics humans, anything for money. And on a daily basis, they go back to Mexico and they take that money and they take weapons because they have access to our porous borders. If you want to get into the United States, hook up with one of the drug cartels and they'll get you in the U.S. And that's obvious what this Iranian operative was trying to do was to hook up with them. The drug cartels, for little money, will do anything, including commit murder in the United States.

So that should tell us that the border is still porous, Mr. Speaker. We hear that it's not, it's safe. It is porous, Mr. Speaker. There are portions that are safe, but the portions that are not safe are where the drug cartels go back and forth.

So, two lessons we should be learning are that the Iranian Government has it in for the United States—at least some people do in their government; two, that the border is porous, and we need to protect the national security of the United States' southern border.

So what are we going to do about it? We've heard that, well, we're going to impose some more sanctions to try to isolate Iran. Historically, sanctions have never worked any time countries have tried to use them. It is true that we could actually have some sanctions that would do some good, such as keeping Iran from having refined gasoline going back into the country, and maybe keeping crude oil from going out of Iran, but that doesn't solve the problem long term.

The long-term solution in Iran is a regime change. And let me make it clear, that regime change should be by the people of Iran who live in Iran and people who support the freedom fighters in Iran.

It's time that the regime of Iran be removed by the good folks who live in Iran. And the United States' policy publicly should be that we support those dissidents to get rid of the rogue regime of Ahmadinejad.

And that's just the way it is.

IN OPPOSITION TO THE PROTECT
LIFE ACT

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to state my strident opposition to H.R. 358, proposed by our colleague, Representative PITTS, which we will be considering later on today.

H.R. 358 includes several truly unprecedented restrictions on abortion coverages—coverages which, by the way, our Supreme Court has determined are rights of women. And it would limit access to abortion services for all women, regardless of their health status, economic circumstances, age, or any other considerations.

This bill would also impose sweeping refusal provisions that not only undermine women's health care and women's rights, but actually endanger women's lives. It's not hyperbole to say that the provisions of the Pitts bill represent an extreme and callous attack on women's health.

First, H.R. 358 would effectively end abortion coverage for women in State insurance exchanges, both for those who receive subsidies to buy coverage and for those who use their own private money to buy coverage. This would mean that millions of women—contrary to what we have promised them through the Affordable Care Act, that they would be able to keep coverage they currently have—would actually lose the coverage that they currently have. The Pitts bill represents an unparalleled restriction on the use of private funds and an insurmountable impediment for women who simply want to be able to choose a health plan that will cover all of their potential health needs.

Second, H.R. 358 would codify and expand the vast refusal clause currently in law, the Weldon amendment, granting people with only a tangential connection to abortion services—such as receptionists who make appointments or claims adjusters at insurance companies—the right to refuse services to women who seek abortions. Not only that, but the Pitts bill would make it possible for States to pass a whole new slate of refusal laws that could allow insurers to opt out of covering not just abortion care, but birth control, screening, counseling for sexually transmitted diseases, mammograms, and much more.

But the most shocking expansion of our refusal laws is the provision in H.R. 358 that would exempt hospitals from treating or referring women, in case of emergency abortion care, even if women will die without it. Hospitals would no longer be forbidden from abandoning patients on the doorstep of emergency rooms and providing treatment to at least stabilize the medical condition of such patients. This provision heartlessly puts the preferences of hospitals above the lives of women.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 358 even establishes restrictions on peo-

ple's ability to get information about their coverage options. The Pitts bill would prevent the Federal Government, States, or any other entity implementing the Affordable Care Act from requiring access to abortion services. This means, for example, that people may not get impartial or even accurate information from the patient navigators who are designated to help them choose coverage.

The advocates of Planned Parenthood in Wisconsin sent me a story that truly encapsulates the emotion, the real-life consequences of what we're talking about today. This is Judy's story, not a woman who wanted an abortion so that her bikini line would not be ruined, but a woman whose mother had died when she was 4 years old. She and her husband agonized about their decision, but her health was in jeopardy, and they knew that preserving her health and her life was the best choice for her family.

□ 0950

And she painfully, painfully, agonizingly decided to terminate her pregnancy to save her life and to preserve the quality of the life of the one child that she has so that she could rear him.

To protect the right to safe, legal abortion care takes a serious commitment to Wisconsin's health, and it takes courage, Mr. Speaker. Politicians who want to end private health insurance coverage of abortion have neither of these qualities.

FOCUS ON JOB CREATION IN
AMERICA

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of Nevada's unemployed workers who got a glimpse this week of exactly what is wrong with Washington. Too many politicians in Washington have their priorities upside down.

My State is struggling with record unemployment rates. We should be focused every day here in Washington like a laser on job creation. And yet, this week, Washington voted repeatedly to send more jobs overseas.

Just yesterday, the House voted to kill legislation that would have stopped China from cheating Nevada workers out of thousands of jobs. These unfair currency manipulation tactics by China have already cost the Silver State nearly 15,000 jobs; and ironically, at the same time that Washington Republicans rejected efforts to stand up to China, three job-killing trade agreements sailed through the House and the Senate. These trade agreements could cost our Nation another 200,000 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, we need jobs here in America, not in foreign countries. Unemployed workers in Nevada and across our Nation are counting on us to get our priorities straight. Washington

must stop protecting China and start fighting to create jobs for American workers right here on American soil.

BIG GOVERNMENT CONSERVATISM

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of the American Spectator Magazine, Robert Merry, the former CEO of the Congressional Quarterly, has a great article that I wish everyone would read. It is an article about the Presidency of Andrew Jackson, but it applies lessons of history to modern-day issues and problems better than almost anything I have ever read.

Mr. Merry says the Republican Party should not follow the big government conservatism of David Brooks, William Kristol, or Presidents like Theodore Roosevelt or George W. Bush, who he says "expanded the size and scope of the Federal Government and pursued the global goal of remaking other cultures in far-flung regions."

Mr. Merry asks, "Who among past Presidents should Republicans turn to for lessons and guidance?"

"The answer," he says, "is Andrew Jackson, who would have slapped down the notion of American greatness conservatism," i.e., big government conservatism, "with utter contempt because he believed," that is, Jackson believed, "the country's greatness emanated from its people, not from its government."

"Jackson was the great conservative populist of American history, and his story bears study at a time when the country seems receptive to a well-crafted brand of conservative populism."

"Indeed," Mr. Merry continues, "conservative populism is the essence of the Tea Party—opposed to big, intrusive government; angry about the corporate bailouts of the late Bush and early Obama administrations; fearful of the consequences of fiscal incontinence; suspicious of governmental favoritism; wary of excessive global ambition."

"These concerns and fears were Jackson's concerns and fears 180 years ago when he became President, and his greatest legacy is his constant warning that governmental encroachments would lead to precisely the kinds of problems that are today besieging the country. That legacy deserves attention."

Mr. Merry also admires Thomas Jefferson. He wrote:

"Jackson was of course a Democrat, but the Democratic Party of that era was almost the polar opposite of today's version."

"The 19th-century party emerged from the politics of Thomas Jefferson, who despised the governing Federalists of the early Republic for their elitist tendencies and push for concentrated Federal power."

"Jefferson brought forth new political catchphrases: small government,

strict construction of the Constitution, States' rights, reduced taxes, less intrusion into the lives of citizens.

"His administration, historian Joyce Appleby wrote, would speak for 'the rational, self-improving, independent man who could be counted on to take care of himself and his family if only intrusive institutions were removed.'"

Then Mr. Merry goes on and says about Jackson: "Jackson knew that big government could always be manipulated to benefit the few at the top, especially those who worked or formerly worked for the government and big government contractors."

Merry wrote: "Jackson's most penetrating political insight was that concentrated governmental power always leads to corruption and abuse. The way to prevent this, he believed, was to maintain a diffusion of power and keep it as close to the people as possible."

"It wasn't that ordinary folks were less likely to abuse power; human nature applied to all. But if power were spread out through the polity, it couldn't be directed toward special favors and privileges for those who always managed to get their hands on power when it was available in sufficient increments. The playing field would be level."

Of course the thing Jackson is most remembered for as President is his veto of a federally run national bank.

"The President wasted no time in vetoing legislation, daring his political opponents to make the most of it. Few documents in the American political literature capture conservative populism with the verve and power of Jackson's veto message. In it he portrayed the bank as a government-sponsored monopoly that employed the money of taxpayers to enhance the power, the privileges and wealth of a very few Americans and foreigners—'chiefly the richest class'—who owned stock in the bank and worked for it.

"If government is to grant such gratuities, he said, 'Let them not be bestowed on the subjects of a foreign government nor upon a designated and favored class of men in our own country.'

"Rather, he added, such favors should be granted in such way as to 'let each American in turn enjoy the opportunity to profit by our bounty.'"

Finally, Merry applies the Jackson philosophy the Dodd-Frank bill and similar legislation, which, he says, Jackson would have opposed, and says Jackson "would expel Wall Street henchmen from the government, particularly if they came from Goldman Sachs."

He also wrote that "Jackson would be aghast that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac still exist. Kill 'em, he would demand."

"The whole story of these government-sponsored enterprises would scandalize him—government guarantees that amount to government subsidies that are then used to lobby the government for ever more economic leverage."

He has very accurately described the big government, big business duopoly that runs this country today. I urge all of my colleagues and others to read the Robert Merry article about Andrew Jackson in the October issue of the American Spectator Magazine.

CONGRESSIONAL OUT OF POVERTY CAUCUS

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise as the founder and the co-chair of the Congressional Out of Poverty Caucus to continue to sound the alarm every week that there are millions of Americans in need all across America. They need our help and they need our support.

Imagine for a moment if the entire population of 24 States in America were living in poverty. How would our Nation respond? We would respond as we do in any emergency, mobilizing to provide these people and families with adequate food, clothing and shelter. We would come together as a Nation and work to solve the crisis of poverty.

We know that nearly 47 million people live in poverty in America now, today. That's essentially the entire population of 24 States of this country. The emergency is real, and the crisis is happening each and every day in every city and every town across America.

But we are not mobilizing to solve this crisis of poverty. We are not directing Federal, State and local resources to help these men, women and children.

Mr. Speaker, we are really failing those living in and facing poverty. If you are facing or living in poverty, something as basic as eating is not a guarantee, and millions go to bed hungry every night.

This Sunday, October 16, is recognized as World Food Day. On Sunday, of course, we all should take a moment and be grateful that many are food secure, but we need to think about the nearly 15 percent of households and over 16 million children in America who are food insecure.

In fact, beyond Sunday, I hope that every Member of Congress joins me and other members of the Congressional Out of Poverty Caucus later this month in the 2011 Food Stamp Challenge. Once again, as several of us did a couple of years ago, I challenge my colleagues to live for a week on what a person on food stamps lives on; that is, \$4.50 a day, and that's \$1.50 a meal. So I hope you join us in that effort, my colleagues.

Experience is often the best teacher, and I bet that even a few days on living on what a person on food stamps survives on day in and day out might just bring us together to work to address the crisis of poverty.

□ 1000

We know what we need to do, really. The pathway to addressing the crisis of

poverty, to boosting our stagnating economy and reducing long-term deficits is the same one: create stable living-wage jobs.

The most effective antipoverty program is an effective jobs program. When a family in poverty gains a living-wage job with good benefits, the family stops relying on government services, and that family begins to pay into the tax base instead of drawing from it. When jobs are created, it boosts demand, which helps to create even more jobs, which is what tax cuts for the wealthy, quite frankly, have always failed to accomplish. So we must come together and pass the President's American Jobs Act and support those initiatives that create stable living-wage jobs.

But while we work to create new jobs, we cannot forget that there are millions of Americans who are our most vulnerable. There are millions who face hunger, millions who have been looking for a job for more than 99 weeks, and millions of Americans who are losing their homes and struggling to keep their version of the American Dream alive. We must protect the vital safety net programs that support these people in these very hard times from draconian and shortsighted budget cuts by the so-called supercommittee. We cannot balance the budget on the backs of our most vulnerable.

Poverty is real. It's rural and it's urban. People of all backgrounds, all ethnic backgrounds, are poor in our country. And so I hope we can finally, at least on this issue, end the extreme partisanship and really stand united in a bipartisan way and as a nation to create jobs and to address the crisis of poverty ravaging our Nation.

HONORING ARMY SPECIALIST GARRETT FANT

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, 40 years from now, a beloved high school history teacher at Tahoe High School named Garrett Fant should be celebrating his retirement surrounded by generations of his students and his children and grandchildren. They would have all told affectionate stories about how Mr. Fant inspired them or helped them and wished him a happy and well-deserved retirement.

Unfortunately, history has willed a different story. Army Specialist Garrett Fant instead returned to Lake Tahoe last week as a fallen hero at the age of 21. This young man sacrificed all those years, all those memories, all those pleasures—and all that life—in the service of his country.

He loved the Army, and he had a plan for his life—he'd serve his country as a soldier for 20 years, and then he would come and serve his community as a high school history teacher. From everything I've learned about Garrett

Fant, he would have made a great history teacher. His mother told a reporter, "His thought was that high school was the last stop for kids, and he wanted to influence people."

He'd have made a great family man. His older brother remembers looking up to Garrett as if Garrett were the older brother. Knowing full well the dangers that surrounded him in Afghanistan, his foremost attention went to reassuring his family that he was safe and secure. His mother said, "He always tried to protect me from the dangers of being over there. He was just someone that, if you were his family or his friends—or his country—he gave you his all and loved you with everything."

Above all, Garrett Fant wanted to be a soldier. His brother tried to get him to enlist with him in the Navy, but Garrett would have none of that. He was all Army and had known from the time he was a little boy that's what he most wanted to do. On Facebook, he listed his occupation as "grunt," telling his friends, "You can't spell Infantry without 'Fant.'" He was the top marksman in his class of 1,000.

I wish I'd known him. I wish my grandchildren might one day have been his high school history students. Instead, Army Specialist Garrett Fant takes his place in history, among nine generations of American heroes who sacrificed all those precious years to protect those who couldn't protect themselves, to stand up to the bullies of the world, "to proclaim liberty throughout all the land and unto all the inhabitants thereof."

In his farewell address at West Point, General Douglas MacArthur turned his attention to fallen heroes like Army Specialist Garrett Fant, and with searing insight he observed, "Their story is known to all of you. It is the story of the American man at arms. My estimate of him was formed on the battlefields many, many years ago and has never changed. I regarded him then as I regard him now, as one of the world's noblest figures; not only as one of the finest military characters, but also as one of the most stainless."

"His name and fame are the birthright of every American citizen. In his youth and strength, his love and loyalty, he gave all that mortality can give. He needs no eulogy from me, or any other man."

And MacArthur goes on to say, "But when I think of his patience under adversity, of his courage under fire, and his modesty in victory, I am filled with an emotion of admiration I cannot put into words."

"He belongs to history as furnishing one of the greatest examples of successful patriotism. He belongs to posterity as the instructor of future generations in the principles of liberty and freedom."

And so Garrett Fant became a teacher after all. As Shakespeare said, "this story shall the good man teach his son." Succeeding generations of stu-

dents at South Lake Tahoe High School and also at Valley Oak High School in American Canyon, which Garrett also attended, will know his story. Every Memorial Day in his hometown, his name will be read with a special pride that his friends and neighbors will share. Strangers will pass by his honored grave, adorned with flags and flowers, and they'll note the few years he had and the sacrifice he made and be humbled by it and perhaps inspired by it to become better citizens. No history teacher can do more than that.

To his grieving family, on behalf of a grateful Nation, I can only say that you do not mourn alone. Your pride in Garrett is shared by your community, by your country, and by many, many history teachers who will tell his story to the latest American generation.

CELEBRATING WORLD FOOD DAY

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Let me thank the Speaker for yielding time to me this morning.

As I begin my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a brief remark about one of the preceding speakers, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE from Oakland, California, who has been an advocate for poverty, food insecurity, human rights, and all of the global issues that we have talked about over the years. And I want to thank her for her leadership on this very important issue. Congresswoman LEE is the founder of the Out of Poverty Caucus here in the House of Representatives, and I am honored to serve as one of her cochairs.

But the Congresswoman is absolutely correct; on this Sunday, October 16, we will celebrate World Food Day, a day to increase awareness, understanding, and informed, year-round action to alleviate hunger across the globe and in our neighborhoods.

The statistical evidence of pervasive and persistent hunger is absolutely staggering, notwithstanding the human stories of working families in my communities of eastern North Carolina or families in eastern Africa who cannot get enough food to eat on a daily basis.

And so I want to take this opportunity to remind all the Members of this body that millions of Americans, millions of people suffer from hunger; and unless we commit to eliminating this scourge, these human beings will suffer persistent poverty, reduced rights, and even death. We must come together, Mr. Speaker, to make hunger and nutrition issues, these issues, a priority. It is a priority in my hometown of Wilson, North Carolina. We have a food bank in my community. It is administered by the Wilson OIC, the Wilson Opportunity Industrialization Center.

□ 1010

On at least four occasions, on each occasion each year, this center is responsible for passing out food to those suffering from food insecurity. I have here to my right simply a picture of the last food program in which citizens of our community lined up all night long to receive food in this community. You will see this building. It is a former school. Actually, I went to elementary school there many years ago. This was my first-grade classroom, Congresswoman LEE. This is a former elementary school. It is now the Wilson OIC, and citizens lined up all night long in order to receive food from this program.

What a shame.

But thank you, OIC, for your effort.

Nine hundred twenty-five million people suffer from chronic hunger worldwide—one in seven people. That is an atrocious statistic. Shockingly, in 2011, there is still severe starvation. The worst drought in 60 years caused widespread hunger and starvation across the Horn of Africa, and we need to pay attention to the Horn of Africa. Globally, 12 million people are in danger of starving to death, and children are especially vulnerable.

In the United States—the richest country in the world, the richest country that we've ever known—in our beloved country, 48 million people live in food insecure households, and these are yet examples of that. That is one in six people in our country who suffer from food insecurity. The recession that we talk about on this floor every day has exacerbated the plight of many, but the problems with food insecurity began well before 2007. Since the year 2000, the number of people classified by USDA as having very low food security has doubled. My district has been recently classified as the second most insecure district in the country.

The Federal Government certainly needs to find ways to cut costs and reduce spending, but that burden should not fall heaviest on the people with the greatest needs. We need to continue our investments in agriculture research to empower scientists to develop more efficient and sustainable methods of production. We should maintain and improve our commitments to foreign aid programs through USAID, improving them to provide greater access to needed resources.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, my predecessor in this office, former Congresswoman Eva Clayton, was a strong, clear voice on behalf of the hungry of the country and those abroad. During her 10 years in Congress, she was staunchly committed to improving access and the quality of food stamps, WIC, and other programs. Following her retirement, she was appointed the assistant director of the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization.

In this astounding legacy, we will be introducing legislation, probably tomorrow, to honor the work of Eva Clayton: The Eva Clayton Fellows Program Act of 2011. This is a wonderful

program. I urge my colleagues to pay attention to the introduction of this bill. It will be significant.

THE SPIRIT OF COMPETITION

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

Mr. SCHILLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, in the spirit of competition, in support of American workers and as an advocate for a government that seeks to provide economic certainty for the businesses that create jobs in this country.

Last night, the House voted on bipartisan trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea. These agreements represent an opportunity to compete, grow jobs, and promote American exports.

Here is what we know: Ninety-five percent of the world's customers live outside this great country. Here is another thing: If America gives itself the opportunity to compete with other countries, like these three agreements will, American manufacturers and farmers will deliver, and we will all win. Job creation is red, white, and blue. It's definitely a red, white, and blue issue, and that is why you saw both Democrats and Republicans coming together yesterday to provide this opportunity for American exports to compete.

In the 17th District of Illinois, which I represent, I recently visited a company that makes the big mining trucks, and 80 percent of those trucks ship outside of the United States of America. This company employs 3,000 workers, which is equal to supplying jobs to 2,400 of those. These jobs are dependent upon exports. The same company also manufactures bulldozers. Eight out of 10 of those are sold to buyers from overseas. Yet again, this is an example of jobs being created because of the demand for American products by customers in a global economy.

These trade agreements will reduce tariffs on goods and will remove barriers that are currently in place. By leveling the playing field for our manufacturers and farmers, we can further promote these cornerstones of the American economy. We need to enact these policies that strengthen our manufacturing base, which is why I am cosponsoring legislation offered by my colleague and friend DAN LIPINSKI that will pave the way for our national manufacturing strategy.

Three million manufacturing jobs and almost 4 million ag jobs are dependent upon U.S. exports. The independent U.S. International Trade Commission estimates that these agreements will increase American-made exports by \$13 billion and inject \$10 billion into our GDP. President Obama estimates that these jobs could create a quarter of a million jobs. According to the Congressional Research Service, the last time the United States signed a trade agreement was back in 2006 with Peru.

These three trade agreements the House passed last night could have been sent to Congress back in 2009. Every day we delay is a day we deny American workers job opportunities to compete. These trade agreements aren't about rhetoric. They are about results. We cannot afford to sit on the sidelines anymore while other countries enter into trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea, causing us to lose more of the market share. Again, I support these free trade agreements. If as a country we are allowed to compete, I know we will deliver.

RECOGNIZING MARCIA JO ZERIVITZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I rise today to honor the achievements of Marcia Jo Zerivitz, the founding executive director and chief curator of the Jewish Museum of Florida.

Marcia has been a leader in the organized Florida Jewish community for more than 40 years. Originally from West Virginia, she has been a leader in Jewish organizations since her work with Hillel during her college years. Since the 1970s, Marcia has held various leadership roles within organizations such as Israel Bonds, AIPAC, ORT, and Hadassah.

Throughout her lifetime, Marcia has broken the glass ceiling as the first woman in many positions, including as president of the Greater Orlando Jewish Federation. She is one of the first women nationally to hold this office. She was also the first woman to chair the Florida Association of Jewish Federations Conference in 1979. In 1993, Marcia guided the restoration of an abandoned 1936 art deco building on Miami Beach, which served as an Orthodox synagogue for 50 years, and she opened the Jewish Museum of Florida in 1995.

She led the effort to get the museum accredited and has presented more than 50 exhibits in 15 years. The museum, which is on the National Register of Historic Places, has collected, preserved, and interpreted the Jewish experience in Florida since at least 1763, when Jews were first allowed to live in the State.

In 2003, she initiated State legislation for a Florida Jewish History Month, which is now recognized each January. Then in 2005, Marcia and members of Miami's Jewish community approached me with the idea to designate a month to honor the contributions that American Jews have made to our Nation. As a result, I was the proud sponsor of the Jewish American Heritage Month resolution, which the House and Senate unanimously passed in 2006 and which has been proclaimed by President Bush and President Obama annually since then.

Marcia Zerivitz should take great pride in knowing that Jewish American Heritage Month, which is now celebrated across our Nation each May, began with her work at the Jewish Museum of Florida.

I am honored to recognize Marcia Jo Zerivitz for the positive impact that she has made, not just on Florida's Jewish community but on communities across our Nation. I wish her well on her retirement, and I thank her for enriching the lives of countless others in the Jewish community and around the country.

□ 1020

YUCCA MOUNTAIN

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor a second time, as I promised a couple of weeks ago, to talk about high-level nuclear waste in the Yucca Mountain repository.

Two weeks ago I highlighted Hanford, Washington, a DOE site that has 53 million gallons of nuclear waste—53 million gallons of nuclear waste that's stored 10 feet underground in tanks that are leaking. The waste is 250 feet above the water table and the waste is 1 mile from the Columbia River, versus Federal law which said in 1982 that Yucca Mountain should be our national repository.

Now let's look at Yucca Mountain. Right now there's no nuclear waste on site. The waste would be stored a thousand feet underground. The waste is a thousand feet above the water table, and the waste would be 100 miles from the Colorado River; 100 miles versus 1 mile, high-level nuclear waste, especially with Hanford where you have nuclear waste that actually is leaking outside the tanks.

So then my response was: What are the Senators in these two States doing and what's their position? The reason why we're not moving to Yucca Mountain is because of one U.S. Senator, the majority leader of the Senate, HARRY REID, who has blocked the movement of Yucca Mountain.

Obviously, these Senators have an interest because of the Columbia River, and I was trying to encourage them, through the use of the bully pulpit, that this was a time to move to get this resolution resolved, especially after Fukushima Daiichi, everybody following the tragedy in Japan, and part of that was high-level nuclear waste in storage ponds right on site.

Since then, I have been able to get a few quotes from these Senators, or researched them. Senator CANTWELL said: "The National Academy of Sciences has concluded that the best approach is to bury nuclear waste deep underground. Since that conclusion, Yucca Mountain in Nevada has been chosen as the national repository."

Senator MURRAY said this: "I believe that it is irresponsible for the Department of Energy to discontinue the

Yucca program altogether, its funding, licensing and design.”

Senator WYDEN has said: “I don’t see that (Yucca Mountain will reopen). I think that there’ll be an effort to look at new technologies and on-site storage and a whole host of approaches, but I don’t think that’s going to happen.”

So Senator WYDEN is accepting this in Hanford, a mile from the Columbia River.

Senator MERKLEY has been quiet, as far as we could find from the Google search pairing his name and any Yucca Mountain comments.

Now, lest people think I’m picking on the Northwest, let me go to my home State of Illinois. So one facility, Zion Nuclear Power Station, it’s a decommissioned plant but there’s still 65 casks containing 1,135 metric tons of nuclear waste, versus Yucca Mountain, which has zero.

The waste at Zion is stored above the ground; the waste at Yucca Mountain would be a thousand feet below the surface. The waste at Zion is 5 feet above the water table; the waste at Yucca Mountain would be a thousand feet. The waste at Yucca Mountain is 100 miles from the Colorado River; the waste from Zion is 1,300 feet from Lake Michigan.

I mean, it doesn’t take a rocket scientist to understand that Yucca Mountain is safer than storing high-level nuclear waste next to Lake Michigan.

So what have our Senators said?

Well, let’s start with Senator DURBIN. He’s quoted as saying: “There are a lot of options out there. But I have supported Yucca in the past, and I am not walking away from that. I just think we need to consider other options as well.”

I want him to obviously continue to consider Yucca Mountain.

Senator KIRK has said: “I think in the end Congress needs to fight and win the battle to build the Yucca Mountain facility so that we can store nuclear waste 1,000 feet below the surface.”

I agree.

Senator KOHL is quoted as saying: “This site, on the Nevada nuclear test site”—that’s what people don’t know is that Yucca Mountain is also the Nevada nuclear test site. That’s where we tested the nuclear bombs during the nuclear arms race and the nuclear age. So Senator KOHL is correct in saying: “This site, on the Nevada nuclear test site, is certainly safer than leaving the waste at 132 sites nationwide, sites scattered around the country that were never designed to be a permanent solution.”

Senator JOHNSON is silent.

CURRENCY MANIPULATORS

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

Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the bipartisan majority in the Senate for passing legislation to take on currency

manipulators, and to urge our House of Representatives and our House Republican leadership to do the same—to allow a stand-alone, up-or-down vote on currency manipulation legislation—here in the House of Representatives. In a period of congressional gridlock, we must seize every bipartisan opportunity available to us not only to create jobs, but also to protect the good-paying jobs we already have.

As the Senate demonstrated this week by passing the Currency Exchange Rate Oversight Reform Act, the time is now to take advantage of bipartisan cooperation. Sixteen Republican Senators joined 47 Democratic Senators in voting for this legislation to counter an unfair trade practice that is hampering our economic recovery.

In February, Congressman SANDER LEVIN, TIM RYAN, and TIM MURPHY introduced the Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act. H.R. 639 has garnered 225 bipartisan cosponsors, more than enough secure House passage. This would allow the Department of Commerce to counter imports made cheaper by currency manipulation with a corresponding tariff. A nearly identical bill passed the House of Representatives last year by a strong, overwhelming bipartisan vote of 348–79, both Republicans and Democrats.

When countries are allowed to keep the value of their currencies artificially low and, in turn, the prices of their exports into the United States, American companies and American workers face an unfair disadvantage. Forced to compete on an unlevel playing field where competitors are able to maintain a permanent 30 to 40 percent-off sale on their products, American jobs are lost and our trade deficit grows with countries like China.

The Economic Policy Institute recently released the study, and it showed that in the last 10 years the U.S. lost 2.8 million jobs, including nearly 62,000 jobs in my home State of Indiana as a result directly of the expanding trade deficit with China. Many experts agree: Countries like China that manipulate their currencies are damaging the U.S. economy.

Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke recently expressed concern “that the Chinese currency policy is blocking what might be a more normal recovery process in the global economy,” and he stated that “it is to some extent hurting the recovery.”

Chairman Bernanke is tasked directly with the responsibilities of serving and protecting America’s economic interests. He recognizes the impact that Chinese currency manipulation is having on our economy. It is long past time for this House of Representatives to do the same.

□ 1030

After the Senate expressed interest in considering S. 1619, China immediately went on the offensive, issuing threats and saying such legislation could spark a trade war. Though Chi-

na’s comments are disappointing, they are not unexpected, and Congress should not shy away from doing what is in America’s best interests. That is our job. China’s unfair currency policies have cost millions of Americans their jobs, and I believe inaction on this issue is dangerous to our economic recovery and continues to put at risk hundreds of thousands of additional American jobs.

When I travel around my district, I hear from small businesses and manufacturers on this issue. And they never ask for Congress to guarantee their success. All they want is a fair fight, for the rules to be the same. And I believe given a level playing field, American businesses will win every single time.

Once again, to our House leadership, please allow bipartisan legislation addressing currency manipulation to come before the full House of Representatives for a standalone, up-or-down vote. Who are you going to stand with, the Chinese government or American businesses and American workers? The American people want a vote now and deserve a vote now.

REPUBLICAN ANTI-CHOICE LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, we are now more than 275 days into this 112th Congress, and the GOP leadership has put forward zero American jobs bills and outright rejected consideration of President Obama’s jobs proposal. So if jobs aren’t at the heart of the Republican Tea Party’s agenda, what is?

Passage of anti-labor legislation to weaken the rights of middle class workers and encourage the shipping of jobs overseas. Check.

Passage of anti-middle class legislation to raise taxes on hardworking families. Check.

Passage of anti-environment legislation to roll back clean air standards. Check.

Passage of anti-education legislation to slash Pell Grants for middle-income students to afford college. Check.

And later today, passage of its seventh anti-women’s health measure. Today’s bill will put the government in the middle of American’s health choices and allow hospitals to refuse life-saving treatment to women.

Every day it feels more and more like the movie “Groundhog Day.” I wake up hoping it will be something different, but it’s the same scene played over and over and over. The Republican Tea Party agenda stuck on repeat might satisfy the extreme right wing, but it neither satisfies nor helps hardworking Americans.

It is time for the GOP leadership to learn a lesson from “Groundhog Day”—the only way out of it is to do better.

The American people don’t want token legislation, extreme partisanship, or sideshow politics. They want

real solutions, real jobs, and a real vision. They want a vision for America. A vision for America. And like the movie, they are desperate for a new day.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the National Trust for Historic Preservation's 65th National Preservation Conference, which will be held in my community of western New York next week.

Over 2,000 people from across the country and around the world will converge in Buffalo to be immersed in our considerable and remarkable architecture. What makes this conference unique is that our community's historic preservation assets are the very reason the conference is being held there.

The centerpiece will be the numerous buildings, homes, parks, and neighborhoods that were remarkable upon their construction and will help grow us in the future. This conference will provide international validation to what many in western New York have long known and understood: that our ability to thrive lies in recapturing the potential of what we have built in the past. And we are doing just that.

Buffalo is home to the Nation's first park and parkway system, designed in the 19th century by the famed landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted. The 1,200-acre parklands are some of the very best in the world. The Buffalo Olmsted Parks Conservancy is leading a multimillion dollar effort to restore the parks so western New Yorkers can visit and appreciate and enjoy them for decades to come.

Meanwhile, we are meticulously restoring buildings integral to our architectural legacy. These include the Darwin Martin House and Graycliff Estate by Frank Lloyd Wright; the Guaranty Building by Louis Sullivan; the Buffalo Psychiatric Center by Henry Hobson Richardson; and the Hotel Lafayette by one of America's first female architects, Louise Blanchard Bethune.

These efforts are not just examples of historic preservation. They represent a new confidence that we can take charge of our own future by reclaiming our past.

Mr. Speaker, historic preservation efforts in Buffalo and western New York also demonstrate the importance of partnerships between the Federal Government and the private sector. Without these partnerships, many preservation projects would never get off the ground.

Federal tools like the historic preservation tax credit and the new markets tax credit bring builders, investors, and development professionals together, and they have the capacity to turn around entire communities.

In Buffalo, \$64 million of new market tax credit investments have occurred

since 2005. This investment has leveraged projects totaling over \$141 million in our community. The new markets program has encouraged the redevelopment of the Oak School Lofts, Ellicott Commons, the Electric Tower, the Webb Lofts, Ashbury Hall, AM&A's Warehouse Lofts, 567 Exchange Street, the Larkin at Exchange complex, the Erie Lackawanna Train Station in Jamestown, and the Innovation Center at the Buffalo Niagara Medical Campus. All of these projects involved either a restoration of a historic, vacant building, or new construction in an economically distressed area.

I support legislation that would extend the new markets program and authorize it at \$5 billion or more a year. And I support extending the historic preservation tax credit because I have seen in Buffalo how cost effective and successful these programs can be.

Older industrial areas like Buffalo will be able to compete and succeed in a globalized economy if their leaders develop a culture of innovation and create new economic opportunities while taking advantage of the unique aspects of the past. Buffalo and western New York are ready to meet that challenge.

I congratulate those who have led the effort to host this important conference, especially Bob Skerker and Catherine Schweitzer, and the hundreds of western New Yorkers who will make this conference a success.

To the conference attendees and visitors from all around the world, I would say our community is honored to host you and proud to show off our unique architecture and historic assets. I promise you will not be disappointed.

INVESTING IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for yielding to me this morning.

I wanted to share with my colleagues an important challenge that we have. And I think some would say how obvious with 9 percent unemployment, which I think we should be honest with ourselves and realize that it has been an accident that has been long in coming. Almost as if one slowed down on a rainy day and looked as if one was following the prudent rules of the road and decided to, in a moment's notice, not only speed but speed through a stop sign, an accident waiting to happen. We have of course, had spending without accountability in two wars, Iraq and Afghanistan, preceding this administration; and, of course, tax cuts for the top 1 percent of the population, many of whom acknowledge that where there is opportunity and benefit, there must be sacrifice and contribution.

And if we were to engage them in a reasoned discussion, we would find out, of course, that they would be willing to invest in America. I don't call it tax-

ation. None of us enjoy getting that bill that deals with taxes, but we do understand the value of investing in America.

□ 1040

Yesterday, we debated three trade bills. All of them are my friends. I have had the opportunity to engage with the communities represented by South Korea, Panama, and Colombia. Let me say in particular on Panama, my grandfather worked on the Panama Canal. The evidence is not his words to me, since he died before I was born, but it is the evidence of his name being printed in the annals of the Panamanian history of the canal right there at the canal site that I have visited on many occasions. What an emotional moment to see his name arise as one who helped construct and build in the 1900s amongst all the devastation, the mosquitoes, and disease. He survived and helped build the Panama Canal. So we have a longstanding relationship with them. We have a longstanding relationship with the canal.

But the trade bills, for me, should answer one question—and I respect those who voted for it: Will it have an infusion of opportunity for those who have lost their jobs? Unlike some comments by Presidential candidates running for this job, I don't believe if you're unemployed and if you are not rich, it is your fault. There are college graduates who are unemployed today. There are skilled artisans and those who are in the trades who are unemployed today. There are returning veterans—young men and women—who led almost multinational companies in terms of the jobs that they had in the military in Iraq and Afghanistan. How do I know? Because I have visited them and seen them in operation. If you are over the logistics of moving equipment and moving men and women, and you're 25 years old, I can assure you that you know how to work in a large corporation.

There's no evidence that these bills being passed at this time will in fact bring down the unemployment. I believe our chief responsibility is to find work for the American people.

One of the challenges of the language of the trade bill is the question of protecting our intellectual property. Intellectual property creates jobs. It protects the genius of America. Of course, all of us through our history books have known about the origins of the telephone and we know the origins of the lightbulb and some of the geniuses that we've known in our early history. Many of us have heard of George Washington Carver, who did a lot with the peanut.

America knows how to invent. We know how to do research. I have the privilege of having in my jurisdiction and surrounding areas the Texas Medical Center, where some of the most outstanding research is being done on cancer, which seems to be an epidemic in this country.

So I argue we did not have sufficient protections for intellectual property. But here is the key. In addition to not having a direct correlation and an oversight on the passage of these bills which passed in the Senate last night and the creation of jobs that our population, our citizens, those that we are here to protect, those who we're here to create a pathway of economic opportunity for—a nexus of jobs, that's what you need to prove to me. And so I believe that we are missing a manufacturing strategy. It is interesting that we consider that old stuff and how proud we were of the Model T.

I believe that we cannot go forward on trade bills, Mr. Speaker, until we focus on manufacturing in America, make it in America, and putting people back to work at all levels of education. That's going to be my cause for now and forever and ever. I want America back to work. It's a great Nation. It's the greatest country in the world. Let us focus on our folks getting jobs and getting our folks back to manufacturing, making things, selling things, and America continues to serve this world as the greatest democracy and the greatest country in the world.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 11:30 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 44 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 11:30 a.m.

□ 1130

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON) at 11:30 a.m.

PRAYER

Reverend Jesse Reyes, San Jose Catholic Church, Saipan, Northern Mariana Islands, offered the following prayer:

Gracious and loving Father, we thank You for this beautiful day.

We ask You to send Your Holy Spirit of good counsel and fortitude to all who make the law; enlighten their minds and their hearts to be moved with compassion and to be conducted in righteousness and be eminently useful to Your people over whom they represent.

May they have the courage to promote peace and harmony, and bring us the blessings of liberty and equality.

We make this prayer through Christ our Lord.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HOCHUL) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. HOCHUL 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.

WELCOMING REVEREND JESSE REYES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABLAN. Today, I welcome Father Jesse T. Reyes, from the Diocese of Chalan Kanoa in the Northern Mariana Islands, as our guest chaplain.

Father Reyes, or "Pale Jesse" as we say in the Marianas, was ordained in 2007. Since then, he has devoted himself to serving our people as the parochial vicar for the parish of San Jose in the village of Oleai.

Pale Jesse's ministry also includes serving as chaplain at the adult correctional facility, as vocation director for the diocese, and as the spiritual director for the Christian Mothers and the Divine Mercy prayer group.

I am very grateful that Pale Jesse was able to set aside that work for a few days to accept the invitation to be here. This marks the first time that a member of the clergy of the Northern Mariana Islands has offered the opening prayer for the U.S. House of Representatives; and it is, indeed, a great honor for the people of our islands—people of all creeds and denominations.

Welcome, Pale Jesse, and thank you for your blessings.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 13, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 13, 2011 at 9:20 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3080.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3079.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3078.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

EXPRESSING FRUSTRATION WITH WASHINGTON POLITICIANS

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, last week we witnessed shocking, shocking hypocrisy from President Obama. His Justice Department filed a lawsuit, a frivolous lawsuit, to block the State of Alabama from enforcing a law that would keep illegal immigrants from taking American jobs.

In the lawsuit, Mr. Obama's lawyers claimed that the law would expose those whom authorities suspect might be here illegally from "new difficulties in routine dealings." Now, keep in mind that this is the same Obama administration that is strangling small businesses with job-killing regulations, and because of Barack Obama, virtually every small business in America is now facing "new difficulties in routine dealings."

The people I represent are beyond frustrated with Washington politicians, who are slow to protect America's businesses, yet who are quick to sue over a law that would help American citizens get jobs. Americans have given up on their leadership, so here is a message for President Obama:

Stop targeting small businesses, and let these job creators get back to doing what they do best—creating jobs.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

CHINESE CURRENCY BILL

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

Ms. HOCHUL. I rise in support of bipartisan, job-creating legislation to crack down on the unfair manipulation of Chinese currency.

Businesses in my district, like Pyrotek and I Squared R Element, are ready to lead the resurgence of American manufacturing, but these businesses are competing on an unlevel playing field.

For far too long, China has gotten away with manipulating its currency to make Chinese exports to America cheaper and American exports to China more expensive. There is overwhelming bipartisan support to hold China accountable. Level the playing field, and I would put my team up against any team in this world—second to none. The Currency Reform for Fair Trade

Act would enhance our economic security; it would enhance our national security; and it would help create over 1 million jobs here in America.

I call on the leadership of this House to bring this legislation to a vote, and I call on all of my colleagues to support it.

JOHN 3:16 MINISTRIES

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak on the important role that John 3:16 Ministries plays in the lives of recovering addicts in the First District of Arkansas, which I am privileged to represent.

John 3:16 Ministries is a nonprofit, faith-based recovery center, located in Cord, Arkansas, which offers men an opportunity to overcome their addictions through faith and service to others. This organization was founded by Bryan and Beverly Tuggle, who were inspired to open a spiritual boot camp for addicts after Bryan sought help for his own addictions years earlier at the New Beginnings Ministry.

John 3:16 Ministries took its first resident on May 5, 2003, and it has been helping men who struggle with addiction ever since. Residents receive lodging, are taught skills to help them become more productive citizens in their communities, and are encouraged to enroll in classes offered through the local community college. Most importantly, residents of John 3:16 Ministries are given an opportunity to heal physically and spiritually.

Unlike most recovery centers, John 3:16 Ministries offers these services free of charge and is funded by donations only from local churches, businesses, and individuals. When asked about the cost of the services that John 3:16 Ministries provides, Bryan always has the same response: Jesus Christ has paid the cost in full.

Mr. and Mrs. Tuggle provide an incredible service, and I am honored to serve such selfless constituents in the First District of Arkansas.

GREAT LAKES RESTORATION

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, the Great Lakes are one of America's most overlooked and underappreciated resources. They are the largest source of surface freshwater in the world, providing more than 30 million people with drinking water and supporting a multibillion dollar boating, shipping, fishing, and recreation economy. The Great Lakes fishery alone generates \$7 billion in economic activity and directly supports 75,000 jobs.

Yet the lakes are threatened by toxic algal blooms that are fueled by agriculture runoff, sewer overflows, and other pollution. Lake Erie, in par-

ticular, as the shallowest of the lakes, is exceptionally vulnerable to excess nutrients and phosphorus.

According to a recent report by the National Wildlife Federation, this summer, Lake Erie saw the most severe algal blooms since the 1960s. Madam Speaker, the Brookings Institution reports that every dollar invested in Great Lakes restoration results in a \$2 return in the form of increased fishing, tourism, and home values.

This program is cost-effective, and I urge Congress to reject cuts to Great Lakes restoration.

□ 1140

TRIBUTE TO RAY REID

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

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Arkansas' "fifth Congressman," Colonel (Retired) Raymond T. Reid, who passed away last weekend at the age of 90.

Ray Reid had an amazing love for his country. At the outbreak of World War II, he left school to join the Army and over the ensuing 31 years, faithfully served his Nation in uniform. His record of service placed him among our Nation's most unique: a veteran of World War II, Korea, and Vietnam.

And, Madam Speaker, as if his distinguished military service was not enough, Ray Reid came to Capitol Hill and served a quarter-century on the staffs of John Paul Hammerschmidt, Tim Hutchinson, and Asa Hutchinson, where, upon his retirement, he earned the nickname of Arkansas' "fifth Congressman."

Ray Reid was an institution. He enjoyed a long and adventurous life. Married to his sweetheart, Jean, for 51 years, he was the father of four, grandfather of six, and great-grandfather of two.

I am honored to acknowledge the dedicated service of this great American hero.

OPPOSITION TO THE KOREA, COLOMBIA, AND PANAMA TRADE AGREEMENTS

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

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address the need to keep good-paying jobs in America. I voted "no" on the trade agreements passed in this House last night, but in that same vote I voted "yes" for American jobs, I voted "yes" for jobs on American soil, I voted "yes" for human rights and "yes" for labor protections.

The trade agreements will cost us jobs at a time when we should be investing in America, and they will lead to further decline of the middle class.

These agreements are toxic for Ohioans who work in manufacturing and other sectors.

The U.S.-Korea trade agreement alone will cost almost 160,000 jobs in this country in the first 7 years. Stand with me for the middle class and against shipping jobs overseas.

MESSAGE FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT: BACK OFF

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, when I meet with businesses across southeast Texas, their message for the Federal Government is clear. Back off.

Over 14 million Americans are unemployed because companies are not hiring. Companies are not hiring because of the uncertainty in the economy.

The Federal Government redtape, high taxes, and unnecessary regulations are crippling job creators and adding to the uncertainty. America has become an unfriendly place to do business, so businesses are either not hiring or they move out of the country.

The Judiciary Committee will soon vote on the REINS Act. I support this bill because it says that Congress must approve every major rule proposed by the executive branch before it could be imposed on the American people and the American companies.

So the EPA's dust regulation, among several, would be no more. It is the responsibility of Congress to rein in the administration's runaway regulators. That is how we get America back to work.

The Federal Government cannot create jobs, but its self-inflicted overregulation is destroying jobs. It's time to end the out-of-control Federal regulation terror on American businesses.

And that's just the way it is.

URGING ACTION ON JOBS LEGISLATION

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

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, 2 days ago the United States Senate, the Republicans in the United States Senate, unanimously decided to not bring for consideration the jobs bill. I don't understand the workings of the United States Senate, and I don't understand the logic behind that decision, but I do understand why on a good day the approval ratings of the United States Congress are 12 percent.

Maybe the bill wasn't perfect. The only justification for not bringing the jobs bill today is because you've got a better bill.

So I ask the Senate and I ask the leadership of this House, there are 14 million Americans who today need a job; so if the bill's not perfect, that's fine; let's make it good. But let's do it today.

The American people cannot wait on the politics of this institution. Let's bring a jobs bill to the floor today.

AGAINST THE PRESIDENT'S JOBS BILL

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

Ms. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, on September 14, 2011, this year, Mark Prosachik from Hopewell Junction, New York, sent the following letter to me, and I quote:

"Dear Congresswoman Hayworth, I have been unemployed for over 18 months and my unemployment insurance ran out, reducing my eligibility for extended benefits. You would think I would be fuming mad . . . and demanding the government make companies hire me. But, no. Instead I'm against President Obama's jobs bill. It is guaranteed to add to the country's bloated debt. It will require taxes to be raised. It will waste money training people when there are many with the skills who are unemployed."

Mr. Prosachik, I think you're absolutely right. Spending more of your hard-earned dollars or anybody's else's on projects like Solyndra or other efforts that unfortunately have not grown our economy will not work. I commend the Senate for rejecting a jobs bill that was a job-killing bill.

We in the House majority have passed bills throughout this year, joined often by our Democratic colleagues, that will grow jobs, that will revive our economy. I urge all of our colleagues in the Senate to pass that agenda immediately.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, as Hispanic Heritage Month comes to a close, let us all take a moment to celebrate the Hispanic community and their contributions throughout the United States.

The story of Hispanic Americans is truly the story of America and all its groups. Their dream is the American Dream.

In America, if you work hard and play by the rules, dream big, there is absolutely no limit to what you can achieve. Hispanics have succeeded in every walk of life, and the success of their community strengthens the very fabric of our Nation.

Let us all recommit ourselves to working on issues that are important to the Hispanic community, which, after all, are the same issues important to all Americans: creating good jobs, expanding access to higher education, and mending our broken immigration system. When we reflect upon America's history, we are a Nation of immigrants from the past and present.

Let us work together today as Democrats and Republicans so that every citizen in America can achieve the American Dream.

MORTGAGE FRAUD

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Madam Speaker, in my district and across America, mortgage fraud is a serious crime that's hurt homeowners, businesses, and the economy.

The exact amount of losses attributed to mortgage fraud is unknown, but some estimates state that \$10 billion of loans were originated with fraudulent applications in 2010. Major contributors to mortgage fraud are carried out by nonresident aliens and illegal immigrants.

HUD's Office of Inspector General noted that one loan officer gave fraudulent documents to undocumented immigrants in order to obtain FHA-insured mortgages. HUD then realized \$3.2 million in losses.

To correct this problem, I've introduced H.R. 695. The purpose of my bill is to cut down on such waste. It does so by requiring E-Verify checks with mortgage applications where the mortgage is guaranteed by an agency of the Federal Government. This will help stop the fraud in our mortgage system.

Please join with me in ending this mortgage fraud and help me support H.R. 695.

TIME TO END THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Ms. HAHN. Madam Speaker, over the weekend I visited Arlington West on the beach in Santa Monica, a beautiful memorial to the men and women in uniform who have lost their lives in the 10 years of war.

As I walked through hundreds of crosses in the sand marking the lives of thousands of young people who've given everything they had to give, on the weekend that marked the 10th anniversary of the start of the war in Afghanistan, I held these heroes and their families in my thoughts and my prayers.

I want this war to end, and I want to speed up the timetable so our President brings our troops home. We are simply losing too many lives and spending too many resources abroad. We cannot afford to spend \$190 million a day on this war when we have crumbling schools and infrastructure here at home that needs fixing.

Just think what we could build with \$190 million a day in this country. Think of the jobs we could create with projects rebuilding America.

And when our heroes come home, we should do everything we can to help them reenter their families and their workforce.

Let's put people to work building an American future worthy of the sacrifices of our brave young people in uniform.

□ 1150

CALLING FOR A BALANCED AMENDMENT

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, if our Nation's debt crisis has taught us anything, it's that we need a permanent spending solution to keep America the permanent land of the free. There's only one way to bind Congress to such a commitment, and that is through a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

House Republicans have already changed the debate from how much to spend to how much to cut, yet our extraordinary crisis still demands extraordinary action.

Washington Democrats went on a record spending binge and left America in an economic hangover. New taxes, as the President proposes, would only punish the Nation and reward the spenders with more money to waste.

We need to stop spending money we don't have and begin living within our means like every American family and business is expected to do. We need a permanent constitutional amendment. For the sake of tomorrow's generations, let's get it done today.

CURRENCY REFORM FOR FAIR TRADE ACT

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, China's policy of undervaluing its currency is undercutting American manufacturing and American jobs by giving China an artificial and unfair advantage. In this time of economic uncertainty and high employment, we need to take direct, commonsense action to protect the American worker from unfair Chinese trade practices.

The Senate has passed a bill to investigate currency cheating by China and other countries and to impose tariffs if they are found guilty. Yesterday, Democrats attempted to offer a similar bill, which has 61 Republican cosponsors, but 235 Republicans voted against it. Moreover, House Republican leaders have indicated the Senate bill will never see the light of day if they have their way. Speaker BOEHNER says the fair trade bill with China is "dangerous."

The American people don't think there is anything dangerous about protecting American workers from schemes that burden our exports, subsidize their imports, and kill jobs. Republican leadership should bring the China currency and fair trade bill to

the floor so the House can give it the bipartisan vote it deserves.

HOCKEY FIGHTS CANCER DAY ON THE HILL

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in celebration of National Hockey League's Hockey Fights Cancer Day on the Hill.

Anyone who has played the great sport of hockey or who has watched a game has probably seen a fight or two on the ice. It's no secret that hockey players are a tough group. But off the ice, there are bigger fights being waged each and every day by people even tougher than your average hockey player, even players like former Blackhawk Reid Simpson.

Those living with and fighting against cancer are tougher than the toughest odds and incredibly brave in spite of daunting treatment and an uncertain future. With nearly 12 million patients in America today, most of us know someone fighting cancer, be it a family member, friend, or neighbor.

The NHL's Hockey Fights Cancer initiative is an extraordinary opportunity for members of the hockey family to stand up for our loved ones and to support the organizations that provide cutting-edge research, therapy, and vital support services that make their lives better.

This is one fight I'm proud to be a part of, and I encourage other hockey fans out there to join me as Hockey Fights Cancer.

CURRENCY REFORM FOR FAIR TRADE ACT

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of American families whose jobs and livelihoods are being undermined by China and other countries which purposely undervalue their currency.

For the past several years, the best economic research has shown that China manipulates the value of its currency by at least 25 to 30 percent against the dollar.

This blatantly unfair trading practice has contributed to our trade deficit with China, growing it from \$68 billion to \$273 billion in just 11 years. Worst of all, the American people have become the ultimate victims. Last month, the Economic Policy Institute found that 2.8 million U.S. jobs have been eliminated or displaced since 2001 due to the growing U.S.-China trade deficit.

Last year, the Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act passed this Chamber with strong bipartisan support. Yesterday, unfortunately, the new House majority voted nearly identical legisla-

tion down. The Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act has been supported by Members on both sides of the aisle and would give this and any administration the authority to take countervailing measures against currency manipulators, like China, in support of hard-working Americans.

We need to change that, Madam Speaker.

AMERICAN JOBS ACT

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, the best way to reduce the debt that this country has is to put people back to work. When they are back to work, they are paying their taxes and they are not getting unemployment. We need to get everybody in this country working, and the President proposed a bill called the American Jobs Act that does just that. It focuses on innovation, American innovation and ingenuity. It focuses on education and our community colleges and our K-12, and it focuses on rebuilding this country's infrastructure: our roads, our bridges, and our energy system.

But you know what happened over in the Senate yesterday; every single Republican voted against this. That bill has Republican ideas and Democratic ideas, but every single Republican voted against it.

We need to put the people in this country back to work. We don't need to be playing politics about the White House 13 months out from the election. That American Jobs Act needs to be passed, and it needs to be passed right now.

VOTER SUPPRESSION

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

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, this year a number of States are taking steps to make it more difficult for citizens to register to vote, to limit early voting, and to require photo IDs at the polls. The proponents of these new laws argue that they are designed to combat voter fraud. Clearly, we don't want people voting illegally, but these new laws are a solution to a problem that does not exist, and these steps will create serious problems.

A recent report by the Brennan Center at NYU shows that these new laws would affect more than 5 million eligible voters and would disproportionately disenfranchise young, low-income, and minority citizens.

In the past, literacy tests and poll taxes were used selectively to allow certain citizens to vote and disenfranchise others. They were and are illegal, and they should remain so. So we must oppose 21st century poll taxes which seek to suppress the vote of eligible voters and deny them their constitu-

tional rights and weaken our democracy.

PROTECT LIFE ACT

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, there is a strange thing that is going to be happening on this floor in just a little while. We should be focusing like a laser on jobs and strengthening the middle class. But instead, the majority is bringing forth a measure, the Protect Life Act. It's a measure coming before this body which, quite honestly, Members have had a chance to express themselves on numerous times. This does not create jobs. And what's ironic about it is this Protect Life Act is actually putting the lives of women at risk.

I really don't think that the American people feel that right now, today, that this is the highest priority for our country. Our highest priority is finding jobs for people in our country, not taking away lifesaving care from women.

PROTECT LIFE ACT

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to H.R. 358. When I speak with women in my district, they are concerned about finding a job, keeping their home from foreclosure, or putting food on the table. What they do not ask for is their constitutional rights to be threatened or their health to be endangered. Yet this bill does just that.

Rather than focus on continuing to rebuild our Nation's economy, the Republican majority is focusing their time on, once again, seeking to limit women's access to reproductive care.

I am particularly troubled that this bill, the Protect Life Act, actually does just the opposite. This bill would override core patient protections and allow hospitals to legally refuse lifesaving treatment to women, thus allowing them to die in a hospital despite their treatable condition. This extreme legislation is dangerous to women's health and does nothing to address the jobs crisis facing American families.

I urge my colleagues, if they truly want to protect life, to vote against this bill.

□ 1200

SOCIAL SECURITY, MEDICARE, AND MEDICAID: KEEPING FAITH WITH AMERICA'S SENIORS, THE DISABLED, AND THE NEEDY

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to issue a warning to America's seniors and working families: Top Republicans are still trying to privatize Social Security. The GOP Budget Chairman PAUL RYAN, author of the budget that ends Medicare and increased health costs for seniors, admitted he views Social Security as a Ponzi scheme. And Congressman PETE SESSIONS, who serves in House leadership for the GOP, introduced legislation labeled "Savings Account For Every American Act" that would have people opt out of Social Security by sending their contributions to a private account.

According to Stephen Goss, Social Security's chief actuary, this change will "severely compromise" the ability to pay for current seniors and those near retirement. "So Social Security, the ability to pay benefits to people who are currently receiving, or are now approaching the time of receiving benefits, would be severely compromised. Our year of trust fund exhaustion would certainly come to be much sooner than 2036." In other words, the plan of the Republicans to privatize Social Security would put that program that has never missed a check to Americans in danger. We need to oppose those efforts.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 358, PROTECT LIFE ACT

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 430 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 430

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 358) to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to modify special rules relating to coverage of abortion services under such Act. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted and that the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

POINT OF ORDER

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I raise a point of order that the rule, H. Res. 430, violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. The resolution contains a waiver of all points of order against consideration of the bill, which includes a waiver of section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act, which causes a violation of section 426(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin makes a point of order that the resolution vio-

lates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentlewoman has met the threshold under the rule, and the gentlewoman from Wisconsin and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I raise this point of order that H.R. 358 contains several potential unfunded mandates that would burden the States, burden private insurance companies, and burden women. I am also raising this point of order because it is a powerful vehicle to register my concern that this bill is a misguided ideological distraction from what should be our top priority—getting people back to work and protecting working families who have been hit hard by economic circumstances.

It is so clear to me that in spite of what our colleagues may say across the aisle, this bill is not about public funding for abortion. It's really crystal clear, Madam Speaker, that the Affordable Care Act already explicitly prohibits Federal funding for abortion. It reaffirms the Hyde amendment. It even includes the Nelson amendment to ensure that there's no commingling of funds. H.R. 358 would bring back the infamous world of Stupak-Pitts. But this time it adds even more restrictive language to the proposal.

This bill would essentially ban insurance coverage of abortion in health care exchanges, not just for women who are being publicly funded or subsidized in the exchanges, but even for women paying with their own private dollars, Madam Speaker. In addition, H.R. 358 would create a system that plays Russian roulette with pregnant women's lives when they enter a hospital. This would mean that any hospital could refuse to perform an emergency abortion—even if a woman would die without it—without violating the Federal law designed to prevent people from being denied emergency medical care.

It goes even further by paving the way to allow State refusal laws that are not limited to the provision of abortion services, but to anything that would be considered controversial—treatment for STIs, birth control services, screening services, and counseling.

With that, I would yield time to my good colleague from California, Representative SPEIER.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentlelady from Wisconsin.

Madam Speaker, I think this bill goes to the farthest extreme in trying to take women down not just a peg but take them in shackles to some cave somewhere. Twenty-five years ago, this body passed EMTALA, a bill that basi-

cally said anyone that shows up at an emergency room would access health care, no questions asked. Now, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to amend that law and basically say, Oh, except for a woman who is in need of an abortion, or except for a woman who's bleeding to death who happens to be pregnant, or except for a woman who is miscarrying.

Basically, what this bill would do is say that any hospital could decline to provide services to one class of people in this country. And that one class of people is pregnant women.

Let me tell you something. My story is pretty well known now. I was pregnant. I was miscarrying. I was bleeding. If I had to go from one hospital to the next trying to find one emergency room that would take me in, who knows if I would even be here today.

What my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are attempting to do is misogynist. It is absolutely misogynist.

The time has come for us to stop taking up this issue over and over again this year and do something that the American people really care about. They want jobs. They want to be able to hold on to their homes. They want some mortgage relief. And what do we do? We stand here on the floor and create yet another opportunity for women to be cast in shackles.

Ms. MOORE. Thank you for that compelling story.

How much time do I have, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin has 5½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MOORE. I would like to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Illinois, Representative JAN SCHAKOWSKY.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank my friend, the gentlewoman, for yielding to me. I rise in support of her point of order.

The American people are begging us to work together to create jobs to bolster the economy. Instead, we're here once again to consider legislation that endangers and attacks the right of women and is far out of the mainstream of American priorities.

H.R. 358 is extreme legislation. It is another attempt to unravel the health care law while at the same time expanding anti-choice laws that will harm women's health. It would take away a woman's right to make her own decisions about her reproductive health—even with her own money. It would allow public hospitals, as you heard, to deny emergency abortion care to women in life-threatening situations. It would expand the existing conscience objection to allow providers to avoid providing contraception. We're talking now about birth control.

This legislation revives a debate that has already been settled. There is no Federal funding for an abortion in the health care reform law. Legal experts have said it, independent fact-check organizations have said it. Yet Republicans continue to insist that the possibility of funding remains.

□ 1210

Federal funds are already prohibited from being used for abortions under the Hyde amendment—at the expense, I should add, of poor women, Federal employees, women of the District of Columbia, and women in the military. But this bill goes way beyond that law. The attention Republicans are focusing on the private lives of women—what American families do with their own money—makes it clear that their real goal is to ban all abortions and end access to birth control and contraceptives.

Republicans don't want government to protect the water we drink—oh, no—or the air we breathe or the food we eat, but they do want to intrude in a woman's right to choose.

We are now at 280 days into this Congress without passing a jobs plan, yet the Republican majority has consistently managed to pass extreme and divisive legislation targeted at women's health. The administration strongly opposes H.R. 358, and this bill has no chance of becoming law. Now is the time to work on the issues that are most important to Americans—creating jobs and improving the economy—rather than restricting reproductive choice and access to family planning.

American women will suffer if this bill becomes law, but we're just wasting time here because it will not. And it just shows how mean spirited and extreme this legislation is. It's a way to roll back women's health and rights. It's too extreme for women, too extreme for America, and we should reject it right now.

Ms. MOORE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I claim time in opposition to the point of order and in favor of consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 10 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. The question before the House is: Should the House now consider H. Res. 430? While the resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, the committee is not aware of any points of order. The waiver is prophylactic in nature.

The Congressional Budget Office has stated that H.R. 358 contains no intergovernmental or private sector mandates, as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, and would impose no cost on State, local, or tribal governments. Again, Madam Speaker, this waiver is prophylactic, and the motion of the gentlewoman is dilatory.

I would like to now yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding me this time.

I have listened very carefully to the arguments that have been advanced by the speakers on the other side—my

friend and neighbor, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER), and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY). None of them address the question before the House. The question before the House is whether or not to consider this bill. It's not about jobs—although they're important. It's not about the merits of the bill—which we will debate later should the House vote to consider this bill. It's about whether there are unfunded mandates in the bill.

The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) read the CBO statement of February 28, 2011: "H.R. 358 contains no intergovernmental or private sector mandates, as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would impose no costs on State, local, or tribal governments." That's what the CBO said, and that has not been rebutted either by the proposer of the point of order, my colleague from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), or those who have spoken on behalf of this.

Now, if we're to follow the rules and say, okay, if there's an unfunded mandate, we ought to waive it—which the resolution does—then we've all got to vote "yes" on consideration, because there are no unfunded mandates and nobody has claimed that there are any unfunded mandates. That's why the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is correct in saying that the point of order is dilatory.

If you want to debate the bill, let's debate the bill. If you want to object to consideration of the bill, then all you want to do, those who decide to vote "no" on this motion to consider ought to have a debate on whether there should be public funding of abortion.

Now, when the taxpayers are asked to fund abortions, that's a whole different issue than whether there should be a right to abortion. This question is whether there should be taxpayer funding of abortion. There are no unfunded mandates. And the honest vote is "yes" on the motion to consider.

Ms. MOORE. I would reserve my right to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina would have the right to close.

Ms. MOORE. Does the gentlewoman have more speakers?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman from North Carolina have other speakers?

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry. I believe that we have the right to close; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has the right to close.

Ms. FOXX. Then I will reserve my time.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, can you tell me how much time I have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MOORE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would yield 1 minute to my colleague from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I find it actually somewhat humorous to think that the argument on the other side of the aisle is that this is dilatory when, in fact, the entire bill is dilatory when you look at what is really facing this country right now.

This bill makes it very clear that any hospital that does not want to provide emergency room services to a woman who is miscarrying and needs an abortion would no longer have to do it. Let's make that very clear.

Let me read one little example from the American Journal of Public Health:

A woman with a condition that prevented her blood from clotting was in the process of miscarrying at a Catholic-owned hospital. According to her doctor, she was dying before his eyes. In fact, her eyes were filling with blood. But even though her life was in danger and the fetus had no chance of survival, the hospital wouldn't let the doctor treat her by terminating the pregnancy until the fetal heartbeat ceased.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I can tell you this bill does waive the health and lives of women if the point of order is not found to be in order.

To sum it up, H.R. 358 is incredibly divisive. It takes away comprehensive health coverage from women in not only eliminating the protections they currently have right now, but going even further than current law and completely undermining women's health.

At a time when the majority should be using its tremendous power to create jobs and turn the economy around, the majority is using its power to turn on women.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I find it unbelievable that our colleagues across the aisle could make the comments that they are making today. H.R. 358 takes away no protections from women in this country. It takes away no rights of women. It is not extreme.

Seventy-seven percent of the people in this country are opposed to taxpayer funding for abortions. What H.R. 358 does is to say we are going to make it absolutely certain that we are not going to use taxpayer funding to pay for abortions, even under what has become known as ObamaCare. This bill does not go beyond the pale, as our colleagues have said. It is not outside the mainstream. It is our colleagues across the aisle who are outside the mainstream. They represent 23 percent of the people in this country who do want to see taxpayer funding for abortions. They are outside the mainstream.

And talk about dilatory, this whole point of order is dilatory. It is an effort on their part to simply bring up issues that are irrelevant. And in many cases, the points made are not true. They are

the ones who are wasting time. They say we should be dealing with the jobs bill.

Well, Madam Speaker, let me point out to our colleagues across the aisle that not one of them who spoke today, not one of them who gave 1-minute on the jobs bill have cared to be cosponsors of the jobs bill. The jobs bill, which President Obama has been asking the Congress to pass, was defeated in the Senate.

□ 1220

It was introduced in the House by one Member, and he put on the bill, "by request." That means it was a courtesy to the President. No other Member across the aisle has chosen to cosponsor that bill. If they are so eager to get that bill passed, you would think that they would become cosponsors of the bill.

We are doing a lot on our side of the aisle to create jobs. We are doing our best to reduce spending and to reduce rules and regulations, and that will create jobs in this country.

Additional spending by the Federal Government doesn't create jobs. We know that from the stimulus bill that was passed in 2009.

And for my colleagues across the aisle who say that this is a misogynist bill, nobody has ever fought more for the rights of women than I have. But 50 percent of the unborn babies that are being aborted are females. So the misogyny comes from those who promote the killing of unborn babies. That's where the misogyny comes in, Madam Speaker. It doesn't come in from our trying to protect taxpayers' money from being spent on killing unborn children.

Madam Speaker, in order to allow the House to continue its scheduled business for the day, I urge Members to vote "yes" on the question of consideration of the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), 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. FOXX. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 430 provides for a closed rule providing for consideration of H.R. 358, the Protect Life Act.

I would now like to yield 2 minutes to my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the Protect Life Act offered by Chairman JOE PITTS and DAN LIPINSKI ensures that all the elements of the Hyde amendment apply to all the programs that are authorized and appropriated in ObamaCare.

By now I trust that all Members fully understand that because programs in ObamaCare are both authorized and appropriated in the law on a parallel track but not subject to appropriations under HHS, the actual Hyde amendment therefore has no legal effect whatsoever. Hyde only affects Labor-HHS programs including Medicaid, not the massive expansion of government-funded health care. Thus, ObamaCare, when phased in fully in 2014, will open up the floodgates of public funding for abortion in a myriad of programs, including and especially in the "exchanges", resulting in more dead babies and wounded mothers than would otherwise have been the case.

Because abortion methods dismember, decapitate, crush, poison, or starve to death or induce premature labor, pro-life Members of Congress and, according to every reputable poll, majorities of Americans want no complicity whatsoever in the destruction of human life. ObamaCare forces us to be complicit.

Despite breathtaking advances in recent years, and respecting and treating unborn children as patients in need of diagnosis and care and treatment for any number of diseases just like any other patient, far too many people dismiss the baby in the womb as *persona non grata*.

I respectfully submit: How can violence against children by abortion be construed as benign or compassionate or caring?

The dangerous myth of "safe abortion" must be exposed—and absolutely not subsidized by taxpayers. So-called safe abortion is the ultimate oxymoron, an Orwellian manipulation of language designed to convey bogus respectability to a lethal act. Abortion is, by any reasonable definition, child mortality. Its sole purpose is to kill a baby.

I would also suggest that presumptuous talk that brands any child as "unwanted" or an "unwanted child" reduces that child to a mere object bereft of inherent dignity or value.

We should not be paying for abortion. I support the Protect Life Act.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the Protect Life Act amends the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to prohibit Federal funds from being used to pay for abortion services or any health plan that

includes such service. It also imposes new restrictions on health insurance coverage for termination care and expands conscience protection laws, while limiting access to reproductive health services.

At a time when our Nation is facing great economic uncertainty and millions of Americans are in need of jobs, please, somebody tell me why we are here considering a bill that is a direct attack on a woman's constitutionally protected right to choose and that does not create one single job.

Let's be serious here. Republicans have yet to pass a jobs bill. Instead of getting down to the business of creating jobs, they're bringing to the House floor a deeply flawed and deeply divisive bill that will not pass the Senate and would be vetoed if it reached the President's desk. They know that. I know that. Everybody knows that.

The Protect Life Act is both unnecessary and clearly politically motivated. Republicans are resorting to their old bag of tricks and pulling the abortion card in order to distract from their clear lack of leadership. In April they rammed through H.R. 3, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, instead of focusing on efforts to pass a clean continuing resolution that would prevent a government shutdown.

As the deadline approaches for the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction in Congress to approve a deficit reduction plan in excess of \$1.5 trillion, Republicans have deemed it necessary to rehash the health care reform debate and roll back women's rights.

And I want to clear up one thing. You keep saying "ObamaCare." I've said repeatedly that there are those of us, and I am among them, that advocated for health care, including a public option and universal health care long before we even knew Barack Obama's name. So perhaps it should be called "Hastings-ObamaCare."

This time, however, they take it to a new harmful extreme. The Protect Life Act is not about the regulation of Federal funds with regard to abortion services. The Hyde amendment already does that. This act is about restricting access to care and intimidating women and their families in the use of their own money.

Since 1976, the Hyde amendment has prohibited the use of taxpayer money for funding abortions, unless the abortion is performed in the case of rape, incest, or a threat to the life of the mother. The Affordable Care Act is no exception.

Regardless of the facts, however, House Republicans continue their assault on a woman's right to choose. Contrary to popular belief, the Protect Life Act is not the Stupak-Pitts amendment of the 2009-2010 health care reform debate. It goes far beyond Stupak-Pitts to impose unprecedented limitations on abortion coverage and restricts access to abortion services for all women.

The Protect Life Act would have an adverse effect on women's access to reproductive services, especially for low-income minority women who are very likely to be underinsured or uninsured and use partial subsidies to purchase insurance.

□ 1230

It not only ends abortion coverage for women in the exchange who use their own private funds to pay for their insurance, but also essentially shuts down the private insurance market for abortion coverage. This act imposes crippling administrative burdens on insurance companies that choose to cover abortion care and bans abortion coverage from all multi-State plans, interfering with private insurance companies' decisions about what benefits to offer.

Simply put, the Protect Life Act is a misnomer. It poses a direct threat to the health and lives of women by restricting access to termination services, including factually accurate information such as the availability and coverage of abortion care by insurance plans. Even more troubling is the fact that this act creates an exception to the obligation of hospitals to comply with the Emergency Medical Treatment and Labor Act, which requires appropriate treatment and referral for emergency patients. If enacted, hospitals could refuse to provide abortion services to pregnant women whose lives are in critical danger. This is beyond irresponsible. It is, indeed, reprehensible.

Finally, the Protect Life Act vastly broadens already expansive federal conscience laws without regard for patient protection or anti-discrimination protection for providers of abortion services. It safeguards from federal preemption State conscience laws beyond abortion, which could allow providers to drop their coverage of other reproductive health services like contraception and possibly even reproductive care such as mental health services and HIV counseling.

All I hear from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, especially those within segments of their party, is that they want the government to butt out. Why, then, are we considering legislation on the House floor that effectively overturns the privacy rights enumerated by the United States Supreme Court as well as increases burdensome government regulations on insurance companies? Congress should not be making personal health care decisions for women, and Congressmen really shouldn't be even involved in making personal health care decisions for women. That should be between a woman, her family, and her doctor.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairwoman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank my good friend for yielding me the time.

I stand in strong support of the Protect Life Act.

I thank my good friend, my colleague, Congressman PITTS, for introducing this important legislation because this bill will help ensure that no funds authorized or appropriated by the President's health care law will be used to pay for abortion except in the cases of rape, incest, or to save the life of the mother.

This is not something new. This is not something radical. This simply applies the bipartisan principles of the Hyde amendment, which has helped guide this Chamber's legislative deliberations for over three decades. It extends the same standards applied to Medicaid, the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program, and other federal programs.

The American people, Madam Speaker, have made it quite clear that they do not want their taxpayer dollars used to fund abortions. And the Stupak-Pitts amendment, as we know, was gutted in the Senate. The President's Executive order stating that the Hyde amendment would apply is not enough. Why? It is flawed because Executive orders can disappear as quickly as they are issued. But the Protect Life Act will create a solid framework that will safeguard taxpayer dollars.

We must protect the sanctity of an innocent human life, we must stand behind the rights of the unborn, and we must prevent taxpayer dollars from being used to fund abortions. That's why I'm proud to support the Protect Life Act and the rule for it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, would you be so kind as to tell me how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 23 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 26½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, with your permission, at this time, I am going to yield to a number of Members for unanimous consent, the first of whom is the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in opposition to this bill because it is an assault on a woman's health and her right to make her own life decisions.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ).

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in opposition to this bill because this extreme legislation is dangerous to women's health and does nothing to address the main issue affecting American families: the lack of jobs.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina will state it.

Ms. FOXX. Is it appropriate for our colleagues across the aisle to make comments about the bill when they're asking unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise Members to confine their unanimous consent requests to a simple declarative statement of the Member's attitude toward the measure, either "aye" or "no." Further embellishments will result in deductions of time from the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. That declarative statement that you speak to, am I correct, Madam Speaker, that it could include a sentence?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A simple declarative statement is acceptable. "Because tada-tada-tada" would be an embellishment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. At this time, I yield for a non-embellishment, unanimous consent request to the distinguished lady from California (Ms. HAHN).

Ms. HAHN. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in opposition to this bill because Americans need us to focus on jobs right now, not this extreme bill that endangers the lives of women.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will begin deducting time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield for a unanimous consent request to the distinguished lady from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in opposition to this bill that is extreme, dangerous legislation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished lady from California, a former member of the Rules Committee, Ms. MATSUI, for unanimous consent.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in opposition to this bill because it's extreme legislation that is dangerous to women's health and does nothing to address the jobs crisis facing America today.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will be charged.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am very pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in opposition to this bill because it is an attack on women, and it does nothing to deal with the job crisis of this country.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will be charged.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the distinguished lady from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strident, strident opposition to this bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, as a cosponsor and the proud parent of two young boys—adopted young boys—whose family exists only because two women in two difficult situations in two different States chose life and gave us a family, I am proud to rise in strong support of the rule to allow the House to consider the Protect Life Act, led by my friend and colleague, Congressman JOE PITTS.

Over a year ago, President Obama's health care plan was signed into law—despite a strenuous outcry by the American people—without significant and substantial prohibitions on federal funding for abortion. This funding of abortion through insurance plans, community health centers, and other programs created by the new health care law could have been avoided. But such language was intentionally left out. There have been restrictions on abortions and subsidies for over 30 years, beginning with the Hyde amendment in 1976, and I'm proud that today we are acting in that spirit.

Regardless of whether you are pro-choice or, like me, strongly pro-life, Americans have always agreed we will not use federal tax dollars to subsidize or incentivize abortion. And you don't have to take my word for it.

□ 1240

In poll after poll, more than 60 percent of Americans oppose using Federal funding for abortions. More recently, two-thirds of Americans said we shouldn't subsidize health insurance that includes abortions.

The President's health care plan fails to provide real conscience protection

for health care providers who decline to participate in abortions by mandating that they not be discriminated against because of their religious faiths.

The bottom line is that this bill we take up today strikes an important balance. It makes sure your Federal tax dollars are not used to subsidize abortions in the President's plan, and we make sure that people and institutions are able to care for their patients and are not forced to violate their moral principles.

I strongly urge my colleagues to respect America's conscientious objections to abortion by voting for the rule and by voting for the Protect Life Act.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, earlier this year, we learned what opponents of choice really think of women when they attempted to redefine rape in H.R. 3, when they claimed to be fiscal watchdogs and then voted to repeal funding for family planning services and Planned Parenthood, which saves the public \$4 for every \$1 invested.

Now they are pushing H.R. 358, the falsely named Protect Life Act, which, rather than protecting life, would actually allow hospitals to refuse lifesaving treatment to women on religious or moral grounds. This bill would also effectively ban comprehensive insurance coverage, which includes abortion care—even if a woman pays with her own private dollars.

H.R. 358, like every extremist, antichoice measure before it reveals what choice opponents really think of women. Here is what I think of women: I think they should be able to make their own life choices about their own bodies.

I think we should vote down this bill and every other destructive measure being pushed by those who think so little of our mothers, sisters, wives, and daughters.

Ms. FOXX. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

Mr. POMPEO. I thank the gentle lady for yielding.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 358, the Protect Life Act, and I want to thank Congressman PITTS for his hard work on this legislation.

Kansas has long been on the front lines of defending life, and I join most other Kansans in acknowledging that life begins at conception. Nearly all Kansans understand that Federal taxpayer dollars should never be used for abortions.

I know the history here. For a very long time, there was bipartisan support for the Hyde amendment and for legislation that said that taxpayer money should not go for abortions; but today, the left has moved so far that they object to this simple, commonsense measure which will protect taxpayers from their money going to a procedure which they find abhorrent.

Simply put, we must end what ObamaCare did, and we must stop subsidizing abortions with Federal taxpayer dollars. I urge my colleagues to support both this rule and H.R. 358 and to protect the life of the unborn.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the so-called Protect Life Act. Our first priorities here now must be to help to foster job creation and support middle class families.

We are 280 days into this Congress without even having a jobs plan from the majority. Instead, the Republicans have chosen to continue their radical assault on women's health and health care in the guise of preventing the use of Federal funds to pay for abortion procedures.

This bill is as unnecessary as it is offensive and inhumane. The bill would penalize private insurers that offer comprehensive plans; would allow hospitals to refuse lifesaving care to women; and would prevent access to birth control, including providing emergency contraception to sexual assault survivors.

Instead of debating how to put Americans back to work, the majority party is spending our time on socially divisive bills that are going nowhere.

Ms. FOXX. I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the gentle lady for yielding.

I rise in support of H.R. 358, the Protect Life Act.

Doesn't that name really say it all, the "Protect Life Act"?

Historically, the Federal funding of abortion has been restricted. Time and time and time again, an overwhelming majority of Americans has indicated that they oppose the Federal funding of abortion. Go all the way back to 1976. Congress has repeatedly passed the Hyde amendment.

What does it do?

It ensures that no Federal Government dollars are used to pay for elective abortion or insurance plans that provide elective abortion under Medicaid. Unfortunately, the insurance plan that was forced through Congress this last session would now allow Federal funds to subsidize, to basically support and pay for, abortions on demand in America for the very first time since 1976. So the Hyde amendment, as it stands today, only extends to HHS.

The Obama health care plan, what does it do?

It exploits that loophole. As the law now stands, the government can literally force that federally funded and private health care providers cover abortion under the guise of family planning or pregnant women services or countless other euphemisms.

My friends on the other side of the aisle will say, Well, that's incorrect because President Obama signed an Executive order to bar abortion funding.

No. Members on both sides of the aisle know that pointing to an Executive order is disingenuous at best. We all know, as we come to this floor, that this Executive order, the same one that the Planned Parenthood Federation of America calls a "symbolic gesture," can be completely undone by a future administration.

The only way to ensure that taxpayer dollars are not spent on abortion is—how?—through legislative action.

President Obama's insurance plan passed Congress. It did so over the objection of the majority of the American public. So it is time now that we come to the floor to respect that majority of Americans and to ensure that they do not fund abortions simply by paying their taxes every April 15. Therefore, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, as I said at the very beginning, the Protect Life Act—the bill that says it all.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

Ms. TSONGAS. Madam Speaker, recently, I got an email from a constituent from my hometown of Lowell, Massachusetts, that read, "I think Republicans are focusing on the wrong thing. We need jobs."

Our constituents are pleading with us to focus on jobs; yet here we are again, debating an ideologically driven bill that does nothing for the economy as it endangers women's health. For women to receive the best possible health care, they need—we need—access to all legal and appropriate medical procedures. Decisions about these procedures should be made by a woman in consultation with her doctor and her family.

I believe a woman's right to choose is fundamental to a woman's freedom, but this bill puts the government in the middle of that decision. This bill discriminates against women, and it goes so far as to prevent those who want to buy health plans that cover abortion services with their own money from making that choice. This bill also permits hospitals and hospital workers to choose to deny women care that could save their lives, putting ideology above women's health.

Let's focus on the right thing and vote down this bill.

Ms. FOXX. I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of both the rule and the bill.

In 1973, the Supreme Court decided that a right to an abortion was a constitutional right, but they did not decide that there was a constitutional right to have the taxpayers pay for it.

The Hyde amendment has been passed every year since 1976 with my

support and with the support of an overwhelming bipartisan majority. However, when the President's health care bill was rammed through this House in March of last year, the Hyde amendment didn't apply. So, if you try to get a Medicaid abortion, the Hyde amendment applies, and the taxpayers don't finance it; but if you try to get an abortion under the Obama plan or under the exchanges that have been set up under the Obama plan, then there will be taxpayer money that will be used to pay for it. This bill closes that loophole. It is in response to the overwhelming sentiment of the American public, including the sentiment of many of those who do support legalized abortion.

Secondly, this bill also reaffirms Federal and State conscience protection laws. The Supreme Court, when it decided *Roe v. Wade*, did not force people to choose between their faiths and their jobs if they had religious objections to abortion. This protection is not afforded in the Obama health care bill. This legislation closes that loophole.

□ 1250

We've heard a lot about jobs from people on the other side of the aisle that don't want to talk about the fact that this legislation shuts the door to the two loopholes that I have just described.

Maybe there will be more unemployment if someone who has a license to practice medicine or is in the healthcare profession is told that they have to violate the tenets of their religion in order to keep their job.

Now, we have a choice. We have a choice of freedom and liberty by closing the loopholes and passing the bill or not.

I urge support of the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlelady from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for the purpose of offering a unanimous consent.

Mrs. MALONEY. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD my opposition to this attack on women's access to reproductive health services and our fundamental right to lifesaving medical care.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 358.

There is no question and there can be no debating the fact that this bill endangers women's health and puts their lives at risk and intrudes on their constitutionally protected liberties.

This bill extends the reach of government more cynically and in a more profoundly disturbing way than any piece of legislation in modern times.

This bill carries with it the clear implication that under some circumstances—a woman just doesn't have a right to live.

The Republican majority has consistently said its priority is jobs and job creation, but

here we are debating a bill that even their Members admit is the wrong bill at the wrong time.

Instead of creating jobs, they remain focused on creating obstacles for women to access safe, legal, and badly needed health care.

H.R. 358 is an attack on women's access to reproductive health services and our fundamental right to life saving medical care.

It is stunning in its scope, appalling in its indifference and outrageous in its arrogance.

This bill is deliberately divisive and cynical in its intent.

Madam Speaker, Americans want Congress to create jobs, strengthen middle class families, and find bipartisan consensus.

It's time to end this attack on women and get to work on our top priority: Creating Jobs.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, this bill threatens the health and basic rights of American women.

The majority is once again trying to embed their extreme and divisive ideological preferences into law. They are trying to impose their backward view of a woman's role on everyone else, forcing women back into traditional roles with limited opportunities.

They need to trust and respect American women. The bill goes beyond prior legislation. It bans working women access to a legal medical procedure. It denies all but the wealthiest women their choice in health services. It puts the government between a woman and her doctor. It allows hospitals to deny lifesaving care to women. We should be standing up today for the middle class by working to create jobs, not trying to prevent women access to lifesaving health services.

This bill is an affront to women's health. I urge all of my colleagues to oppose it.

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am a little appalled at some of the comments that I have heard across the aisle, especially those that say talking about jobs is more important than talking about saving lives.

I don't believe there are many Americans who would agree with our colleagues who say that we in this country pride ourselves on saving lives at every opportunity, both humans, animals, any form of life, and I believe this is a worthy debate for us to be having today.

But, Madam Speaker, the Republican-led House has also been working hard to rein in out-of-control government spending and represent the majority of the American people who elected us, and we know that by reining in spending we could do something to help create jobs. So we are not a one-note party. We understand we can do both of those things.

The bill before us today is a continuing effort to steward the taxpayer money wisely, represent the majority

of Americans who believe taxpayer money should not be used to pay for elective abortions, and, thereby, protect innocent life.

Last year, as others have said, the liberal Democrats rammed through their overall health care legislation and refused to include standard pro-life protections that have had broad bipartisan support in the past.

The rule before us today provides for consideration of H.R. 358, the Protect Life Act, which prohibits taxpayer funding for elective abortions under ObamaCare and also prohibits the Federal Government from forcing private insurance companies to offer plans that cover elective abortions. It does not take away any rights of women.

In addition, the underlying bill ensures that taxpayer subsidies for purchasing health insurance plans on the ObamaCare exchanges are not used to pay for plans that cover elective abortions, and does not allow the Federal Government to administer health plans that cover elective abortions. This is consistent with the history in our country of not using taxpayer funding for elective abortions.

Finally, the bill provides for conscience protections for pro-life health providers and entities to ensure they are not discriminated against for their pro-life beliefs and practices.

This bill has gone through regular committee consideration and passed the House Energy and Commerce Committee on February 15 with bipartisan support. The need for this legislation is critical, as the Institute of Medicine recommended in July that what has come to be called ObamaCare should cover emergency contraception with no copay or deductible. Many pro-life conservatives are concerned that their recommendation is a slippery slope to, again, what has been known as ObamaCare mandating and covering elective abortions, because the law does not contain specific longstanding pro-life protections.

A Zogby poll last year found that 77 percent of Americans believe Federal taxpayer funds should never pay for abortion or should pay only to save the life of the mother, and it is unacceptable that the liberal Democrats ignored the will of the people last year in ramming through their government takeover of health care.

As you can see, Madam Speaker, the vast majority of Americans don't want their tax dollars paying for or promoting abortion.

This isn't part of a radical agenda, as some of our friends on the left like to say. This is part of a longstanding and growing social consensus. Americans do not want their tax dollars supporting the abortion industry or promoting this terrible practice.

In May this House passed H.R. 3, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. This legislation would codify many longstanding pro-life provisions and ensure that taxpayer money is not being used to perform abortions. H.R. 3 is

now awaiting consideration in the Senate.

As a proud cosponsor of H.R. 3 and H.R. 358, I will not cease to fight to protect the lives of the unborn at every turn. Since 1973, approximately 52 million children's lives have been tragically aborted in the United States. Until we have a permanent prohibition on taxpayer funding of abortion and protection for health care providers who cherish life, I will continue to offer and support efforts to protect taxpayers' families and children from the scourge of abortion.

The unborn are the most innocent and vulnerable members of our society, and their right to life must be protected.

Yesterday in the Rules Committee our friends across the aisle who spoke against this rule and bill said we're bringing up "hot-button social issues as diversions from the important topic of jobs."

I have two responses to them on that comment. The issue of life is not a hot-button social issue; it's at the very core of our values as a country. We go to extraordinary lengths to save not only human beings, but even animals, because we value life so much. However, there are many who do not hold the unborn in the same esteem, and that is tragic for more than 1 billion unborn babies every year.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule in favor of the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, would you tell us again how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 18 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from North Carolina has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Thank you very much.

I am pleased at this time to yield 1 minute to the distinguished minority leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

□ 1300

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for giving me this opportunity.

As a mother of five children, when I brought my baby, my youngest baby, number five home from the hospital, that week my oldest baby was turning 6 years old. The birth of a baby is such a jubilant occasion, and women's health is essential to the health of families and raising our children in a way that has respect for all of them.

It's very interesting that we're taking this bill up now when the American people are calling out for jobs. Their number one priority is the creation of jobs, and once again we come to the floor of the House with a major distraction that "ain't going nowhere" in order to cater to an extreme agenda of the Republican majority.

The American people want us to take up jobs. They want us to take up the

American Jobs Act, which three-quarters of the American people say they want us to consider. It would create nearly 2 million jobs. Or we could vote on the China currency legislation which would save 1 million jobs and has the support of the majority of the Members, including 61 cosponsors from the Republican side of the aisle. But again, instead, we are pursuing the Republicans' ideological agenda, forcing us to relitigate a very divisive issue.

Every woman in America should be very concerned about this assault on women's health. Let us begin the debate with a very clear understanding of the facts. The Federal funding of abortion is already, and has been for a long time, prohibited under the Hyde amendment, except in cases of rape, incest, or to save the life of the mother.

Furthermore, the Affordable Care Act prohibits the use of U.S. taxpayer dollars to fund abortions. That is why the Catholic Health Association said: "We are confident that health care reform does not allow Federal funding of abortion and that it keeps in place important conscience protections for caregivers and institutions alike." I repeat, the Catholic Health Association said: "We are confident that health care reform does not allow Federal funding of abortion and that it keeps in place important conscience protections for caregivers and institutions alike."

This bill is a radical departure from existing law. It represents an unprecedented and radical assault on a woman's access to the full range of health care services. For the first time, this bill places restrictions on how a woman with private insurance can spend her own private dollars in purchasing health insurance. As a result of this bill, millions of women using health insurance exchanges are likely to no longer have access to insurance policies that cover all reproductive services.

Furthermore, supporters of this bill falsely claim that this bill is simply a restatement of the Stupak amendment considered by the House in 2009. It is not. This bill is very different from the Stupak amendment. It appears that health care providers could withhold care for women with life-threatening conditions. In other words, a woman could be dying on the floor of the hospital and, when you vote for this bill, you will be saying that caregivers would not allow medical professionals to treat that woman and keep her from dying.

The Obama administration has come out strongly against this legislation, rightly saying it intrudes on women's reproductive freedom and access to health care and unnecessarily restricts the private insurance choices that women and their families have today.

So just a few points again:

Public funding of abortion is prohibited under the Hyde amendment except in cases of rape, incest, and life of the mother;

The Catholic Health Association says: We are confident the Affordable

Care Act “does not allow Federal funding of abortion and that it keeps in place important conscience protections for caregivers and institutions alike”; and

Third, it is not the Stupak amendment.

This legislation is bad public policy. It's the wrong priority for Congress. It's an assault on women's health, and women should know that. It prevents them from using their own dollars to buy their own private insurance should they be part of an exchange.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” and implore the Republican majority to turn their attention to what this country needs, and that is jobs, jobs, jobs, and more jobs.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I want to remind my colleagues across the aisle that they are entitled to form their own opinions, but they are not entitled to form their own facts which are in opposition to what is true.

Our colleagues across the aisle know that the Hyde amendment applies only to discretionary spending, has to be introduced every year into the appropriations bill, and has never applied to mandatory spending.

The Affordable Care Act is mandatory spending, and if the protection for life were in the Affordable Care Act, then why did President Obama issue his Executive order saying that he was clarifying the issue?

Ms. DEGETTE. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. FOXX. I will not yield.

I think it is very important that we get the facts out here again. Several of my colleagues have pointed those out.

The gentlewoman has time on her side and she will be able to make her points.

I now would like to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE).

Mr. NUNNELEE. I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 358, the Protect Life Act, which would prohibit Federal funding for abortions and would end abortion coverage under President Obama's health care law.

As a member of the Mississippi State Senate, I introduced similar legislation that would have prevented hard-earned tax dollars of Mississippians for paying for abortions under ObamaCare. That legislation specifically allowed Mississippi to opt out of using the State tax money to pay for abortions in the State health care exchange. And I'm proud to say that in May of 2010, our Governor, Haley Barbour, signed that legislation into law and Mississippi became the third State in the Nation to approve the abortion subsidy opt-out.

For 16 years, it was my privilege to stand up for life on the floor of the Mississippi Senate. And I'm proud to say that as a result of that effort, Mississippi is now one of the safest States in the Nation for unborn children and one of the strongest pro-life States in

the Nation. Today, I'm proud to take that voice to the floor of the House of Representatives in our Nation's Capitol.

ObamaCare should not have served as a vehicle for abandoning or weakening Federal policies on abortion funding. Health care is about saving and nurturing, not about taking human life. Even though President Obama signed an Executive order to address abortion funding concerns in the health care bill, an Executive order is not law. The Protect Life Act would strengthen long-standing Federal policies on abortions; and, more importantly, would codify the principles of the President's Executive order.

As I stand here today, I have the privilege of serving the First District of Mississippi in the United States House of Representatives, and I will continue to fight to protect the lives of the innocent and to serve as a voice for those who cannot speak for themselves. Americans recognize the value of life.

As a cosponsor of this legislation, I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to support this bill as we work to defend the morals of our taxpayers and give the needed protections to the unborn.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place my statement in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, at this time I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

□ 1310

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Since my colleague on the other side of the aisle did not yield to my colleague from Colorado, I want to yield to her.

Ms. DEGETTE. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I just wanted to point out that while the gentlelady on the other side is correct that the Hyde amendment is in the annual appropriations bills, if she would look at section 1303(b) of the Affordable Health Care Act, the provisions that say no Federal funding shall be used to pay for abortion are extended to that Act and to the exchanges. So in fact, the Democratic leader is correct. Under the Affordable Health Care Act there are no Federal funds used under that Act to pay for abortions, period, end of story.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I thank my colleague for clarifying that.

Madam Speaker, we have had this discussion many times on the floor. That's why my colleagues and I want to get back to the issues at hand today, which is jobs and enhancing and sup-

porting the middle class in this country.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentlelady an additional 15 seconds.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. But I want remind us all that what we were talking about here is denying millions of women from purchasing comprehensive coverage with their own private funds. This would upend the promise of health care reform for many, many women across this country. We need to put a stop to these attacks on women's health. I urge my colleagues to join me as well in strong opposition.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. How much time is remaining again, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 15¼ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from North Carolina has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. At this time I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, when you ask Americans what Congress' focus should be, guess what they don't say? They don't say, Forget about jobs. What this country really needs is a divisive assault on women's privacy and primary care.

This bill tells women, Madam Speaker, that if they use their own money, using their own money they can't purchase insurance that includes abortion coverage. Isn't it the majority party that is constantly saying that they trust people with their own money? I guess that applies if you're a CEO but not if you're a woman making a wrenching decision about your reproductive health.

This bill has no chance of becoming law. It is a dog-and-pony show designed to please the far-right fringe. I say: Do it on your own time, Republicans, and not on the American people's time.

I ask us to vote “no” now and get to the job at hand, which is to put America back to work.

Ms. FOXX. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman, my good friend from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, it's not news that the majority refuses to address our jobs crisis. But passing time by attacking women's health is appalling.

Despite Americans' overwhelming support for the American Jobs Act, today we have before us H.R. 358, a cruel attack on women's health. We could help jobless workers feed their families today. Instead, this bill grants hospitals the right to deny abortions even in life-and-death cases. We could cut taxes for small businesses today. Instead, this bill forbids Americans

from using their own dollars to buy private health insurance that includes abortion coverage. We could put teachers back to work today. Instead, this bill denies abortion even for the thousands of women each year who develop breast cancer while pregnant and need an abortion to start chemotherapy to save their lives and retain the hope of childbirth.

Americans don't want a war on women. They want a war on joblessness. They want us to work so that they can work. They want us, Madam Speaker, to take up the American Jobs Act. Oppose this rule so that we can get to work on their behalf.

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, our colleague across the aisle I think was not here earlier when we talked about the fact that the jobs bill, which he says has overwhelming support by the American people, was introduced by request and has not a single cosponsor. I'm curious as to why he is not a cosponsor if he thinks we should be bringing up that bill.

I would also like to point out again that this bill, this rule, is not a war on women. And if this is such a cruel act, I want to point out that this is a bipartisan bill, and that the support for not giving taxpayer funding for abortions has always been nonpartisan or bipartisan in this House.

This is not purely a Republican issue. I thank God every day for our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are pro-life.

Mr. DEUTCH. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. FOXX. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished woman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. EDWARDS. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in opposition to this bill that doesn't create jobs but strips women of appropriate reproductive health care services.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, with 21 legislative days remaining on the calendar, I urge my colleagues in the Majority to finally bring to the floor a jobs bill that puts Americans back to work rather than work to restrict a woman's right to receive affordable and comprehensive care. Bills like the falsely named Protect Life Act only serve as cover for the Republicans' unwillingness to bring forth a real jobs plan and restore the economy.

This Republican package is wrapped in a label that says, "I care", but contains nothing more than an empty promise. Let me be clear—this bill jeopardizes the health and wellness of women throughout this country and is a clear assault on women's choice. I have heard from women throughout Maryland and across the 4th Congressional District who value access to and information on abortion services. I have heard from women who have

had planned and wanted pregnancies, but suffered unexpected and costly complications. I have heard from women like Mary who, after undergoing years of fertility treatment, had finally been pregnant with her son David, but found out that due to atrophy of his lungs and kidneys there was virtually no chance of his survival beyond a few hours. I have heard from women who are faced with difficult, personal, and emotional choices about their health and that of their children.

These are the women who need access to health care when they face unexpected health complications. H.R. 358 would allow hospitals to deny care to patients whose lives are in peril, while also denying many Americans, not just women, access to safe, affordable, and comprehensive care when they need it most.

It is simply unfair, unwise, and irresponsible for this Chamber to decide what health care options women and families are able to explore. I urge my colleagues to oppose both this unfair rule that does not allow any amendments and the underlying, mean-spirited legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished lady from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. H.R. 358 would stop abortion coverage for millions of women. It allows doctors and hospitals to refuse treatment even if women will die without their help. This bill is so extreme that it prohibits a pregnant woman with cancer from getting an abortion so radiation can save her life. For those women, every day and every week of treatment could be the difference between life and death.

If this bill passes, we will see thousands more women abandoned by their doctors—women like Stephanie, who was pregnant at 19 weeks. She came to the hospital with a 108-degree fever. The whites of her eyes were filled with blood. She was dying before her doctor's eyes. But the hospital considered the life of the fetus more important than the life of the mother and refused treatment until the fetus died. Because they delayed, Stephanie almost lost her life.

This bill should really be called the "Don't Protect the Life of the Mother Act."

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS).

Mr. HARRIS. Much has been said on the floor about perhaps taking time out from a jobs agenda to pass the bill. The fact of the matter is this bill corrects a problem with the bill that shouldn't have been discussed by the last Congress; they should have spent time dealing with the jobs issue instead of leaving it to this Congress. So we do need to make a correction.

Madam Speaker, this one very important correction is the conscience protection in this bill. And I know as someone who's worked in a hospital where abortions are done—but they never forced me to do it because we have conscience protections in the State of Maryland. We need those conscience protections for everyone in the

country, so that if you don't believe in abortion, you don't have to participate in it. That's a basic freedom, a basic religious freedom, we should protect for every single American health care provider.

Madam Speaker, I would like to introduce into the RECORD four letters from obstetricians who work in facilities who point out that the conscience clause is not going to harm anyone's health in this bill. There's no evidence that it will.

Madam Speaker, in conclusion, the conscience protection clause is needed. It's a correction for the work of the last Congress. We should pass this bill.

VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH
UNIVERSITY HEALTH SYSTEM,
Richmond, VA, October 12, 2011.

Hon. JOE PITTS,

Hon. DAN LIPINSKI,

Hon. ERIC CANTOR.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES PITTS, LIPINSKI, AND CANTOR: I understand that the House of Representatives may soon consider H.R. 358, the Protect Life Act. As a physician I am especially interested in this bill's section reaffirming federal protection for health care providers' conscience rights on abortion. I have heard there may be an effort in the House to insert an exception into this law, so governmental bodies can discriminate against providers who decline to provide abortions in "emergency" cases.

As a physician who has worked in emergency rooms for over 30 years, I am well versed in the federal Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act (EMTALA) and similar policies. I continue to practice emergency medicine, and to teach it at Virginia Commonwealth University. Based on then decades of experience, I see absolutely no merit in the claim that conscience laws on abortion pose any risk of allowing pregnant women to die in emergency rooms. Current federal laws as well as a Virginia state law respect conscientious objection to abortion in all circumstances and I have never seen or heard of a case in which these laws created any conflict with women's safety or with legal obligations to stabilize patients' conditions in emergencies.

Your provision on conscience protection is warranted and I do not think it should be weakened in any way.

Sincerely,

EDWARD J. READ JR., MD, FACEP.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,

Chapel Hill, NC, October 12, 2011.

Representatives JOE PITTS and DAN LIPINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES PITTS AND LIPINSKI: I am a board certified specialist in Obstetrics and Gynecology with a sub-specialty certification in Maternal-Fetal Medicine. I have over twenty-seven years of experience in practice, teaching and research at a major academic health center. During my career I have cared for numerous women and babies with complications that increase the risk of maternal death. In some of these situations, both a mother and her baby have lost their lives. I care deeply about the effects that public policy and legislation can have on both those of us who provide perinatal care and on our patients.

My personal conscience directs me to provide the best of care to pregnant women and their unborn children and I am able to do so without performing abortions, as are several

of my colleagues and a proportion of the residents we train each year. I have not seen a situation where an emergent or even urgent abortion was needed to prevent a maternal death. I am aware of, and have read, sections 2(a)(6) and 2(a)(7) of H.R. 358 and I am writing to provide my opinion that I support the formalization of these protections. No woman at UNC hospitals has ever been denied care due to her conscience or beliefs; nor does any physician ever feel obliged to direct or change the standard of care for any woman due to race, ethnicity, religion, or conscience. I see no need for any exceptions or amendments to the law as written.

I am available for question or comment or for further discussion on this matter. You may reach me at thorp@med.unc.edu or by calling my office (919) 843-7851.

Sincerely,

JOHN THORP, MD.

ROBERT C. BYRD HEALTH SCIENCES
CENTER OF WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY,

Charleston, WV, October 12, 2011.

Representatives JOE PITTS and DAN LIPINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES PITTS AND LIPINSKI: I am writing in support of Sections 2(a)(6) and 2(a)(7) of H.R. 358 that provide federal legal protection of conscience regarding abortion for those who care for pregnant women. My experience includes 20 plus years of clinical care, research, and instruction as a Board certified Obstetrician & Gynecologist and Maternal-Fetal medicine. I daily provide care for women and babies who have medically complicated, life-threatening, and uncommon pregnancy complications. Further, as the originator of "perinatal hospice", I have cared for (and still do) dozens of women with babies who have terminal prenatal diagnoses who will die shortly after birth.

No one in my entire 20 plus years of clinical experience has ever been denied appropriate care because of the exercise of rights of conscience in the provision of abortion. Women and babies may die in spite of our best efforts, but this is not related to abortion availability or provision.

In my understanding of this new federal statute, conscience will now be formally and legally protected. There is no need for additional exceptions or amendments to this law as it is written.

I am more than happy to discuss this issue with either of you or with one of your colleagues. I may be contacted by email at byron.calhoun@camc.org or directly on my cell phone at (304) 741-4031.

Sincerely,

BYRON G. CALHOUN, M.D., FACOG.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,

Minneapolis, MN, October 13, 2011.

Representatives JOE PITTS and DAN LIPINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES PITTS AND LIPINSKI: I am a board certified specialist in Obstetrics/Gynecology and Maternal/Fetal Medicine with 31 years of experience in practice, teaching and research. During that time I have cared for hundreds of women and babies with life-threatening, complicated, and rare pregnancy conditions. In some of those situations mothers and babies have lost their lives despite undergoing the best available treatment including induced delivery at the margins of viability. I care deeply about the effects that public policy and legislation can have on the care of mothers and babies.

During my years of practice I have worked under informal and formal conscience rights protections that permit me to provide the

best pregnancy care without being forced to perform abortions. I have read Sections 2 (a) (6) and 2 (a) (7) or H.R. 358 and I agree with the federal formalization of these protections. In my years of practice I have never seen a woman denied appropriate care because of the exercise of rights of conscience in this regard. There is no need for additional exceptions or amendments to this law as it is written.

I am happy to discuss this with either of you or with one of your colleagues. I can be reached by email at calvis@umn.edu or on my cell phone at 612-868-9199

Sincerely,

STEVE CALVIN, MD.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, this bill seeks to undo women's constitutional rights under the guise of being about government funding for abortion. The law, unfortunately, already forbids Federal funds from paying for abortions except in the case of rape, incest, or where the woman's life is in danger. This bill goes well beyond that. It would make it virtually impossible for any of the health plans offered through the health exchanges set up as part of the Affordable Care Act to cover abortions.

As the authors plainly intend, it would make it virtually impossible for most women to buy insurance coverage for abortions with their own money. The bill would also allow a doctor or hospital to refuse to provide an abortion to a woman whose life is in imminent peril. They could let that woman die right there in the emergency room, and the government would be powerless to do anything.

□ 1320

Madam Speaker, I remember a time not that long ago when women had no options for legal abortions and had to resort to illegal back alley abortionists. Women were butchered, many died, others became sterile, all because the medical care they desperately sought and the compassion they desperately needed was denied to them. No woman should be treated with this contempt.

The real purpose of this bill—which denies women the right to purchase insurance coverage for legal abortions, even with their own money—is to make it impossible for women to exercise their constitutional right to choose for themselves.

This bill is an abomination. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I would like to point out to my colleague across the aisle that if we have a constitutional right for taxpayer funding of abortions, then we should have a right to taxpayer funding of guns. The Second Amendment allows us to keep and bear arms.

I now would like to yield 3 minutes to our distinguished colleague from Louisiana, Dr. CASSIDY.

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam Speaker, if anyone is concerned about our jobs

program, go to gop.gov.jobs. That's all the bills we've introduced so far that we have passed—most of the time you have not participated, but indeed it directly addresses the need for more jobs.

Secondly, I think we may have some common ground, it just may be that we have not read the same bill. For example, folks keep saying that this will not allow women to purchase coverage even with their own money. May I direct folks to page 6, line 8: Premiums for such coverage or plan—it goes on to say—may be used as long as it's not government money. It can be the individual's own money.

Third, there is this kind of myth that this will prevent women from having abortions. Medicaid currently does not pay for abortions; there are many Medicaid women who get abortions. The Federal Employees Health Benefits Program does not cover abortion. I suspect—although I don't know—that there are many women covered by the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program who indeed get abortions. Empirically, we know what's being asserted is not true.

Then there is the question of whether or not they're going to be denied life-saving health care. If you go to page 4, line 20: This does not apply in the case where a pregnant woman suffers from physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness that would, as certified by a physician, place the female in danger of death unless an abortion is performed.

So I think we have common ground.

The leader on the other side's next point said that this is a dramatic departure from current law, but that's kind of a curious term or phrase, because we know that current law is the President's health care plan. It is current law that has turned upside down the equilibrium that had been reached between freedom of faith for the provider to practice versus the dicta of State as to what to provide. So she is right; it dramatically overturns current law—that's the point—because the Affordable Care Act dramatically overturned that delicate balance.

Lastly, I want to point out something else. I'm a physician. I work in a hospital for the uninsured, and I teach medical students. I was there last Monday teaching medical students. You know, over 50 percent of the residents, probably 60 percent of the residents doing OB/GYN are women, and many of them are concerned about issues like this.

As we speak about women, let's not also forget the woman's right to practice her faith. And if she chooses to practice her faith in a way which preserves life, she should not be coerced by the dictates of an overreaching State.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished lady from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and this bill. Instead of focusing on jobs, Republicans are continuing to wage their war on women with this dangerous legislation today.

This bill forces comprehensive coverage for women to be dropped from the State exchanges, cutting off millions of women from affordable, comprehensive health care. And you know that Federal funds have not been allowed for abortion since 1976—to my dismay—and nothing has changed.

This bill makes it virtually impossible for any health care plan to offer abortion coverage and allows hospitals to refuse—mind you, refuse—to provide lifesaving care to a woman who needs an abortion to protect her own life. This is unprecedented and should be rejected.

We cannot and must not allow the Republicans to turn the clock back on women, on choice, and on our access to health care. I remember the days of back alley abortions—women died, women were injured for life. Let's not go back there.

I urge my colleagues to reject this unnecessary and harmful legislation. Health care decisions should be made by women and their health care providers, not Republicans and the House of Representatives who want to impose their own ideological agenda on women. We should be creating jobs, not interfering with women's reproductive rights.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. At this time, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this so-called Protect Life Act. This bill is another egregious, over-the-top assault on America's women, their health and their autonomy over their bodies. Instead of doing what we've been sent here to do, focus on jobs, once again we are talking about this extreme Republican right-wing agenda against women.

What we're essentially talking about is going back to the dark ages here. We started this Congress by talking about ending Federal support for birth control, a debate that women in my district thought ended a generation ago. And now we're going so far as to say that women can't even have access to information about the full extent of choices with respect to their health care.

This is a war on women. This is a distraction from job creation. We should reject this bill; we should end this assault on women's health care; and we should get back to the work that we were sent here to do, to fix this economy for everyone in this country, women and men, together.

Ms. FOXX. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1

minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the gentleman. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition. I'm not surprised by this bill. In March, they tried to close down the Federal Government over a woman's right to go to Planned Parenthood for health care, and today they are trying to close down a woman's right to life-saving treatment in our hospitals.

They call this "protecting life." It is the opposite of protecting life, Madam Speaker. This allows hospitals to deny lifesaving treatment to women. It limits essential health care services to women. It denies preventive health care to women. It even hurts the victims of rape and sexual assault who have been hurt enough.

Madam Speaker, the American people want a Republican majority that will help create a climate for small businesses to create jobs, not create a climate of war against women's health care. They want a war on unemployment; they do not want a war on women. They want more jobs and less extremism. This bill is about extremism, and it ought to be defeated.

Ms. FOXX. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. I thank my friend. Madam Speaker, how much floor time do we have to spend on redundant legislation that will surely die in the Senate and has already been threatened with a veto?

We've had this debate. We know what the final result will be. Federal funding of abortion is already illegal except in cases of incest, rape, and life-threatening situations. We accept that. But while millions of Americans are losing their jobs and seeing their life savings evaporate, the Republican majority insists on wasting our time on publicly demagoguing a deeply personal issue.

This bill also contains a refusal clause that would allow emergency room health professionals to deny lifesaving care to a pregnant woman because of their personal beliefs. Evidence shows that barriers to abortion services increase the risk of maternal injury and death, and that the best way to reduce the number of abortions is with accurate sexual education and the widespread availability of contraception. Yet the same people who oppose abortions also oppose appropriate sex education and family planning services.

The Supreme Court has ruled abortion is legal. Federal funds don't pay for abortion. Those policies are in place. Let's move on with help for the millions of unemployed individuals who need a good job and leave the women of America alone to control their own body and their own lives.

Ms. FOXX. I yield 1½ minutes to my distinguished colleague from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, health care is a necessary element to a good and orderly and compassionate society. We all support health, but abortion is not health care.

□ 1330

The vast majority of Americans do not support using their dollars in support of the abortion industry, and Americans should not be forced by the strong arm of the government to subsidize the abortion industry.

Here's the problem. The health care law passed in 2010 contains some serious flaws in this regard. Namely, now the Federal Government will subsidize insurance policies that cover abortion on demand.

The health care law also forces enrollees in health care plans that cover abortion to pay for abortions obtained by others. The health care law also gives license to Federal agencies to mandate abortion coverage.

We have just seen that the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Kathleen Sebelius, under the guise of preventative care, has now promulgated rules that will force everyone to pay for abortifacient drugs and not to mention sterilization. And this also tramples on the conscience rights of health care entities that do not perform or promote abortion.

Madam Speaker, I believe this: The Protect Life Act is in the interest of the right type of health care for America.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. It's unfortunate that we have to come to the floor of the House to discuss the personal decisions that a woman has to make. And I can assure you that the question of choice, the question of abortion, the question of what a woman does to her body is not one that a woman takes lightly. On many occasions, there is the necessity for a doctor and his female patient to make decisions to save the life or health of the mother.

Just as the federal courts have ruled unconstitutional and rejected the Texas law that requires a doctor to talk first to a woman seeking an abortion and to allow or force them both to listen to sounds that might discourage this needed action, this is going to be held unconstitutional. This is not a law that can pass. You can not tell a woman her insurance company can not provide her all the benefits of that coverage. It goes way beyond the pale.

I would ask my colleagues to vote against this rule and protect the right of a woman to choose and the dignity of all people in this Nation to make their own decisions over their lives, through consultation with her family, faith leader and doctor. I am saddened that we're here today discussing such an issue. Please vote no on this rule and for a woman's right to choose.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. We all know that the ObamaCare bill allows for both the implicit and explicit taxpayer funding of abortion, and we all know that the Executive order signed by the President is not worth the paper that it was written on. It repeats the accounting gimmick that allows for Federal subsidies to go to insurance plans that cover abortion. And that's why we need to pass the Protect Life Act, which would apply the principles of the Hyde amendment to every component of ObamaCare. The Protect Life Act eliminates that accounting gimmick and ensures that Americans are not forced to pay an abortion surcharge, if you will, in order to get a health care plan. It ensures State laws are not preempted by Federal law.

This is the right move, the right bill. Americans deserve to have this assurance.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, this is nothing more or less than an attack on poor women.

I stood beside the bed of a couple of women in the Buffalo General Hospital in 1963 and watched them die because of back alley abortions.

I was in the State legislature in 1970 when we, in the State of Washington, granted, by referendum, a vote of all the people, the right of women to have an abortion. Now the question is how to get it paid for.

Well, when I came to Seattle, if you wanted an abortion, what you did was you went down and bought a ticket to Japan; you flew to Japan, had an abortion, had a day of shopping in Tokyo while you made sure that you were okay medically; and then you came home. Rich women never had any problem, but the women that I stood next to as they died and left 12 kids without mothers were poor. And that's what this is really all about. It is an attack by the right wing who consider that they wrap themselves in theological raiment and then attack poor women. Christ wouldn't have done that.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I would ask the gentlelady if she is prepared to close.

Ms. FOXX. I am.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 5½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from North Carolina has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I won't take all of that time, Madam Speaker,

but I do wish to assert into this debate, it's been said often on the other side, and my distinguished friend from the Rules Committee made the point, that people came here and said that jobs were more important than life. I didn't hear anybody say that, and I don't believe anybody believes that.

But what I do believe that most of us understand is that this is not going to become the law and, therefore, what we are doing, in the final analysis, is a waste of time, and we could have been trying to do as we have not done in this session of Congress, address the subject of jobs.

Madam Speaker, what we have before us is an extremely flawed bill; and, contrary to their self-professed commitment to an open process, this particular provision being considered is under a closed rule.

Furthermore, I would also like to call into question how it's possible for us to consider this bill on the House floor when its sponsor, Mr. PITTS of Pennsylvania, failed to provide a statement citing Congress's constitutional authority to enact it. Mr. PITTS's statement of constitutional authority for the Protect Life Act cites no provision of the Constitution or any amendment to the Constitution.

Therefore, I would like to request of him or Members on the other side to share with us the basis for this bill which violates the fundamental right to privacy upheld by the Supreme Court. It restricts women's access to health care and imposes further regulations on health insurance coverage. It's clear that the Protect Life Act lacks both constitutional and moral integrity.

Let me insert additionally some feelings that have been expressed in public, and I take the prerogative of using them here on the floor.

H.R. 358 comes on top of votes by the Republican-led House to eliminate all Federal funding for title X, the National Family Planning Program, to eliminate funding for all other reproductive health programs offering breast and cervical cancer exams or well-woman and primary health care and family planning to prevent unintended pregnancies and to reduce the need for abortion.

They've led measures that eliminate requirements in health care reform covering maternal health care, mammograms, breastfeeding support, and other essential health services.

In addition, they've made it impossible for women to speak to their doctors about abortion using Internet-based telemedicine.

□ 1340

Now, these are just a few examples. The Republicans are full of fuzzy facts. I start my day almost every day, Madam Speaker, by reading the cartoon, after other parts of the newspaper, "Get Fuzzy." And the cat in that particular cartoon constantly comes up with fuzzy facts. If you put

all the fuzzy facts together and all the things that the Republican majority has done, they include Tea Party-led efforts to gut Environmental Protection Agency rules that keep the air we breathe, the water we drink, and the environment in which we live safe. They have done efforts to virtually eliminate child nutrition. And I can't believe that 20 years I'm here, and I hear Republicans talk about cutting out the Head Start program, the one documented program that has benefited American society over and above what was thought.

They have done things to eliminate programs to help the unemployed to survive, to slash Medicaid and Medicare, to effectively abrogate any social contract and tear to shreds any social safety net.

I have to ask, exactly whose lives are we protecting here?

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, our position on taxpayer funding for elective abortion is bipartisan, bicameral, and supported by the majority of the American people. We all know that.

I'd like to point out to my colleagues across the aisle when they keep saying we need to be talking about jobs, when the Democrats took control of the Congress in 2007, the unemployment rate was 4.6 percent. Between then and the time that Republicans regained control of the House this January, the unemployment rate rose to over 9 percent—6.9 million more Americans became unemployed during that period of time. I'd also like to point out to my colleague that the constitutional authority for H.R. 358 is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He knows it's required when the bill is introduced.

Madam Speaker, the American people are probably a little confused by listening to this debate because they hear two very conflicting stories. I would like to urge them to go to thomas.gov. H.R. 358 is only nine pages long. It's very simple to read. It's not like what they call the Affordable Care Act, which we had to get passed before we would know what was in it.

There is nothing more important, Madam Speaker, than protecting voiceless, unborn children and their families from the travesty of abortion. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to put aside all this rhetoric that has been spoken of in this debate today and vote for life by voting in favor of this rule and the underlying bill.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 248, nays 173, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 786]

YEAS—248

Adams	Goodlatte	Olson
Aderholt	Gosar	Palazzo
Akin	Gowdy	Paulsen
Alexander	Granger	Pearce
Altmire	Graves (GA)	Pence
Amash	Graves (MO)	Peterson
Amodi	Griffin (AR)	Petri
Austria	Griffith (VA)	Pitts
Bachus	Grimm	Platts
Barletta	Guinta	Poe (TX)
Bartlett	Guthrie	Pompeo
Barton (TX)	Hall	Posey
Bass (NH)	Hanna	Price (GA)
Benishkek	Harper	Quayle
Berg	Harris	Rahall
Biggert	Hartzler	Reed
Billray	Hastings (WA)	Rehberg
Bilirakis	Hayworth	Reichert
Bishop (UT)	Heck	Renacci
Black	Hensarling	Ribble
Blackburn	Herger	Rigell
Bonner	Huelskamp	Rivera
Bono Mack	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Boren	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Boustany	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Hurt	Rogers (KY)
Brooks	Issa	Rogers (MI)
Buchanan	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Bucshon	Johnson (IL)	Rokita
Buerkle	Johnson (OH)	Rooney
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton (IN)	Jones	Roskam
Calvert	Jordan	Ross (AR)
Camp	Kelly	Ross (FL)
Campbell	King (IA)	Royce
Canseco	King (NY)	Runyan
Cantor	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Capito	Kinzinger (IL)	Scalise
Carter	Kline	Schilling
Cassidy	Labrador	Schmidt
Chabot	Lamborn	Schock
Chaffetz	Lance	Schweikert
Coble	Landry	Scott (SC)
Coffman (CO)	Lankford	Scott, Austin
Cole	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	LaTourette	Sessions
Costello	Latta	Lewis (CA)
Cravaack	Lipinski	Shimkus
Crawford	LoBiondo	Shuler
Crenshaw	Long	Shuster
Culberson	Lucas	Simpson
Davis (KY)	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Dent	Lummis	Smith (TX)
DesJarlais	Lungren, Daniel	Southerland
Diaz-Balart	E.	Stearns
Dold	Mack	Stivers
Donnelly (IN)	Manzullo	Stutzman
Dreier	Marchant	Sullivan
Duffy	Marino	Terry
Duncan (SC)	Matheson	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Ellmers	McCaul	Tiberi
Emerson	McClintock	Tipton
Farenthold	McCotter	Turner (NY)
Fincher	McHenry	Turner (OH)
Fitzpatrick	McIntyre	Upton
Flake	McKeon	Walberg
Fleischmann	McKinley	Walden
Fleming	McMorris	Walsh (IL)
Flores	Rodgers	Webster
Forbes	Meehan	West
Fortenberry	Mica	Westmoreland
Foxx	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Gary	Wittman
Gallely	Mulvaney	Wolf
Gardner	Murphy (PA)	Womack
Garrett	Myrick	Woodall
Gerlach	Neugebauer	Yoder
Gibbs	Noem	Young (AK)
Gibson	Nugent	Young (FL)
Gingrey (GA)	Nunes	Young (IN)
Gohmert	Nunnelee	

NAYS—173

Ackerman	Becerra	Boswell
Andrews	Berkley	Brady (PA)
Baca	Berman	Brale (IA)
Baldwin	Bishop (GA)	Brown (FL)
Barrow	Bishop (NY)	Butterfield
Bass (CA)	Blumenauer	Capps

Capuano	Himes	Payne
Carnahan	Hinchoy	Pelosi
Carney	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Carson (IN)	Hirono	Peters
Castor (FL)	Hochul	Pingree (ME)
Chandler	Holden	Price (NC)
Chu	Holt	Quigley
Cicilline	Honda	Rangel
Clarke (MI)	Inslee	Reyes
Clarke (NY)	Israel	Richardson
Clay	Jackson (IL)	Richmond
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Rothman (NJ)
Clyburn	(TX)	Roybal-Allard
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Connolly (VA)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Conyers	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Cooper	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Costa	Kildee	T.
Courtney	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Critz	Kissell	Sarbanes
Crowley	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Schrader
Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)	Schwartz
Davis (IL)	Levin	Scott (VA)
DeFazio	Loeb sack	Scott, David
DeGette	Lofgren, Zoe	Serrano
DeLauro	Lowey	Sewell
Deutch	Luján	Sherman
Dicks	Lynch	Sires
Dingell	Maloney	Smith (WA)
Doggett	Markey	Speier
Doyle	Matsui	Stark
Edwards	McCarthy (NY)	Sutton
Ellison	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Engel	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	McGovern	Tierney
Farr	McNerney	Tonko
Fattah	Meeks	Towns
Filner	Michaud	Tsongas
Frank (MA)	Miller (NC)	Van Hollen
Fudge	Miller, George	Velázquez
Garamendi	Moore	Visclosky
Gonzalez	Moran	Walz (MN)
Green, Al	Murphy (CT)	Wasserman
Green, Gene	Nadler	Schultz
Grijalva	Napolitano	Neal
Gutiérrez	Neal	Olver
Hahn	Olver	Watt
Hanabusa	Owens	Waxman
Hastings (FL)	Pallone	Welch
Heinrich	Pascrell	Woolsey
Higgins	Pastor (AZ)	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Bachmann	Herrera Beutler	Paul
Broun (GA)	Hoyer	Polis
Cardoza	Langevin	Slaughter
Giffords	Lewis (GA)	Wilson (FL)

□ 1407

Ms. ESHOO and Mr. DICKS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. FRANKS of Arizona, FLEMING, STIVERS, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. CAMP changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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.

Stated for:

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 786 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “Yes.”

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

H.R. 2832. An act to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes.

EPA REGULATORY RELIEF ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). Pursuant to House Resolution 419 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2250.

□ 1407

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2250) to provide additional time for the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue achievable standards for industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers, process heaters, and incinerators, and for other purposes, with Mrs. EMERSON (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, October 12, 2011, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 22 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 250, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 787]

AYES—174

Ackerman	Clay	Fattah
Andrews	Cleaver	Filner
Baca	Clyburn	Frank (MA)
Bachus	Cohen	Fudge
Baldwin	Connolly (VA)	Garamendi
Bass (CA)	Conyers	Gonzalez
Becerra	Cooper	Green, Al
Berkley	Costello	Green, Gene
Berman	Courtney	Grijalva
Bishop (GA)	Crowley	Gutiérrez
Bishop (NY)	Cuellar	Hahn
Blumenauer	Cummings	Hanabusa
Boswell	Davis (CA)	Hastings (FL)
Brady (PA)	Davis (IL)	Heinrich
Brale (IA)	DeFazio	Higgins
Brown (FL)	DeLauro	Himes
Butterfield	Deutch	Hinchoy
Capps	Dicks	Hinojosa
Capuano	Dingell	Hirono
Carnahan	Doggett	Hochul
Carney	Donnelly (IN)	Holt
Carson (IN)	Doyle	Honda
Castor (FL)	Edwards	Inslee
Chandler	Ellison	Israel
Chu	Engel	Jackson (IL)
Cicilline	Eshoo	Jackson Lee
Clarke (MI)	Farenthold	(TX)
Clarke (NY)	Farr	Johnson (GA)

Johnson, E. B. Murphy (CT)
 Kaptur Nadler
 Keating Napolitano
 Kildee Neal
 Kucinich Olver
 Langevin Pallone
 Larsen (WA) Pascarell
 Larson (CT) Pastor (AZ)
 Lee (CA) Payne
 Levin Pelosi
 Lewis (GA) Perlmutter
 Lipinski Peters
 Loeb sack Pingree (ME)
 Lofgren, Zoe Price (NC)
 Lowey Quigley
 Luján Rangel
 Lynch Reichert
 Maloney Reyes
 Markey Richardson
 Matsui Richmond
 McCarthy (NY) Rothman (NJ)
 McCollum Roybal-Allard
 McDermott Ruppertsberger
 McGovern Rush
 McIntyre Ryan (OH)
 McNerney Sánchez, Linda
 Meeks T.
 Miller (NC) Sanchez, Loretta
 Miller, George Sarbanes
 Moore Schakowsky
 Moran Schiff

NOES—250

Adams Fitzpatrick
 Aderholt LaTourette
 Akin Fleischmann
 Alexander Fleming
 Altmire Flores
 Amash Forbes
 Amodei Fortenberry
 Austria Foyx
 Barletta Franks (AZ)
 Barrow Frelinghuysen
 Bartlett Gallegly
 Barton (TX) Gardner
 Bass (NH) Garrett
 Benishek Gerlach
 Berg Gibbs
 Biggert Gibson
 Bilbray Gingrey (GA)
 Bilirakis Gohmert
 Bishop (UT) Goodlatte
 Black Gosar
 Blackburn Gowdy
 Bonner Granger
 Bono Mack Graves (GA)
 Boren Graves (MO)
 Boustany Griffin (AR)
 Brady (TX) Griffith (VA)
 Brooks Grimm
 Brown (GA) Guinta
 Buchanan Guthrie
 Bucshon Hall
 Buerkle Hanna
 Burgess Harper
 Burton (IN) Harris
 Calvert Hartzler
 Camp Hastings (WA)
 Campbell Hayworth
 Canseco Heck
 Cantor Hensarling
 Capito Herger
 Carter Herrera Beutler
 Cassidy Holden
 Chabot Huelskamp
 Chaffetz Huizenga (MI)
 Coble Hultgren
 Coffman (CO) Hunter
 Cole Hurt
 Conaway Issa
 Costa Jenkins
 Cravaack Johnson (IL)
 Crawford Johnson (OH)
 Crenshaw Johnson, Sam
 Critz Jones
 Culberson Jordan
 Davis (KY) Kelly
 Denham Kind
 Dent King (IA)
 DesJarlais King (NY)
 Diaz-Balart Kingston
 Dold Kinzinger (IL)
 Dreier Kissell
 Duffy Kline
 Duncan (SC) Labrador
 Duncan (TN) Lamborn
 Eillers Lance
 Emerson Landry
 Fincher Lankford

Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell
 Sherman
 Shuler
 Sires
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Stark
 Sutton
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz (MN)
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Welch
 Woolsey
 Yarmuth

Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross (AR)
 Ross (FL)
 Royce
 Runyan
 Ryan (WI)
 Scalise
 Schilling
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Schweikert
 Scott (SC)
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner

Bachmann
 Cardoza
 DeGette

NOT VOTING—9

□ 1425

Mr. STUTZMAN changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) having assumed the chair, Mrs. EMERSON, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2250) to provide additional time for the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue achievable standards for industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers, process heaters, and incinerators, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 419, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 2250 is postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After consultation among the Speaker and the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent, the Chair announces that, when the two Houses meet in joint meeting to hear an address by His Excellency Lee Myung-bak, President of the Republic of Korea, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those immediately to his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House. Due to the large attendance that is anticipated, the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly enforced. Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor. The cooperation of all Members is requested.

The practice of reserving seats prior to the joint meeting by placard will not be allowed. Members may reserve their seats by physical presence only following the security sweep of the Chamber.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, October 11, 2011, the House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1550

JOINT MEETING TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY LEE MYUNG-BAK, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

During the recess, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms, Kerri Hanley, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The joint meeting will come to order.

The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort His Excellency Lee Myung-bak, President of the Republic of Korea, into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR);

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING);

The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER);

The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN);

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP);

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON);

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO);

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY);

The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER);

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI);

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER);

The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON);

The gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA);

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL);

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ);

The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ);

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN); and

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort His Excellency Lee Myung-bak, President of the Republic of Korea, into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL);

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER);

The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO);

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE);

The Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN);

The Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR);

The Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN);

The Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID);

The Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH);

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY);

The Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB).

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms announced the Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, Her Excellency Chan Heng Chee, Ambassador of the Republic of Singapore to the U.S.

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for her.

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The Members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m., the Deputy Sergeant at Arms announced His Excellency Lee Myung-bak, President of the Republic of Korea.

The President of the Republic of Korea, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

The SPEAKER. Members of Congress, I have the high privilege and the

distinct honor of presenting to you His Excellency Lee Myung-bak, President of the Republic of Korea.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

President LEE. Will you please allow me to speak in Korean.

[In Korean]

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, distinguished Members of Congress, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great privilege to speak to you from this podium, in this great institution representing democracy and freedom. And I am particularly grateful to the leadership of both parties and to all the esteemed Members of Congress for their support in ratifying the Korea-U.S. trade agreement last night in a swift manner, in a swift manner which, I am told, was quite unprecedented.

I flew halfway around the world to be here today among friends, thinking about and deeply grateful for the friendship between our two countries.

For Korea, America is not a distant land. America is our neighbor and our friend. America is our ally and our partner.

There is a Korean expression that describes our 60-year partnership: "katchi kashida." In English, it means "We go together." Indeed, we have been going together for 60 years.

For the last 60 years, remarkable changes took place in both of our countries. For the United States, it has been a journey to new frontiers—on this planet and beyond. It has been a journey of achieving fantastic breakthroughs in science and technology which led to the advent of the information age. It was a journey of developing new cures and making advances in machinery. And throughout this journey, you served as the greatest inspiration for peace and prosperity the world has ever known.

For the Republic of Korea, the last 60 years has been an incredible time of transformation and renewal. It was an epic journey from poverty to prosperity; from dictatorship to a thriving democracy; from a hermit nation to a global Korea. Korea's story is your story, too. And that fact is clear in our capital city of Seoul.

During the Korean War, Seoul was almost completely destroyed. Today, however, Seoul is reborn. Where there was once rubble now stands the Seoul Tower, looking out over a thriving modern metropolis. In the streets where women and children searched the wreckage for fuel, soon vehicles powered by magnetic strips will roam the streets. Seoul is also the most wired city on the planet.

Seoul is also one of the most dynamic and cosmopolitan cities in the world. Last year, Seoul was host to the G20 Summit and next March it will host the second Nuclear Security Summit, which will be attended by more than 50 heads of state and government.

To mark the 60th anniversary of the Korean War, we invited American veterans back to see the land they helped liberate. And when they visited Korea,

they found very few landmarks that they recognized from the war. Instead, they saw in Korea what you see here and experience in the United States today. The pace and the pulse of modern life. A creative entrepreneurial spirit that knows no bounds. A sense of self-confidence, optimism, and pride. And an unshakable faith in freedom, in free elections, a free press, and free markets. Oh, and yes, personally, our love for fried chicken.

Yes, ladies and gentlemen, these are the values that we share.

Your great President and statesman, Thomas Jefferson, said that the only safe place to locate "the ultimate powers of the society" is in the hands of the people themselves. These same values can be found in Korea, too.

One of Korea's greatest kings, King Sejong, said approximately 600 years ago that "The people are heaven. The will of the people is the will of heaven. Revere the people as you would heaven."

Here, an ocean away, in the people's House, these ancient words of our ancestors that call us to revere our people still ring true.

We also share a belief that political freedom and economic freedom must go hand in hand. During the 1960s, Koreans demanded democracy and freedom. As one of the student leaders who organized protests calling for democracy, I was caught and imprisoned, but this only strengthened my conviction that universal rights such as democracy, dignity of man, and human rights must never be compromised.

At the same time, the Korean people yearned for another kind of freedom—freedom from poverty. Back then, Korea's per capita GDP was less than \$80. University graduates roamed the streets, unable to find a job. Opportunities were scarce. It was difficult for people to have hope for the future.

This is when I realized that even if we had political freedom and democracy, we would not be truly free without economic freedom. So, after I was released from prison for my political activities, I joined a small local company. This company, which had less than 100 employees at the time, later evolved into a global conglomerate with over 160,000 employees. And as one of its youngest-ever CEOs, I was privileged to be part of Korea's remarkable economic rise as Korea's economy grew into being near the global top 10. Along the way, I was able to escape poverty myself, but being able to contribute to my country's growth will always remain as one of my proudest moments.

As you can see, we have won the fight to win two very important freedoms—our political freedom and our economic freedom. Very few countries were successful in their quest to win freedom from poverty and freedom from oppression. And Koreans are proud of this.

And they also know that your friendship—and our alliance—has been indispensable throughout this remarkable journey of hope. And this is why all of

you here should be proud of what Korea and the Korean people have achieved.

Nevertheless, I still get asked by many foreign leaders, how did a country with no natural resources, no technology, no capital, and no experience manage to achieve so much in just one generation?

My answer to them is very simple: the power of education.

The Korean War, as I've said, completely destroyed my country. The people had nothing to eat and nothing to wear. For years, we relied on foreign aid. But the Korean people believed in one thing, and that was education. Even if parents had to work day and night and drink nothing but water to chase away their hunger, they spared nothing when it came to their children's education. My parents were the same. They were determined to give their children hope by giving them a chance to learn.

And I was determined to learn. I used to be a street vendor selling anything and everything during the day and attending night school. After night school, however, going on to college was but a dream. Yet I managed to get in through the help of many others around me. Although I had to wake up every day at 4 a.m. to haul garbage to pay my way through college, I knew that learning was the key. My parents, all Korean parents, believed that education was the best way to break that vicious cycle of poverty.

These children later became the lead actors in this great drama. Their sweat and their tears is what transformed Korea from being one of the poorest countries in the world to one of the most dynamic today.

Our desire for learning continues. Currently, there are more than 100,000 Korean students studying in your schools. These young students will become the leaders of tomorrow. They will become scientists, doctors, bankers, engineers, teachers, and artists. They will continue to contribute to making both of our countries stronger. And they will bring our two countries closer together.

Distinguished Members, today the United States and Korea have one of the closest, most important economic relationships in the world. For both countries it has brought untold benefits and opportunities. Our trade in goods, services, and mutual investments has grown dramatically. We invest in you and you invest in us because we are interdependent. When we trade together, we grow together. When we build together, we rise together. And when we work together, we win together.

We see this in the towns and cities and States this Congress represents. We see it in West Point, Georgia, where a new Kia automotive plant is expected to create 1,400 new businesses and more than 20,000 new jobs nearby. We see it in Midland, Michigan, as well, where Dow Chemical, a distinctly American company, and Kokam Engineering, a

distinctly Korean company, have joined together to make some of the world's most advanced batteries—the building blocks for a new era of electric vehicles. I understand that Vice President BIDEN has been to the opening ceremony of this plant. And we have more than 10,000 Korean companies, including global conglomerates such as Samsung and LG, doing business and investing all across America.

And, of course, we see such cooperation in Korea as well. Just west of Seoul, a GM-Korea joint venture is manufacturing and selling Chevrolets to Korean consumers. Sales are up 27 percent in just the first 6 months since the brand was launched, and 55 percent of Koreans say they would consider buying one. And our cooperation is not just limited to automobiles. Many others, from microchips to biotech, provide similar examples of such cooperation. Our mutual investment is yet another good example.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, distinguished Members of Congress, thanks to all of you in this Chamber, our economic ties are becoming even stronger. The Korea-U.S. free trade agreement was ratified by this Congress here last night. Here, where the Mutual Defense Treaty was signed by Korea and the United States in 1953, a new chapter in our relationship has opened. Our relationship has become stronger. This agreement is a major step toward future growth and job creation. It is a win for our corporations.

The Korea-U.S. free trade agreement will be able to ensure continued growth and also create jobs. And this is a win for our corporations, it is a win for our workers, a win for small businesses, and a win for all the innovators on both sides the Pacific.

Perhaps you have heard what the experts have said: America's economic output will grow more due to the Korea-U.S. free trade agreement than from America's last nine trade agreements combined, and that the tariff reductions and many of the fair labor provisions, rigorous environmental standards, and strong protections for intellectual property rights will be beneficial for all of us. These provisions will improve our business environments. These provisions will allow for us to widely share the benefits of trade more than ever. In this century much has changed, but not this basic truth: Open markets build strong economies. And in this 21st century I firmly believe economies must be green to grow.

Unfortunately, this was not always our way. For far too long in my country, growth came at a cost. Rapid economic growth cast a dark shadow in our environment, in the air that we breathed, and the water that we drank. This is why when I was mayor of Seoul, I considered it my calling to restore Seoul's Cheonggyecheon Stream, which was neglected for decades. The restored stream revitalized the surrounding landscape, it revived commercial activ-

ity, and enriched the lives of the people in countless ways.

As President, I announced a new national vision—one of low-carbon green growth. And it is our goal to become the world's seventh-largest green economy by 2020. The benefits of green growth are real. This is why we are investing heavily in the research and development of next-generation power technologies such as the smart grids. This is why we are trying to become the leader in renewable energy sources. This is why we've required our biggest carbon-emitting companies to set greenhouse gas targets this year. And they will, of course, work to deliver on this promise.

I am aware that the U.S. is also taking measures to ensure a sustainable future. Some of those steps we are taking together. For example, in 2009, our governments signed a statement of intention to work together on renewable energy, energy efficiency, and power technologies. The Chicago Smart Building Initiative is a good example of our cooperation between our two countries.

And during my visit this time, our two governments signed a statement of intent on the Joint Research Project on Clean Energy. Joint investments and cooperation will only increase. Our work will lead to tangible results that will benefit mankind. As our countries move down this path, we will be moving even closer together, and we will move forward together.

Distinguished Members, ladies and gentlemen, the strength of a country is not measured in dollars alone. Our mutual defense keeps us strong and it keeps us safe. Ours is an alliance forged in blood. That is how we Koreans describe our Mutual Defense Treaty.

Fifty-eight years ago today in October 1953, here in Washington, D.C., the Republic of Korea and the United States signed the Mutual Defense Treaty. In the words of that treaty, we pledged our common determination to defend ourselves against external armed attack so that no potential aggressor could be under the illusion that either of us stands alone in the Pacific area. But we know that defending freedom is never easy; it is never free of cost or free of risk. For this, I want to thank you. I thank you on behalf of the Korean people for standing by us.

We also want to thank the 28,500 American men and women in uniform who serve today in Korea. We want to thank each and every one of you for keeping faith with the generation of your parents and grandparents, defending freedom on the Korean Peninsula. We thank you for your service.

Today, I would also like to thank the Korean War veterans who are here with us today. They are Representatives JOHN CONYERS, CHARLES RANGEL, SAM JOHNSON, and HOWARD COBLE. We thank these gentlemen for their service. To these gentleman and to millions of others, the Korean War or the peninsula are not abstract concepts, and they're

not concepts for me either. My older sister and younger brother, both just children, were killed in that war. I will never forget them. I will never forget how my mother tried so hard to keep them alive. With the war raging all around us, there were no doctors, and we couldn't afford to buy medicine. All my mother could do was stay up all night and pray to God. Many Koreans still live with such pain.

I recognize the reality that Korea has been split in two, but I will never accept it as a permanent condition. The two Koreas share the same language, history, and customs. We are one people. In both Koreas, there are families who have never spoken to their loved ones for more than half a century. And my hope is that these people and all 70 million Koreans will enjoy real happiness and real peace. And for this, we must first lay the foundation for peace on the Korean Peninsula. And upon this foundation, we must strengthen cooperation between the two Koreas. We must seek the path that will lead us towards mutual prosperity. And we must achieve peaceful unification.

A unified Korea will be a friend to all and a threat to none. A unified Korea will contribute to peace and prosperity, not only in northeast Asia, but far beyond. We therefore must achieve the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, and North Korea must give up their nuclear ambitions.

Korea and the United States stand united. We are in full agreement that the Six Party Talks is an effective way to achieve tangible progress. We are in full agreement that we must also pursue dialogue with North Korea. However, we must also maintain our principled approach. A North Korea policy that is firmly rooted upon such principles is the key that will allow us to ultimately and fundamentally resolve this issue.

North Korea's development is in our collective interest, and this is what we want. However, this depends on its willingness to end all provocations and make genuine peace. We will work with you and the international community so that North Korea makes the right choice.

Our Mutual Defense Treaty has ensured stability and prosperity to flourish not only on the Korean Peninsula, but across northeast Asia. Northeast Asia today is a more dynamic region than ever. And economic change in this region brings geopolitical change, and it brings shifts in the balance of power that has long prevailed.

The United States, as a key player of the Asia-Pacific region and as a global leader, has vital interests in northeast Asia. For northeast Asia to play a more constructive role in global affairs, there must be peace and stability in the region.

And your leadership that has ensured peace and stability of northeast Asia and beyond in the 20th century must remain supreme in the 21st century. The ideals that you represent and the

leadership that allows for such ideals to become true must continue.

There remain many challenges in the world today, and your leadership is vital. Terrorism, proliferation of WMD, climate change, energy, poverty, and disease; these are just a few of the challenges that require your leadership.

Our free trade agreement has significance because it will be a force for stability, because lasting stability, again, depends on economic opportunity being open and robust. Our relationship can be the catalyst that generates growth and stability all along the Pacific Rim. And, in doing so, it will make clear how fully our fates are connected.

More than ever, Korea is looking beyond the horizon. It will willingly embrace its international responsibilities. It will work to resolve global challenges.

Since becoming President of Korea, my vision for Korea in the coming decades is for a global Korea.

Global Korea has joined United Nations peacekeeping operations in East Timor, Lebanon, and Haiti. Korea was the third-largest contributor of troops to the coalition forces in Iraq. We have sent reconstruction teams to rebuild Afghanistan. Our naval vessels support the United States and EU in fighting against piracy off the coast of Somalia.

We will take part in the international effort in bringing democracy to Libya and rebuilding its shattered economy. And we have pledged to double our overseas development assistance by 2015. And next month the High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness will be held in Busan, Korea's second-largest city.

In these and countless other ways, Korea will carry out its duties as a responsible member of the international community. As we face the many global challenges that lie ahead, we will promote universal values.

In 2009, when President Obama and I signed the Joint Vision for the Future of the Alliance, we agreed to work closely together in resolving regional and international issues, based on shared values and mutual trust. And during our summit today we renewed this commitment. We also reaffirmed our commitment to face the challenges of today for the generation of tomorrow.

Our alliance will grow, and it will continue to evolve. And it will prevail.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, distinguished Members of Congress, before I part, I want to thank you again for the honor of addressing this Congress. I would also like to thank President Obama and Mrs. Obama for their invitation.

I also take this opportunity to pay tribute to the 1.5 million Korean-Americans who have been contributing to this great country. As President of Korea, I am proud that they are giving back to the country that gave them so much. I am also deeply grateful to you and the American people for giving

them the chance to make their dreams come true.

Your ideals and aspirations have been ours, as they have been for much of the world.

Half a century ago, young Americans served in the Korean War "for duty beyond the seas." And today, our peoples hear the same call. It may not always be active combat, not always to brave the rugged mountains or bitter winters, but it is an important duty nonetheless, a charge to help create a more peaceful, more prosperous world.

In the 21st century, duty and destiny calls us once again. As before, let us rise to meet these challenges. Let us go together. Together and forward.

Thank you.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m., His Excellency Lee Myung-bak, President of the Republic of Korea, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The Members of the President's Cabinet;

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m., the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1719

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. ROBY) at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

PROTECT LIFE ACT

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 358 and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 430, I call up the bill (H.R. 358) to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to modify special rules relating to coverage of abortion services under such Act, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 430, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce printed in the bill is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 358

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 "Protect Life Act".

SEC. 2. MODIFYING SPECIAL RULES RELATING TO COVERAGE OF ABORTION SERVICES UNDER THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT TO CONFORM TO LONG-STANDING FEDERAL POLICY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1303 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148), as amended by section 10104(c) of such Act, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) of subsection (b) as subsection (d) and transferring such subsection (d) after the subsection (c) inserted by paragraph (4) of this subsection with appropriate indentation (and conforming the style of the heading to a subsection heading);

(3) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) SPECIAL RULES RELATING TO TRAINING IN AND COVERAGE OF ABORTION SERVICES.—Nothing in this Act (or any amendment made by this Act) shall be construed to require any health plan to provide coverage of or access to abortion services or to allow the Secretary or any other Federal or non-Federal person or entity in implementing this Act (or amendment) to require coverage of, access to, or training in abortion services.";

(4) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) LIMITATION ON ABORTION FUNDING.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—No funds authorized or appropriated by this Act (or an amendment made by this Act), including credits applied toward qualified health plans under section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or cost-sharing reductions under section 1402 of this Act, may be used to pay for any abortion or to cover any part of the costs of any health plan that includes coverage of abortion, except—

"(A) if the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest; or

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

"(2) OPTION TO PURCHASE SEPARATE COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as prohibiting any non-Federal entity (including an individual or a State or local government) from purchasing separate coverage for

abortions for which funding is prohibited under this subsection, or a qualified health plan that includes such abortions, so long as—

"(A) such coverage or plan is paid for entirely using only funds not authorized or appropriated by this Act; and

"(B) such coverage or plan is not purchased using—

"(i) individual premium payments required for a qualified health plan offered through an Exchange towards which a credit is applied under section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or

"(ii) other non-Federal funds required to receive a Federal payment, including a State's or locality's contribution of Medicaid matching funds.

"(3) OPTION TO OFFER COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Nothing in this subsection or section 1311(d)(2)(B)(i) shall restrict any non-Federal health insurance issuer offering a qualified health plan from offering separate coverage for abortions for which funding is prohibited under this subsection, or a qualified health plan that includes such abortions, so long as—

"(A) premiums for such separate coverage or plan are paid for entirely with funds not authorized or appropriated by this Act;

"(B) administrative costs and all services offered through such coverage or plan are paid for using only premiums collected for such coverage or plan; and

"(C) any such non-Federal health insurance issuer that offers a qualified health plan through an Exchange that includes coverage for abortions for which funding is prohibited under this subsection also offers a qualified health plan through the Exchange that is identical in every respect except that it does not cover abortions for which funding is prohibited under this subsection.";

(5) in subsection (e), as redesignated by paragraph (1)—

(A) in the heading, by striking "REGARDING ABORTION";

(B) in the heading of each of paragraphs (1) and (2), by striking each place it appears "REGARDING ABORTION";

(C) in paragraph (1), by striking "regarding the prohibition of (or requirement of) coverage, funding, or" and inserting "protecting conscience rights, restricting or prohibiting abortion or coverage or funding of abortion, or establishing"; and

(D) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking "Nothing" and inserting "Subject to subsection (g), nothing";

(6) in subsection (f), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by striking "Nothing" and inserting "Subject to subsection (g), nothing"; and

(7) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) NONDISCRIMINATION ON ABORTION.—

"(1) NONDISCRIMINATION.—A Federal agency or program, and any State or local government that receives Federal financial assistance under this Act (or an amendment made by this Act), may not subject any institutional or individual health care entity to discrimination, or require any health plan created or regulated under this Act (or an amendment made by this Act) to subject any institutional or individual health care entity to discrimination, on the basis that the health care entity refuses to—

"(A) undergo training in the performance of induced abortions;

"(B) require or provide such training;

"(C) perform, participate in, provide coverage of, or pay for induced abortions; or

"(D) provide referrals for such training or such abortions.

"(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'health care entity' includes an individual physician or other health care professional, a hospital, a provider-sponsored organization, a health maintenance organization, a health insurance plan, or any other kind of health care facility, organization, or plan.

"(3) REMEDIES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to prevent and redress actual or threatened violations of this section by issuing any form of legal or equitable relief, including—

"(i) injunctions prohibiting conduct that violates this subsection; and

"(ii) orders preventing the disbursement of all or a portion of Federal financial assistance to a State or local government, or to a specific offending agency or program of a State or local government, until such time as the conduct prohibited by this subsection has ceased.

"(B) COMMENCEMENT OF ACTION.—An action under this subsection may be instituted by—

"(i) any health care entity that has standing to complain of an actual or threatened violation of this subsection; or

"(ii) the Attorney General of the United States.

"(4) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary shall designate the Director of the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Health and Human Services—

"(A) to receive complaints alleging a violation of this subsection; and

"(B) to pursue investigation of such complaints in coordination with the Attorney General.";

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1334(a)(6) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(6) COVERAGE CONSISTENT WITH FEDERAL POLICY.—In entering into contracts under this subsection, the Director shall ensure that no multi-State qualified health plan offered in an Exchange provides coverage for abortions for which funding is prohibited under section 1303(c) of this Act.";

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PITTS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am humbled to stand in this Chamber and engage in debate over such a critical matter as this. Like the civil rights movement, the pro-life cause has always been about one of securing rights for those who cannot speak for themselves and who cannot on their own obtain them. The fight goes all the way back to our Nation's beginning.

What more could our Founding Fathers have envisioned when they drafted the Declaration of Independence, proclaiming to all that America would "hold these truths would be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness"? There it is.

The first unalienable right designated by the Declaration of Independence is our right to life. Our Founding Fathers must have deemed this an indispensable right, for its placement signifies it was not an afterthought.

From the start of our great Nation until now, countless men and women have fought and even sacrificed their own lives to protect that right for others. Yet, in 1973, the U.S. Supreme Court issued a decision that has

changed the course of history in this country. A right that had been protected for nearly 200 years was tossed aside by a court decision to legalize abortion. Up until that point, an unwanted pregnancy was likely to lead to an adoption, a process that placed an unwanted child in a caring home.

The legacy of the late Steve Jobs reminds us of the impact an adoption can have on the entire world. Fortunately for us, Jobs was born 18 years before *Roe v. Wade*. Shortly after his birth to a single mother, Jobs was adopted by a married couple in central California. He would go on to be the founder of a tech company that has literally changed the world. His was the route of many unexpected children before 1973.

Maya Angelou, Babe Ruth, and Eleanor Roosevelt are just a few of the many adoptees that have transformed the world we live in today.

Unfortunately, since *Roe v. Wade*, more and more women are being persuaded that abortion is nothing more than a simple medical procedure that will help them move on with their lives. This could not be further from the truth.

A study of Medi-Cal patients in California revealed that women who had had an abortion were 160 percent more likely to be admitted for psychiatric treatment than those who had carried the child to term and delivery. These women who chose to terminate their pregnancies then had to deal with the psychological devastation that is often associated with such a decision. Adding harm upon harm, abortion is a procedure that brings mental trauma to the mother and irreparable damage to the unborn.

Because of this, the policy of the Federal Government for the last 35 years has been to ban funding for such a procedure. Studies have shown that when the government subsidizes abortion, their number increases. The President, a supporter of abortion rights, has stated his commitment to reducing the amount of abortions in this country. Restoring the policy of prohibiting Federal funds for abortion would be a good first step. The American people, to a large degree, agree with this policy. In fact, as recently as last year, a survey revealed that 67 percent of Americans support a ban on abortion funding. But the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act failed to include this prohibition, and that is why we are here today.

President Obama indicated his support for upholding the ban on Federal funding for abortion in health reform, and that is exactly what the Protect Life Act does. The issue of prohibiting taxpayer funds for abortion is important to the American people. And so it should be important to Congress as well. Protecting the unalienable right to life is important to the American people. It should be to the Congress as well.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Hon. FRED UPTON,

Chairman, House Committee on Energy & Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON, as you know, I requested a referral on H.R. 358, the "Protect Life Act," because it has provisions that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee. We are able to agree to waive seeking a formal referral of the bill in order that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 358 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any issues in our jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the House floor. Thank you for your attention to this request, and for the cooperative relationship between our two committees.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, October 12, 2011.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,

Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH, thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 358, the "Protect Life Act." As you noted, there are provisions of the bill that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

I appreciate your willingness to forgo action on H.R. 358. I agree that your decision should not prejudice the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 358 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, September 14, 2011.

Hon. FRED UPTON,

Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON, I am writing concerning H.R. 358, the "Protect Life Act," which was favorably reported out of your Committee on February 15, 2011.

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction over revenue measures generally, including federal tax laws and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (IRC). Section 2(a)(4) of H.R. 358 amends section 1303 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (P.L. 111-148), as amended by section 10104(c) of such Act, by limiting the purposes for which taxpayers may claim tax credits under section 36B of the IRC. I wanted to notify you the Committee will forgo action on H.R. 358. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 358, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, September 15, 2011.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,

Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP, thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 358, the "Protect Life Act." As you noted, there are provisions of the bill that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

I appreciate your willingness to forgo action on H.R. 358. I agree that your decision should not prejudice the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 358 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

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

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 358, legislation that infringes upon a woman's right to choose. This bill is unnecessary, divisive, and extreme. And it saddens me that the Republican leadership has chosen to bring this bill to the House floor when Americans are struggling.

The American people want us to work together to address their top priority: creating jobs. As such, we should be focusing on putting Americans back to work, not dividing Congress on ideological issues. And we certainly shouldn't be considering legislation that rolls back women's reproductive rights 38 years.

Supporters of this bill claim it is amending the Affordable Care Act to ensure U.S. tax dollars are not used to fund abortions. However, the Affordable Care Act already prohibits the use of Federal dollars to fund abortions. Instead, H.R. 358 will eliminate access to abortion care for many women by banning insurance plans regulated by the Affordable Care Act from offering abortion-inclusive coverage if they take even one federally subsidized customer. So if a plan takes one subsidized customer, then they can't provide abortion coverage insurance to anyone else in the plan.

What's even more concerning is that this legislation could place many women who need reproductive health care in dangerous, potentially life-threatening situations by expanding a lopsided policy that allows health workers and hospitals the ability to refuse to provide and refer for abortion care and even deny emergency abortion care.

So that's why I was so appalled, truly appalled yesterday by comments that

were made at the Rules Committee, and I want to set the record straight. This bill is not simply the Stupak-Pitts amendment that was debated and supported during the health reform consideration. During the Rules Committee, I heard that over and over again from the Republican side—this is just the Stupak bill all over again. That is simply not true.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 358 goes significantly beyond the Stupak amendment. The Stupak amendment limited its reach only to qualified health plans and had no effect on completely private plans. But H.R. 358 affects any health plan.

The Stupak amendment limited its reach only to Federal funding and insurance coverage of abortion. H.R. 358 includes access to abortion services, a much broader term with far-reaching effects.

And the Stupak amendment limited its reach only to State conscience protection laws that deal with abortion. But H.R. 358 expands that protection to those covering health and medical services outside of abortion.

The Stupak amendment did not create any exception to the obligation of hospitals to comply with EMTALA. Instead, it left that obligation intact.

So, as my colleagues will see, no one should be fooled by the argument that this is simply Stupak because it's simply not. I want to emphasize, the effect of this amendment would mean that, effectively, women would not be able to get any kind of health insurance for abortion coverage either because they wouldn't be able to get a comprehensive plan on the exchange or because they would be forced to try to buy one outside the exchange just for abortion services, which isn't going to be available.

So, practically speaking, what the Pitts amendment does is make it impossible for a woman to exercise her right under the Constitution if she chooses to have an abortion because she won't be able to get insurance coverage for it at all.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 358 is a massive overreach of women's health. It extensively restricts women's access to reproductive health services and life-saving care. It is a step towards eliminating a choice that our Supreme Court has deemed legal and remains legal to this day.

Now, if you want to overturn *Roe v. Wade*, and I know that there are Members on the other side of the aisle who feel that way, then they can try to do that. But don't do it in a sneaky way by denying women insurance and effectively saying that they can't exercise what the Supreme Court says is their right under the Constitution.

□ 1730

Women need and are entitled to safe, affordable health care options. This bill only serves to create health and financial challenges that I think are going to be impossible to overcome. It's dangerous to women's health.

I urge my colleagues to vote "nay" on the legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. JOHN FLEMING.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his work on this bill and his lifelong career in protecting life.

Madam Speaker, the bill before us today, H.R. 358, the Protect Life Act, would accomplish two important things: It would remove funding for abortion and abortion coverage under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and it would extend the conscience protections to pro-life doctors, nurses, hospitals, and other health care facilities who object to destroying the lives of unborn children.

Madam Speaker, I've been a doctor for 36 years, father of four, grandfather of two, and I can tell you that the taking of innocent life is not health care. It is not health care. Having said that, this country is still divided on whether or not a woman should have the right to take an unborn infant. However, the country is not divided on the issue for who should pay for it—and that issue is taxpayers. Two to one, Americans say taxpayers should not be footing the bill. And that's what this is about, as well as the conscience clause.

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

Mr. PITTS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. FLEMING. This protection is critical for pro-life and religious health care providers and entities. EMTALA, which is part of the discussion here, requires that health care providers such as myself must take care of women and must take care of their infants, unborn or otherwise.

And so I say to you, Madam Speaker, today, this bill protects life and it does not require taxpayers to foot the bill for those who choose to take innocent life.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to our distinguished Democratic whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

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

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership.

I rise in opposition to this bill, the so-called Protect Life Act.

First of all, over and over again we repeat the premise that somehow we're using government funds through the Affordable Care Act for abortion. We are not. No matter how many times you say it, the fact is that we specifically precluded that from happening.

What this bill does goes much further. It threatens to make it harder for women across the country to receive health care that they need. I understand the doctor who just said that the termination of a pregnancy is not health care. I understand his premise.

But I also understand that we in America have adopted the premise that if a woman comes to the hospital and has at great risk to her life a pregnancy which is causing her health to be at great risk and her life as well, what this bill does is say you don't have to intervene under those circumstances. I don't think that's protecting life, I say to my friend. In fact, I think it is ignoring the protection of life.

Moreover, it does nothing to create jobs, which is what Congress should be focusing on during this time when so many Americans are out of work. Very frankly, you have criticized the President of the United States for submitting a jobs bill to this Congress that doesn't have a chance of passage. I have heard that over and over again. All of you know this has no chance of passage. It may pass this House—I hope not; I urge its defeat—but it won't pass. It won't become law.

So while millions of Americans' quality of life is put at risk because of the lack of jobs and opportunity that they have, we consider what I believe is simply legislation to speak to a particular interest group in our parties. I understand that.

Republicans come to this floor and speak all the time about keeping government out of people's lives, but this bill does exactly the opposite. What it says is that women won't be able to spend their own money on comprehensive reform for reproductive coverage under a new health exchange. You don't want us to tell people they have to have insurance, but you want to tell them what they can't have in an insurance—with their own money. I'm not sure I get the distinction there. Maybe you can come up with a distinction, but it certainly is a very nuanced one, if it exists at all.

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

Mr. PALLONE. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HOYER. Even more unbelievably, the bill will allow a hospital to refuse women emergency care of this kind even when necessary to save their lives. I don't think that's what you intend. I certainly hope it's not. But it is the interpretation that many of us have put on the language of your bill.

So, ladies and gentlemen of this House, this issue has been debated over and over again. We adopted a Hyde amendment. The premise of the Hyde amendment was that we shouldn't take taxpayers' money and spend it on abortion.

Very frankly, I represent 60,000 Federal employees. We precluded them from using the salary that they receive to buy insurance that has abortion coverage. It's their money. I hear that all the time: It's their money. But you don't allow them to use their money for that purpose. Now you are saying to the private sector women: You can't use your money.

You can't have it both ways. Either it's their money for services they constitutionally can receive or it's not.

Defeat this bill. This is a difficult issue. Let us let women, doctors, and their faith deal with it.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, before I yield to the next speaker, I have a copy here of the PPACA law. On page 65, I'll just read one title of a paragraph: Abortions for which public funding is allowed.

At this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana, STEVE SCALISE.

Mr. SCALISE. I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding and especially for his leadership in bringing the Protect Life Act to the floor of the House of Representatives.

When we look at a time right now when our country is going broke, it's offensive to most Americans that taxpayer money can still be used to subsidize abortion in this country. We had this debate during the President's health care law. We've tried to put real language that would protect that from happening. Unfortunately, we weren't able to get that protection. For those of us that want to repeal the President's health care law completely, we've already passed that bill and sent it to the Senate and they've taken no action.

But we're here today to address specifically this problem and say there should be no taxpayer money that is allowed to be used to subsidize abortion. And if you look in the bill, there are employers out there who are providing good health care to their employees today; yet under the law that the President passed and signed into law, Federal officials can tell those private employers that they have to provide abortion services in their policy, and so they'll just drop the policy. This prevents that from happening as well. It gives conscience protections so that if there's a medical professional that doesn't want to participate in abortion, they don't have to.

These are all commonsense proposals that should pass and have bipartisan support, and they should also pass the Senate.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to our ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker and Members of the Congress of the United States, this bill is an absolute disgrace. With all the problems we have in this country—economic crisis, poverty levels at the highest we've seen in a generation, urgent needs for our schools, Americans still too dependent on foreign oil and imported energy—what does the Republican leadership bring up for us to debate? Yet another bill to limit women's access to reproductive health services.

□ 1740

Now, I say another bill because the House has already adopted H.R. 3, and that bill codified into law that no Fed-

eral dollars would be used to pay for abortion services, whether it's under Medicaid, the traditional Hyde amendment, or the D.C. appropriations, or for Federal employees, or women who serve in the military, or those who get subsidies under the Affordable Care Act.

What this bill seeks to do, pure and simple, is to destroy one of the most hard-fought but delicately balanced sections of the Affordable Care Act, and that was on abortion. This section came about as a result of a lot of hard work by many Members in the House and the Senate—particularly Senator NELSON, whose pro-life record speaks for itself, clearly and unequivocally.

The law prohibits the use of Federal funds for abortion. It keeps State and Federal abortion-related laws in place. It ensures that those whose conscience dictates against abortion are protected and not discriminated against. And it went further. The language in the Affordable Care Act said you cannot use any subsidies to pay for your abortion insurance coverage; you had to use only private personal dollars. Well, this bill would restrict insurance plans' flexibility regarding abortion coverage, and I think it will result in a virtual shutdown of private coverage for this service for everyone.

This legislation also takes away the Affordable Care Act's limited anti-discrimination protection for those providers whose conscience dictates that women should have access to abortion. It's a legal and, in many cases, an appropriate medical service.

Among the most disturbing features of the Pitts bill is it would say that health care providers would no longer be required to provide emergency services as required under the Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act, commonly known as EMTALA.

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

Mr. PALLONE. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. WAXMAN. In other words, a woman who may die from her pregnancy, if she is in for emergency services, the doctor can refuse to give her emergency services if his conscience would prohibit performing an abortion.

Taken as a whole, this bill is a full-throttled assault on women's health and a woman's right to choose. It's not what the American people voted for last November. We should be focusing our attention on jobs, economic growth, and the numerous pressing and important challenges we face as a Nation.

This is a shameless, just a shameless bill. I urge a "no" vote on H.R. 358.

Mr. PITTS. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished vice chairman of the Health Subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas, Dr. BURGESS.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the chairman. I won't take the full minute. I just simply wanted to respond to what we just heard here on the floor of the House.

H.R. 358 does not change current law or any standard related to section 1867 of the Social Security Act, commonly referred to as EMTALA. The section states that a hospital must provide such treatment to stabilize the medical condition. Paragraph (e) of section 1867 defines an emergency medical condition as a medical condition of sufficient severity such that the absence of immediate medical attention could be reasonably expected to place the life and health of a pregnant woman or her unborn child in serious jeopardy.

EMTALA currently recognizes both lives. Therefore, the Protect Life Act provides conscience protection that is consistent with the emergency treatment requirements of current law under EMTALA.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield 2 minutes to a member of the Health Subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition—and I must say honest bafflement—to this so-called "Protect Life Act." I'm baffled because it truly stretches the limits of the rational mind to imagine why the Republican majority—a group of people who supposedly say they make it their mission to limit government involvement in every way possible—why they continue to insert themselves—and the government—into the personal health care decisions of Americans across the country.

What's even more baffling is that for 30 years Federal law has prohibited funding of abortions. It's one thing to say the government won't pay for abortions, but quite another, as we're doing here, to say that women can't use their own dollars to pay for abortion coverage.

Here we are with this absurd song and dance that has no basis in reality, is entirely about scoring political points with the Republican base once again while, as my colleagues have said, doing nothing to help employment and create jobs in this country. If this bill stopped at being absurd, it would be one thing. But more than absurd, this cruel legislation would actually allow hospitals to refuse to provide a woman abortion care even if she would die without it.

Now, my colleagues who claim they want smaller government and say they want to get the government out of people's lives, this is a hell of a way to do it or to prove it.

I urge my colleagues to fight for common sense, to protect women from this harsh attack, and to vote "no" on H.R. 358.

The gentleman before was talking about public funding being used for abortions. What is that—using taxpayers' money for incest, or to save the life of a woman, or for rape? Would we deny women the right to have an abortion if they were raped or if it would save their lives? I think not. I think the American people can see through this one. This is nothing more than

playing to the base. It's bad policy for this country.

Let's get the government out of people's lives. Vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to another distinguished member of the Health Subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. PHIL GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding, and I commend him for his great work on this bill.

As a practicing OB/GYN for nearly 30 years, I believe that all life is sacred. Having delivered more than 5,000 babies into this world, I have a deep appreciation for how wonderful life is.

The issue of abortion is a very personal matter for me, as it is for many in this country and on both sides of the aisle of this issue. However, the decades-old debate on the issue of abortion in this country, that's not why we're on the floor today. We're here today to answer one question: Should taxpayer dollars be used to fund abortions? And when an elective procedure—a choice—can decide between life and death, I would suggest that it is an important question to answer. The Protect Life Act is a piece of legislation that seeks to answer that question and set right what the Congress got wrong.

Speaking as a grandfather, a father, a son, and an OB/GYN physician, I will be voting to ensure that our government does not put taxpayer dollars behind any person who seeks an elective abortion.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, may I ask how much time remains on both sides of the aisle?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 16 minutes. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 20¾ minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank my dear colleague here for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Protect Life Act, which will ensure that taxpayer dollars are not used to pay for abortions through last year's health care bill. It is right and proper that we should do so.

Every life deserves to be born and is worthy of life. Every life has a purpose and a plan. King David reminds us of the value of life in our Creator's eyes when he penned the following: "For You created my inmost being; You knit me together in my mother's womb. I praise You because I am fearfully and wonderfully made; Your works are wonderful, I know that full well. My frame was not hidden from You when I was made in the secret place. When I was woven together in the depths of the Earth, Your eyes saw my unformed body. All the days ordained for me were written in Your Book before one of them came to be."

I'm thankful that our Declaration of Independence recognizes that we are

endowed by our Creator with inalienable rights, including the right to life.

□ 1750

Our Founding Fathers laid out the principle of life, and today we have an opportunity to affirm and carry on that mantle by passing the Protect Life Act.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this dangerous legislation, the so-called Protect Life Act, which will, in fact, endanger the lives of women.

With only 23 legislative days remaining in this session before the end of the year, I'm stunned by the decision to waste precious time debating this bill, this unprecedented attack on women's health and the right of women to access reproductive health care.

We should, instead, be spending this time debating ways to grow our economy, ways to help small businesses create jobs, and ways to rebuild our roads and schools so that we can put people back to work and improve our competitiveness in the global marketplace.

But instead of talking about how we create jobs, we're debating merits of a bill intended to continue the war on women being waged by my Republican colleagues. This bill would effectively limit, for the first time, how women can spend their own private dollars to purchase health insurance. This is outrageous.

I am certain Members of this body would never dare to enact legislation limiting the ability of men to access health care.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill, to end the attack on women's rights and women's health, and to focus, instead, on job creation.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

For over 30 years, the Hyde amendment, in conjunction with a patchwork of other policies, has regulated the Federal funding of abortions under programs such as Medicaid; and together, these various policies ensure the American taxpayer is not involved in funding the destruction of innocent human life.

And despite the assurances from President Obama, the Patient Protection and Affordability Care Act will allow Federal funds to subsidize abortions for the first time since 1976 through State high-risk pools and community health centers.

While the President's Executive order was an attempt to reassure Congress after the Stupak amendment did not make it into the bill's final version, the fact of the matter is that the Executive order is not law and it can change all too easily.

This bill will prohibit funding for abortions and abortion coverage under

the Patient Protection and Affordability Act. This legislation also protects the conscience rights for health care workers such as myself by providing that Federal agencies and State and local governments funding by PPACA may not discriminate against health care entities that refuse to be involved in abortion.

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

Mr. PITTS. I yield the gentlelady an additional 15 seconds.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, this bill is not about a mother's right to choose, as the President and the congressional Democrats would lead us to believe. Rather, this is about ensuring that the proper restrictions are in place in order to assure that taxpayer funds are not used to fund abortion or abortion coverage under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. A new poll today suggests that the 9-9-9 campaign theme of the new Republican Presidential front-runner is starting to gain traction. And it appears that the majority has taken a page from the Cain playbook with their 10-10-10 program, because this is the 10th month without a jobs bill on the floor, the 10th time we've put polarizing social issues and attacks on women's health before job creation and economic security, and the 10th attempt at repealing parts or all of the Affordable Care Act.

This bill creates no jobs, it doesn't help the economy, and it inserts the government smack in the middle of people's health care decisions.

I urge a "no" vote on this bill and urge the majority to get to work helping the economy and creating jobs.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to another leader on the life issue, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership on this issue, and I'm privileged to be on the floor with a lot of pro-life activists.

I rise in support of the Protect Life Act, and I think we should talk about what is really going on behind those dollars that would go into abortion clinics.

It's been called cruel legislation. Think about how cruel it is to take a pair of forceps and pull a baby apart piece by piece in dilation and extraction, or D&E. Fourteen to 24 weeks, a fully formed, perfect, perfectly formed and perfectly innocent baby pulled apart piece by piece, put into a pan and added up to see if all the pieces are there. It is ghastly, it's gruesome, it's ghoulish, and it's grotesque, and we should never compel taxpayers to pay for something that we couldn't bear the sight of. And you'll never see a video of it for that reason.

It is a process that degrades our entire culture. And to argue that women can't spend their own dollars to get an abortion just simply isn't true. There is a side piece in this that still prevails, and there's always that cash right up to the Planned Parenthood.

So, Madam Speaker, I urge support for the Protect Life Act, and I congratulate the people that have stood for innocent, unborn human life so many times on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

At a time when the American people are crying out for action on jobs, we are debating legislation that will instead trample on a woman's fundamental reproductive rights. The fact of the matter is that the Affordable Care Act prohibits any taxpayers' dollars from paying for abortions. That's the law of the land.

The legislation before the House goes far beyond that, restricting, for the first time, how women with private insurance can spend their own private dollars in purchasing insurance. For women, this bill constitutes nothing less than a full-fledged assault on their right to choose.

Madam Speaker, with 8 million people unemployed in this country, with wages going down, poverty is on the rise, and this is all that the Republicans have to offer. This is why people are literally in the streets demanding solutions to the job crisis, seeking greater opportunity and an end to economic inequality.

The American people do not want ideological posturing. They want real solutions that create real jobs. Vote down this legislation.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to another eloquent voice for the unborn, the chair of the Pro-Life Women's Caucus, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT).

Mrs. SCHMIDT. I'm actually one of the folks that read the bill before we passed it, and there are passages in the bill that do allow for Federal funding of abortion. What this bill does is it seeks to correct that language.

The Hyde amendment clearly states that no Federal tax dollars can be used for abortion. At the time that the Hyde amendment was created, we really only had Medicaid to worry about; but with the vast changes in our lifestyles, other avenues have come forward for Federal funding of abortion to occur if we are not careful in the way we construct laws in this awesome body.

Time and time again, the American public has said we're conflicted on the issue of abortion, but we're not conflicted about not using Federal funds to pay for it. Just in April of this year, 61 percent of respondents on a CNN poll said no Federal funding of abortion.

What this bill does is what we should have done in March of 2010—not allow

any Federal funds to be used to pay for abortion any time, any place in this health care bill.

I urge my colleagues to pass this and correct the language that should have been done a year ago.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to another outstanding voice for the unborn, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

□ 1800

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Protect Life Act with a grateful heart for Chairman JOE PITTS and Congressman DAN LIPINSKI for their bipartisan leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor. I believe that ending an innocent human life is morally wrong. But I also believe that it's morally wrong to take the taxpayer dollars of millions of pro-life Americans and use them to subsidize abortion or abortion coverage in this country. As it stands today, ObamaCare requires millions of pro-life taxpayers to pay for abortions and subsidize health care plans that cover abortions. This legislation will correct that profound flaw.

Now, I know President Obama issued an Executive order during the heat of the legislative battle over ObamaCare, but we all know Executive orders do not carry the force of law. They can be overturned by the courts and are superseded by statutes.

ObamaCare should be repealed. But in the meantime, let's take this moment to say "yes" to life, to say "yes" to respecting the values of tens of millions of Americans and make right that which was wrong in ObamaCare itself. Let's pass the Protect Life Act, and let's protect taxpayers of pro-life values all across this country and do it now.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin, who is also a member of the Health Subcommittee, Ms. BALDWIN.

Ms. BALDWIN. Notably absent from the Republican agenda this year are the issues that the American people really care about—creating jobs and growing our economy. Just when we should be pulling together to work on these issues, instead, Republicans have put forth divisive and extreme legislation that takes away women's ability to make their own important life decisions about their reproductive health.

This extremist legislation is an unprecedented display of lack of respect for American women and our safety. The effect of this bill would be to cut off millions of women from the private care they already have and limit the ability of a woman to get the care she needs, even if the result is a serious permanent health condition that could shorten her life.

So we now know the Republicans' real agenda: to roll back women's health and rights. They have shown their true colors by trying to weaken the rape and incest exceptions for abortions. It's hard to believe, but a majority of the Republican House Members cosponsored legislation to give insurance companies new authority to decide if a woman had been raped and to deny care to incest victims. Thanks to the American women who spoke out, this dangerous provision was dropped. But I think it raises an important question: If Republicans are willing to redefine what constitutes rape and incest, what are they going to try next?

Enough is enough. It is time for the Republican majority to respect women's important life decisions, and it is time that they start to stand and start to refocus on the priorities of this country right now—jobs and growing the economy. I urge my colleagues to oppose this extreme and intrusive legislation.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, before I yield to the next gentleman, in response to the gentlelady, the House has passed 12 different jobs bills already. I believe the gentlelady has voted against every one. They're sitting in the Senate waiting for action.

I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona, another leader in the pro-life movement, Mr. FRANKS.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I certainly thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, when ObamaCare was being unceremoniously rammed through this Congress against the will of the American people, Democrats tried to assure everyone that it was all about compassion.

But, Madam Speaker, nothing so completely destroys the notion that ObamaCare was ever about compassion more than the tragic determination on the part of the Democratic leadership to include the killing of little children by abortion in its provisions.

Now, Madam Speaker, as we face a debt that grows by \$4 billion under the strain of Mr. Obama's record-setting spending every day, maybe we should all ask ourselves a question, and that is, is setting aside millions of taxpayer dollars to pay for the killing of innocent unborn children really one of our financial priorities?

And if it is, we should ask another question, and that is, what in God's name has become of all of us?

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, may I ask about the time again?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 11 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 14¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AUSTRIA).

Mr. AUSTRIA. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his hard

work on this bill. As a member of the Congressional Pro-Life Caucus and original cosponsor of this bill, I strongly support the Protect Life Act.

We heard during the health care reform debate that tax dollars would not be used to fund abortions. However, this important language was stripped from the final bill and replaced with accounting gimmicks and an Executive order that can be reversed at any time by this President or future administrations.

This opens the door for federally funded abortions in the future and goes against the majority of Americans who believe that the government should not be in the business of paying for abortions. Congress must act now to protect the lives of our unborn children and to fully ensure that no tax dollars from ObamaCare are used to fund abortions.

The Protect Life Act also ensures that medical providers and workers are not discriminated against for refusing to perform abortions. These protections are crucial for health care providers around the Nation whose core values include a deeply held belief that we must protect all human life. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Protect Life Act.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON).

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, the Republican majority is at it again. With no real jobs plan, we've seen this majority attempt to thrust on the American people bills that strip them of their rights instead of putting them back to work. Make no mistake: Those proposing this know this extreme bill will not pass the Senate and it will not be signed into law by the President.

This bill, at its core, is an attack on women, especially poor women. Its extreme provisions will jeopardize a woman's access to lifesaving care. It is outrageous that this Republican majority continues to focus on protecting subsidies for Big Oil, tax cuts for billionaires, and targeting women and their access to health care.

Instead of working to help create jobs and empower women to improve their lives, the Republican majority is, instead, trying to pass this bill to allow hospitals to refuse to provide critical, lifesaving care. That means women in rural areas who may only have access to one hospital could be left to die.

This isn't the time to be putting America's women at risk. This is the time to be putting them and all Americans back to work. I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this extreme bill.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of H.R. 358, the Protect Life Act, of which I'm a cosponsor. It's been the practice of this House for

decades to ensure that federal funds are not used for abortion except in rare cases of rape, incest, or to save the life of the mother. This is typically done by attaching language to appropriation bills that go through this House. Unfortunately, we don't always have regular order.

Appropriation bills this year are likely to see a minibus or an omnibus or a vehicle that might not lend itself to attachment of this language. So I think it is prudent what the House is doing today to ensure that this language goes into legislation to make sure that federal funds are not used for abortion services and to carry on the will of this body. For that, I urge support of the bill.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPES), who is a member of the Health Subcommittee.

Mrs. CAPPES. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this misguided legislation.

While the House leadership claims that this week's agenda is all about jobs, the discussion of this bill on the House floor shows their true colors. Just like when they almost shut down the government over Planned Parenthood, today we, once again, witness how ideological campaign promises trump needed actions on jobs and the economy.

It's been said before, and I'll say it again, H.R. 358 does not create a single job—not one. Instead, it's an unprecedented assault on the rights of women and families everywhere to make important life decisions.

□ 1810

This bill does a lot. It limits the choices of women and families to purchase health insurance with their own dollars; it removes vital protections to ensure that a pregnant woman with a life-threatening condition can get lifesaving care; and it circumvents State laws that ensure that women have access to preventive services, like screenings and birth control.

But what this bill doesn't do is trust our Nation's women and families to make their own health care choices.

This is unacceptable.

Some have claimed that the Affordable Care Act has led to taxpayer-funded abortions. That is false. Others have claimed that this bill is nothing but the Stupak language that divided our Chamber last year. I was involved in every debate over the Stupak amendment in the House. Madam Speaker, I can tell you this is way beyond that misguided amendment.

So I urge my colleagues to abandon this divisive effort, to put the brakes on this extreme legislation, and to let us turn our focus to the issue of job creation to help the American people.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, just to correct the gentlelady, there were three Stupak-Pitts amendments. Two were adopted in committee and one on the floor, which got the most publicity.

When they went to the Senate, they were all taken out. We're going back to the original Stupak-Pitts amendments.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I appreciate the leadership of my friend from Pennsylvania, who has been stalwart on this issue.

Really, what we're seeing, folks, is a sleight of hand. They want to talk about jobs, and they want to talk about Big Oil because they don't want to talk about the preciousness of life and how this procedure takes the life of an innocent. It has been labeled an "extreme" bill when, actually, this is a reasonable step that codifies what this President says is his own position.

I have a brother-in-law who is a doctor down in Cincinnati. A little earlier today, I called him to talk to him about what he went through in his training and what he had to deal with as to this particular issue.

When I described to him what we were trying to do about allowing him and any other med student and any other person who is going through that to conscientiously object from putting forward a procedure that they don't agree with, he said, Of course, that makes sense.

When I started talking to him about some of the rhetoric and about some of the demagoguery that's surrounding this, he sarcastically said, Boy, that doesn't sound political, does it?

That's exactly what it is.

The American people who are watching this right now need to understand that this is about life and protecting that life and making sure that our health care providers have the ability to say "no" to a procedure that they don't want to do.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, let me be very clear. The only "no" that is being said is "no" to the vulnerable women who are traveling in emergency ambulances to the hospital, desiring emergency treatment, dying, and not being able to be treated, needing to correct a problem that has, in fact, damaged their health and not being able to be treated.

Not only is this bill unconstitutional, but the Affordable Care Act does not promote abortion. Frankly, Federal funds are not being utilized for abortion as it will complicate the insurance process for all women in America.

All you can hear is the siren going around and around and around—that woman lying on a gurney—and that hospital being able to say "no" and "yes." The only "no" is that she will not live because this bill is passed.

I ask my colleagues to vote against this bill. Vote for life. Vote against this bill.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 358, The Protect Life Act. This bill will have a detrimental impact on women's

health, and moreover, attacks a woman's constitutionally protected right to choose. It will restrict Access to health care services. It would effectively shut down the private insurance market for allowing women to get complete health care coverage. Once again instead of focusing on JOBS we are again focusing on issues that will not help to feed American families.

As a strong advocate for women's health, I cannot stand by and watch as those who do not support the rights of women to determine their health care options find different and often insidious ways to take away their ability to have full health care coverage.

We are asking women to give up their right to privacy. These decisions need to be between a woman and her doctor. She has the right to determine who, if anyone else she would like to inform of her health care choices. In addition to rendering it nearly impossible for women to get insurance coverage for abortion care in the new state health exchanges, H.R. 358 allows public hospitals to refuse to provide emergency abortion care, even in situations when the procedure is necessary to save a woman's life.

This has been a long and hard fight. Thirty-eight years ago, the American people learned of the Supreme Court's momentous ruling in *Roe versus Wade*—the case which established constitutional restrictions on the State's ability to regulate or restrict a woman's decision to have an abortion. In the year 1973, the Supreme Court asserted that the 14th amendment protects a woman's right to choose for herself whether to have an abortion.

Many women in 1973 must have viewed the Supreme Court's ruling in *Roe versus Wade* as an encouraging turning point in the way our courts recognize the rights of women under the Constitution. The *Roe versus Wade* decision at last offered a choice to many women who had been victims of rape or incest, but had been denied abortion as a legal option. *Roe versus Wade* offered a choice to many women whose lives would have been threatened by going through childbirth, but had been denied abortion as a legal option. And *Roe versus Wade* offered a choice to women who, for a variety of personal reasons, would prefer not to carry a pregnancy to term, but had earlier been denied abortion as a legal option.

Indeed, it is my hope that the Supreme Court will continue to protect women against any State erosion of a woman's individual rights. Let us not undermine the breakthrough made for women by the Supreme Court in 1973. Let us not jeopardize the right of a woman to choose whether she will bear children. Let us not place a woman's right to personal privacy at risk. Instead, let us reaffirm those rights and give consistent support not only to those who choose to have children, but also to those who do not.

Since *Roe v. Wade*, a woman's right to choose has been systematically eroded by anti-choice legislators. In fact, more than 450 anti-choice measures have been enacted in the states since 1995, essentially rolling back this fundamental right for many women. Women in 19 states could face sweeping bans on abortion if the Supreme Court reverses *Roe* and allows states to re-criminalize abortion, menacing doctors and their patients with the threat of criminal investigation, prosecution, and even imprisonment.

The argument has been over and over that tax payer dollars should not be used to fund

abortions. This argument is an extreme overreach. The Affordable Care Act already includes a provision that prohibits any U.S. taxpayer dollars from funding abortions. As this is the case the purpose of this bill seems to only be to rattle people's cages by attacking women and failing to address the job crisis in this country. We should focus on creating jobs. This bill seems to be a red herring. Instead of focusing on jobs, the economy, rebuilding America, we are instead focusing on an issue that everyone knows is divisive.

Women would no longer be able to have full health care coverage without disclosing very personal information. They must predict in advance whether or not they are going to use a service that is legal in this country. It is the law, and the law should be upheld. Women would be required to buy separate coverage specifically for abortions. There is no such policy for any health procedure that a man may be required to undergo. This is an issue of privacy, this is an issue of fairness, and this is an issue of gender equality. A woman like a man has the right to make private, personal choices about her health. She should not be punished by not having access to adequate health care. This is about a constitutional right!

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to another outstanding voice for the unborn, one of our freshmen from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

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

Mr. LANKFORD. We are a Nation that values all life.

When a bridge is under construction and a migratory bird's nest with eggs is discovered, the Fish and Wildlife Migratory Bird Treaty Act forces the delay of construction until the birds have hatched and flown away.

Why? Because life is important to us.

When a baby is born prematurely, we spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to save that child because each life is important to us. We have one glaring and obvious exception to this passion for life: abortion.

For some reason, we see the life of a duck and its egg as more valuable than an infant in the womb. For some reason, we think that a baby born 5 weeks early is worthy of hundreds of thousands of dollars of medical technology to save; but if that same mother wanted to hire a doctor to reach in the womb and kill that child with scissors 5 weeks before delivery, some would demand her choice must be protected.

What our Founding Fathers considered a self-evident truth is that we have been endowed by our Creator with certain rights, beginning with "life," which is now a topic open for discussion in our modern day ethic.

I still believe in the value of the instructions given to leaders thousands of years ago in Proverbs 31: "Speak up for those who cannot speak for themselves, for the rights of all who are destitute. Speak up and judge fairly."

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I believe there is still more time on the other side; so I would reserve at this time.

Mr. PITTS. At this time I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER).

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his tireless work for the unborn.

I think it's a little interesting. I came down here tonight to talk about life, and my colleagues across the aisle are talking about the jobs bill that their President introduced. Unfortunately, the last time I checked, zero Democrats had cosigned that bill.

Really, what I want to talk about tonight, Madam Speaker, are the rights of the unborn.

We were told when we did this health care bill, Don't worry about it. We'll do the Executive order because we're going to take the Stupak-Pitts amendment out.

The truth of the matter is, if we were going to do the Executive order, why didn't we go ahead and pass the Stupak-Pitts amendment? The reason is that we know, inside that bill, in several paragraphs and in several areas, is the ability for taxpayer money to be used for abortion.

In fact, according to Douglas Johnson, the Federal legislative director of the National Right to Life Committee, "ObamaCare contains multiple provisions that provide authorizations for subsidies for abortion, both implicit and explicit, and also multiple provisions which may be used as bases for abortion-expanding administrative actions."

Let's vote for life.

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We are running out of legislative days before the end of the year, and instead of focusing on jobs or the economy, the House leadership has decided once again to consider legislation that endangers and attacks the rights of women.

H.R. 358 is extreme legislation that puts the lives of women in danger. This legislation undermines the guarantee of emergency care under the Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act, EMTALA.

H.R. 358 strips EMTALA of its power to ensure that women receive abortion care in emergency situations at hospitals by making their right to health care secondary to a hospital's ability to refuse to provide abortion care.

Abortion care is necessary in some circumstances to save a woman's life. During the hearing on H.R. 358 in the Energy and Commerce Committee, some witnesses wrongly claimed that this was not the case. In response to those claims, Dr. Cassing Hammond, director of Northwestern University's Center for Family Planning and Contraception wrote a letter, based on his 20 years of experience in obstetric and complex abortion care, to the committee to set the record straight.

In his letter, Dr. Hammond states:

"Most patients are healthy women having healthy babies, but I am frequently asked to provide abortions for

women confronting severely troubled pregnancies or their own life-endangering health issues. Physicians who provide health care to women cannot choose to ignore the more tragic consequences of human pregnancy—and neither should Congress.”

This legislation is an extreme and mean-spirited way to roll back women’s health and rights. It is too extreme for women, too extreme for America, and we must reject it.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to one of the outstanding pro-life leaders in this House, a pro-life Democrat, my cosponsor of the Protect Life Act, the gentleman from Illinois, DAN LIPINSKI.

□ 1820

Mr. LIPINSKI. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this issue.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Protect Life Act, a bill which will apply the decades-old Hyde amendment policy prohibiting taxpayer funding of elective abortion to the Affordable Care Act.

While the discussion in our Nation continues concerning laws governing abortions, there has been a general consensus to prohibit the use of taxpayer money to pay for elective abortion or insurance coverage of abortion. This has long been embodied in the Hyde amendment that annually has been included in an appropriations bill which most of us on both sides of the aisle have voted for.

The Protect Life Act simply applies the Hyde amendment to the Affordable Care Act, just as the House did in 2009 with the Stupak-Pitts amendment during our initial consideration of the Affordable Care Act. At that time, 63 of my Democratic colleagues joined me in voting for that amendment. However, the final bill that became law did not include that language, and the President’s Executive order does not implement the Hyde amendment.

The order does not include Hyde prohibitions on taxpayer funding for insurance coverage of abortion, and it can be struck down by courts or overturned by any administration at any time. In addition, what happened last year with State high-risk health plans covering abortion demonstrates the vulnerability that the Executive order has and the need for clarity.

Madam Speaker, today we have the opportunity to provide that clarity and do what a large majority of Americans want and what Congress has done for more than three decades; that is, prohibit the use of taxpayer dollars for abortion. So today I urge my colleagues to support the Protect Life Act.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, let me just ask about the time again. I have two more speakers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 6 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

In the United States, if you destroy an eagle egg you are subject to 5 years in jail and a \$250,000 fine. If you destroy a human egg, it’s not only legal, but it’s taxpayer funded. That’s what we’re here to talk about.

You would hear our friends say that we’ve taken too much time today, that we can’t give 2 hours out of the endless lunches, out of the fundraisers, out of the rubbing elbows with the powerful to talk for the unborn and the innocents.

I would tell you that even in economic times we cannot suspend our voices against injustice. We cannot suspend our voices for the weak, the powerless. It is our sacred duty to be a voice in the Republic for those who have no standing. The unborn have no standing and no voice.

Let us allow our voices to be heard for these 2 hours.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

What I’m hearing from the people in my area, I think most Members are hearing this, is the American people want the divisiveness to stop and the jobs to start.

This bill tonight does the opposite. It’s the most divisive issue we could really put before this House and this country.

There was a carefully balanced compromise that’s been the law of the land—and is the law of the land—for a very long time that says that taxpayer money should not pay for abortion, but that a woman who chooses to have an abortion with her own money has that right.

This bill upsets that balance but, more importantly than that, I think this bill ignores the opportunity for us to come together and stop the divisiveness and start working on the problem the country wants us to work on, which is the creation of jobs.

Tomorrow will be yet another Friday without a paycheck for millions of Americans. It might be the day that a small businessman or businesswoman closes their shop for the last time. It might be the day that the mortgage foreclosure is executed and someone loses their home.

This country is in crisis. There is an emergency around this country that needs to be dealt with right now.

People feel very, very deeply about the issue of abortion on both sides. I respect both sides. The law respects both sides with the compromise that we have.

What we ought to collectively respect is the urgent demands of the American public to come together and get to work to put the country back to work. That should be the agenda of the Congress, not this bill. Let us work our will, and whatever it is tonight, I’ll be voting “no.” But can’t we work our will on a plan to work together and put the country back to work?

Mr. PITTS. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY).

Mr. LANDRY. Madam Speaker, this is not a divisive issue; this is a bipartisan issue. The language in H.R. 358 was in the Stupak-Pitts amendment passed in the Democrat-led House last Congress.

If they supported it then, why would they not support it now? Because of Executive order? Absolutely not.

ObamaCare created a fund specifically reserved for abortion coverage. So what in the world makes one think this money will not support abortion coverage? We all remember, “We have to pass this bill before we find out what’s in it.”

Unfortunately, they passed the bill, and we found no language to ensure taxpayers won’t have to pay for something the majority of Americans don’t support.

Madam Speaker, if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle insisted the health care law prohibits taxpayer funding for abortion, then they should support the bipartisan H.R. 358 to ensure that it is, indeed, the case.

Mr. PALLONE. I have one speaker left; so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

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

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Madam Speaker, I rise today, as the father of four adopted children, to offer my strong support for the Protect Life Act.

Opponents of this bill allege it is unconstitutional, and that is simply not true. While the Supreme Court has wrongfully decided abortion is a constitutional right, they have also clearly upheld the constitutionality of the Hyde amendment and the language in this bill.

Madam Speaker, this is not revolutionary, earth-shaking legislation we are considering. I would like to see Congress go much further in protecting life.

We should not be funding the abortions in the District. We should be protecting conscience rights for health care providers. We should stop giving money to organizations like Planned Parenthood. We should be ending the practice of abortion in America.

This bill is an important step, but more certainly needs to be done. I urge my colleagues to protect life and support this bill in honor of all adopted children, their birth families, and their adoptive families.

Mr. PALLONE. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairman of the Pro-Life Caucus, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, abortion not only dismembers and chemically poisons unborn children to death, and my friend from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) used to know that. He used to be very pro-life, as some other Members who have reversed themselves.

But it also hurts women's health and puts future children subsequently born to women who aborted at significant risk. At least 102 studies show significant psychological harm, major depression, and elevated suicide risk in women who abort.

Published just last month in the British Journal of Psychiatry, a meta-analysis comprised of 22 studies and over 887,000 participants, the largest quantitative estimate of mental health risk associated with abortion in world literature ever, revealed that women who have undergone an abortion experience an 81 percent increased risk of mental health problems. You never hear that from the abortion side.

The Times of London has also found the clear link that women had twice the level of psychological problems and three times the level of depression, and subsequent risk to children born to women who have had a previous abortion.

This is all about no taxpayer funding for abortion.

Nothing less than a comprehensive prohibition on public funding, promotion and facilitation of elective abortion in any federal health program, satisfies the demands of social justice.

The Protect Life Act, authored by Chairman JOE PITTS and DAN LIPINSKI, ensures that all the elements of the Hyde amendment applies to all the programs that are both authorized and appropriated in Obamacare.

By now, I trust that all members fully understand that because programs in Obamacare are both authorized and appropriated in the law, the actual Hyde Amendment has no legal affect whatsoever. Hyde only affects Labor HHS programs not this massive expansion of government funded health care.

Thus Obamacare when phased in fully in 2014 will open up the floodgates of public funding for abortion in a myriad of programs resulting in more dead babies and wounded moms than would otherwise have been the case.

Because abortion methods dismember, decapitate, crush, poison, starve to death and induce premature labor, pro-life Members of Congress, and according to every reputable poll, significant majorities of Americans want no complicity whatsoever in this evil. Obamacare forces us to be complicit.

Despite breathtaking advances in recent years in respecting and treating the unborn child as a patient—in need of diagnosis and treatment for any number of diseases or con-

ditions, just like any other patient—far too many people dismiss the baby in the womb as *persona non grata*.

I respectfully but firmly asked how violence against children by abortion—dismemberment, chemical poisoning, lethal pills euphemistically marketed as medical abortion—can be construed as benign or compassionate or caring.

The dangerous myth of “safe abortion” must be exposed.

So-called “safe abortion” is the ultimate oxymoron, an Orwellian manipulation of language, designed to convey bogus respectability to a lethal act. Abortion is never safe for the child and is antithetical to UN Development Goal 4—which rallies the world to reduce child mortality. Abortion is, by any reasonable definition, child mortality. Its sole purpose is to kill a baby.

Arrogant and presumptuous talk that brands any child as an “unwanted child” reduces that child to a mere object, bereft of inherent dignity or value.

Abortion, not only dismembers and chemically poisons unborn children to death, but hurts women's health and puts future children subsequently born to women who, aborted at significant risk. At least 102 studies show significant psychological harm, major depression and elevated suicide risk in women who abort.

Published last month in the British Journal of Psychiatry, a meta analysis, comprised of 22 studies and 887,181 participants, the largest quantitative estimate of mental health risks associated with abortion in world literature revealed “women who had undergone an abortion experienced an 81% increased risk of mental health problems.”

Recently, the Times of London reported “that women who have had abortions have twice the level of psychological problems and three times the level of depression as women who have given birth or who have never been pregnant . . .”

Similarly, the risk of subsequent children being born with low birth weight increases by 35 percent after one and 72 percent after two or more abortions. Another study shows the risk increases 9 times after a woman has had three abortions.

What does this mean for her children? Preterm birth is the leading cause of infant mortality in the industrialized world after congenital anomalies. Preterm infants have a greater risk of suffering from chronic lung disease, sensory deficits, cerebral palsy, cognitive impairments and behavior problems. Low birth weight is similarly associated with neonatal mortality and morbidity.

Obamacare authorizes health care plans and policies funded with tax credits to pay for abortion, so long as the issuer of the federally subsidized plan collects a new congressionally mandated fee from every enrollee in that plan to pay for other peoples abortions. Requiring the segregation of funds into allocation accounts—a mere bookkeeping exercise touted by some as an improvement to the new pro-abortion funding scheme—does absolutely nothing to protect any victims—baby or mother—from publically funded abortion.

Also billions for new Community Health Centers are outside the scope of the Hyde amendment as well.

Obamacare also contains a little known provision that creates a devastating loophole for conscience rights. Section 1303(d) allows any state or federal law involving emergency serv-

ices to override any conscience protections added to PPACA. Contrary to the claims of H.R. 358 opponents, Section 1303(d) is NOT uniquely about the 1986 Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act (EMTALA). The section references EMTALA but the operative language is much broader, giving authority to override conscience laws to any federal or state law that employs the term emergency services.

The “Nondiscrimination on Abortion” (new subsection 1303 (g)) portion of H.R. 358, the Protect Life Act applies to Obamacare the language of the Hyde/Weldon amendment, which has been in the annual Labor/HHS appropriations bills every year since 2004 without any effort to change or remove it. This subsection is needed because Obamacare creates many new funding streams that bypass the Labor/HHS appropriations act, and therefore bypass the protections of the Hyde/Weldon amendment in that act.

Also, Obamacare creates a huge new program administered by OPM that would manage two or more new multi-state or national health plans. The new law stipulates that at least one plan not pay for abortion. Which only begs to question: what about the other new multi-state plans administered by OPM? Why can those federally administered plans include funding abortion on demand? This represents a radical departure from current policy.

Additionally, other appropriated funds under Obamacare that have no Hyde-type protections include billions for a temporary high risk health insurance pools and billions in grants and loans for health care co-ops.

In testimony before the Energy and Commerce Committee on February, 9, 2011, Douglas Johnson, Federal Legislative Director for the National Right to Life Committee said:

The first major component of the PPACA to be implemented, the Pre-Existing Condition Insurance Plan (PCIP) program, a 100% federally funded program, provided a graphic demonstration of the problem: The Department of Health and Human Services approved plans from multiple states that would have covered elective abortions. NRLC documented this and blew the whistle in July, 2010, which produced a public outcry, after which DHHS announced a discretionary decision that the PCIP plans would not cover elective abortions. Commentators on all sides of the issue were in agreement about one thing: Coverage of elective abortions within this new, 100% federally funded program was not impeded by any provision of the PPACA, and was not even addressed in Executive Order 13535.

On the same day that DHHS issued its decision to exclude abortion from this program—July 29, 2010—the head of the White House Office of Health Reform, Nancy-Ann DeParle, issued a statement on the White House blog explaining that the discretionary decision to exclude abortion from the PCIP “is not a precedent for other programs or policies [under the PPACA] given the unique, temporary nature of the program . . .” Laura Murphy, director of the Washington Legislative Office of the American Civil Liberties Union, said, “The White House has decided to voluntarily impose the ban for all women in the newly-created high risk insurance pools. . . . What is disappointing is that there is nothing in the law that requires the Obama Administration to impose this broad and highly restrictive abortion ban.” (“ACLU steps into healthcare reform fray over abortion.” The Hill, July 17, 2010.)”

Then there's the Mikulski Amendment, Sec. 2713, which empowers the HHS Secretary

with broad new authority to force private health care plans in America to cover “preventable” services. When Senator BEN NELSON suggested that abortion not be included in the so-called preventative services mandate, Ms. MIKULSKI said no—raising a serious red flag that abortion is being postured as “preventable abortion service in the future”—after all, abortion prevents a live birth, by exterminating the child.

Killing unborn children and calling it preventative health care isn't new.

And as far back as 1976, Dr. Willard Cates, Jr. and Dr. David Grimes then with CDC presented a paper to a Planned Parenthood meeting, entitled: Abortion as a Treatment for Unintended Pregnancy: The Number Two Sexually Transmitted “Disease”. To designate pregnancy a sexually transmitted disease; and call abortion a treatment or a means of prevention for this “disease” is barbaric.

Abortion isn't health care—preventative or otherwise.

Madam Speaker, we live in an age of ultrasound imaging—the ultimate window to the womb and it's occupant. We are in the midst of a fetal health care revolution, an explosion of benign innovative interventions designed to diagnose, treat and cure disease or illness any unborn child may be suffering.

Unborn children are society's youngest and most vulnerable patients. Obamacare should do them no harm. Tragically, it does the worst harm of all. It kills them.

□ 1830

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, is the gentleman prepared to close?

Mr. PITTS. We have two additional speakers.

Mr. PALLONE. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. At this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation, the Protect Life Act. I do want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) for this bipartisan legislation.

As we have heard during this debate, the health care legislation that was signed into law back in 2010 simply did not protect the unborn. It in no way included clear or direct provisions that would prohibit Federal funding of abortion, and the President's Executive order on this issue is totally inadequate. Executive orders can simply be rescinded at any time and cannot be relied upon to clarify such an issue at any time.

There are some people who have said the legislation that's before us today will stop women from buying health insurance coverage that includes abortion, even if they want to from their own money. According to the bill that's before us, the bill sets out and articulates that an individual may purchase plans that cover abortion with their own money. On top of that, the bill also allows a supplemental abortion policy for those who use a government subsidy to buy insurance.

So I wanted to point that out to my colleagues here this evening, and I

would ask for support for this legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), who is really the most knowledgeable on this issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Colorado is recognized for 4 minutes.

Ms. DEGETTE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, there are some days in this Congress I feel like I'm in Alice in Wonderland where logic is turned on its head and all of us have fallen down the rabbit hole. Today is certainly one of those days.

Here we stand on the 282nd day of this Congress, and the House majority has not yet passed a jobs plan. Instead, we have spent all day long once again attacking women's health with a bill that will never become law. A similar bill already passed the House and died in the Senate, and the President has issued a veto threat on this bill even if it did somehow become law.

With only 20 legislative days left this year, the leadership of this body has somehow decided that we should spend the day advancing legislation which would severely compromise women's health.

Madam Speaker, despite the claims from my colleagues across the aisle, this bill does not simply say that there won't be any public funds for abortion. It goes far, far beyond. In fact, the Hyde amendment, which is the law of the land, says that there will be no Federal funds for abortions except in cases of rape, incest, or the life of the woman, period.

Let me say that again. There is no Federal funding of abortion anywhere in Federal law.

Let me say that again. The Federal law, not the Federal employees health care plan, not Medicaid, not the military, not the Affordable Health Care Act, nowhere in the law is there Federal funding for abortion, period. In the Affordable Health Care Act, in section 1303, it specifically says there will be no Federal funding for abortion.

Now, this bill, contrary to the claims of its proponents, goes far beyond current law, and here's how. It says women who purchase health care insurance in the exchanges cannot use their own money to buy private insurance plans that have a full range of reproductive coverage. Under current law, women can use their own money to buy insurance that covers that full range of reproductive health care. And, Madam Speaker, that is not changed by the Affordable Health Care Act. But under this law, what would happen would be women purchasing private insurance plans in the exchanges with their own private money would not be able to purchase a plan that had a full range of reproductive care. That would take away the rights of women to exercise their own constitutional rights to have a full range of health care.

In addition, Madam Speaker, this bill also includes such broad refusal language it could override core patient protections contained in the Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act, allowing hospitals to refuse lifesaving treatment to women on religious or moral grounds, thus causing their death inside the hospital despite their treatable condition.

Now listen, when I listen to this debate, it's really clear to me that the proponents of this bill, their main concern is not Federal funding of abortion. Their main concern is they want abortion to be illegal, and so here's my view. Having debated this now for 15 years in this body, here's my view. If the majority wants to pass a bill banning abortion, pass a bill banning abortion and we'll fight it out in the courts. Don't make claims that there is somehow Federal funding for abortion when in fact there is none to confuse the issues and to try to confuse the American public because I'm going to tell you something. The public will not be confused. They know what this bill does. They know they want jobs, and they know that's our agenda.

Vote “no” on this ill-conceived piece of legislation.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas, Dr. BURGESS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for the recognition.

Let's be clear about the Affordable Care Act. The EMTALA provision of the underlying law, the Affordable Care Act, is not actually the EMTALA provision because it puts in a great big loophole. The loophole is in the language of the law, and it said providing emergency services as required by State or Federal law, which may be changed; and therein is the problem.

Most of us remember the night before the Affordable Care Act passed. We remember the drama of Bart Stupak going down to the White House. We remember the drama of the Executive order. So what Mr. PITTS is providing us today is the ability to put the language of the Executive order into legislative language and make it law so that it may not be arbitrarily changed by this President or some other President at a future time.

Now, I want to take just a few moments and read into the RECORD from doctors who have written to our committee, doctors who provide emergency services, obstetric services, who tell us over and over again that they have never been required to do something that was against their conscience and put someone's life in danger.

A doctor from the University of Minnesota writes in: During my years of practice, I have worked under informal and formal conscience rights protections that permit me to provide the best pregnancy care without being forced to perform abortions. In my

years of practice, I have never seen a woman denied appropriate care because of the exercise of the rights of conscience in this regard.

Another letter, from a Virginia hospital: As a physician who has worked in emergency rooms for over 30 years, I am well-versed in the Federal Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act and similar policies. I continue to practice emergency medicine. I teach it. Based on three decades of experience, I see absolutely no merit in the claim that conscience laws on abortion pose any risk of allowing pregnant women to die in emergency rooms.

Another letter, from the University of North Carolina: My personal conscience directs me to provide the best of care to pregnant women and their unborn children, and I am able to do so without performing abortions, as are several of my colleagues, and a proportion of the residents we train each year. I have not seen a situation where an emergent event or urgent abortion was needed. No one in my entire 20 years of clinical practice has ever been denied appropriate care because of the exercise of my rights of conscience.

Our committee receives these letters all of the time. I submit them for the RECORD, and I urge an "aye" vote on the Pitts bill.

ROBERT C. BYRD HEALTH SCIENCES
CENTER OF WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY,
Charleston, WV, October 12, 2011.

Representatives JOE PITTS and DAN LIPINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES PITTS AND LIPINSKI: I am writing in support of Sections 2(a)(6) and 2(a)(7) of H.R. 358 that provide federal legal protection of conscience regarding abortion for those who care for pregnant women. My experience includes 20 plus years of clinical care, research, and instruction as a Board certified Obstetrician & Gynecologist and Maternal-Fetal medicine. I daily provide care for women and babies who have medically complicated, life-threatening, and uncommon pregnancy complications. Further, as the originator of "perinatal hospice", I have cared for (and still do) dozens of women with babies who have terminal prenatal diagnoses who will die shortly after birth.

No one in my entire 20 plus years of clinical experience has ever been denied appropriate care because of the exercise of rights of conscience in the provision of abortion. Women and babies may die in spite of our best efforts, but this is not related to abortion availability or provision.

In my understanding of this new federal statute, conscience will now be formally and legally protected. There is no need for additional exceptions or amendments to this law as it is written.

I am more than happy to discuss this issue with either of you or with one of your colleagues. I may be contacted by email at byron.calhoun@camc.org or directly on my cell phone at (304) 741-4031.

Sincerely,

BYRON C. CALHOUN, M.D.,
FACOG,
*Professor and Vice
Chairman of Maternal-Fetal Medicine,
Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology,*

*West Virginia University
School of Medicine,
Charleston Division,
Charleston, WV.*

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
Chapel Hill, NC, October 12, 2011.
Representatives JOE PITTS and DAN LIPINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES PITTS AND LIPINSKI: I am board certified specialist in Obstetrics and Gynecology with a sub-specialty certification in Maternal-Fetal Medicine. I have over twenty-seven years of experience in practice, teaching and research at a major academic health center. During my career I have cared for numerous women and babies with complications that increase the risk of maternal death. In some of these situations, both a mother and her baby have lost their lives. I care deeply about the effects that public policy and legislation can have on both those of us who provide perinatal care and on our patients.

My personal conscience directs me to provide the best of care to pregnant women and their unborn children and I am able to do so without performing abortions, as are several of my colleagues and a proportion of the residents we train each year. I have not seen a situation where an emergent or even urgent abortion was needed to prevent a maternal death. I am aware of, and have read, sections 2(a)(6) and 2(a)(7) of H.R. 358 and I am writing to provide my opinion that I support the formalization of these protections. No woman at UNC hospitals has ever been denied care due to her conscience or beliefs; nor does any physician ever feel obliged to direct or change the standard of care for any woman due to race, ethnicity, religion, or conscience. I see no need for any exceptions or amendments to the law as written.

I am available for question or comment or for further discussion on this matter. You may reach me at thorj@med.unc.edu or by calling my office (919) 843-7851.

Sincerely,

JOHN THORP, MD
*Hugh McAllister Distinguished Professor
of Obstetrics and
Gynecology, Professor,
Maternal & Child Health, School
of Public Health, Director,
Women's Primary Healthcare.*

VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH
UNIVERSITY HEALTH SYSTEM,
Richmond, VA, October 12, 2011.

Hon. JOE PITTS,
Hon. DAN LIPINSKI,
Hon. ERIC CANTOR.

DEAR REPS. PITTS, LIPINSKI AND CANTOR: I understand that the House of Representatives may soon consider HR 358, the Protect Life Act. As a physician I am especially interested in this bill's section reaffirming federal protection for health care providers' conscience rights on abortion. I have heard there may be an effort in the House to insert an exception into this law, so governmental bodies can discriminate against providers who decline to provide abortions in "emergency" cases.

As a physician who has worked in emergency rooms for over 30 years, I am well versed in the federal Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act (EMTALA) and similar policies. I continue to practice emergency medicine, and to teach it at Virginia Commonwealth University. Based on these decades of experience, I see absolutely

no merit in the claim that conscience laws on abortion pose any risk of allowing pregnant women to die in emergency rooms. Current federal laws as well as Virginia state law respect conscientious objection to abortion in all circumstances; and I have never seen or heard of a case in which these laws created any conflict with women's safety or with legal obligations to stabilize patients' conditions in emergencies.

Your provision on conscience protection is warranted and I do not think it should be weakened in any way.

Sincerely,

EDWARD J. READ, JR., MD,
FACEP,
*Attending Physician,
Emergency Medicine,
Hunter Holmes McGuire VA Medical
Center Assistant
Professor, Department
of Emergency Medicine,
Virginia Commonwealth University,
Richmond,
Virginia.*

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
Minneapolis, MN, October 13, 2011.
Representatives JOE PITTS and DAN LIPINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES PITTS AND LIPINSKI: I am a board certified specialist in Obstetrics/Gynecology and Maternal/Fetal Medicine with 31 years of experience in practice, teaching and research. During that time I have cared for hundreds of women and babies with life-threatening, complicated, and rare pregnancy conditions. In some of those situations mothers and babies have lost their lives despite undergoing the best available treatment including induced delivery at the margins of viability. I care deeply about the effects that public policy and legislation can have on the care of mothers and babies.

During my years of practice I have worked under informal and formal conscience rights protections that permit me to provide the best pregnancy care without being forced to perform abortions. I have read Sections 2(a)(6) and 2(a)(7) or H.R. 358 and I agree with the federal formalization of these protections. In my years of practice I have never seen a woman denied appropriate care because of the exercise of rights of conscience in this regard. There is no need for additional exceptions or amendments to this law as it is written.

I am happy to discuss this with either of you or with one of your colleagues. I can be reached by email at calvis@umn.edu or on my cell phone at 612-868-9199.

Sincerely,

STEVE CALVIN, MD,
*Clinical Associate Professor
of Obstetrics/
Gynecology and
Women's Health, Co-
chair Program in
Human Rights and
Health, University of
Minnesota, Minneapolis,
MN.*

Ms. HIRONO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 358, a bill restricting women's access to reproductive health services.

It's odd to me that we are choosing to take up this bill now, when just last week, we saw that our country only created 103,000 jobs.

This is not what people in Hawaii or our nation want us working on.

Debating divisive social issues isn't going to create one single job.

Instead, this bill puts a fundamental freedom—our right to choose—under direct attack.

Those supporting this bill say it's necessary to prevent federal funding for abortion. They're wrong.

Longstanding federal policy prohibits federal funding of abortion, a provision preserved in The Affordable Care Act. President Obama even issued an executive order reaffirming this prohibition in March 2010.

So what's the real reason behind this bill?

The real reason is to make abortion as unavailable as possible because making abortion illegal is still not possible under *Roe v. Wade*. This is yet another bill taking a shot at restricting women's access to reproductive health services.

It starts with restricting how women purchase private health insurance with their own money.

The practical result of this bill would be to restrict, for the first time, how women with private insurance can spend their own private dollars in purchasing health insurance.

It says that women who receive a federal subsidy to make coverage affordable in the health insurance exchanges would be unable to purchase a comprehensive health plan.

These women could not even use their own money to pay for the portion of the plan providing abortion coverage. These aren't federal dollars going to purchase that coverage—these are the women's own dollars.

So what happens? It's the ripple effect.

Since many women would be prevented from purchasing insurance with abortion coverage in the exchange, the insurers will probably stop offering it.

Then, no woman will be able to buy health insurance in the exchange with abortion coverage.

And their access to a legal medical procedure just got a lot smaller.

Let's be clear: The goal of this bill is not to maintain the status quo.

Rather, its true goal is to make abortion as unavailable as possible.

For these reasons, it should be rejected.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 358 and the on-going Republican war against women's health in America. This bill continues Congressional Republicans' extreme social agenda that jeopardizes women's health care.

This Congress has already debated similar legislation to prevent women from accessing their legal health care. H.R. 358 does nothing to create jobs, reduce our federal deficits, or make America safer. Instead, this legislation furthers a divisive agenda to impose unprecedented restrictions on a woman's ability to access and purchase health care for a legal medical procedure.

Contrary to what my colleagues have said today, H.R. 358 is not needed to ensure federal funding does not pay for abortions. Current federal law, including provisions included in the Affordable Care Act, already prohibits federal money from being used to pay for abortion services, except in the cases of rape, incest, or to save the life of the mother. Instead this bill is another attempt by the Republican majority to legislatively intimidate women with respect to their constitutional right to abortion services.

The unprecedented restrictions included in this bill would effectively end coverage of abortion-related services. Beginning in 2014,

women and their families receiving federal subsidies would be prohibited from purchasing a health plan that includes abortion coverage within the Health Exchanges. This provision would leave millions of women without affordable health care options that meet all their health care needs.

Even more concerning is that this bill could jeopardize a woman's ability to receive emergency medical care as required under Emergency Medicare Treatment and Active Labor Act (EMTALA; P.L. 99–272). This bill could allow a hospital to deny a woman abortion-care even when this legal medical procedure would save her life. H.R. 358 does not protect life; rather it endangers the lives of American women.

Instead of this radical agenda, we should be focusing on policies that will improve the lives of women and girls, put Americans back to work, and advance our nation's economy. I encourage my colleagues to vote against this bill and keep safe, comprehensive reproductive care accessible to all Americans.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to the bill before us today.

This bill would impose crippling restrictions on a woman's ability to seek abortion services—services that are legal in this country and upheld by the Supreme Court.

The so-called "Protect Life Act" would effectively ban private insurance companies from offering abortion services.

I was shocked to learn that under this bill, a woman's life could be in danger in the event she needs emergency care—even if the emergency circumstances require an abortion—and that procedure is recommended by a doctor. This change in the current law would amount to an extreme and regressive policy.

Unfortunately, the bill before us is part of a larger attack on women's health, specifically on programs like Title X and organizations like Planned Parenthood.

Madam Speaker, let me tell you why it is so important that we maintain women's access to the full range of legal health care options.

Recently, I heard from Cathy, who has been a health educator for the past 13 years.

Cathy explained to me how the House Republican attacks on women's health would, "Cut millions of American women off from birth control, cancer screenings, HIV tests, and other lifesaving care;" that without the information and preventative services that these programs provide we are, "Bound to accrue more expenses in reactive versus pro-active measures."

These outrageous attacks would have a devastating impact on the women, men, and teens in our community.

At a time when we, as Members of Congress, should be debating and passing job legislation, we are instead debating whether or not to roll-back a woman's access to legal health services.

I urge my colleagues to reject this harmful bill.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 358, a resolution which seeks to enhance current law to modify special rules relating to abortion services and provides protections for those who object to abortion. As a staunch supporter of pro-life principles, I strongly urge this House to pass H.R. 358 the Protect Life Act.

It is important for Congress to remember that our work in pursuing healthcare reform is

to move our society toward accessible medical coverage across the nation, especially for the poor and marginalized. H.R. 358 builds off these tenets and enhances the compromise language that was developed by former Congressman Bart Stupak of Michigan, and other pro-life members of Congress, to restrict federal funds from being used for abortion coverage under the health reform Act passed in the last Congress. Although the Stupak language upheld the key tenets of the Hyde Amendment, H.R. 358 provides further clarification on that matter. The Protect Life Act provides clearer conscience protection for institutions and individual health care providers.

I commend the gentlemen from Pennsylvania, Mr. JOE PITTS, for his work on this bill and for his persistence in seeing this through our legislative process. I urge members of the House of Representatives to vote yes on H.R. 358 and to continue to work toward a society that upholds the total respect of the human person and the commitment to the right to life.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 358, the misleadingly titled the "Protect Life Act".

Let me be clear. The Affordable Care Act already prohibits the use of federal funds to pay for abortions, except in cases of rape, incest, or where the woman's life is endangered. We included extensive mechanisms to ensure that no federal subsidies in the health insurance exchanges would go to pay for abortions.

The bill on the Floor today takes the unprecedented step of preventing a woman from using her own private funds to purchase a full, comprehensive health care plan through the exchanges established in the Affordable Care Act. That is simply another way of denying a woman the right to choose.

I urge House Republicans to stop playing ideological games and to pursue an agenda to help create jobs, strengthen the economy, and move our country forward.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 358, the Protect Life Act.

The American people want us to work together to create jobs to bolster the economy. Instead, we are here, once again, to consider legislation that endangers and attacks the right of women and is far out of the mainstream of American priorities.

H.R. 358 is extreme legislation. It is another attempt to unravel the health care law while at the same time expanding anti-choice laws that will harm women's health.

This legislation revives a debate that has already been settled—there is no federal funding for abortion in the health care reform law. Legal experts have said it. Independent fact check organizations have said it. Yet, Republicans continue to insist that the possibility of funding remains.

Federal funds are already prohibited from being used for abortions under the Hyde Amendment—at the expense of poor women, federal employees, women in the District of Columbia and women in the military. But this bill goes way beyond that law.

It would take away a woman's right to make her own decisions about her reproductive health—even with her own money.

It could expand the existing conscience objection to avoid providing contraception.

And, it would allow public hospitals to deny emergency abortion care to women in life-threatening situations.

H.R. 358 undermines the guarantee of emergency care under the Emergency Medical

Treatment and Active Labor Act (EMTALA). EMTALA creates a legal safety net that guarantees that anyone in need of emergency health care, including those unable to pay for health care, cannot be denied such care at hospitals.

H.R. 358 would strip EMTALA of its power to ensure that women receive abortion care in emergency situations at hospitals by making their right to health care secondary to the hospital's ability to refuse to provide abortion care.

Abortion care is necessary in some circumstances to save a woman's life. During the hearing on H.R. 358 in the Energy and Commerce Committee, some witnesses wrongly claimed that this was not the case.

In response to those claims, Dr. Cassing Hammond, Director of Northwestern University's Center for Family Planning and Contraception as well as its academic Section of Family Planning, wrote a letter to the Committee to set the record straight. Dr. Hammond has twenty years of experience in obstetric and complex abortion care.

In his letter, Dr. Hammond states:

Most patients are healthy women having healthy babies, but I am frequently asked to provide abortions for women confronting severely troubled pregnancies or their own life endangering health issues. Physicians who provide health care to women cannot choose to ignore the more tragic consequences of human pregnancy—and neither should Congress.

Dr. Hammond then proceeds to give several examples from his own experience of women who required abortion care in life-saving circumstances. The following examples illustrate just a few of those instances:

One of my own obstetric patients carrying a desired pregnancy recently experienced rupture of the amniotic sac at 20 weeks gestation. The patient had a complete placenta previa, a condition where the afterbirth covers the opening of the uterus. Although the patient hoped the pregnancy might continue, she began contracting and suddenly hemorrhaged, losing nearly a liter of blood into her bed in a single gush. Had we not quickly intervened to terminate the pregnancy, she would have bled to death, just as women do in countries with limited access to obstetric services.

My service often receives consults regarding patients with serious medical issues complicating pregnancy. We recently had a 44-year-old patient whose pregnancy had been complicated by a variety of non-specific symptoms. A CT scan obtained at 23 weeks gestation revealed that the patient had lung cancer that had metastasized to her brain, liver, and other organs. Her family confronted the difficult choice of terminating a desired pregnancy or continuing the pregnancy knowing that the physiological burden of pregnancy and cancer might worsen her already poor prognosis. The family chose to proceed with the pregnancy termination.

My service frequently sees patients with early pre-eclampsia, often referred to by the term "toxemia." Pre-eclampsia usually complicates later gestation, but occasionally complicates pregnancy as early as 18 to 20 weeks, well before the fetus is viable. The only treatment for severe pre-eclampsia is delivery. Otherwise, the condition will worsen, exposing the mother to kidney failure, liver failure, stroke and death. One Christmas morning I had to leave my own family so that I could provide a pregnancy termination for a remarkably sick, pre-eclamptic teenager.

These are women suffering from the most serious of health conditions. If H.R. 358 were in place, they could be denied the emergency care they need.

The attention Republicans are focusing on the private lives of women—what American family do with their own money—makes it clear that their real goal is to ban all abortions and end access to birth control and contraceptives.

Republicans don't want government to protect the water we drink, the air we breathe, or the food we eat—but they do want to intrude in a women's right to choose.

We are now at 280 days in this Congress without passing a jobs plan—yet the Republican majority has consistently managed to pass extreme and divisive legislation targeted at women's health.

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 358, and this bill has no chance of becoming law.

We are running out of legislative days left before the end of the year. When is the Republican majority going to focus on jobs and the economy?

Now is the time to work on the issues that are most important to Americans—creating jobs and improving the economy—rather than restricting reproductive choice and access to family planning.

This legislation is an extreme and mean-spirited way to roll back women's health and rights. It is too extreme for women, too extreme for America, and we must reject it.

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Speaker, never in my life will I forget the Sunday afternoon when this House, under the previous majority, passed a health care law that permitted taxpayer funding of abortions.

It remains as inconceivable to me now, as it was then, that the very first act by our government on an innocent and defenseless life could be to end it. We all remember the assurances we heard that the bill would respect the Hyde Amendment, which has enjoyed bipartisan support in this House for decades. Many of us knew better.

The ink had barely dried on the legislation before instances came up of taxpayer money potentially being used, in one form or another, for abortion services. This House needs to state without equivocation that the Hyde Amendment fully applies to the new health care law, for however long the act may continue to be in effect. There should be no possible wiggle room for abortion providers like Planned Parenthood.

The law also put health care providers and hospitals in the unconscionable dilemma of having to perform abortions against their own beliefs and principles. The government should not have the power to do that. This bill protects the exercise of individual conscience.

In my view, the health care law—Obamacare, as many of us call it—is so flawed that the best approach is to repeal it altogether, but we will not get that with this President. Until that day, we must stand in support of life and innocent babies and we can do that by passing The Protect Life Act.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. The American people want us to work together to address their top priority: creating jobs. We're now 280 days into this Congress, and we haven't passed a jobs plan.

With only 22 legislative days left this Congress, instead of addressing jobs, Republicans are continuing to propose legislation targeting women's health.

This bill disregards the compromise on abortion reached during last year's debate on the Affordable Care Act (ACA). The ACA is consistent with long-standing federal law by prohibiting the use of federal funds to pay for

abortions (except in cases of rape or incest, or when the life of the woman would be endangered). The Act requires two separate premium payments for women and families receiving federal subsidies that choose health plans that include abortion coverage. The language is clear—no portion of federal subsidies may be used to pay for the portion of coverage that is purchased in state exchanges that relates to abortions. While I don't agree with the ban on federal funding, Members decided last year to call a truce and preserve the status quo. This bill would go further.

This bill restricts how women with private insurance can spend their own private dollars in purchasing health insurance. The Protect Life Act would prohibit all individuals who receive federal subsidies from purchasing a plan that includes abortion coverage (even if they are using their own private dollars to purchase the portion of coverage relating to abortions), and would also prohibit insurance plans from offering abortion services if they accept even one individual who receives a subsidy. Health care plans will likely be deterred from covering abortion, and since most insurance plans currently cover abortion, the Protect Life Act would result in millions of women losing the coverage they currently have.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Republican assault on women's health and to oppose the Protect Life Act.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 358, the Protect Life Act. This legislation intrudes on women's reproductive freedom and access to health care and unnecessarily restricts the private insurance choices that women and their families have today. Proponents say that it would simply ban federal funding of abortion. However, as we all know, current law prohibits federal funding of abortion.

The American people want us to work together to address their top priority: creating jobs. We are now at 280 days in this Congress without passing a jobs plan. Yet the Republican Majority continues to bring legislation to the floor that restricts women's reproductive health care.

H.R. 358 is another attempt by the Majority to pass an anti-abortion policy that already failed during the health care reform debate.

Current law allows policy holders to buy abortion coverage by making separate payments, but H.R. 358 would prohibit any insurance plan from offering abortion coverage if they have even one enrollee that receives federal subsidies. Thus, it effectively forces plans to choose between not offering abortion care to the entire population of a state and offering a plan to only a small number of enrollees—which choice makes more economic sense? What do you think insurance companies will choose?

H.R. 358 also supersedes current law by expanding the current definition of health care providers to include any employee of a health care entity that provides abortion services, whether they actually provide patient care or not. Make no mistake: these newly designated health care entities can refuse to provide or refer a woman for abortion care, even when a woman's life is in critical danger.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 358 makes it clear to the American people that the Republican Majority is much more interested in dismantling

health reform and playing politics with divisive social issues than creating jobs and fixing our broken economy.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 358, the Protect Life Act.

We've worked so hard over the last few decades to advance women's health and the Protect Life Act just steamrolls right over that progress.

This bill would bar anyone getting federal health subsidies from purchasing private insurance policies that include abortion coverage. This makes it unlikely that ANY health plan would cover abortion, alienating all American women from truly comprehensive health plans.

It allows hospitals to refuse to provide life-saving abortions to women who face imminent threat of death.

And it gives states the ability to attack coverage of non-abortion related services, such as contraception.

I support a woman's legal right to opt for, or against, an abortion. The decision is private. It's a matter of faith and it's a matter of conscience, and our Constitution recognizes this.

The Protect Life Act is a shameful attempt to impose a radical political agenda on women. It strips away their individual liberties and puts their health at serious risk. This bill is wrong, this bill is dangerous, and this House should reject it.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, today I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 358: a bill that is completely unnecessary; a bill that denies women the freedom of choice; a bill that re-opens an abortion debate that was settled in 2010; and a bill that will have a detrimental impact on the health and health care of women across the United States and in the U.S. Territories.

Contrary to the very false claims of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, not only is the Hyde Amendment fully in effect and fully enforced, but the Affordable Care Act includes several strong provisions that explicitly prohibit the use of U.S. taxpayer dollars to fund abortions. In fact, those provisions were endorsed by the Catholic Health Association. Additionally, there have been numerous audits—including by the Government Accounting Office and the Inspector General—as well as congressional hearings, they all concluded that the law is being followed.

The sad irony here is that this bill is named the "Protect Life Act." However, despite its name, this bill does very little to protect and improve the lives of women. What this bill would do, however, is to restrict—for the first time in history—how millions of women with private health insurance can spend their own private health insurance dollars. It also will undermine the success we achieved in expanding access to affordable, quality health care for women because it will force health plans participating in the health insurance Exchanges—which will begin in 2014 and which are expected to lift tens of millions of Americans out of the ranks of the uninsured—to drop comprehensive coverage. And, if those aspects of this bill are not bad enough, consider this: H.R. 358 also eliminates the existing protections for women who seek abortion care in emergency circumstances and in situations that would literally save the woman's life. How, I must ask, does such a provision protect a woman's life?

Today, millions of Americans are suffering the consequences of very real hardships—so

many of which sometimes seem insurmountable. In times like these, we should be working together to create jobs by passing the American Jobs Act and we should be working together to move this nation forward building upon—and not trying to dismantle—the many successes we achieved with the historical health reform law. The problems we are facing today are very serious and require serious people to develop serious solutions instead of pursuing an ideological agenda that divides the nation. As a physician, I fully support legislation that would actually protect and improve lives, not only in title, but in reality. This bill, however, is not such a bill. I, therefore, strongly oppose H.R. 358 and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, today I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 358, the Protect Life Act. Instead of focusing on creating jobs, the House majority has decided instead to continue their relentless assault on women's rights and limit access to fair and adequate health care.

Despite its name, this bill is not about protecting life. In fact, it is far from it. One provision in this bill would put women's lives in danger by allowing hospitals to refuse to provide life-saving abortion care even when a woman's life is in critical danger.

This bill would also allow states to ostensibly deny critical non-abortion services to women. The Protect Life Act has the potential to undermine laws guaranteeing health care services well beyond those in the reproductive-health area. This could result in the denial of mental health care, HIV counseling, and other vital services.

Current law is clear: Federal funding of abortion is forbidden except under very limited circumstances. This bill would impose unprecedented limitations on abortion coverage and restrict access to abortion services and contraceptives for all women. I urge my colleagues to reject this dangerous assault on women and I urge the majority to work on legislation that will put Americans back to work.

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the underlying bill. At a time when Americans' top priority is job creation—when Americans are desperately calling on us to work together to turn our economy around—some are instead launching the most comprehensive and radical assault on women's health in our lifetime. This shameful attack on women's ability to obtain complete health information and services does a disservice to women, families, and all Americans.

To begin with, according to the stated purpose of the bill, which is to prevent federal funds from being used to cover abortion services, the bill is already gratuitous. Recent legal challenges to the Affordable Care Act have revealed that it contains "strict safeguards at multiple levels to prevent federal funds from being used to pay for abortion services beyond those in the case of rape or incest or where the life of the woman is endangered," rendering this legislation unnecessary. This type of extreme and redundant legislation will prove insightful to jobless Americans wondering why they have yet to see meaningful economic turnaround.

H.R. 358 would effectively prevent women from obtaining private insurance coverage for abortion services. By banning coverage of abortion in health exchanges, the bill will ensure that no one will be able to purchase

abortion coverage—including women who do not receive federal assistance. The book-keeping burden that would be required for insurers to offer separate policies, with and without abortion coverage, is simply too high. Insurance providers are surely not interested in providing both, when most women cannot afford to pay for the abortion coverage option out-of-pocket anyway. Proponents of the legislation suggest that insurance companies could simply offer an "abortion rider." Women would have to plan for an unplanned pregnancy by purchasing supplemental insurance. This is unlikely, considering that most cannot afford to purchase even a single insurance policy. Furthermore, history has shown that insurers are reluctant to offer "riders" even when given the option to do so. As health exchanges grow as they are expected to, these restrictions will only affect more and more women looking for affordable and adequate health insurance.

Furthermore, the bill seeks to dramatically expand dangerous refusal provisions which contradict prevailing standards of care. Such expansion ignores the basic tenant of ethical health care, which requires that patients be presented with all of their medical options when making health care decisions. This bill would allow professionals with only a tangential connection to abortion services, such as a hospital receptionists or claims adjusters at insurance companies, to obstruct the medical process due to their beliefs. This would effectively tip the balance against patients seeking effective and comprehensive health care.

The 'non-discrimination' provision in fact discriminates against abortion providers, as it provides no protection for their beliefs. A one-sided non-discrimination provision is not non-discriminatory at all. We cannot allow this expansion, which would create a culture of refusal where anyone could obstruct access to abortion services for any reason.

Most disturbingly, a late addition to the Pitts bill would allow the expansive refusal provision to trump important patient protections guaranteed by the Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act, as well as similar protections in state laws requiring emergency care providers to save a woman's life. This would be an unprecedented expansion of the right to refusal. We simply cannot allow for the possibility that a pregnant woman suffering from a medical emergency would see her right to medical care overridden by health professionals' moral views, which do not always place her health and safety first. Unfortunately, we have already seen what happens when professionals place their views over the health of the patient. In one case several months ago, a woman almost died over an unviable fetus as medical professionals exercised their right of refusal and waited for the fetus to die, delaying treatment for the mother. We cannot allow women to unwittingly seek emergency treatment at medical facilities that do not value their safety first. We cannot override existing EMTALA patient protections.

Finally, language in the Pitts bill extends far beyond abortion, and could allow insurers to refuse to provide other vital health services that are part of the minimum standards for health coverage set by the Affordable Care Act. This bill would open the door to refusal of effective reproductive services concerning contraception and infertility, for example. As we look to preventative services to avoid more

□ 1840

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. CAPPs. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. CAPPs. I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Capps moves to recommit the bill H.R. 358 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In section 2(a)(7), in the amendment instruction adding the new subsection (g), strike "subsection" and insert "subsections".

Insert after the subsection (g) of section 1303 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, as proposed to be added by section 2(a)(7), the following:

"(h) PROTECTING THE LIFE OF THE MOTHER IN A MEDICAL EMERGENCY.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to exempt any hospital or health care provider from Federal or State laws that require such hospital or provider to provide medical examination, treatment, referral, or transfer to prevent the death of a pregnant woman with an emergency medical condition."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPs. Madam Speaker, as the debate today has shown, this Chamber is deeply divided over this bill. But we should all be able to agree that when a pregnant woman is in a medical emergency, we must do all we can to save her, and that is what this final amendment affirms.

I want to be clear: The passage of this amendment will not prevent the passage of the underlying bill. If it's adopted, my amendment will be incorporated into the bill and the bill will immediately be voted upon.

Madam Speaker, the underlying bill creates a loophole which would allow hospitals to circumvent the Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act, a law that has saved many lives. The law, called EMTALA for short, was established to ensure that when a patient arrives at a hospital in critical condition, particularly women in labor, the patient will at least be stabilized. It is truly the embodiment of the Hippocratic Oath to "apply, for the benefit of the sick, all measures that are required."

EMTALA has been law for over 25 years—and it works. However, the bill before us today could lead to a radical and uncalled for loophole to this law. It would allow providers to refuse emergency care for women even if their lives are endangered by their pregnancy. The hospitals could even refuse to give a referral.

I'm a nurse who's worked long shifts in the hospital setting, and I find it immoral to deny care to a woman with a life-threatening condition just because she's pregnant. This loophole is wrong, it's extreme, and it's cruel.

Unfortunately, there are some tragic complications that can occur during

pregnancy for which a therapeutic abortion is necessary to save the life of a pregnant woman. I'm speaking about conditions like severe preeclampsia, where a pregnant woman's rapid rise in blood pressure can lead to seizure, stroke, multiple organ failure, and her death; or pulmonary hypertension, a condition that the American College of Cardiology guidelines explicitly states necessitates the termination of a pregnancy to avoid maternal death.

If you've never heard of these conditions, it might be easy to think they're not significant. But to the women whose lives are saved by these emergency abortion services—oftentimes mothers who very much want this pregnancy to be successful—this issue is more than politics. It's literally life or death. What if your wife or your daughter was rushed to the hospital, pregnant, with severe bleeding. You don't research or compare the policies of your local hospitals. You go to the one that's closest—the one you trust will save your loved one. But when the diagnosis is made and an emergency abortion is necessary to save her life, what would you do if that hospital refused to perform it to stabilize her or even provide a referral for her care elsewhere? Thanks to the protections provided by EMTALA, this cannot happen today. But if this bill before us becomes law without my amendment, it very well could.

Madam Speaker, my amendment is not just a debate between two sides of the abortion issue. It is about saving women's lives in the middle of very traumatic times for them and their families.

I would like to bring to your attention a letter sent to Chairman PITTS from the Catholic Health Association. CHA is clear in its religious affiliation and its opposition to abortion. So perhaps because of this perspective, CHA says this best. "CHA member hospitals have been providing compassionate, quality care under both EMTALA and the Weldon amendment without conflict since the enactment of these provisions. Accordingly, the Catholic Health Association does not believe that there's a need for the provider nondiscrimination section to apply to EMTALA."

CHA's statement is clear: EMTALA's treatment requirement and the current provider conscience laws work together hand in hand. There is no need for an unprecedented carveout or exception that would endanger women's lives.

As a nurse, I respect the conscience clause language a great deal. But I cannot ever imagine a situation where morally, ethically, and legally a medical professional could be allowed to stand by and let someone needlessly die. No pregnant woman or her family should be afraid that she would be denied the care she needs when she goes to a hospital in an emergency. We need to make sure that doesn't happen.

Today we have the opportunity to fix a problem created with this legislation

expensive future treatments, this bill could prevent access to screening for sexually transmitted diseases and cervical cancer. At a time when many Americans are struggling to make ends meet, put food on the table, and pay their mortgages, it is unfathomable that we could consider restricting access to these essential, safe, and effective health services.

To reiterate, the Affordable Care Act contains ample protection against federal funding for abortion. The Pitts bill, in addition to being discriminatory, would create undue hardship on women and families as they attempt to make private health care decisions. It is dangerous to the health of pregnant women, and all women. At a time of staggering unemployment and economic hardship, this bill, unnecessary and unfair as it is, is not the kind of leadership Americans are looking for from Congress. To vote Yes on this bill is to roll back the strides we have been making toward equitable and effective health care for all Americans, and that is unacceptable.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote No on this Bill.

Mr. TERRY. Madam Speaker, today, I rise in support of H.R. 358, The Protect Life Act. This bill would amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA) to prevent federal funding for abortion or abortion coverage through any program authorized by the health care law.

Nebraskans feel strongly—federal dollars should never be used to pay for abortion coverage. Unfortunately, last year's misguided health care law contains loopholes and ambiguities, which opens the door to allow taxpayer subsidies for coverage that includes abortion. This bill also protects the right of conscience for health care professionals by ensuring private insurance companies are not mandated to cover abortion. This bill does allow for some exemptions, including if the pregnancy is the result of rape or incest, or if the life of the mother is endangered.

This bill specifically targets the abortion funding scheme created in PPACA. I have always been an ardent supporter of the unborn, and today's vote is a step towards protecting those that cannot protect themselves.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 358. As a staunch pro-life member of Congress, I have always supported the Hyde Amendment. During the health care reform debate, I made it very clear on the House floor and reassured my pro-life colleagues that the Hyde Amendment was included in the Affordable Care Act. It has been the law since 1976 and it is still the law now. Not only is the Hyde Amendment included in the Affordable Care Act, but the President signed an executive order reinforcing that federal funding cannot be used for abortions. We cannot let people imply or infer that the Hyde Amendment is not already part of the Affordable Care Act. A vote in support of H.R. 358 would be an admission that the Hyde Amendment was not included in the Affordable Care Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 430, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

before tragedy strikes. So I urge you to protect women's lives and support this final amendment to this bill.

CATHOLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, February 9, 2011.

Hon. JOSEPH R. PITTS,
Chairman, House Energy and Commerce Sub-
committee on Health, House of Representa-
tives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Catholic Health Association of the United States (CHA) would like to express our continued support for the intent of your legislation, H.R. 358, the Protect Life Act, to further ensure protection of the unborn and of providers' conscience rights.

We have had the opportunity to review your revised version of H.R. 358 and would like to share our concern regarding one specific modification to your legislation. Section 1303(f) regarding emergency services laws, including Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act (EMTALA), now includes a reference to a new provision regarding provider nondiscrimination (Section 1303(g)). Your provider nondiscrimination language is similar to the conscience protections of the Weldon Amendment. CHA member hospitals have been providing compassionate, quality care under both EMTALA and the "Weldon Amendment," without conflict since the enactment of these provisions. Accordingly, CHA does not believe that there is a need for the provider nondiscrimination section to apply to EMTALA.

As the national leadership organization of more than 2,000 Catholic health care systems, hospitals, long-term care facilities, sponsors, and related organizations, the Catholic health ministry provides care throughout the nation to patients of all ages, races and religious beliefs. Catholic hospitals provide a higher percentage of public health and specialty services than other health care providers including state and local government, other not-for-profit, or investor-owned (for-profit) hospitals. These services include neonatal ICU, obstetrics, breast cancer screening and mammograms, children's wellness, child and adolescent psychiatric services, community outreach, dental services, crisis prevention, palliative care, pain management programs, nutrition programs, hospice, HIV/AIDS services, geriatric services, alcohol and drug abuse treatment, and trauma care. Many of these services are critical to our communities and we continue to provide them even though many of these services are not self-sustaining and must be subsidized by other hospital revenue.

Building upon our country's tradition of pluralism and the freedom to exercise our beliefs, CHA has long supported language within appropriations legislation to prohibit federal funding of abortions (Hyde amendment) and language to protect hospitals and other institutional and individual health care providers should they decline to provide, pay for, or refer for abortions (Weldon Amendment).

Again, while we continue to believe the current provisions of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) prevent federal funding of abortion, we support your efforts to further ensure permanent protection of the unborn and of provider's conscience rights and look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

SR. CAROL KEEHAN, DC,
President and CEO.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I claim time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, a vast majority of Americans, regardless of whether they support or oppose abortion being legal, believe that the Federal Government should not be subsidizing abortions. Some on the other side are bringing up a red herring in an attempt to continue to allow Federal funding of abortion.

To dispel the myths being disseminated by opponents of H.R. 358, every Member should understand that this bill would not change the Hyde amendment, the EMTALA statute, or the standard of care required of providers under the EMTALA law. Section 1867(e) of the Social Security Act, commonly known as EMTALA, calls on emergency personnel to respond to distress on the part of a pregnant woman or her unborn child by stabilizing the condition of both mother and the unborn child.

It is ironic that opponents of H.R. 358 claim it will establish an objectionable standard of care when that balanced standard has long been recognized under EMTALA.

My colleagues, the question before us today is simple: If you favor federally funded abortion coverage, then you should support the motion to recommit and oppose the bill. If you believe, like a majority of Americans, that the Federal Government should not be subsidizing abortion, then you should oppose the motion to recommit and support H.R. 358.

Vote "no" on the motion to recommit. Vote "yes" on this critical legislation.

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.

Mrs. CAPPS. 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 passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 173, nays 249, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 788]

YEAS—173

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)

Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cielline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn

Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell

Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fudge
Garamendi
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchee
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin

Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richardson

Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
 Waxman
Welch
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NAYS—249

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz

Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler

Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter

McHenry Reed Simpson Flores Latta
 McIntyre Rehberg Smith (NE) Fortes Lewis (CA)
 McKeon Reichert Smith (NJ) Fortenberry Lipinski
 McKinley Renacci Smith (TX) Foxx LongBiondo
 McMorris Ribble Southerland Franks (AZ) Long
 Rodgers Rigell Stearns Frelinghuysen Lucas
 Meehan Rivera Stivers Gallegly Luetkemeyer
 Mica Roby Stutzman Gardner Lummis
 Miller (FL) Roe (TN) Sullivan Garrett
 Miller (MI) Rogers (AL) Terry Gerlach
 Miller, Gary Rogers (KY) Thompson (PA) Gibbs
 Mulvaney Rogers (MI) Thornberry Gibson
 Murphy (PA) Rohrabacher Tiberi Gingrey (GA)
 Myrick Rokita Tipton Gohmert
 Neugebauer Rooney Goodlatte Matheson
 Noem Ros-Lehtinen Gosar McCarthy (CA)
 Nugent Roskam Turner (NY) McCaul
 Nunes Ross (AR) Upton Granger
 Nunnelee Ross (FL) Walberg Graves (GA)
 Olson Royce Walden Graves (MO)
 Palazzo Runyan Walsh (IL) Griffin (AR)
 Paulsen Ryan (WI) Griffith (VA)
 Pearce Scalise Grimm
 Pence Schilling Guinta
 Peterson Schmidt Whitfield
 Petri Schock Wilson (SC)
 Pitts Schweikert Wittman
 Platts Scott (SC) Wolf
 Poe (TX) Scott, Austin Womack
 Pompeo Sensenbrenner Woodall
 Posey Sessions Yoder
 Price (GA) Shimkus Young (AK)
 Quayle Shuler Young (FL)
 Rahall Shuster Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Bachmann Giffords Reyes
 Camp Gonzalez Slaughter
 Carter Paul Wilson (FL)
 Frank (MA) Polis

□ 1913

Messrs. PETERSON and CASSIDY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. TOWNS changed his 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. 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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. 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 251, noes 172, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 789]

AYES—251

Adams Boustany Crawford
 Aderholt Brady (TX) Crenshaw
 Akin Brooks Critz
 Alexander Broun (GA) Cuellar
 Altmire Buchanan Culberson
 Amash Bucshon Davis (KY)
 Amodei Buerkle Denham
 Austria Burgess Dent
 Bachus Burton (IN) DesJarlais
 Barletta Calvert Diaz-Balart
 Bartlett Campbell Dold
 Barton (TX) Canseco Donnelly (IN)
 Bass (NH) Cantor Dreier
 Benishek Capito Duffy
 Berg Carter Duncan (SC)
 Bilbray Cassidy Duncan (TN)
 Bilirakis Chabot Elmers
 Bishop (GA) Chaffetz Emerson
 Bishop (UT) Coble Farenthold
 Black Coffman (CO)
 Blackburn Cole Fitzpatrick
 Bonner Conaway Flake
 Bono Mack Costello Fleischmann
 Boren Cravaack Fleming

Flores Latta
 Fortes Lewis (CA)
 Fortenberry Lipinski
 Foxx LongBiondo
 Franks (AZ) Long
 Frelinghuysen Lucas
 Gallegly Luetkemeyer
 Gardner Lummis
 Garrett Lungren, Daniel
 Gerlach E.
 Gibbs Mack
 Gibson Manzullo
 Gingrey (GA) Marchant
 Gohmert Marino
 Goodlatte Matheson
 Gosar McCarthy (CA)
 Gowdy McCaul
 Granger McCintock
 Graves (GA) McCotter
 Graves (MO) McHenry
 Griffin (AR) McIntyre
 Griffith (VA) McKeon
 Grimm McKinley
 Guinta McMorris
 Guthrie Rodgers
 Hall Meehan
 Harper Mica
 Harris Miller (FL)
 Hartzler Miller (MI)
 Hastings (WA) Miller, Gary
 Hayworth Mulvaney
 Heck Murphy (PA)
 Hensarling Myrick
 Herger Neugebauer
 Noem Noem
 Holdren Nugent
 Sullivan Nunes
 Terry Nunnelee
 Thompson (PA) Olson
 Thornberry Palazzo
 Tiberi Paulsen
 Tipton Pearce
 Turner (NY) Turner (OH)
 Upton Upton
 Walberg Walberg
 Walden Walden
 Walsh (IL) Walsh (IL)
 Webster Webster
 West West
 Westmoreland Westmoreland
 Whitfield Whitfield
 Wilson (SC) Wilson (SC)
 Wittman Wittman
 Wolf Wolf
 Womack Womack
 Woodall Woodall
 Yoder Yoder
 Young (AK) Young (AK)
 Young (FL) Young (FL)
 Young (IN) Young (IN)

NOES—172

Ackerman Courtney
 Andrews Crowley
 Baca Cummings
 Baldwin Davis (CA)
 Barrow Davis (IL)
 Bass (CA) DeFazio
 Becerra DeGette
 Berkeley DeLauro
 Berman Deutch
 Biggert Dicks
 Bishop (NY) Dingell
 Blumenauer Doggett
 Boswell Doyle
 Brady (PA) Edwards
 Braley (IA) Ellison
 Butterfield Engel
 Capps Eshoo
 Capuano Farr
 Cardoza Fattah
 Carnahan Filner
 Carney Frank (MA)
 Carson (IN) Fudge
 Castor (FL) Garamendi
 Chandler Green, Al
 Chu Green, Gene
 Cicilline Grijalva
 Clarke (MI) Gutierrez
 Clarke (NY) Hahn
 Clay Hanabusa
 Cleaver Hanna
 Clyburn Hastings (FL)
 Cohen Heinrich
 Connolly (VA) Higgins
 Conyers Himes
 Cooper Hinchey
 Costa Hinojosa

McNerney Rangel Speier
 Meeks Richardson Stark
 Michaud Richmond Sutton
 Miller (NC) Rothman (NJ)
 Miller, George Roybal-Allard Thompson (CA)
 Moore Ruppelberger Thompson (MS)
 Moran Rush Tierney
 Murphy (CT) Ryan (OH) Tonko
 Nadler Sanchez, Linda Towns
 Napolitano T. Tsongas
 Neal Sanchez, Loretta Van Hollen
 Olver Sarbanes Velazquez
 Owens Schakowsky Vislosky
 Pallone Schiff Walz (MN)
 Pascrell Schrader Wasserman
 Pastor (AZ) Schwartz Schultz
 Payne Scott (VA) Waters
 Pelosi Scott, David Watt
 Perlmutter Serrano Waxman
 Peters Sewell Welch
 Pingree (ME) Sherman Woolsey
 Price (NC) Sires Yarmuth
 Quigley Smith (WA)

NOT VOTING—10

Bachmann Gonzalez Slaughter
 Brown (FL) Paul Wilson (FL)
 Camp Polis
 Giffords Reyes

□ 1920

Mr. LANDRY changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EPA REGULATORY RELIEF ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2250) to provide additional time for the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue achievable standards for industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers, process heaters, and incinerators, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I am opposed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Castor of Florida moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2250 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following sections:

SEC. 6. PROTECTION OF SENIORS FROM LIFE-THREATENING AIR POLLUTION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Administrator shall not delay actions pursuant to the rule identified in section 2(b)(3) of this Act to reduce air pollution from waste incinerators, as defined pursuant to this Act, where such waste incinerators are within 5 miles of any nursing home, assisted living facility, or hospital.

SEC. 7. NOTIFICATION TO COMMUNITIES.

With respect to each requirement for a major source facility to implement an air pollution control or emissions reduction that

is eliminated by this Act, such facility shall provide notice of such elimination to affected communities not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, the debate on the GOP pollution bills has been very heated at times. The debate has exposed very divergent views between the parties here in Congress on the importance of clean air and on the value of good health for all Americans.

Despite our differences on how we treat air pollution, my amendment offers us an opportunity to come together on a bipartisan basis, specifically to protect the health of our older neighbors—America's seniors.

The passage of my amendment will not prevent the passage of the underlying bill. If the amendment is adopted, it will be incorporated into the bill, and the bill will proceed to a vote. The amendment I offer today will ensure that we respect the health of our older neighbors, our parents, and our grandparents by protecting the quality of the air that they breathe.

Seniors are more susceptible than others to the harmful impacts of dirty air and pollution, and our neighbors need to understand what is in the air that they breathe, so my amendment proposes to do two things:

One, require waste incinerators located within 5 miles of a nursing home, an assisted living facility, or a hospital to simply use the most effective pollution control methods available. Two, require polluting boilers to notify surrounding communities of toxic emissions.

Without my amendment, the GOP bill will cause a dramatic increase in the emissions of mercury, dioxins, acid gases, and sulfur dioxide near populations that are particularly vulnerable to pollution.

Madam Speaker, the Clean Air Act protects us all from some of the most carcinogenic and dangerous pollutants. Mercury damages the developing brain and reduces IQ and the ability to learn. Sulfur dioxide is known to interfere with breathing, and as a result, is especially harmful to seniors.

Some seniors are so sensitive to dirty air and pollution they require oxygen tanks to aid their breathing, and a variety of health conditions afflicting seniors is aggravated by poor air quality. Any increase in hazardous air pollution will disproportionately harm our older neighbors at a time in their lives when they are the most vulnerable. We can save lives, and we can save money by requiring that these waste incinerators that are located near our older neighbors use the most effective pollution control methods available.

When it comes to the health and health care costs for older Americans, my colleagues, we've got to be smarter. It is not wise to aggravate the res-

piratory ailments of our older neighbors who likely are on Medicare, just as it is not wise for the GOP to advocate for ending Medicare as we know it. It doesn't save any money.

The nonpartisan CBO explained that the GOP plan to dismantle Medicare would simply shift costs to seniors without addressing the underlying issues. Actually, the GOP pollution bills here can be viewed as handing our parents, our grandparents, and our older neighbors higher medical bills tied to dirtier air.

So let's be smart. Let's ensure that waste incinerators located in areas where our seniors live use the most effective pollution controls. Other industries have done it, and this small industrial subset should not receive a special interest "carve-out."

Madam Speaker, while our older neighbors would be disproportionately affected by this GOP bill in its current form, they're not the only ones. Young people and pregnant women are also extremely vulnerable to an increase in the toxic emissions that this GOP bill promotes. This Congress has a duty to prevent such harm from happening when the evidence is so clear.

One sure way that we can help our families take adequate steps to protect themselves and their children is to ensure they're fully aware of the dangers that they face from specific pollution sources. So this amendment also requires large boilers to notify their local communities of emissions that are likely to increase because of this GOP bill. That way, families can take adequate steps to protect their children from mercury, dioxins, particulates, and sulfur dioxide. This information will also enable our local communities to make determinations on where to locate playgrounds and schools.

We must ensure that our families and communities have all the information they need to make the best decisions for the health of their children, and that they have a complete understanding of the location and scale of the threat posed by air pollution.

Madam Speaker, the GOP bill blocks critical health protections against air pollution. The EPA estimates that the GOP's anti-clean air bills together mean over 30,000 more premature deaths, over 19,000 additional heart attacks, and over 200,000 asthma attacks that otherwise would have been prevented.

We shouldn't let it happen.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I will close by asking, in the spirit of the original bipartisan adoption of the Clean Air Act 40 years ago, that we come together on a bipartisan basis to adopt this important amendment to protect the health of our seniors and children all across America.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Speaker, I claim time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Back in 2004, the D.C. Federal Court of Appeals, in a court decision, invalidated the 2004 Boiler MACT rules promulgated by EPA. In that court decision, EPA came to the court and said, We need additional time to come out with new Boiler MACT rules. So, in that court decision, EPA made the argument that they needed additional time to come forth with a more balanced approach on a Boiler MACT rule.

Our legislation, H.R. 2250, does nothing that EPA did not ask the court to do as far as extending time. Our legislation is a balanced approach. Particularly at this time of a weakened economy and when our job unemployment rate is at 9.1 percent and when our economy continues to struggle, it is imperative that we have a balanced regulation that considers jobs—yes—but that also considers health care and the benefits of the regulation and the impact that that has on health care.

□ 1930

We've had extensive hearings on this legislation. We've had representatives from hospitals. We've had representatives from universities, representatives from manufacturers, industrial users and others, and all of them almost universally have asked that we pass H.R. 2250 to provide a more balanced approach in these regulations.

Testimony has shown that over 230,000 jobs are at risk if EPA moves forward with these regulations. So what we're proposing in our legislation is we give EPA 15 months to come forth with a new regulation. We then say that they need at least a minimum, that the industries and hospitals and schools need a minimum of 5 years to comply with those regulations. I will never forget the University of Notre Dame came and indicated that they had spent \$20 million trying to comply with the old regulations, and now they're going to have to come forth with additional funds to comply with these new regulations.

So all we're doing is we're protecting jobs. We're protecting the health care of the American people. We give the EPA 15 months to come forth with new rules, 5 years at a minimum to comply. For that reason, I think it's imperative that we adopt our legislation, and I would urge every Member to oppose this motion to recommit.

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 noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was 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 passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 170, noes 246, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 790]

AYES—170

Ackerman Garamendi Nadler
 Andrews Green, Al Napoliitano
 Baca Green, Gene Neal
 Baldwin Grijalva Olver
 Bass (CA) Gutierrez Pallone
 Becerra Hahn Pascrell
 Berkley Hanabusa Pastor (AZ)
 Berman Hastings (FL) Payne
 Bishop (GA) Heinrich Perlmutter
 Bishop (NY) Higgins Peters
 Blumenauer Himes Pingree (ME)
 Boswell Hinchey Price (NC)
 Brady (PA) Hinojosa Quigley
 Braley (IA) Hirono Rahall
 Brown (FL) Hochul Rangel
 Capps Holden Richardson
 Capuano Holt Richmond
 Cardoza Honda Rothman (NJ)
 Carnahan Hoyer Roybal-Allard
 Carney Inslee Ruppersberger
 Carson (IN) Israel Rush
 Castor (FL) Jackson (IL) Ryan (OH)
 Chandler Jackson Lee
 Chu (TX) Sanchez, Linda
 T.
 Cicilline Johnson (GA) Sanchez, Loretta
 Clarke (MI) Johnson, E. B. Sarbanes
 Clarke (NY) Jones Schakowsky
 Clay Kaptur Schiff
 Cleaver Keating Scott (VA)
 Clyburn Kildee Scott, David
 Connolly (VA) Kissell Serrano
 Conyers Kucinich Sewell
 Cooper Langevin Sherman
 Costa Larsen (WA) Shuler
 Costello Larson (CT) Smith (WA)
 Courtney Lee (CA) Speier
 Crowley Levin Stark
 Cuellar Lewis (GA) Sutton
 Cummings Lipinski Thompson (CA)
 Davis (CA) Loeb sack Thompson (MS)
 Davis (IL) Lofgren, Zoe Tierney
 DeFazio Lowey Tonko
 DeGette Lujan Towns
 DeLauro Lynch Tsongas
 Deutch Maloney Van Hollen
 Dicks Matsui McCarthy (NY)
 Dingell McCollum Velázquez
 Doggett McCollum Vislosky
 Doyle McDermott Walz (MN)
 Edwards McGovern Wasserman
 Ellison McIntyre Schultz
 Engel McNerney Waters
 Eshoo Meeks Watt
 Farr Miller (NC) Waxman
 Fattah Miller, George Welch
 Filner Moore Woolsey
 Frank (MA) Moran Yarmuth
 Fudge Murphy (CT)

NOES—246

Adams Boren Cravaack
 Aderholt Boustany Crawford
 Akin Brady (TX) Crenshaw
 Alexander Brooks Critz
 Altmire Broun (GA) Culberson
 Amash Buchanan Davis (KY)
 Amodei Bucshon Denham
 Austria Buerkle Dent
 Bachus Burgess DesJarlais
 Barletta Burton (IN) Diaz-Balart
 Barrow Butterfield Dold
 Bartlett Calvert Donnelly (IN)
 Barton (TX) Campbell Dreier
 Bass (NH) Canseco Duffy
 Benishek Cantor Duncan (SC)
 Berg Capito Duncan (TN)
 Biggert Carter Ellmers
 Bilbray Cassidy Emerson
 Bilirakis Chabot Farenthold
 Bishop (UT) Chaffetz Fincher
 Black Coble Fitzpatrick
 Blackburn Coffman (CO) Flake
 Bonner Cole Fleischmann
 Bono Mack Conaway Fleming

Flores Latta
 Forbes Lewis (CA) Roe (TN)
 Fortenberry LoBiondo Rogers (AL)
 Foxx Long Rogers (KY)
 Franks (AZ) Lucas Rogers (MI)
 Frelinghuysen Luetkemeyer Rohrabacher
 Gallegly Lummis Rokita
 Gardner Lungren, Daniel Rooney
 Garrett E. Ros-Lehtinen
 Gerlach Mack Roskam
 Gibbs Manzullo Ross (AR)
 Gibson Marchant Ross (FL)
 Gingrey (GA) Marino Royce
 Gohmert Matheson Runyan
 Goodlatte McCarthy (CA) Ryan (WI)
 Gosar McCaul Scalise
 Gowdy McClintock Schilling
 Graves (GA) McCotter Schmidt
 Graves (MO) McHenry Schock
 Griffin (AR) McKeon Schrader
 Griffith (VA) McKinley Schweikert
 Grimm McMorris Scott (SC)
 Guinta Rodgers Scott, Austin
 Guthrie Meehan Sensenbrenner
 Hall Mica Sessions
 Hanna Michaud Shimkus
 Harper Miller (FL) Shuster
 Harris Miller (MI) Simpson
 Hartzler Miller, Gary Smith (NE)
 Hastings (WA) Mulvaney Smith (NJ)
 Hayworth Murphy (PA) Smith (TX)
 Heck Myrick Southerland
 Hensarling Neugebauer Stearns
 Herger Noem Stivers
 Herrera Beutler Nugent Stutzman
 Huelskamp Nunes Sullivan
 Huizenga (MI) Nunnelee Terry
 Hultgren Olson Thompson (PA)
 Hunter Owens Thornberry
 Hurt Palazzo Tiberi
 Issa Paulsen Tipton
 Jenkins Pearce Turner (NY)
 Johnson (IL) Peterson Turner (OH)
 Johnson (OH) Petri Upton
 Jordan Pitts Walberg
 Kelly Platts Walden
 King (IA) Poe (TX) Walsh (IL)
 King (NY) Pompeo Webster
 Kingston Quayle West
 Kinzinger (IL) Reed Westmoreland
 Kline Reberg Wilson (SC)
 Labrador Reichert Wittman
 Lamborn Renacci Wolf
 Lance Ribble Womack
 Lankford Rigell Woodall
 Latham Rivera Yoder
 LaTourette Roby Young (AK)
 Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—17

Bachmann Landry Reyes
 Camp Markey Sires
 Cohen Paul Slaughter
 Ciffords Pelosi Wilson (FL)
 Gonzalez Pence Young (FL)
 Granger Polis

□ 1949

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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

Mr. WELCH. 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 275, noes 142, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 791]

AYES—275

Adams Alexander Austria
 Aderholt Altmire Baca
 Akin Amash Bachus

Barletta
 Barrow
 Bartlett
 Barton (TX)
 Bass (NH)
 Benishek
 Berg
 Biggert
 Bilbray
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Bonner
 Bono Mack
 Boren
 Boswell
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Brooks
 Broun (GA)
 Brown (FL)
 Buchanan
 Bucshon
 Buerkle
 Burgess
 Burton (IN)
 Butterfield
 Calvert
 Campbell
 Canseco
 Cantor
 Capito
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Chandler
 Clyburn
 Coble
 Coffman (CO)
 Cole
 Conaway
 Costa
 Costello
 Cravaack
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Critz
 Culberson
 Davis (KY)
 Denham
 Dent
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Dold
 Donnelly (IN)
 Dreier
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Emerson
 McCarty (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCotter
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Meehan
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Myrick
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee

NOES—142

Ackerman
 Andrews
 Baldwin
 Bass (CA)
 Becerra
 Berkley
 Berman
 Bishop (NY)
 Blumenauer
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Capps
 Capuano
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Castor (FL)
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clarke (MI)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay

Cleaver	Israel	Pingree (ME)
Cohen	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Connolly (VA)	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Conyers	(TX)	Rangel
Cooper	Johnson (GA)	Richardson
Courtney	Kaptur	Rothman (NJ)
Crowley	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Cummings	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Davis (CA)	Kucinich	Rush
Davis (IL)	Langevin	Ryan (OH)
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
DeLauro	Lee (CA)	T.
Deutch	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Sarbanes
Dingell	Loebach	Schakowsky
Doggett	Lofgren, Zoe	Schiff
Doyle	Lowey	Schwartz
Edwards	Lujan	Scott (VA)
Ellison	Lynch	Serrano
Engel	Maloney	Sherman
Eshoo	Markey	Smith (WA)
Farr	Matsui	Speier
Fattah	McCarthy (NY)	Stark
Filner	McCollum	Sutton
Frank (MA)	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
Fudge	McGovern	Tierney
Garamendi	McNerney	Tonko
Green, Al	Meeks	Towns
Grijalva	Miller (NC)	Tsongas
Gutierrez	Miller, George	Van Hollen
Hahn	Moore	Velázquez
Hastings (FL)	Moran	Visclosky
Heinrich	Murphy (CT)	Wasserman
Higgins	Nadler	Schultz
Himes	Napolitano	Waters
Hinchee	Neal	Watt
Hirono	Olver	Waxman
Hochul	Pallone	Welch
Holt	Pascarell	Woolsey
Honda	Pastor (AZ)	Yarmuth
Hoyer	Payne	
Inslie	Peters	

NOT VOTING—16

Amodei	Granger	Sires
Bachmann	Paul	Slaughter
Camp	Pelosi	Wilson (FL)
Carnahan	Pence	Young (FL)
Giffords	Polis	
Gonzalez	Reyes	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1956

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. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote numbers 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, and 791. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote numbers 787, 788, and 790. I would have voted "no" on rollcall vote numbers 786, 789, and 791.

Bill, question, rollcall vote number, vote:

H. Res. 430, Final Passage, 786, no;

H.R. 2250, Cohen Amendment No. 22, 787, aye;

H.R. 358, Motion to Recommit, 788, aye;

H.R. 358, Final Passage, 789, no;

H.R. 2250, Motion to Recommit, 790, aye;

H.R. 2250, Final Passage, 791, no.

HONORING MAJOR THOMAS E. CLARK

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. The motto inscribed on the Prisoners

of War/Missing in Action flag reads, "You are not forgotten."

I rise today to honor Major Thomas E. Clark, a U.S. soldier who served in Vietnam, an airman who gave his life defending this country.

Originally from Emporium, Pennsylvania, Major Clark studied at Penn State before being accepted into the Air Force Academy and graduating in 1963. In 1969, while flying an F-100 in a mission over Laos, Major Clark's aircraft was hit by enemy fire. The plane went crashing into the jungle canopy. The wreckage was not found and Major Clark went missing in action for 4 years when, in 1973, the Air Force determined Clark was "killed in action; body not recovered." In 1991, some of the wreckage of the F-100 was found. Finally, in 2009, an investigation found the remains of Major Clark.

Next week, the Air Force will bring home Major Clark to Emporium, Pennsylvania, to have him properly laid to rest in his family's plot. I'm truly proud and honored to recognize his bravery and thank him for making the ultimate sacrifice for this country. He will not be forgotten.

Major Clark, may you rest in peace.

HONORING MILKEN AWARD
WINNER SETH BROWN

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Wayzata West Middle School math teacher Seth Brown on winning the 2011 Milken Educator Award. Seth was honored by the Milken Family Foundation for his efforts to close the achievement gap and use creative technology in the classroom, particularly in using iPods as math aids.

This award is known as the "Oscars of Teaching." The Milken Family Foundation gives these outstanding teachers a \$25,000 award, with no strings attached. Seth plans to use this money to help pay his graduate school bills as well as donating some of the money to the local PTA, which was a strong supporter of his use of technology in the classroom.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Seth Brown on his achievement and for also being an outstanding teacher. And to Seth and all the other teachers out there, I want to thank you for doing what you do in educating and inspiring the next generation of American leaders.

□ 2000

THE PROGRESSIVE MESSAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOWDY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

I'm Congressman KEITH ELLISON. We're claiming this hour on behalf of the Progressive Caucus, which tonight is going to feature a number of critical issues, all focusing on the importance of the rights of women and the assault they have been under in this Congress.

To lead off our hour and to get started, I first want to introduce a good colleague from the great State of California—Oakland, California, who's going to lead off our hour.

Congresswoman BARBARA LEE has been a champion of the rights of all people. She has been a champion for peace and justice around the world. And she has been an unswerving champion for civil and human rights not only for women, but for all people around the world.

So let me first recognize, on behalf of this Special Order hour, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE.

Congresswoman LEE, I yield the floor to you.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much. I want to thank our chair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus for yielding and for your amazing leadership on so many tough issues that we're dealing with.

Tonight we're joining with the Congressional Pro-Choice Caucus, of which I'm also a member. And so I'm very pleased to be down here with my colleagues to discuss this critical issue, a very sad day, quite frankly, for women in this country, and especially for poor women, for African American women, for women of color.

This bill which was passed today is really just the newest attack in what I have been calling from day one the Republican "war on women." Today, instead of focusing on ways to find jobs for Americans, the Republicans are focusing on eliminating family planning programs, undercutting women's right to choose, and returning our country, unfortunately, to the days of back-alley abortions, which I remember very well.

H.R. 358, the Protect Life Act—can you believe that, "Protect Life Act"—forces coverage for women to be dropped from State exchanges, which will cut off millions of women from affordable, comprehensive health care. In fact, this bill makes it virtually impossible for any health care plan to offer abortion coverage and allows hospitals to refuse to provide lifesaving care to a woman who needs an abortion to protect her own life. This is unprecedented, and it should have been rejected on this floor.

This legislation really though is part of a coordinated, nationwide war on women. Just last week, the Republican-controlled House Foreign Affairs Committee voted to defund the United Nations Population Fund, an organization that supports lifesaving activities for women and families in post-conflict and disaster situations. And before that, the very same committee voted

to reinstate the Global Gag Rule, which prevents health care providers from even discussing or offering comprehensive health services to women and girls. This affects women and girls in sub-Saharan Africa who bear the brunt of the global AIDS pandemic. And of course, as usual, the Republicans have targeted Planned Parenthood, putting increased requirements on how this nonprofit, which provides affordable health care to low-income women, black women, women of color, Latino women, Asian-Pacific American women—if Planned Parenthood wants to receive Federal funding, they have to stop, mind you, providing women reproductive health choices, which really is only a tiny percentage of what Planned Parenthood offers to women.

Sadly, it does not end there. It's nothing less than shocking that after holding the fiscal year 2011 budget hostage over their controversial policy proposals, the anti-choice leaders in the House seem eager to pick up some of the very same fights once again this year.

The Republican appropriations bill continued this attack on women's reproductive health by eliminating title X, the Nation's family planning program, defunding Planned Parenthood, cutting funding for science-based teenage pregnancy prevention initiatives—prevention, mind you—and redirecting those funds into failed abstinence-only programs. And the list goes on.

So let's just return to the battle, though, that took place today. In putting forward this very divisive bill, Republicans made the false claim that the Affordable Care Act needs to be amended to ensure that United States taxpayer dollars are not used to fund abortions. The fact of the matter is that it's very disingenuous, and it's just wrong. And it's really amazing that that argument could even be put out there because the fact is the Hyde amendment has been in effect for decades, since 1976, and the Affordable Care Act continues the Hyde amendment policy, despite my personal view that it should be overturned.

The Republicans continue to invent new ways to try and erode and deny women their constitutionally guaranteed rights purely on religious beliefs and on ideology. This is a democracy; this is not a theocracy. The religious views of some—and I am a woman of faith, but I have to tell you, the religious views, the personal religious views of some should not dictate public policy for all.

I'm also aware of the fact that sometimes we as a Nation really don't give young women and girls the right tools to prevent unintended pregnancies in the first place. But the fact of the matter is this Republican war on women and this bill will put more lives at risk, isolate us from women who have no money, who are poor—especially women of color, who have become really central targets of these efforts. Evidence of this is seen all over the coun-

try, and very recently in the form of very offensive billboards that denigrated African American women in my own district in Oakland, California—which we fought against and which were quickly taken down. Now, by using a combination or at least trying to use a combination of law and guilt, these efforts undermine really the basic health care rights of women, African American women, low-income women, women of color.

As SisterSong Women of Color Reproductive Justice Collective states, "Black women make decisions every day about whether to parent or not, not just whether to give birth. Those who think they should dictate our choices won't be there when the child is born to help us fight for better education, increase childcare, keep our kids out of jail, send our children to college, or get affordable health care."

This war on women must stop. We cannot and we must not allow the Republicans to turn back the clock on women, on choice, and on our access to health care. So I urge my colleagues to fight this war, fight against these unnecessary and these harmful initiatives that keep coming forward that continue to do damage to women and that continue to try to erode our basic health care and basic human rights. We need to create jobs rather than continue to deny health care to women.

Thank you, Mr. ELLISON, our cochair of the Progressive Caucus, for your leadership. Once again, I want to thank you for your leadership on our jobs initiative, on each and every effort that the Congressional Black Caucus has mounted. And thank you for joining with the Congressional Pro-Choice Caucus in our efforts to protect women and protect our basic rights.

Mr. ELLISON. Let me thank the gentlelady from California, BARBARA LEE, a fearless, unrelenting struggler for the rights of all people.

Tonight we're here with the Progressive Caucus. We're talking about the harm that H.R. 358 would do to women's rights. It would hurt the rights of women in three important ways. It would deprive women of comprehensive health insurance coverage, eliminate emergency lifesaving protections, and undermine health care benefits in the Affordable Care Act. For the first time, private health care insurance coverage for women will be restricted.

And so to carry the discussion further, and from a very important perspective, my good friend from New York—also a tireless fighter for the rights of all people, a leader in the area of choice and women's rights—let me yield the floor to CAROLYN MALONEY.

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you, Congressman ELLISON, who is the chair of the Progressive Caucus. Thank you for your leadership on this and in so many other areas. And thank you for having this Special Order on this disturbing vote that took place today in the Congress.

There is no question and there can be no debating the fact that the bill that

the Republicans put forward endangers women's health, puts their lives at risk, and intrudes on their constitutionally protected liberties.

The bill extends the reach of government more cynically and in a very profoundly disturbing way. And that is why President Obama put out a veto threat on Wednesday that he would veto any bill that would restrict insurers from paying for abortions, saying, in the President's words, "it goes too far." And I'd like to quote from the President's statement on this.

"Longstanding Federal policy prohibits Federal funds from being used for abortions, except in cases of rape or incest, or when the life of the woman would be endangered."

□ 2010

The Affordable Care Act preserved this prohibition and included policies to ensure that Federal funding is segregated from any private dollars used to fund abortions for which Federal funding is prohibited. So that's very, very clear, and I don't understand why the Republicans forced a vote on this, like the other anti-women, anti-choice, anti-respect of a woman's right to choose and her judgment have failed so far in the Senate.

So I feel that instead of looking at creating jobs, which is the priority, and the Republican majority has consistently said that jobs and job creation is their priority, but then they spend their time on debating a bill that even their own Members admit the President will veto and it is going nowhere in the Senate. So instead of creating jobs, they remain focused, Mr. ELLISON, on creating obstacles for women to access safe, legal, and badly needed health care.

This bill, H.R. 358, is an attack on women's access to reproductive health services and our fundamental right to lifesaving medical care. It is stunning in its scope, appalling in its indifference, and outrageous in its arrogance.

Americans want Congress to create jobs, strengthen the middle class, and find bipartisan consensus. So it's time to end this attack on women and get to work on our top priority, or what should be our top priority, creating jobs.

This bill is just another attempt to keep women down and back and not to protect their constitutional rights and access to the health care that they feel they deserve.

I thank the gentleman for organizing this and for yielding to me.

Mr. ELLISON. Congresswoman MALONEY, I wonder if you would yield for a question.

Mrs. MALONEY. Absolutely.
Mr. ELLISON. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists wrote, in order for women to receive the best health care and disease prevention, they must have access to all medically appropriate, legal medical procedures, regardless of the ability to pay. The American College of Gynecologists and Obstetricians opposes

legislative proposals to limit women's access to any needed medical care. These proposals can jeopardize the health and safety of our patients and put government between a physician and a patient.

My question to you is: This bill, H.R. 358, the very deceptively titled Protect Life Act, does this bill have scientific and medical backing behind it as the opposition to this bill has? In other words, do they have trained medical professionals operating on the basis of science supporting their position?

I yield to the gentlelady.

Mrs. MALONEY. No, they do not. In fact, the scientists and the medical professions all support access to all medically appropriate legal medical procedures. There are some times when the fetus is not—could not live or has died and is in jeopardy of causing, literally, the destruction of organs or even death of the woman. So this is, I would say, a life-taking bill from the health and welfare. And this bill also allows hospitals to deny lifesaving care. This is a big change in our values and our procedures in this country.

And I want to point out very importantly, Mr. Chairman, that at the same time they are restricting reproductive choices, Republicans are limiting access to family planning and primary care by their efforts to defund Planned Parenthood, which is a primary care provider to most women for their basic health in this country. And these actions I would label just plain too extreme.

Mr. ELLISON. The gentlelady has been very eloquent about the assault on women's health. If you don't mind, given that you are a member of the Joint Economic Committee, which is a bicameral committee, bipartisan committee, I think, in the Congress, I wonder if you don't mind talking with me just a little while about the assault on women's economic prospects.

In your opinion, Congresswoman MALONEY, how will assaults and cuts to Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security impact women, given that women statistically live longer than men and have a greater representation for use of those important programs? Are we seeing not just the health but also the economic viability of women under threat, as well as seeing important programs that women rely on disproportionately cut into?

I yield to the gentlelady.

Mrs. MALONEY. It is true that women disproportionately rely on government programs and, regrettably, women are the largest segment, older women are the largest segment of people living in poverty. So the discrimination that has existed in pay, there is still, for over 30 years, an unexplained gap between men and women, the pay gap, well over 20 percent; and this then translates into your Social Security—less Social Security, less pension—and the need for Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare to help women.

And also, a lot of women that are around the age of 55, when their

spouses die and they've been stay-at-home-mothers and wives, they lose the coverage that their husbands have, and there is a gap that's not there until they reach Medicare age of 65. So they rely disproportionately on these safety net programs.

So any cuts—and I hear from my constituents, I know that you do, too, that say: I can't absorb another cut to my Medicare; I can't absorb a cut to my Social Security. And I believe that's one reason why Democrats have fought so hard to keep that safety net in place for working men and women in our country.

Mr. ELLISON. I appreciate the gentlelady shedding some light on this issue because the fact is that today we were looking at a bill that would restrict women's health care access.

But you know that we have been trying to fend off assaults on the viability of women's economic situation. We still know that women earn about 80 cents for every dollar men make. This is unexplained, or it is explained. It's explained by gender discrimination.

And I think it's important for even men to take account of this important fact, that if your wife or partner is being discriminated against in the workplace because she's a woman, then your total family income is being hurt because of sex discrimination in the workplace. It's important that men and women come together to fight these attacks on women's rights because, even though the direct victims of this kind of discrimination are women, this invariably hurts the entire family, and so this is everybody's business to stand up for the rights of all people.

I tell you, one of the things that really concerns me is this gap in pay between men and women. The median weekly—women earn about 81.2 percent of what men earn. In addition to that, they have assaults on their access to health care. When you add these things up, what does this mean in terms of the majority's commitment to women's rights? What does it all add up to?

I wonder if the gentlelady might offer her views on this subject.

I yield to the gentlelady.

Mrs. MALONEY. I think all of those efforts, whether it's the Pitts bill that passed today, I think it's a very dangerous bill that threatens women's ability to even purchase private health insurance that includes abortion coverage with their own money, and codifies broad and troubling conscience provisions. And it's another attempt to unravel the health care law while at the same time expanding anti-choice laws that will harm women's health.

□ 2020

That's an anti-woman agenda that just passed this great body. And when you talk about the assaults on programs that women disproportionately rely on, it is another step that will keep women down and back. And I'm proud of the Democrats for standing up

for women, children, and families. You rightfully pointed out that when you discriminate against a woman, you discriminate against her husband and her children. And you and I know that it takes two working parents sometimes two jobs by each parent to pay the bills and keep the food on the table. So these are very serious concerns and ways that we need to fight back and stand up for the women of America.

Mr. ELLISON. Now, Congresswoman MALONEY, I know you might have to run, but I appreciate your standing here with me tonight because I think that the people of America, Mr. Speaker, need to hear from a person like yourself, Congresswoman MALONEY, who has been laboring in the vineyards of economic and civil rights, both, for a few years now. You know what you're talking about, you've been doing this work, you've served the community for many years, and I just want to see if I can get your views on another issue, and that is that one of the things that Republicans have been doing is having this program to cut, cut, cut government services, which, of course, has led to reductions in public employees.

So, for example, while the private sector has added about 1.7 million jobs over the last 12 months—of course, during the Bush administration we were losing jobs—the public sector has lost about 400,000 jobs. When you consider the fact that women are disproportionately likely to work for the public sector, their employment decline has been particularly hit when public sector employees get laid off.

So I want to keep connecting the dots tonight, if I may. We started out the conversation with the cuts to women's health in this deceptively entitled bill, the so-called—I don't even want to repeat it because it is so wrong, but the Protect Life Act, actually it's a "not to protect women's life" act.

Mrs. MALONEY. That's a better name.

Mr. ELLISON. But then we move on to cuts to important programs that older women are disproportionately relying on, we move to the wage gap, and now we're seeing that these cuts to public employees are falling more heavily on the shoulders of women.

You mentioned an agenda. Are we really talking about an agenda here, not just a single program but a whole agenda?

I yield to the gentlelady.

Mrs. MALONEY. Well, the gentleman is correct to connect the dots, and you are absolutely correct that when you cut education and health care, these are the two areas that women are employed in predominately. In many cases they have achieved leadership positions in these two fields. Yet these are the two areas that have been cut the most in the municipal areas across the country that have hurt our States and our cities.

And the gentleman is very correct to point out that you cannot cut your way to prosperity. Many economists

have come out in support of President Obama's jobs bill, including two Nobel laureates. And one economist that I like to read because he is employed by the private sector, which means if he's wrong he's going to get fired, and he was a Republican economist in that he was the chief analyst for Senator MCCAIN when McCain ran for President, and this is Mr. Zandi. And Mr. Zandi said that President Obama's economic plan, the jobs bill that he's put out, would create next year 1.9 million new jobs, add 2 percentage points to the GDP, and also cut the unemployment rate by at least 1 percent. I use his numbers since he was Senator MCCAIN's adviser and economist.

But there is a drumbeat of economists across the country that are saying you cannot cut your way out of a recession and that we are getting dangerously close to a double-dip when you combine all these massive cuts with what's happening in Europe and the instability with the countries' finances and certain of our allies, and this is an extreme challenge here at home. And economists have universally said that we need to invest and continue to work to get the economy moving by investing in job-creating areas such as the infrastructure bank and such as rebuilding our bridges and making sure they're safe.

One part that I particularly like as a former teacher is the plan to rehab schools and make them ready for the 21st century. That will employ people across this country and invest in making our schools appropriate. I know that even in the great State of New York, some of our schools are not properly wired for computers. Mr. ELLISON, when you and I were in school, all you needed was a pencil. But, today, our young people need computers. They are competing not with the people in the class but with people around the world. And they need to have high-tech access, and our schools have to be wired for the 21st century.

And the investment in creating good jobs by building high-speed rail to move us into the 21st century and repairing our infrastructure with our roads and our trains in so many ways, and also making sure that our teachers, our police and our fire are not laid off during this recession when we need to invest in helping America.

Every economist will tell us the best investment we can make for the future of our country is to invest in education. We can't afford to not be competitive with modern schools and not competitive with the proper number of teachers so that our classrooms are not so overcrowded. So that is a particular area that I like in this particular jobs program.

Mr. ELLISON. I like the jobs bill as well. It's too bad that the American Jobs Act was not even able to be debated in the Senate yesterday. You would think that we could debate the bill at least. If Republicans have different ideas about job creation than we

do as Democrats, I'm okay with that. Let's debate it, and let's get it out on the floor. But they don't even want to have the debate. You mentioned the public sector getting support.

Mrs. MALONEY. I would like to applaud what you just said. I truly do believe that there is no idea that is so frightening or threatening that it can't be debated in the United States Congress. And so I agree with you. Let's have a debate. The President has put forward his program. Let's see what the Republican program is. Let's bring it down, have it debated, and let's have the economists across the country and across the world weigh in on which program is going to get the economy moving and move us with greater strength in the growth of our economy.

Mr. ELLISON. Congresswoman MALONEY, as you know, the President challenged them, the Republicans, to do this. He said, look, I'm putting my bill up here, you bring yours up here, and we'll see which one creates more jobs. And folks like Mark Zandi, an economist who has advised both Republicans and Democrats, took an evaluation. He said the Republican plan is not likely to create any jobs next year. Well, people are employed this year and next year. And what are they doing about it? Well, they're just cutting basic services in local government, they're getting rid of health regulations in the EPA, they're doing things like creating cultural fights, like the one they did today, trying to sort of divide Americans based on people's deeply held views about the issue of abortion when we need to be getting people back to work, which is, in my view, trying to take our eye off the ball.

But I just wanted to throw out a couple of facts that I think may contribute to the dialogue. Here's one: In September, 2011, a month that just passed, the public sector lost 34,000 jobs. Eighty-two percent of those jobs were women's jobs. This is an important fact. This is according to the National Women's Law Center. And then also, the damage in the public sector was driven largely by cuts to local governments' education. I'll say that again. And, Congresswoman MALONEY, you're a former teacher, so I know this is close to your heart. The damage in the public sector was largely by cuts to the local governments' education.

In this field, one that is nearly three-quarters women, 24,400 jobs were lost from August to September. Since the recovery began in 2009, this field has lost more than 250,000 jobs. What does it mean when we, as a society, disinvest in public education?

□ 2030

One thing it means is that women workers will be hit harder because that's who three-quarters of our teachers are. It also means that our young people will be deprived.

As a person who has been in the classroom, Congresswoman MALONEY, what does that mean when a classroom

goes from 20 kids to 35 kids? What does it mean to the kids who might not be catching on to the lesson or who may have a learning disability? I mean, is it even possible for a competent, caring teacher to teach all the kids given that some may need extra help?

Mrs. MALONEY. There is scientific data that, as schools are overcrowded, the quality of the teaching goes down. That's very troubling when you talk about the hemorrhaging of so many jobs.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, there are 14 million people out of work, and there are 3 million jobs that are out there now. So, if we could miraculously fill those 3 million jobs overnight, there would still be 11 million Americans out of work and looking for jobs. For every job opening, there are five people, at least, standing in line for that job.

What I find particularly troubling is that many of these people are young people who have invested in their education and who are burdened with huge student loans, but they can't find employment. They are facing a terrible situation. Studies show that, if you can't find employment in the early years of your career, it affects your earnings and your self-confidence and your productivity for the rest of your life. For no fault of theirs, they are confronting, really, the worst employment situation in my lifetime and, really, in decades.

So we need to work together. If there were one area in which the Republicans and Democrats should work together, it's in creating jobs and moving our economy forward. Regretfully, some people don't want to do anything until the 2012 election, but the people who are out of work can't afford to wait until 2012. It is really incumbent on us to act now to help them.

Mr. ELLISON. Congresswoman MALONEY, you just mentioned a moment ago this idea of reinvesting in our schools. Today, I had a visit from a number of superintendents in my State of Minnesota. They were not all from the Fifth Congressional District, which I'm honored to represent, but they were from a cross-section around the State.

They told me that there were literally nearly 100 different school districts going to the voters for a referendum so that they could pay their basic expenses because the State government is backing off its commitment to education because the Federal Government is backing off its commitment.

The fact of the matter is we have a disturbing trend here.

They said, Look, if we could just get the part of the American Jobs Act passed that would help us with these old and outdated and rupturing boilers, these old, beat-up pipes, this poor ventilation, these windows that are not opening and closing properly—if we could get some help with our capital budget—that would free up money for

us to hire teachers and to do some real instruction.

What do you think of that part of the American Jobs Act which goes to this issue of investing in our schools and in keeping our teachers out there and preventing 280,000 teachers from being laid off? What do you think about this idea of, really, just making sure that the infrastructure of our schools is sound for our kids and for the people working in the schools?

Mrs. MALONEY. You focused, really, on one of the critical parts of the President's jobs proposal—modernizing our schools.

Not only would it help you through this period by creating good-paying jobs to modernize the schools and to keep the teachers working—and, I would say, the police and fire—but it also invests in better education, a better environment for our young people to learn and grow, and to modernize the schools to the extent that they are wired appropriately for the 21st century. These are important areas that we need to look at and think about.

I also want to point out the unemployed. The jobs aren't out there, so when you don't continue the unemployment insurance, there is no hope for these people. It's better for them to continue looking for a job and to continue trying and not to give up hope so that they continue working towards that end.

I just want to tell you how much I enjoyed sharing with you information on the jobs program for the President and, really, of the opposition's agenda—our friends on the other side of the aisle—to keep women down and back, of disproportionately cutting programs that aid women, of disproportionately going after, literally, their constitutional rights to make the choices that are legal in our country which provide the best health care for them.

The Progressive Caucus has always stood up for women, children, and families, and I want to thank you and the caucus in a programmatic way for standing up for women, children, and families and also for organizing this Special Order.

Mr. ELLISON. Congresswoman MALONEY, I know that you have to take care of other important responsibilities, so I want to just thank you.

I just think it's important, Mr. Speaker, for people to know that Congresswoman MALONEY is the author of the Credit Cardholders' Bill of Rights Act. It's when you go and use your credit card and don't get back a bunch of fees and stuff you didn't even bargain for—terms being changed without any notice to you. When you used that credit card and were late on that card, sometimes they used to jack you up on the card you weren't even late on because you were late on some other card. They can't do that anymore.

When people benefit from credit card justice, you have to thank CAROLYN MALONEY. You cannot just use that card and say, Wow, things are better

than they used to be with this card. They're better because CAROLYN MALONEY fought tirelessly.

This was an uphill climb for you. It wasn't easy. You had to work on editorial boards; you had to work on Republicans; you had to work on Democrats; you had to work on the Senate. You had to just pound the pavement night and day; yet you got that done, and this country cannot pay you back for the good work you did.

Congresswoman MALONEY, I wish you many, many, many years here in this Congress; but no matter how long you stay here, I just want you to know that that accomplishment is a towering achievement which will stand the test of time and is historic. So I don't want to hold you up, because I know you've got to go do some important things, but I just didn't want you to leave without my mentioning how important that service that you gave was, not to mention the work that you do every single day, including the work you do on the Joint Economic Committee, on the rights of all people as well as on women's rights.

Mrs. MALONEY. I just want to thank the gentleman for his statement.

The Credit Cardholders' Bill of Rights, according to the Pew Foundation, saved consumers over \$10 billion in the last year by cutting out unfair, abusive, deceptive practices—and I'm using the terms from the Federal Reserve. I am proud that it helps Americans better manage their credit.

No longer can people raise rates any time, for any reason retroactively on their balances, trapping them, really, in a never-ending cycle of debt. I had many constituents who had purchased items, and they had paid so much in interest over that time that they could have paid for the car or the washing machine; yet they still had not paid it off. This is wrong and unfair.

Central to this bill, it gives consumers the opportunity and the right to make a decision. If they're going to raise their rates, they must notify them, and the consumers have the choice of whether they opt in to a higher rate or pay off their cards and go to another provider that may have a lower rate. So it puts more competition in the system. It has lowered the interest rates, the fees, and has really helped consumers.

I want to say that we were cochairs of the Consumer Justice Caucus. We started that, really, to build support for the bill, and you were a strong part of helping me pass it.

Mr. ELLISON. That's right.

Mrs. MALONEY. It was difficult, but I'm proud that the President signed it into law and that it is now benefiting Americans and allowing more of an ability for them to control their own businesses, their own assets, their own credit. I must say, when it did pass the House, there was strong Republican support for it in both the House and the Senate.

Mr. ELLISON. Yes, there was.

Mrs. MALONEY. I am pleased that Americans have this added benefit in their lives.

Thank you so much for your leadership. It has been a pleasure to join you tonight.

□ 2040

Mr. ELLISON. Let me thank you again, Congresswoman MALONEY. You have a wonderful evening and, again, thank you for all of the great work you have done and thank you for your help tonight. I am just going to remain a few more minutes to help the American people understand what is in the American Jobs Act.

The American Jobs Act is an excellent piece of legislation. We have been talking a lot tonight here at this Progressive Caucus Special Order about women's rights, but we've also been talking about jobs and, of course, these subjects go right together.

But it's important, as we talk about this subject tonight, that the American people know what's in the American Jobs Act. The American Jobs Act will put Americans to work when jobs are needed, which is now, not later, not next year, not some other time, now.

The emphasis of the American Jobs Act is immediacy. It will preserve and create jobs now. It will put money in the pockets of working Americans now. It will give businesses job-creating tax breaks now. And it will provide a boost to the economy right now.

So this is what we're aiming for in the American Jobs Act. Republican colleagues have failed to produce any kinds of a jobs bill. The only time they ever talk about jobs is when they're not talking about jobs. They say that cutting important health regulations will create jobs. They won't.

They say that cutting taxes for people at the very top of the American income scale, corporations, will create jobs. It won't. Corporations already are awash in corporate profits. They're not using the money to create jobs, and they won't use the money even if we give them more money because what they don't have is customers. Why don't they have customers? Because people aren't working.

Americans need to be put back to work, and when businesses find that they have customers and orders they will hire people to fill those orders. When they have excess capacity, they are not going to just hire people. They're going to hire people when they need to hire people because they've got sales that they need to make.

Of course, this is a basic and fundamental difference of opinion that we have with our Republican colleagues about the way the economy works. But I do believe that after years and years of trying, trickle-down economics must be discarded, must be dismissed, must be thrown away as a discredited economic theory.

Trickle-down economics, which is the Republican mantra—they believe in trickle down. They believe if you give

rich people enough money maybe the money will trickle down to the rest of us.

This has been a failed economic policy. They are wrong. They have been proven to be wrong, and yet they never stop coming here saying, if we just gave the rich people another tax cut, if we just gave the rich corporations, who don't pay any taxes now, more money. If we just gave them more money, all those profits that they have they might maybe hire somebody. They're wrong, and history has proven them to be wrong. I don't know why they cling to this outmoded, discredited, discarded theory of economics, but they cling to it.

The American Jobs Act would do something different. It would put people back to work, and with people working again, this will boost aggregate demand, aggregate meaning added up, cumulative demand. And with that, more customers, more people with money to buy and spend, this economy will take off and the store will hire people because they will have a reason to. So the American Jobs Act goes right to the problem.

But here's the other thing. The American Jobs Act calls it a Jobs Act, and it is. But there's something also very important that the American Jobs Act does that I wish got more play. It invests in our Nation's basic infrastructure, and it invests in our Nation's human capital.

It puts targeted tax breaks—not just giving money to rich people and corporations who have plenty of money and who won't use it to hire people—but it gives targeted tax breaks and puts money in the pockets of American workers and American employers so that they will add and grow jobs. And it puts the money into job training, which does skill upgrades for our people so that they are more productive and better at what they do. The job saving and job-producing actions will put paychecks into the economy, will provide vital economic needs and invest in economic growth.

I just want to quote Mark Zandi for a moment, this economist who works for both Republicans and Democrats. He is unbiased, and here's what he had to say. He says, President Obama's job proposal would help stabilize confidence and help keep the U.S. from sliding back into recession, add 2 percentage points to GDP, and add 1.9 million jobs and cut the unemployment rate by a percentage point.

Now, that's a big deal. Wouldn't the people watching this show, Mr. Speaker, like to be able to see America go from 9.1 percent unemployment to 8.1 percent unemployment? I think this would be great, and here's the best thing about the American Jobs Act. It's paid for.

Unlike the two wars that the Republicans got us into in the last decade, unlike the big PhRMA Medicare part D, unlike the tax breaks under George Bush and the Republican majority,

these, the American Jobs Act, is paid for.

President Obama has offered pay-fors in this which cover the cost of the bill. This is something the Republicans are not used to, which is why they may not quite understand the American Jobs Act. They like to spend money that we don't have. That's what they did with the two wars, Iraq and Afghanistan. That's what they did with the Bush tax cuts. And that's, of course, what they did with the Big Pharma giveaway.

But this bill is paid for. The American Jobs Act is paid for, which may be why they don't support it, because they don't understand things that are paid for. They just understand spending and adding to the deficit.

But the Republicans have not only failed to produce or support any jobs bill of their own, other than just absurdly claiming that getting rid of important health regulations is going to create jobs, they're refusing to even act on the American Jobs Act. In fact, Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR has already said the Jobs Act was dead, his words.

The Republicans not only failed to produce or support any jobs bill, they are refusing to act on this bill, and I think ERIC CANTOR has also said it was "unacceptable," another word that he used. Now, that's, again, fine with me.

If the majority leader could say, look, I don't like this part, but I can maybe go for that part, let's get the bill up here, all four amendments, debate this thing. But by all means let's start talking about jobs around here. The Republicans are more invested in protecting millionaires from paying their fair share than helping their middle class to work.

By a 16-point margin, Mr. Speaker, the Americans support President Obama's proposal to create jobs, 52 percent to 36 percent. Fifty-two percent of Americans want it, 36 percent of Americans don't. By a 16-point margin Americans support President Obama's proposal to create jobs.

By a 15-point margin, more Americans trust President Obama to do a better job creating jobs than congressional Republicans, 49 percent to 34 percent. Sixty-two percent of all Americans, Mr. Speaker, and at least 62 percent of the people surveyed support a balanced approach. That means cutting spending and raising revenue to reduce the deficit.

And, Mr. Speaker, three out of four Americans support raising taxes on Americans with incomes of \$1 million or more. These are the so-called job creators Republicans like to talk about. The only problem is they haven't been creating any jobs.

But what will create jobs is businesses and small businesses that have orders and have consumers and have people working and have people who have money to spend at their businesses. That's what will create jobs.

I think it's important, Mr. Speaker, to point out to the American people

that the three components of the American Jobs Act are designed to win. One, the American Jobs Act and reinvesting in America, preventing up to 280,000 teacher layoffs and keeping first responders, firefighters, and police officers on the job. Two, modernizing at least 35,000 public schools across the country.

Mr. Speaker, myself and Congresswoman MALONEY were talking about this. She's a former teacher. We were talking about supporting new science labs, Internet-ready classrooms, school innovations, both rural and urban. But as I talked about earlier today, the superintendents and the schools that I represent, some of them have boilers that are about to go out, windows that aren't fixed up right, roofs that need repair, basic stuff.

This would put thousands of Americans back to work as we give our young people a good decent place and a modern place to go learn in.

□ 2050

Of course, another part of the American Jobs Act, all under this important category of investing in America, is making immediate investments in infrastructure, modernizing our roads, our railways, our airports, and putting hundreds of thousands of Americans back to work; Project Rebuild, a great effort, an effort to put people back to work, rehabilitating homes and businesses and stabilizing communities, leveraging private capital and scaling up successful models of public-private collaboration; and, of course, expanding wireless Internet, expanding wireless Internet to 98 percent of Americans by freeing up the Nation's spectrum.

The second element of this important American Jobs Act which Republicans should support and Democrats do support is tax cuts for employers and employees. This is not just some giveaway. This is targeted tax cuts that are designed to succeed.

Some of my friends on the Republican side of the aisle like to say Democrats don't like tax cuts. This is not true. We are for tax cuts when they are targeted and designed to help the average working American, not just some giveaway to rich people. And, of course, I have nothing against rich people. I like rich people. In fact, one day when I leave Congress and go back to the private sector, maybe I can be one of them. But the fact is right now, right now the fact of the matter is we need tax cuts that are targeted and designed to spur the economy, not just giveaways, hoping and praying that the money will trickle down.

Specifically what I'm referring to is cutting payroll taxes in half for 160 million workers next year. The President's plan will expand the payroll tax cut passed last year to cut workers' payroll taxes in half in 2012, providing \$1,500, a tax cut to the typical American family, without negatively impacting the Social Security trust fund.

This is important because things are tough around the house. Things are tough around the kitchen table, and Americans could really use this, particularly now. It will help maintain aggregate demand, and it would be very helpful.

Also, allowing more Americans to refinance their mortgages at today's near 4 percent interest rate, which can put more than \$2,000 a year in a family's pocket.

Also, cutting the payroll tax in half for 98 percent of businesses. The President's plan will cut in half taxes paid by businesses on their first \$5 million in payroll.

Mr. Speaker, another important element of the American Jobs Act that has to do with this tax issue is a complete payroll tax holiday for added workers or increased wages. The President's plan will completely eliminate payroll taxes for firms that increase payroll by adding new workers or increasing wages. That's a targeted tax cut. That's a tax cut that's going to get people to hire somebody, not just some give money to rich people and hope they hire somebody. This is a targeted tax cut that will actually be of value.

The next one, Mr. Speaker, encouraging businesses to make investments by extending 100 percent business expensing into 2012. This extension would put an additional \$85 billion in the hands of businesses next year.

The third thing that I think is important to mention is helping the unemployed with pathways back to work. Some people like to refer to our social safety net. I think it is much more effective to refer to it as our social safety trampoline. That is when you fall down, America, caring, compassionate Nation that we are, provides a way for people to bounce back. And that is what the third element of this American Jobs Act does. Returning heroes, offering tax cuts to encourage businesses to hire unemployed veterans.

Now, I know there are some Republicans who would vote for this provision. There's got to be. Businesses that hire veterans who have been unemployed for 6 months or longer would receive a tax credit up to \$5,600, and that credit rises to \$9,600 for veterans who have a service-connected disability. Now, I have just got to believe that there are a few Republicans who would give a green vote to a good piece of legislation like that.

In the same vein of helping our unemployed, the most innovative reform to the unemployment insurance program in 40 years, as part of the extension of the unemployment insurance, to prevent 5 million Americans looking for work from losing their benefits, the President's plan includes innovative work-based reforms to prevent layoffs and give States greater flexibility to use unemployment insurance funds to best support job seekers and connect them to work, including in this innovative program things like work sharing, unemployment insurance for workers

whose employers choose work sharing over layoffs.

Second, improve reemployment services for long-term unemployed through counseling eligibility assessments.

Three, new bridge to work program. This plan builds on and improves innovative State programs where those displaced take temporary, voluntary, or pursue on-the-job training.

I'm about at the end of my time tonight. This has been the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and we are here with the progressive message, which we like to come to as often as we can. What we're talking about tonight is standing up for the rights of women. More than 50 percent of Americans are female. My daughter is one of them. I just want to argue that for this country to rise to its full measure of greatness, we have to have full and equal rights for everybody, especially women.

Today, there was an attack on women's constitutional rights today. There also have been assaults to programs which women disproportionately rely on like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, and also employment sectors that women are employed in such as the public sector. This is too bad, and we need to stand up against it. But also jobs. Instead of dealing with divisive social issues where Americans of honestly held conscience disagree very severely on this issue of pro-choice/pro-life, instead of dealing with these old issues, things that we have been fighting over for years and will probably never be solved, why don't we talk about jobs.

And so we did go into the American Jobs Act tonight where we talked about the key parts of this important bill by President Obama. First, investing in our infrastructure and in our people skills; second, targeted tax breaks designed to put people back to work, not just giveaways for the rich; and, third, help for the unemployed. These are three very important features which I believe will really help America.

All we want is a chance to debate these issues on the House floor. We can bring amendments, debate them, vote some up, vote some down, but it's just wrong to deny the American people a chance to get a good jobs bill. So tonight, I just want to wrap up by saying that it's always a pleasure to come before the House and discuss critical issues facing the American people.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

CURRENT EVENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FARENTHOLD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do appreciate the opinions of our friends across the aisle and those who

have spoken here tonight, and I know we both have similar goals—get people back to work. But when I hear my colleague across the aisle say Republicans keep proposing plans that have proved failures, the truth is the failures that the Republicans have supported were the things that our Democratic friends were in favor of.

I sure like President George W. Bush, but in January of 2008, he took a page right out of the Democrats' playbook—proposed a \$160 billion stimulus, \$40 billion of which went as rebates to people that didn't pay any income tax. So you had people getting rebates that didn't put any "bate" in. That money really didn't do any good.

And then we come around and end up in late September or early October of 2008, having unfortunately the Treasury Secretary appointed by a Republican, pull a page out of the Democratic playbook and help the folks on Wall Street that contribute and vote 4-1 for Democrats over Republicans. Bailed them out.

□ 2100

Some of us made clear you don't abandon free market principles to try to save the free market. If you have to abandon free market principles to save the free market, it's not worth saving. The trouble is we've gotten away from free market principles and that's why we were in trouble.

We had friends across the aisle that were demanding that loans be made to people that couldn't afford the loans. We had friends across the aisle that were verifying here in this room and in other hearing rooms that, by golly, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, they were healthy, there were no problems, when it turned out they were rotting from the inside.

So, apparently, as smart as my dear friends are across the aisle, they have not been taught history very well. The things that have failed are the very things that are being proposed again. The \$700 billion wasn't enough. Actually, President Bush's Treasury Secretary, the second worst Treasury Secretary in the history of our country, exceeded only now recently by Secretary Geithner in just how poor a job has been done, but they spent maybe \$300 billion, \$250 billion of the \$700 billion. So the Obama administration got about \$400 billion, \$450 billion of that \$700 billion. President Bush unfortunately listened to "Chicken Little" Paulson as he ran around saying that the financial sky was falling. That ended up all going to President Obama and Secretary Geithner for them to squander, which they have, and basically used it as a slush fund, in fact.

Then we're told we have got to build bridges. We have got to do infrastructure. How could anybody disagree with infrastructure? Well, most of us didn't disagree with doing infrastructure as long as it was governmental functions. The trouble is the President had \$400 billion, \$450 billion from TARP still

left over, and asked for \$800 billion on top of that. And then it turned out that \$800 billion may have been close to a trillion by the time they got around to having what was available under the bill. Of course, forty-two cents out of every dollar of that was borrowed, much of it from our friends and neighbors across the world in China.

But here again these governmental giveaways, the governmental rebates to people that didn't put any "bate" in, the giving more and more money to entities that were not creating jobs, the fiascos like Solyndra. And I understand even after Solyndra, Leader REID down the hall was able to procure another \$700 million for a similar company in Nevada. This is insane.

My friends, were just saying in the last hour that Republicans keep proposing plans that have proved failures. The failures of Republicans are when we adopt the Democratic strategies on these things. It's time to get back to the principles on which our government was founded. It's very basic, very simple. You give equal opportunities to people to excel, you stop paying people to fail, and we can get this country going again.

We also had a bill today that was finally going to allow people to exercise their First Amendment rights. There's not supposed to be, under the Constitution, under the Bill of Rights, the First Amendment, the government's forcing people to practice religion that is entirely opposite from the religion they believe. So we passed a bill here in the House that would allow health care providers who believe with all their heart, soul, and mind—most of them, it's a religious conviction—that to conduct an abortion and to take and kill a baby in utero, remove it and kill the baby in utero, out of utero, that it is wrong.

Having had my wife's and my first child come 8 to 10 weeks prematurely and sitting by her isolette for 8 hours—it was supposed to be only 2, but I couldn't leave, and they didn't make me until I had been there for 8 hours—with that little child, her hand clutching to the end of my finger. She was hanging on to life. The doctor pointed out, Look at the monitors. They've stabilized since she's been holding on to you. She's drawing strength. She's drawing life from you. That tiny preemie, my daughter, trying to cling to life, and my friends across the aisle condemning people like me or health care providers who think it's wrong to take that life when they just want to cling to life. Give them a chance.

I was a bit surprised but embarrassed for Minority Leader PELOSI when she said here on Capitol Hill about that bill that would allow people to practice their religious beliefs and not kill babies, the quote from our former Speaker PELOSI, was: "Under this bill, when Republicans vote for this bill today, they will be voting to say that women can die on the floor and health care providers do not have to intervene."

Well, there's good news for former Speaker PELOSI. We didn't vote to allow women to die on the floor and health care providers do not have to intervene. That did not happen. Yet the bill passed.

Good news. Apparently, the Speaker did not read the bill. She didn't know that what this allows is a health care provider not to have to kill a baby if it's against their religious beliefs. And also, no women will be allowed to die on the floor. If they do, there will be severe and dire consequences for any health care provider that allows that to happen.

There is nobody, despite the former Speaker's contentions here on Capitol Hill, there is nobody that voted for that bill today that would in their wildest nightmares want a woman to die on the floor without a health care provider intervening. And the bill doesn't do that. So whatever nightmarish bill the Speaker was referring to when she thought she was talking about the bill we passed today, good news for her. She didn't know what she was talking about. It does not allow women to die on the floor. It just allows people who believe with all their heart, mind, and soul, and their religious beliefs, that killing a baby is wrong, that when that baby wants to cling to life, as my little girl was clinging to my finger and her heart rate stabilized and her breathing stabilized, they can live. They don't have to be killed. They don't have to be killed in utero.

It's good news. It's a great thing. I hope that the Senate will pass it and not be dissuaded by those who misread the bill. Maybe they were reading some disaster book or something, because obviously they were not reading the bill that we passed.

There is also a real easy fix to establish cuts in the Federal budget. And it would be so great if our colleagues down the aisle in the Senate, our colleagues across the aisle, the Democrats, would take the fact that this House agreed to cut our own budgets in this legislative session by 5 percent and say, Hey, rest of the Federal Government, look what we have done.

□ 2110

We've not talked about it. We did it, but we haven't really talked about it. And the truth is, by Congress, by the House at least cutting our legislative budgets by 5 percent this year, and as I understand it we're going to cut 6 percent next year, it gives us the moral authority to say to every Federal department in this government, Congress has cut—or at least the House has cut—our own budgets by 5 percent this year, and you're going to, every one of you, cut your budgets by 5 percent next year. We have the moral authority to do it because we've done it. Now, maybe the Senate doesn't want to do that, but it's the morally responsible thing to do.

And then, if it comes through and we do cut our legislative budget here 6

percent in the House, we have the moral authority to say, hey, Federal Government, every department, every agency, we cut our own budgets 5 percent last year, 6 percent next year, so you're going to cut 5 percent next year and 6 percent the year after that. That's an 11 percent cut. Now we're on the right track. And if you don't want to cut some invaluable program, there's good news: cut it off some program that's a waste.

My friend, DANIEL WEBSTER from Florida, has been looking into the different transportation agencies that provide rides to people to get to their place of appointments, whether it's with the VA, whether it's with a doctor, whether it's with the Federal Government, different agencies. Eighty-five different groups provide rides. How could that be? Well, the rules, the way they were set up in 1974 by a Democratic Congress—that also set up the screwy CBO rules that do not allow a good score for things that really do help the country—that same time they were also busy sticking different agencies that do the same thing in different committees so that we have massive duplications of those type things. Well, all we've got to do is start cutting those things out.

And I hope and pray that before I leave Congress, this body and the one down the hall will have the courage to step up and say, you know what, I know I've been on my committee for a number of years and I've got seniority, and I know this committee is critical and this committee is critical, but it's time to reform the committee process. And the only way that we'll ever be able to completely eliminate or come close to eliminating all the massive duplication, replication of the same programs—spending massive amounts of money to do the same thing and yet we could combine those and save trillions of dollars over the next 10 years—we need to have a welfare committee. We take the food stamps out of the ag budget. People hear how big the agriculture budget is and they just can't believe it—there aren't that many farmers. They don't know that between 70 and 80 percent of the ag budget goes for food stamps. Let's put that in a welfare committee.

Robert Rector over at the Heritage Foundation has done fantastic work. He was telling me it takes him 2 years to find all the hidden welfare provided from all the different subcommittees, all the different agency budgets, it takes 2 full years to do that. It's time to change things here. And I realize that with a Democratic-controlled Senate it's not going to happen this session. But I hope and pray that the next session of the Senate that begins in January of 2013 will have people in the House and the Senate, regardless of their party, that will finally reform the government here in Washington, and to use the President's words, fundamentally change the way we do business so

that we don't set ourselves up to provide massive amounts of waste, fraud, and abuse.

Now, it helps to reform government if the people here in Washington who vote on the bills and down Pennsylvania Avenue who sign bills or veto bills actually read them. Wow, what a concept. It would help if the President himself, before he had gone out on the road condemning Congress for not passing his American Jobs Act, had actually had an American Jobs Act written. But after he spoke here on this floor, Mr. Speaker, he went around the country spending millions and millions of dollars—some say it was campaigning. Whatever he was doing, he was condemning Congress for not passing a bill that didn't exist. He did so that weekend, did so on Monday. Monday evening they finally had a bill, and I got it printed out. But it turns out nobody was filing it. And yet that didn't stop the President from running around saying we were refusing to pass a bill, pass his bill, right away, right now. Nobody bothered to file it. In fact, if he had taken 10 minutes out of his schedule running around the country, spending millions of dollars condemning us for not passing his bill, to have picked up the phone and called one of his Democratic friends here in the House and said, hey, I'm running around the country condemning Republicans for not passing my bill, I'm embarrassed that nobody filed the bill. I forgot to ask anybody over there to file the bill so that you could pass it. So how about filing my bill? Didn't bother to do that. Just kept running around the country condemning us for not passing his bill.

By Wednesday, that's when I realized if the President of the United States, who obviously had not read his bill, which I did, the entire bill—clearly, from the things he said about the bill, he hadn't read it at all—I decided, you know what? If he's going to condemn us for not passing the American Jobs Act, there ought to be one, so I filed one. And I was flexible. I said here on the floor I'd be willing to negotiate. And it would create jobs because it deals with an insidious tariff of 35 percent that we put on every American-made company's goods here, which keeps them from being able to compete globally because nobody else in the world slaps that kind of tariff on their own goods produced in their country. We're doing it to ourselves.

And then the insidious part is that the American public has been convinced by people here in Washington, hey, hey, it's a corporate tax, so you don't have to pay it. Of course they pay it. The corporations are nothing but a collection agent. And the way that crony capitalism has been working around this town, the only way you get out of paying corporate taxes or the massive tariffs so you can compete globally is if you've got a friend down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, or in the Senate, perhaps. Because friends of those here in the House are

not fairing so well—they're having to pay taxes. But if you are an entity like General Electric and you're close friends with the President, you really enjoy each other's company, top executives and the President, good news: You're probably going to get out of paying any taxes no matter how many billions you make.

So why not level the playing field, which would bring back manufacturing jobs—and I'm surprised the unions are not all for this—it would bring union manufacturing jobs in massive numbers back to this country. And I know there's a lot of environmentalists in the United States who really don't want the manufacturing jobs back. Even though they provide good union jobs, folks that would probably vote Democrat, they don't want them back because they think somehow—and it's really unbelievable that they think this, but they think somehow by driving those manufacturing jobs out of the United States and into countries that pollute 4 to 10 times more, producing the same products, as there was added to the atmosphere here, that somehow they've helped the environment, not realizing that that pollution goes up in the air, and the way the world turns we get an awful lot of that Chinese pollution right here in our own country, even though we don't have the jobs, we don't have the tax revenue from those, and we suffer the consequences of having run those companies out. So we get all of the disadvantages of running them out and none of the advantages.

□ 2120

We hurt our economy and we hurt our ability to prepare for any type of defense that may be necessary to those who want to destroy us, because anybody that knows history knows a country that is looked to as the securer and protector of freedom must be able to provide all of the things that it would need in a battle within its own country. And if it can't do that, it's not going to last very long as the protector of freedom, which means freedom won't last very much longer.

Now, the President talked about his bill so much, and it would be easy to be very cynical since the President went on the road and went for 6 days before there was ever an American Jobs Act filed, which was my bill. It might be easy to become cynical and say, "It doesn't sound like the President had any intention of ever getting a bill voted on; all he wanted to do was run around the country and condemn Republicans," when this was some kind of political game. He had no intention of that bill being pushed, even being filed.

There is a dramatically important piece of evidence that would seem to establish irrefutably that Leader HARRY REID and the President were not serious at all about his bill passing. What would that piece of evidence be?

Well, it would start with article I, section 7 of the United States Constitu-

tion, which says all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives. But the Senate may propose or concur with amendments, as on other bills. The critical part was all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.

Well, it's not hard to find, from the President's bill, that he's raising revenue, he's raising taxes. So, clearly, under the Constitution, no question about it, the President's bill has to originate in the House. No question about it. It raises revenue. Everybody knows that. Leader REID knows that.

So, when I heard that finally the President's bill was passed in the Senate, or not passed but filed in the Senate, then I knew, because I know something about the Constitution, well, that has to be a House bill. The President is popping people with extra tax. It raises revenue. So, obviously, it has to originate in the House.

Now, normally, unless there were games played in this town, that would mean the bill starts here, and we would take up the President's bill, and if it passed, then the Senate would take it up. But over the years, both parties, apparently, have played a political game where, if the Senate wants to start a bill that raises revenue, they will take a House bill that has already passed, strip out of it every word, and substitute for all that language of the House bill the Senate bill. And then, under the gamesmanship up here in Congress, that's been considered to satisfy the requirements of the Constitution because, technically, the bill started in the House. It has a House bill number on it, and so it did start in the House. They just took out every word and then put in the Senate bill.

From a practical standpoint, it originated in the Senate, but from a technical standpoint, since it has a House number on it, then obviously they slide by, under the gamesmanship here, by saying it's a House bill.

In fact, that's exactly what happened with ObamaCare. The House had not passed a bill that the Senate would take up on health care back 2 years ago. So what the Senate did was take a House bill, H.R. 3590, and this is the actual name of the ObamaCare health bill. I've got the first volume of the two volumes that make up the 2,400 or 2,500 pages of the President's health care so-called bill, H.R. 3590, entitled, "An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the first-time homebuyers credit in the case of members of the Armed Forces and certain other Federal employees, and for other purposes." ObamaCare is H.R. 3590, and it was a bill the House of Representatives passed mainly to help our veterans, to help our armed services, our members who have pledged their lives, their fortunes, their sacred honor to serve in our military—that is mainly who it was for—and give them a tax credit for the first-time purchase of a home.

It just seems so coldhearted to have taken a bill that started out to help

veterans and our armed services members and, beginning with line 1, page 1, strip out every single word of the bill to help our veterans and substitute therein ObamaCare, 2,400, 2,500 pages. But that's what they did because that was the game. Because they knew in the Senate, if they were going to pass a bill that raised revenue, under Article I, section 7 of the Constitution, they had to take a House bill so they could play the game of saying, Well, it did originate in the House, has a House number on it, House title on it. We just stripped all that language out and put our bill in.

That's the only way that the President's so-called jobs bill could originate in the Senate, practically, is to take a House bill, strip out every word, keep the House bill number, keep the House bill title, and put the President's so-called jobs bill in there. That's the only way that bill could ever have a chance of becoming law. And Leader REID knows that. He's a smart man.

And from what I understand, the President at one time was a local instructor in a law school, and surely he had to have read the Constitution and understand that. So he would know, as would Leader REID, that for the President's jobs bill to meet the constitutional requirement of Article I, section 7, then Leader REID would have to strip out a House bill.

So when I heard that Leader REID had filed the President's so-called jobs bill, I directed my staff to find out what House bill number and what House bill title that Leader REID had stripped every word out of and substituted therein the President's so-called jobs bill. And I found the answer. He didn't do that. Leader REID filed the President's bill with no cosponsors.

A little trivia. The American Jobs Act, my bill, I think it's got five cosponsors. The President's so-called jobs bill, zero cosponsors. Mr. REID filed it. Mr. Speaker, it is S. 1549. That's a Senate number, S. 1549. That's a Senate bill.

□ 2130

Leader REID did not bother to do what would be required, even under the gamesmanship of Capitol Hill, to strip out a House bill. And there's only one reason he wouldn't do that. There's only one reason the President wouldn't request that he do that, and that is because they had no intention of that bill—this bill—ever passing. Now I've only got the first few pages because the President's bill is actually 155 pages. But that came before. I got a copy of that before it was ever filed by anybody.

So then I heard that Leader REID actually filed an amendment to the President's so-called jobs bill, and I thought, ah, now he's no longer going to play this ridiculous charade of acting like he wants a bill to pass that he knows could never become law because it originated in the Senate and doesn't have a House bill number. So, okay,

he's filed an amendment, the new bill, it has surely got to be some House bill that was stripped of every word, but it turns out that was Senate bill 1660. It's still a Senate number, it is still originating in the Senate, there's not even a charade, facade being shown here, which makes very, very clear Senator REID and President Obama never ever intended for the so-called jobs bill of the President to pass. Never intended for it to pass. They never did.

A smokescreen is all this has been for weeks now, millions and millions and millions of dollars running around the country demanding we pass a bill that neither Leader REID nor the President had any intention of ever having passed because they knew the way the procedure works here when a bill like this that raises revenue originates in the Senate and the Senate were to actually pass it, then the Senate Clerk would send it to the House, it would go to our Clerk, and they would review it, and they would find that it raises revenue, as the President and Leader REID know and acknowledge, and they would do what's called blue slipping it. They put a blue slip on it in essence saying that the House cannot take up the Senate bill because it raises revenue. And that means under article I, section 7, it must originate in the House, and, therefore, it's being sent back to the Senate without any action whatsoever because obviously people at the other end of the hall were playing some kind of game, knowing that a bill to raise revenue that originated in the Senate and did not have a House number, did not have a House title, would never become law. It was all a game. All a game.

Apparently, the goal of this political game played by the President, and Leader REID has as a goal the President winning the game, the political game, and getting reelected and the American people losing because there was no bill that was ever seriously intended to pass by the President or Leader REID. That is tragic, simply tragic.

The American people suffer, people are losing their jobs, and the only reason that the unemployment rate did not rise one more time again, that it stayed at 9.1 percent, that disastrous rate, was because so many employees who had been out on strike came back on to work. If they had not done that, then the unemployment rate would have reflected the truth.

This country is still in big trouble, all while the President travels around making speeches about passing a bill that neither he nor Leader REID ever had any intention of passing and becoming law as the American people suffer.

Now, I heard my friends across the aisle here tonight say they wish, in essence, that the Republicans would bring their jobs bill. Well, there's great news. Apparently, while my friends hadn't noticed, we have passed about a dozen bills out of this body and sent them down to Leader REID that will

create jobs across the country, will bring down the price of gasoline, will bring down the price of energy, all kinds of bills we've sent down there, and they're sitting in the Senate.

So for all of those people who have said the President is flat wrong when he says that we have a do-nothing Congress and as he is traveling around this week saying there's a do-nothing Congress, I'm going to defend the President here. For those that say the President is completely wrong when he says it's a do-nothing Congress, well, I'm going to defend the President. And I stand up for him because the President, when he says there's a do-nothing Congress, is one-half right, and he ought to be acknowledged for being one-half right when he says there's a do-nothing Congress because there is a do-nothing Senate.

They're sitting on bills that would create jobs, bring down energy prices and would bring jobs back to America easing the burdens that have sent companies fleeing from this country to South America, to China, to India and to other countries. We bear them no ill will, but we want our jobs back here in America. And how wonderful to have the President's big job czar as a guy who has sent thousands and thousands of jobs from his own company overseas.

Well, he apparently knows what he's doing because since he's been our jobs czar for President Obama, we've had thousands and thousands and thousands and thousands more jobs continue to flee and go across to other countries. He knows what he's doing. He did it with his own company, and now we're continuing to have that happen with other companies.

Well, obviously, since the President, based on the things he said about his so-called jobs bill, has not read the bill, clearly, that's how we know he's not misrepresenting things, he just doesn't know what his bill says. And, in fairness, he could not possibly know what his bill says because he was on the road for 4 or 5 days, the whole time the bill was being written, demanding we pass a bill that hadn't even been written.

I'll just flip through some of the provisions here. We're told, once again, just like we were in January of 2009, that we must pass the President's bill, just like in 2009, because it's going to provide bridges and infrastructure. I'm surprised that in 2½ short years the President was thinking people would have already forgotten that he used that sales pitch to sell a nearly trillion-dollar bill that didn't do anything he said it would. And then I found out today—my friend, MICK MULVANEY, pointed out this morning that when adjusted for inflation to the current level today, every interstate highway in this country had \$425 billion spent in total to construct all the interstate highways we have in the country. Yet the President, in January of 2009, talked about creating all these new roads, infrastructure and bridges, and yet there was only a tiny fraction of all that

money that was used at all on such infrastructure, and if he had taken half of that money and used it on infrastructure, we could have had an entirely new interstate highway system to mirror the one that we already have.

It is amazing the kind of money that was squandered with nothing to show for it. That's the embarrassing part. If we had more people employed today than ever before, then even though it was an abandonment of free market principles, I would have to be grateful that there were new jobs and people were employed. You want to help people? Let them get a job that was not a giveaway from some government agency. Let them earn their own keep.

□ 2140

For those of us who believe the Bible—I won't try to shove my religious beliefs on anybody else, but for those of us who do believe the Bible, you can look. Before there was a fall from grace, before such a thing as some people call "sin" was ever introduced into the world by improper choices, God gave Adam and Eve—not Adam and Steve, but Adam and Eve—a job.

He said, "Tend the garden." They were in a perfect paradise where there were no thorns, no sweat—a perfect paradise. People had a job. "Tend the garden."

A job is a good thing. It builds self-esteem, and it allows people to give of themselves to help others, not to come to Washington and use and abuse the taxing authority to take people's money to give to our favorite charity. It's for individuals to be blessed because they earned money at their own jobs and then helped people.

I believe the Creator knew how much good that did our hearts, minds and souls to earn something and then help ourselves and others who need it.

That's not what you find in the President's so-called "jobs bill." Just when we thought, surely, Washington had learned a big, big lesson about the disaster when the Federal Government starts getting into the business of financing things, we have the President proposing what he calls the American Infrastructure Financing Authority, page 40. It's another massive bureaucracy.

Who would control it?

Oh. Well, it's a financing authority, so maybe it's not run by the government. Fannie and Freddie had government fingerprints all over them, all over some of the worst problems. Maybe the President learned a lesson from the damage done to this country by Fannie and Freddie being improperly managed.

Then you can turn the page to page 41 and see, oh, the board of directors of the American Infrastructure Financing Authority consists of seven voting members appointed by the President. How about that. How about that. I guess the President didn't learn his lesson. He thinks the government is still the way to go about, not only funding

housing for 100,000, 200,000, 300,000 or so, but now we'll fund billions of dollars in infrastructure financing. He'll stand good for that.

Ironically, just as in the President's so-called "stimulus bill" in January of 2009, where the President promised all this great infrastructure and it turned out it was just a tiny bit of infrastructure compared to the overall amount, we find he has done the same thing in this new so-called "jobs bill." There's a little bit of money for infrastructure, but compared to \$450 billion, it is a tiny drop in the bucket. There's a little revenue generated here by auctioning off some broadband spectrum. Oh, I see there are provisions here where the public will relinquish some of its licenses and where other people will relinquish different things.

I always hate to see that word when the government makes people relinquish things, but the language is there.

Then what we get by selling off a little bit of broadband spectrum is found at page 75 of the President's bill, called the Public Safety Broadband Network. If individuals in this country were disappointed that the Federal Communications Commission, the FCC, did not totally control the airwaves the way they wanted them to—maybe they wish there'd been a Fairness Doctrine reinstated or maybe they wanted the Federal Government to just exercise with an iron fist its authority, which I think would be unconstitutional, but to limit speech—well then, people would have to be encouraged by this new entity, the Public Safety Broadband Network, because it will take over the broadband for us.

But not to worry. We'll call it a "corporation," so it won't be government, right? Wrong.

If you look at page 76, even though it says it will be established as a private, nonprofit corporation, it turns out the members of the board will be the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General of the United States, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and they will go about appointing 11 more individuals to serve as non-Federal members of the board.

Well, happy days, happy days.

More and more government.

It's interesting. There's a little money for a reemployment program. How many reemployment programs are we going to throw money away on to train people for jobs that don't exist? How about allowing the public sector to have that money?—which is not available to borrow when the Federal Government is sucking that money out of use by the private sector. It's not there to be borrowed and used to build up companies, to build up jobs, to create jobs. Oh, no. The Federal Government is taking it to build more government—more training programs for jobs that don't exist.

Then there's a new program here at page 106 that most people have never heard about, and I really doubt that

the President knows it's here. It's a new program, entitled Short-Term Compensation Program. It does say that it's initially voluntary, but it also says if an employer reduces the number of hours worked by employees in lieu of layoffs—and I've had people tell me they were doing this, where, for example, they didn't want to lose their valuable employees, but business was terrible, so they all agreed among themselves they would take a reduction in hours/a reduction in pay so that they could save the company, weather the storm, maybe get to January 2013 when the economy would rebound because we'd have new free market principles put in place and things would take off. Then everybody could go back to making an even a better living.

Under this provision, if you're part of the President's new program and if you reduce by at least 10 percent the hours of your employees, then according to subsection 3, those employees would be eligible for unemployment compensation. That means the unemployment tax rate for that employer would go up. I've heard from employers who've said, If you raise my unemployment tax rate, I'm going to have to lay off a whole lot of employees instead of being able to save the company, save their jobs and weather this storm.

It does say on down the page, under subsection 7, that if an employer provides health benefits and retirement benefits under a defined benefit plan, then the State agency is required to certify that such benefits will continue to be provided, which means, for the employers I talked to who are struggling and just trying to hold on, they're not going to be able to hold on. They're going to have to keep providing benefits at the same level. They're trying to weather the storm, which is what companies normally do just to survive. That's what individual mom and pop operations do—they cut their budgets. Not here in Washington.

One of the best things I've heard all year is when Chairman RYAN said the vision he has for our budget includes finally adopting a zero baseline budget. I am so grateful to Chairman RYAN. He sees the same thing I do. We need to have a zero baseline—in other words, no automatic increases. It started in 1974. It's time it quit because a mom and pop operation—a mom operation, a pop operation, any operation, any business. When times are tough, they have to cut. Not here in Washington. Under the rules set up in 1974, there is a formula so that we have automatic increases every year. It's time to stop it.

□ 2150

If an agency is going to get additional money, they need to prove that they should get it. But as I started off this hour, Mr. Speaker, saying this House has adopted a budget that cut our legislative budgets by 5 percent across the board, it's time we exercise our moral authority and say everybody else in the Federal Government is

going to have to have the same kind of 5 percent cut across the board. And when we do that 6 percent to our budget next year, it's time to demand, after we do it in the House, everybody else in the Federal Government has to do it too.

There's so many other provisions that have nothing to do with creating jobs, and you can look at page 134 and see that the President, who's talked about all these millionaires and billionaires need to pay their fair share, even though we're now approaching 50 percent of the country that will not pay income tax.

If the President believes what he says, Mr. Speaker, it is time to call the bluff and say, all right, then let's have a flat tax, everybody pays the same amount, it doesn't matter if you're an ultra zillionaire, billionaire, if you're one of the poorer workers, everybody is going to have an investment, as the President likes to say in this government, and that way they'll have more interest in what happens. They'll have more interest in seeing we don't waste so much money up here, and we can do that.

This is why I'm sure, also, the President never read the bill that he demands we pass, that I explained earlier, why we know now neither the President nor Leader REID had any intention of this bill passing, so they didn't bother to meet the constitutional requirements.

At page 135, the President's bill defines what he's been calling a billionaire and a millionaire as a taxpayer whose adjusted gross income is above, C, \$125,000 in the case of married filing separately; 250,000 in the case of a joint return. But if you're a gay couple living together, then you can be grateful to the President because you can claim \$200,000 or \$225,000 as your exemption amount.

But even at that rate, I'm from East Texas, and the public schools I went to were awfully good, but they taught me that when a number has six figures in it, it isn't a million and it isn't a billion. So when the President's bill says \$125,000 if you're married, that's the exemption you've got before they start slapping you with extra tax, and I haven't heard anybody else but me talk about this, but down in subsection C on page 135, not only does the President not do away with the alternative minimum tax, as the title says there's an additional AMT amount in the President's bill.

Now there's a jobs bill. People you're calling millionaires and billionaires

and define it as somebody that makes \$125,000, you slap them with extra alternative minimum tax, you take away deductions.

I'm telling you, Mr. Speaker, it is time that we had a flat tax across the board. Everybody would pay their fair share. And the more money you make on a flat tax, the more money you're going to pay in.

I agree with Art Laffer, who was telling me, there is a strong justification for two deductions only, the mortgage interest deduction and charitable contribution deduction. All the others go away. Now that would be a fair tax. Everybody would pay their fair share. And since the President's not aware of how oil companies work, and since they've spent more and more and more money than ever in the Interior Department budget to consider permits to drill for oil or gas, we've gone from 140-something permits that cost a whole lot less to process to now processing double-digit permits, we're losing jobs.

I hear from people in the Gulf affected by the Deepwater Horizon explosion by the President's good friends at British Petroleum, who were all set to endorse the President's cap-and-trade bill before the blowout, and then they had to postpone that. But when you eliminate deductions that only keep independent oil companies alive, then it affects the majors in only one way, and that is you drive out all the independent producers, the majors will be able to charge more than ever, they'll make more profit than ever.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In the few minutes I have left, with so many wanting to destroy our way of life, with so many out of work, such a troubled time here, I want to finish my time on the floor tonight by reading the words of a man named Abraham Lincoln. In 1851 he wrote to his stepbrother encouraging him about the last illness of their father.

Lincoln said: "I sincerely hope father may recover his health; but at all events tell him to remember to call upon and confide in our great and good and merciful Maker, who will not turn away from him in any extremity. He notes the fall of a sparrow and numbers the hairs of our head, and He will not forget the dying man who puts his trust in Him."

In 1858, Abraham Lincoln said: "Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prized liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seeds of despotism at your own doors. Familiarize yourselves with the chains of bondage and you prepare your own limbs to wear them. Accustomed to trample on the rights of others, you have lost the genius of your own independence and become the fit subjects of the first cunning tyrant who rises among you."

And then finally this from his speech in 1861, as he left Springfield, Illinois, to head for Washington, and I close with this, Mr. Speaker:

"I now leave, not knowing when or whether ever I may return, with a task before me greater than that which rested upon Washington. Without the assistance of that Divine Being who ever attended him, I cannot succeed. With that assistance I cannot fail. Trusting in Him who can go with me, and remain with you, and be everywhere for good, let us confidently hope that all will yet be well."

It is with that faith in that same Divine Being that I have hope for the future, and with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2944. An act to provide for the continued performance of the functions of the United States Parole Commission, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3078. An act to implement the United States-Columbia Trade Promotion Agreement.

H.R. 3079. An act to implement the United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement.

H.R. 3080. An act to implement the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 14, 2011, at 9 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the third quarter of 2011 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2011

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
Shane Wolfe	9/9	9/13	United Kingdom		2,072.00		1,385.80				3,457.80
Per Diem Returned					(397.56)						(397.56)
Jonathan Duecker	9/8	9/13	United Kingdom		2,590.00		1,385.80				3,975.80
Per Diem Returned					(400.00)						(400.00)
Committee total					3,864.44		2,771.60				6,636.04

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. PETER T. KING, Chairman, Sept. 18, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2011

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, Oct. 4, 2011.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3465. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Housing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Intergovernmental Review received September 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3466. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Award Fee Reduction or Denial for Health or Safety Issues (DFARS Case 2011-D033) (RIN: 0750-AH37) received September 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3467. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Annual Representations and Certifications (DFARS Case 2009-D011) (RIN: 0750-AG39) received September 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3468. A letter from the Certifying Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Government Participation in the Automated Clearing House (RIN: 1510-AB24) received September 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3469. A letter from the Certifying Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Indorsement and Payment of Checks Drawn on the United States Treasury (RIN: 1510-AB25) received September 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3470. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rate Increase Disclosure and Review: Definitions of "Individual Market" and "Small Group Market" [CMS-9999-F] (RIN: 0938-AR26) received September 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3471. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Depart-

ment of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Advisory Committee; Change of Name and Function; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: FDA-2011-N-0002] received September 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3472. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination to waive restrictions of Section 1003 of Public Law 100-204; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3473. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-099, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3474. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-101, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3475. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-097, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3476. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-156, "Saving D.C. Homes from Foreclosure Temporary Amendment Act of 2011"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3477. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-155, "Unemployment Compensation Funds Appropriation Authorization Temporary Act of 2011"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3478. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Early Seasons and Bag and Possession Limits for Certain Migratory Game Birds in the Contiguous United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands [Docket No.: FWS-R9-MB-2011-0014] (RIN: 1018-AX34) received September 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3479. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary — Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Reorga-

nization of Title 30 [Docket ID: BOEM-2011-0070] (RIN: 1010-AD79) received October 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3480. A letter from the management and Program Analyst, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Transitional Worker Classification [CIS No.: 2459-08; DHS Docket No.: USCIS-2008-0038] (RIN: 1615-AB76) received September 20, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3481. A letter from the Office Chief, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Quarterly Listings; Safety Zones, Security Zones, Special Local Regulations, Drawbridge Operation Regulations and Regulated Navigation Areas [USCG-2011-0874] received September 22, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3482. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Model A109A and A109AII Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0861; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-092-AD; Amendment 39-16778; AD 2011-17-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3483. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Missouri River from the border between Montana and North Dakota [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0511] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 27, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3484. A letter from the FMCSA Regulatory Ombudsman, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Parts and Accessories Necessary for Safe Operation; Saddle-Mount Braking Requirements [Docket No.: FMCSA-2010-0271] (RIN: 2126-AB30) received September 23, 2011; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3485. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Thunder on Niagara, Niagara River, North

Tonawanda, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0718] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 27, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3486. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company (GE) CF6-45 Series and CF6-50 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0998; Directorate Identifier 2010-NE-29-AD; Amendment 39-16783; AD 2011-18-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3487. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Copperhill, TN [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0402; Airspace Docket No. 11-ASO-18] received September 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3488. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France (ECF) Model EC120B Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0859; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-052-AD; Amendment 39-16777; AD 2011-17-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3489. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Clemson, SC [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0394; Airspace Docket No. 11-ASO-17] received September 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3490. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Model A109A, A109A II, A109C, and A109K2 Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0823; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-018-AD; Amendment 39-16765; AD 2011-17-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3491. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Hawaiian Islands, HI [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0754; Airspace Docket No. 11-AWP-12] received September 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3492. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Area Navigation Route Q-37; Texas [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0867; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASW-16] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received September 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3493. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Forest, VA [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0378; Airspace Docket No. 11-AEA-11] received September 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3494. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2007-27747; Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-030-AD; Amendment 39-16782; AD 2009-10-09 R2] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 16, 2011, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. JONES, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. FLORES, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. ROSS of Florida):

H.R. 3176. A bill to allow a State to opt out of K-12 education grant programs and the requirements of those programs, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit to taxpayers in such a State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. MCGOVERN (for himself and Mrs. EMERSON):

H.R. 3177. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for the transportation of food for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 3178. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to require persons to keep records of non-employees who perform labor or services for remuneration and to provide a special penalty for persons who misclassify employees as non-employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. WOMACK (for himself, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. WELCH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina):

H.R. 3179. A bill to improve the States' rights to enforce the collection of State sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. MARINO, Mr. DENT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. CRITZ):

H.R. 3180. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the legacy of the U.S.S. Cruiser Olympia; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3181. A bill to establish a moratorium on regulatory rulemaking actions and to repeal all rules that became effective after October 1, 1991, and are in effect as of the date of the enactment of this Act, 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. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3182. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 222 West 7th Avenue in Anchorage, Alaska, as the "James M. Fitzgerald United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 3183. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to exempt licensed independent insurance producer remuneration from the medical loss ratio; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. FILLNER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 3184. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to ensure fairness and transparency in contracting with small business concerns; to the Committee on Small Business, 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. LATTA (for himself, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. KLINE):

H.R. 3185. A bill to provide that the rules of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines" have no force or effect with respect to existing stationary compression and spark ignition reciprocating internal combustion engines operated by certain persons and entities for the purpose of generating electricity or operating a water pump; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOEBESACK, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SCHAUGHTER, Mr. STARK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 3186. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce tobacco smuggling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLD (for himself, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. DENT, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. KELLY, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 3187. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the 75th anniversary of the establishment of the March of Dimes Foundation; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. DOLD:

H.R. 3188. A bill to maintain American leadership in multilateral development banks in order to support United States economic and national security by authorizing general capital increases for the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Inter-American Development Bank, the African Development Bank, and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. CAPPES (for herself, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 3189. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish a program to provide grants for cardiopulmonary resuscitation and automated external defibrillator training in public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. CICILLINE:

H.R. 3190. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to prohibit insured depository institutions from charging consumers fees for the use of debit cards; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 3191. A bill to establish the John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PETRI, Mr. KIND, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 3192. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to inter in national cemeteries individuals who supported the United States in Laos during the Vietnam War era; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 3193. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to implement a drug testing program for applicants for and recipients of assistance under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas:

H.R. 3194. A bill to provide for a moratorium on certain regulations, 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. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 3195. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts received on account of claims based on certain unlawful discrimination and to allow income averaging for backpay and frontpay awards received on account of such claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California (for himself and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 3196. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for reassignment of

certain Federal cases upon request of a party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 3197. A bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Spokane, Washington, as the "Mann-Grandstaff Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 3198. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to improve coverage for colorectal screening tests under Medicare and private health insurance coverage, 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. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. BENISHEK):

H.R. 3199. A bill to provide a comprehensive assessment of the scientific and technical research on the implications of the use of mid-level ethanol blends, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. CARNAHAN (for himself, Ms.

BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. CHU, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SHULER, Mr. SIREN, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BARROW, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CARTER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. CAPPES, Mr. TONKO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KEATING, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota):

H.R. 3200. A bill to provide flexibility of certain transit functions to local entities; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 3201. A bill to amend the Budget Control Act of 2011 to eliminate the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction; to the

Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. CLARKE of Michigan):

H. Res. 434. A resolution celebrating the 10-year commemoration of the Underground Railroad Memorial, comprised of the Gateway to Freedom Monument in Detroit, Michigan and the Tower of Freedom Monument in Windsor, Ontario, Canada; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. KAPTUR:

H. Res. 435. A resolution condemning the persecution of political opposition leader Yulia Tymoshenko as well as other political prisoners, among them former internal affairs minister Yuri Lutsenko; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut:

H. Res. 436. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of October, 2011, as "National Youth Justice Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H. Res. 437. A resolution recognizing the security challenges of convening government officials in one specific place and directing the House of Representatives to take appropriate steps so that the House of Representatives can meet in a virtual setting; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and 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.

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.

[Omitted from the Record of August 1, 2011]

By Mr. TOWNS:

H.R. 2785.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This Bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, known as the "General Welfare Clause." This provision grants Congress the broad power "to pay the Debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."¹

¹Please note, pursuant to Article I, section 8, Congress has 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."

[Omitted from the Record of August 5, 2011]

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 2795.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution: Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: No Money

shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 3176.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Tenth Amendment to the Constitution: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H.R. 3177.

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 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution, Clause 3, which says, "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes," and Clause 18, which says, "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. WOOLSEY:

H.R. 3178.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced under the powers granted to Congress under Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 3179.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause of the U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3180.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 5 and 6.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3181.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3182.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 3183.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 3184.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 3185.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This resolution is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 3186.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. DOLD:

H.R. 3187.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 5 which states "The Congress shall have the power . . . To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standards of Weights and Measures."

By Mr. DOLD:

H.R. 3188.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3, which provides Congress the power to "regulate commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States." This legislation authorizes general capital increases for multi-lateral development banks.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 3189.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 3190.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 3191.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. COSTA:

H.R. 3192.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 3193.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas:

H.R. 3194.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 3195.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and as further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California:

H.R. 3196.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Peremptory Challenge Act of 2011 is authorized by Article 1 Section 8 under the Commerce Clause and the authority to constitute Tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 3197.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 3198.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to clauses 3 and 18 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 3199.

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. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 3200.

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 Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 3201.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 5, Clause 2

Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behaviour, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.

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 Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 12: Ms. PELOSI and Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 23: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 114: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 152: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 181: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 210: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 459: Mrs. NOEM, Mr. BARROW, and Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 593: Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. AUSTRIA.

H.R. 615: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 674: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 718: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 719: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 733: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 750: Mr. YODER and Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 791: Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 812: Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CHU, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 822: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 835: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 860: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. COLE, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 886: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SIREN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. REYES, Mr. BACA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GRUJALVA,

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 943: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 948: Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 1005: Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 1041: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 1063: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1085: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1173: Mr. WALSH of Illinois.

H.R. 1179: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 1195: Mr. TOWNS and Ms. HOCHUL.

H.R. 1199: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1206: Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 1219: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1235: Mr. FLAKE.

H.R. 1342: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1418: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1513: Mr. McGOVERN and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 1558: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

- H.R. 1639: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
- H.R. 1653: Mr. SIRES, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Mr. CALVERT.
- H.R. 1704: Mr. HONDA.
- H.R. 1724: Ms. HAHN and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 1744: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Ms. HAYWORTH.
- H.R. 1780: Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 1781: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. CLAY.
- H.R. 1802: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
- H.R. 1834: Mr. CANSECO.
- H.R. 1878: Mr. CARNAHAN.
- H.R. 1904: Mr. SESSIONS.
- H.R. 1957: Mr. MICHAUD.
- H.R. 1983: Mr. MORAN, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. OLVER and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
- H.R. 2014: Mr. PAUL.
- H.R. 2032: Mr. CASSIDY and Mr. ROSS of Florida.
- H.R. 2033: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
- H.R. 2054: Mrs. SCHMIDT.
- H.R. 2059: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mrs. ADAMS, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
- H.R. 2088: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 2180: Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 2182: Mr. KEATING.
- H.R. 2200: Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Ms. KAPTUR.
- H.R. 2245: Mr. WOMACK and Mr. WEST.
- H.R. 2248: Ms. BASS of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
- H.R. 2267: Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. DUFFY.
- H.R. 2287: Mr. KILDEE.
- H.R. 2299: Mr. BROUN of Georgia and Mr. WALSH of Illinois.
- H.R. 2310: Mr. HIMES.
- H.R. 2357: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
- H.R. 2446: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. CAPITO, and Ms. SEWELL.
- H.R. 2447: Mr. POLIS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. NEAL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KIND, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. LANCE, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. DREIER, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. MACK, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CARTER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. KELLY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. NUNES, Mr. OLSON, Mr. RENACCI, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. SCHILLING.
- H.R. 2471: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
- H.R. 2514: Mr. YODER.
- H.R. 2541: Mrs. LUMMIS.
- H.R. 2563: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. PALAZZO.
- H.R. 2569: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. FLAKE.
- H.R. 2597: Mr. MCCOTTER.
- H.R. 2662: Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FORBES, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. WALSH of Illinois.
- H.R. 2672: Mr. PAULSEN.
- H.R. 2789: Mr. POSEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PITTS, Mr. COLE, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
- H.R. 2815: Mr. LIPINSKI.
- H.R. 2874: Mr. BOREN and Mr. HUELSKAMP.
- H.R. 2899: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. MCCOTTER.
- H.R. 2900: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. COLE.
- H.R. 2945: Mr. CANSECO.
- H.R. 2948: Ms. MOORE and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
- H.R. 2953: Ms. BASS of California.
- H.R. 2959: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.
- H.R. 2964: Mr. HARRIS, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. CANSECO.
- H.R. 2966: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
- H.R. 2997: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HANNA, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. MARINO, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HECK, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. WEST, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. COLE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. KLINE, Mr. HALL, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs. BLACK, Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. BERG.
- H.R. 3000: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 3032: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
- H.R. 3035: Mr. MULVANEY.
- H.R. 3046: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. FILNER.
- H.R. 3058: Mr. KLINE.
- H.R. 3059: Mr. FILNER and Ms. DEGETTE.
- H.R. 3074: Mr. COLE.
- H.R. 3076: Ms. FUDGE and Mr. CONYERS.
- H.R. 3077: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
- H.R. 3087: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
- H.R. 3104: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ROSS of Florida, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
- H.R. 3126: Mr. HOLT and Mr. LOEBSACK.
- H.R. 3135: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. LATTA.
- H.R. 3138: Mr. HEINRICH and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
- H.R. 3154: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. CHU.
- H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. DICKS and Mr. PAYNE.
- H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. HANABUSA.
- H. Res. 16: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
- H. Res. 20: Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H. Res. 98: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
- H. Res. 364: Mr. KIND, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
- H. Res. 397: Mr. TOWNS.
- H. Res. 401: Mr. ELLISON.
- H. Res. 402: Mr. HARRIS.
- H. Res. 403: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
- H. Res. 429: Mr. HIGGINS.