

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued today.

DONALD J. TRUMP,
THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 21, 2018.*

THE PROPOSED PROTECTING LIFE RULE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor and privilege to yield to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM), an extremely effective Member of the House of Representatives, the former assistant majority leader of the South Dakota House of Representatives, and a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and his work protecting life in this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, taxpayers should not have to bear the abortion industry's financial burden directly or indirectly, and yet, every single year, the American people are forced to deposit \$60 million into the bank account of Planned Parenthood, an organization that performs more than 300,000 abortions annually.

Now, I understand that this money cannot be directly spent on abortions, and we have been successful in protecting taxpayers from funding these procedures through the Hyde amendment.

But by subsidizing organizations like Planned Parenthood, which promote and perform abortions, taxpayers are propping up the abortion industry, and that is just not right. That is a burden that they should not have to bear.

I know some will try to claim this move as damaging women's health, but that is false. The President's decision will not take a penny from women's health.

Instead, it redirects those funds to clinics and centers that offer comprehensive life-affirming care to women from the moment of conception on.

And in many areas, health centers like this far outnumber Planned Parenthood clinics. For example, in my home State of South Dakota, there are six federally qualified health centers operating in 45 service sites, but just one Planned Parenthood center.

For decades, the abortion industry has tried to normalize this operation. But I want to be clear: Abortion is not healthcare, and it is not family planning either.

Abortion is the intentional ending of an unborn baby's life. There is nothing more fundamental to our society than our kids. Our founding documents speak on behalf of us and our posterity.

The American Dream itself rests on the idea that our children will have more opportunity than we do, and that is how America works.

And no matter how small they are, whether they are born or unborn, we should never stop passionately arguing for their life and their liberty.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for her very eloquent statement.

Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the Trump administration announced its intention to re-assert and promulgate portions of President Ronald Reagan's modest but necessary life-affirming title 10 rule; a policy designed to ensure that taxpayers don't fund, facilitate, or promote abortion in America's \$286 million per year family plan program.

This new old policy comes at a time when huge majorities of Americans, over 60 percent, according to major polls, strongly oppose the use of taxpayer funds for abortion.

The Trump/Reagan policy, now called the Protect Life Rule, comes at a time when the high utilization of ultrasound imaging of the child in the womb has provided spectacular clarity and empathy, and even love, for the baby.

First baby pictures today, the kind you put on the door of your refrigerator, are of unborn babies. Seeing is believing.

No one can seriously deny anymore that unborn children are alive, dynamic, precious, a miracle, and defenseless.

Title 10 was intended to be about family planning, prevention, not the hideous dismemberment or chemical poisoning or deliberate starvation and forced expulsion of a defenseless unborn baby. There is nothing benign or compassionate about killing a defenseless child.

Mr. Speaker, created by Congress in 1970, title 10 of the Public Health Service Act authorized taxpayer funds to assist "voluntary family planning projects," but made absolutely clear in the status that Federal funds were prohibited from being spent on "programs where abortion is a method of family planning."

As title 10 was administered, however, that didn't happen. So to faithfully implement both the spirit and the letter of the law, President Ronald Reagan issued a rule in 1988 that included physical separation of abortion activities from federally funded family planning projects.

In response, the American abortion industry sued to get hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollar subsidies, and they lost. On May 23, 1991, 27 years ago this Wednesday, the U.S. Supreme Court, in *Rust v. Sullivan*, affirmed the constitutionality of the Reagan title 10 rule.

Tragically, President Bill Clinton, by executive order, reversed the Reagan policy. He not only authorized abortion clinics and family planning activities under the same roof, co-location, but went further, mandating, made it a condition of receiving title 10 funds, that title 10 recipients refer for abortion, an egregious violation of conscience rights protected under Federal law.

Thus, by requiring abortion referrals, family planning service providers who oppose abortion, were and are today, precluded from all participation in the Federal program.

Today, hundreds of abortion clinics are co-located as title 10 family planning facilities. For example, 266 of Planned Parenthood's abortion clinics are subsidized by U.S. taxpayers in the title 10 program, to the tune of \$56- to \$60 million each year.

□ 1945

Planned Parenthood is an organization, let's not forget, that is directly responsible for over 7 million deaths of unborn children—a staggering loss of children's lives.

Mr. Speaker, if past is prologue, I fully expect an organized, aggressive, willful distortion of the Protect Life Rule. Nevertheless, in the spirit of honest debate and civil discourse, I urge opponents and the news media to be clear what this rule actually does and what it doesn't do.

According to the White House, the new Protect Life Rule will: one, physically and financially separate family planning clinics from abortions, and will make other important reforms. It will also safeguard the conscience rights of providers by eliminating the egregious illegal mandate that requires all participants in the program to refer pregnant women to abortion.

The Protect Life Rule will not, however, prohibit counseling that may include conversations about abortion. This would be in keeping with guidance issued by George H.W. Bush's administration that affirmed that:

Nothing in these regulations is to prevent a woman from receiving complete medical information about her condition from a physician.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Cardinal Timothy Dolan, chairman of the Committee on Pro-Life Activities, really summed it up when he said: "For too long, title X has been used to subsidize the abortion industry. We need to draw a bright line between what happens before a pregnancy begins and what happens after a child has been created."

He goes on to say: "Abortion always takes the life of a child and often harms the mother, her surviving children, and other family and friends as well."

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), my good friend. He serves on the Committee on Ways and Means and is a former member of the Butler City Council.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, who has been a longstanding and committed champion of life.

Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, the Trump administration proposed cutting title X funding for organizations like Planned Parenthood that perform abortions. Now, the proposed rule does not cut funds from the title X family planning program. Instead, the funds

are directed to community health centers like The Primary Health Network in Sharon, Pennsylvania. Countrywide, there are 20 times more community health centers than Planned Parenthood. In fact, there are absolutely no Planned Parenthood offices in my district, but there are 37 federally funded health centers. Planned Parenthood receives \$56 million a year in taxpayer dollars through title X.

One of the things I wanted to just talk about for a minute, if I can, today we again grieve at the loss of innocent life, and I just would ask people to look at the loss of innocent life that we see every day in the United States. There are approximately 3,000 abortions performed daily in the United States.

So as we grieve so much for the loss of innocent life, I think sometimes we forget about all of the other life that is being lost and we kind of push that aside because we say: The Supreme Court made a ruling that allows that to take place. Regardless, it still is a loss of innocent life, and we see this every day, but somehow as a nation, we have a deaf ear and a blind eye to that loss of innocent life.

To me, it just would seem that at some point we look at this and realize it for what it is. I can't tell the other gentleman how much I appreciate the battle that he has continued, and it shouldn't be a battle. We are all trying to do the same thing, and it is to make sure that innocent life is protected.

So this piece, it doesn't take any money at all away from the title X family planning program. It does take a look at Planned Parenthood and says, you cannot use this taxpayer-funded money, this \$56 million to \$60 million a year to provide abortions. I would just ask the country as a whole, and the Nation, and we, as a people, to please take a look at what is going on.

This loss of innocent life is so tragic and so unnecessary, and I say that because I know a lot of the pregnancies are unintended, but there are loving families waiting for children who are there, who are willing, and who are wanting to provide a loving home for children.

So I would like to see if we can somehow come to an agreement or come to an understanding about what is being lost every day—3,000 innocent lives a day.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman is doing. I know how hard it has been. It is so hard for some people to weigh in on it, but I just think there is a conscience that we all need to have, and preserving life is one of those.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman KELLY so much for his comments and his leadership for many, many years. I deeply appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES), a good friend and colleague, who is a distinguished member of the Education and the Workforce Committee and also serves on Homeland Security.

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the new title X regulations announced by the Trump administration's Department of Health and Human Services.

Title X is a family planning program authorized in 1970 to provide family planning services to low-income women. Currently, Congress approves \$286 million a year to provide these family planning services like: education, counseling, health screenings, and healthcare. For years, pro-life protections like the Hyde amendment sought to ensure tax dollars, including title X funds, would not go to abortion providers.

However, the Clinton-era title X regulations have sadly mandated that all grantees refer abortions as part of their family planning services and created loopholes allowing title X funding to flow to organizations which provide abortions, such as Planned Parenthood.

Under these Clinton-era regulations, Planned Parenthood has been able to receive an average of \$56 million in taxes each year from title X. Clearly, that is not in line with the intent of the title X family planning program and it is past time to change.

I was proud to help lead the effort in Congress to urge the Department of Health and Human Services Secretary Alex Azar to update title X guidelines with those similar to regulations in place during the Reagan era. These Reagan regulations—which were upheld by the Supreme Court in 1991—were rolled back by the Clinton administration and have remained in place since then.

However, today, thanks to President Trump and his administration, we turn this page and mark a historic victory for life. This week the Trump administration will unveil new regulations called the Protect Life Rule which will prohibit any organization that performs or refers abortions from receiving title X family planning funds.

The Protect Life Rule will mandate that title X grant recipients be physically and financially separate from facilities that provide abortions, closing for good that loophole that has allowed organizations like Planned Parenthood to receive title X funding.

Currently, Planned Parenthood conducts 320,000 abortions every year and receives nearly \$60 million in tax dollars annually. Implementing the Protect Life Rule will save thousands of innocent lives and ensure that title X funding supports actual family planning, not abortions.

The Protect Life Rule will also increase safeguards for victims of sexual assault, these victims who have already been abused. Implementing the Protect Life Rule will not cut any funds that go toward family planning to support mothers and families every day. In fact, it will provide more money net for legitimate family planning activities. To suggest otherwise, would be a politically motivated lie to the American people.

Contrary to the doomsday rhetoric used by pro-abortion advocates, this is a great day for life and families across America. I want to thank dozens of pro-life grassroots organizations and more than 150 of my colleagues from the House and Senate who joined this effort to push back for the new title X regulations—especially Representatives BLACK, HARTZLER, and SMITH.

I also want to thank President Trump and his administration for issuing the Protect Life Rule, heeding our calls and the calls of millions of Americans who have long demanded that tax dollars not go to abortion providers, just as the law was intended.

President Trump ran as a pro-life candidate, and the Protect Life Rule is just the latest example of how the President and Republicans in Congress believe in keeping our promises to the American people.

The Protect Life Rule is a win for millions of Americans who have marched for life in our Nation's Capital and the millions more who have marched throughout our country, including in my home State of Kansas.

I look forward to the implementation of the Protect Life Rule.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for his comments and his leadership, especially on this important issue. I deeply appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), a member of the Agriculture Committee, the Small Business Committee, and a force on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and appreciate him yielding, and also appreciate CHRIS SMITH's leadership on the pro-life issue here in the United States Congress.

It takes a strong and committed force to constantly be on top of every component of the life issue every day and night. I am convinced that CHRIS SMITH misses sleep over this, as I do and many of us do. But today, we have got something to be happy about, Mr. Speaker, and that is that the \$286 million that goes into family planning and is under title X, the purpose of those funds is to help plan the number and the spacing of children. And I think that God should be in charge of that.

I have long said that a solution for our society is good people need to have a lot of babies and raise them right. And once we get our social agenda right, if we get our faith right, if we get our families right, if we understand the Constitution, if we have a work ethic that is right, and if our integrity is there, all the rest will automatically take care of itself.

I see these little babies when I look around in my church. Our church is just full of little ones. I had a little newborn in front of me last Sunday and I watched how the family passed that little newborn along. I saw a granddaughter shoot across the aisle to grandparents. Nobody worries. I don't

worry because those kids there are going to be all right.

This country always takes care of its little ones. There has never been a time where we could have more confidence in taking care of our little ones, but we have got to get them born.

We are seeing money borrowed from China to supplement a national debt to go into a title X family planning program. Abortion is not family planning. Abortion is ending a significant component of the family.

This program also has statutory prohibition on abortion. So this policy that is unfolding here—thankfully, from the Trump administration—will restore the statutory provisions and Planned Parenthood themselves—you have heard the number, Mr. Speaker, 56 million—and my math came out to 60 million. It is in that category—that is used to advocate for abortion and to actually commit abortions.

Some people aren't moved by the utter immorality. I have looked at some things that I saw today as I was flying in this morning, and I looked around on the internet and picked up some things. One of them that caught my eye was that the U.S. birth rate has hit a record low. Now, that record low consists of this: There were only 60.2 babies born per thousand women in this past year in 2017. That is the women between the ages of 15 and 44, the fertility years, as the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention describes it—only 60.2. That is the lowest it has ever been since we have been keeping records, and we have been keeping records for decades.

Also, the total fertility rate is the lowest it has been since 1978—and I think we had an anomaly in 1978—but that total fertility rate, Mr. Speaker, I point out that in order to sustain our population as it is, just a level population, it takes 2.1 babies per woman in order to sustain our population. And that is rated in the total fertility rate. That is 1.764 today, babies per woman, the lowest it has been since 1978, and well below—hundreds and hundreds below—what it needs to be able to sustain our population.

And here is another record that is the lowest in 30 years. Now think of this: The population of the United States of America is as high as it has ever been—about 326 million or more. With 326 million people, you would think the higher the population is, the more babies would be born into that population—at least you would set a record on babies born into the population because our population is as large as it has ever been.

But here is the real data on it. There were 3,853,472 births in 2017. That is the lowest number of births in 30 years. The lowest number of births in 30 years, and we also need to add to that, there are roughly 1 million abortions that took place in America in 2017.

So if those babies had been born, we would have had 4,853,472 little ones here rather than the 3.8 million that is in the data that we have.

□ 2000

According to this data, 21 percent of the babies conceived in America's lives are ended by abortion, Mr. Speaker, and I am seeing an administration that is moving around on the side of life. I am seeing a society that is moving along on the side of life. I am watching the 4-D ultrasounds where now we can hear the heartbeat and we can watch them move and squirm in the womb.

I am encouraged that America's society and America's civilization is moving toward the side of life.

Eventually, we will see the end of *Roe v. Wade*, *Doe v. Bolton*, and *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*. We will get there, Mr. Speaker. And the work that is done by Mr. SMITH and others and, thankfully, the President and the administration get us closer to that day.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud this decision, and I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for this Special Order hour.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is now an honor and privilege to introduce a former member of the Colorado General Assembly and a member of the House Armed Services and Natural Resources Committees, DOUG LAMBORN.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's leadership.

The Trump administration is set to announce proposed regulations regarding the title X family planning funding stream, very similar to Reagan-era rules, to clearly separate family planning from abortion services. This is good news and something I have been strongly urging President Trump and Secretary Azar to do.

I think it is important to remind ourselves of something very basic: Family planning should determine when to begin new lives. Abortion ends lives. Abortion should never be considered an ethical method of family planning.

Under the new proposed rule, counseling or referral for abortion would no longer be required for family planning grantees, and colocation with abortion providers would no longer be allowed.

The Trump administration is doing the right thing, as President Reagan did, to ensure that taxpayer money goes to family planning centers that are not in the abortion business. For too long, Planned Parenthood has used title X as their personal slush fund.

I will continue to work to find legislative solutions to end taxpayer funding of Planned Parenthood, but until we are able to get legislation through the Senate—and we have gotten it through the House—this will be a significant step forward.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the Trump administration.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, DOUG LAMALFA is the distinguished gentleman representing California's First District. He serves on the Committees on Agriculture and Natural Resources.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the rest of my colleagues who have spoken up here as well.

This is a great opportunity to, I think, shed light on some truth on what this really means with title X, what has gone on in the last couple decades, really.

The proposed Protect Life Rule used to be the way of doing business in this country for the way funding would be directed to those providing health services. In recent years, a significant portion of that has been now allowed to go towards those who are providing abortions.

A key element to always remember is abortion is not family planning. This rule we are talking about here that I urge President Trump to move forward with would draw, indeed, a very bright line between abortion and family planning, as was clearly intended in the statute. Currently, 266 Planned Parenthood abortion centers are also funded under Federal title X locations.

So what is the general opinion of the public on this? Nearly two-thirds of Americans do not believe that their dollars should be funding abortions. America's taxpayers don't want this. They don't want to be complicit in it. They don't want to be a part of it.

So what is the effect? Family planning funding will not be reduced by a single dollar. It is just which services will be provided by which locations is the question here.

The Protect Life Rule would not decrease title X funding by a single dollar but, instead, will be directing those dollars to the sites willing to comply.

Less than 500 of the roughly already 4,000 title X services under the current rule are Planned Parenthood facilities, less than 500 out of 4,000. So for those claiming that only Planned Parenthood provides these, in some cases, so-called services, there are plenty of those places that are already doing that without Planned Parenthood's help. Indeed, this will provide more opportunities for women and girls to find locations that will provide health services with the dollars going where they are so desperately needed—rural America, especially.

It doesn't have to be just Planned Parenthood, as we would hear so much from the other side of the aisle who desperately defends them at every turn. Clinton-era regulations allowed funding for abortion centers and required all grantees under title X to refer for abortions.

What about those centers and those facilities that have a conscience on this issue? They don't want to have that. We are going through that in California right now. It is going in front of the Supreme Court, whether it is right or not or constitutional to force pro-life centers to refer for abortions. Clinton-era regulations require that as well.

In the new Protect Life Rule being put forward, I hope President Trump and his administration follow through on it to help protect those freedoms to decide if those centers want to be part of that or not. Indeed, centers that don't promote and push abortion will be the ones that come forward and receive this type of funding that is so necessary and the right thing that the American people and the majority want to see happen.

So I commend this effort. I commend the administration for contemplating and pushing through with this. I thank my colleague, Mr. SMITH, for always being that strong voice for what is right. Well done, sir.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for his eloquence and his principled and very courageous stand.

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

GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise today to anchor the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order hour.

I would like to thank the Congressional Black Caucus chairman, CEDRIC RICHMOND, for his leadership in this effort.

For the next 60 minutes, we have an opportunity to speak directly to the American people about issues of great importance to the Congressional Black Caucus and the millions of constituents whom we represent.

Tonight's Special Order hour topic is gun violence and gun violence prevention.

Mr. Speaker, how many more lives?

Mr. Speaker, there are 13,000 gun homicides a year in the United States. On an average day, 96 Americans are killed by guns.

Sadly, our children are not untouched by this senseless violence. On an average day, seven children and teens are killed with guns, and since 2013, there have been 311 school shootings.

Kyle McLeod;
Angelique Ramirez;
Chris Stone;
Jared Black;
Kimberly Vaughan;
Sabika Sheikh;

Cynthia Tisdale;
Glenda Ann Perkins;
Shana Fisher;
Christian Garcia.

On Friday, eight children and two of their teachers were slaughtered during the early morning hours of the school-day, and those were their names.

Many students thought it was a drill when a fellow student wearing a "Born to Kill" shirt opened fire at his school. Throughout the weekend, witnesses and survivors recounted the sheer terror of the shooting and its frenzied aftermath.

This is unacceptable, Mr. Speaker. Enough is enough. We know that there are ways to reduce gun violence in our communities and in our schools. There are solutions.

Today, the movement is being led by young people from around our country, including the Ninth Congressional District of New York that I am honored to represent. In April, I met with students from March for Our Lives NYC.

In my hands are the postcards. I have nearly 100 letters from my constituents calling for us to take up some of these solutions. My constituents are calling on me, their Representative in this esteemed body, and upon all of us to do something now.

One student wrote:

We shouldn't have to be marching for this. Children are dead, lots of them. Do something. Anything.

"Please help," wrote another.

Mr. Speaker, that meeting was nearly 2 months ago, and this President and this Congress have done absolutely nothing.

Since the Parkland shooting, countless numbers of children have died in their schools and in their communities because of our inaction. Our inaction puts our children in danger.

One student wrote:

It is time to serve the American people and not the gun lobby.

One teacher stressed the need to protect kids and staff. Another said:

Schools and teachers need more funding for books, salaries, social support programs, and counseling, not more guns.

One letter came from someone who had actually been shot:

One in three people in the U.S. knows someone who has been shot, and I am one of them.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, am a survivor of gun violence. While serving in the New York City Council during the year 2003, all colleagues were coming back from a recess period, and we were excited to see one another. One of my dearest and closest colleagues, the Honorable James E. Davis, came to work that day as we all did, excited about doing the work for the people of the City of New York.

Unfortunately, James E. Davis had befriended his assailant. His assailant walked into the chambers of the New York City Council and unleashed a violent attack on Mr. DAVIS that took his life. That attack took place in the workplace in front of all his colleagues.

To this very day, I need to just close my eyes, and I can transport myself back into that moment where members had to scramble to the floor, where members ran out of the chambers and barricaded themselves in the speaker's office waiting to be rescued, not knowing whether we were being attacked or it was a lone assailant, not knowing whether our colleague would survive or whether he would perish.

Mr. Speaker, since 2003, we have continued to see senseless death due to uncontrolled unwillingness in this body to do what we know we can do: to do background checks, to make sure that we provide a pathway for those who have mental health concerns to receive treatment, and to ban AK-47s and AR-15s.

If you are 18 and have to be registered to drive in the United States of America, you should also have to be registered to carry a firearm.

We know there are plenty of stories of gun violence that are not shared on the House floor, and many more receive no media coverage.

The gun epidemic has hit underserved communities of color particularly hard. Gun homicide rates in these neighborhoods have reached a critical point, where homicide rates often reach 10 times the national average.

□ 2015

While gun-related deaths have fallen in New York, in parts of my district, the death toll has risen since last year. In Brownsville, Brooklyn alone, murders are up.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of a national crisis. Urban violence has too often been left out of the national conversation about guns, gun running, and gun trafficking, and instead, too often, the epidemic in urban centers is used by many as a misguided, misdirected distraction so that our conversations on gun reform, racial justice, or police tactics are disregarded. But gun violence intervention programs have been shown to be effective at breaking the cycle of violence and impacting communities.

The question is: Will Congress truly get serious about supporting these programs? Will we get serious about universal background checks? Will we get serious about limiting access to weapons of war?

Nine out of 10 Americans agree that we should have universal background checks, including three out of four NRA members. But this Republican Congress has shown to be spineless.

In the East Room of the White House, the President expressed his solidarity with the people of Santa Fe and said his administration would do everything in its power to protect schools and keep guns away from those who should not have them.

Just earlier this year, he also vowed to take action after the Parkland shooting. At that time, the President said he would look at stricter background checks and raising the minimum age for buying an assault weapon. But Donald Trump did not press for