

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Welcome to the 112th Congress.

While there was much pomp and ceremony this week in welcoming all of the new Members to the House of Representatives, this week belonged to the American people.

The American people sent a deafening message on November 2. It was that they wanted to see this national government end this era of borrowing and spending and of bailouts and takeovers and turn our national government back in the direction of fiscal responsibility and limited government.

Madam Speaker, I rise this morning to say in this first week of this new Congress, if House Republicans got the message, we will keep our promises to the American people and more.

If House Republicans got the message, we won't just extend tax rates for a couple of years; we will extend them permanently.

If House Republicans got the message, we won't just find \$100 billion in cuts; we will find more than \$100 billion in cuts, and we will bring about the kind of long-term reform to change the size and scope of government.

If House Republicans got the message, we won't just vote once to repeal ObamaCare; we will vote to repeal ObamaCare again and again until we consign their government takeover of health care to the ash heap of history—where it belongs.

So welcome to the 112th Congress. The American people, this is your week.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF REPEALING HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, those who want to repeal health care reform should be clear and candid about what they are doing. You just can't expect the people to understand the effect of repeal just because you put a label on it like "ObamaCare" or misrepresent job-creating legislation as a "job killer" or misrepresent legislation that doesn't even have a public option in it as a "government takeover."

Health care reform will close the doughnut hole. It allows young adults to stay on their parents' policies. It means that those with preexisting conditions can get insurance. It provides tax credits to small businesses to help them cover their employees. It creates community health centers and additional health professionals. It prohibits insurance company abuses, like cutting off coverage in the middle of illnesses or unreasonable increases in rates. It means that, in 2014, all Americans will have the security of knowing that they can have health care insurance.

You just don't call or put a label on it or recite a poll-tested slogan. Tell

the public what will happen to the doughnut hole, to young adults, to those with preexisting conditions, to small businesses. Tell the public what is going to happen if we repeal health care reform.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2, REPEALING THE JOB-KILLING HEALTH CARE LAW ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 9, INSTRUCTING CERTAIN COMMITTEES TO REPORT LEGISLATION REPLACING THE JOB-KILLING HEALTH CARE LAW; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 26 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 26

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2) to repeal the job-killing health care law and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. 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) seven hours of debate, with 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and Minority Leader or their respective designees, 90 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 90 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 90 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Small Business; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 9) instructing certain committees to report legislation replacing the job-killing health care law. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and any amendment thereto to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules or their respective designees; (2) the amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative Matheson of Utah or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as

read, and shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House a resolution, if offered by the Majority Leader or his designee, relating to the status of certain actions taken by Members-elect. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except four minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and Minority Leader or their respective designees.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, it is a great honor for me, for the first time in 4 years, to say, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very good friend and Rules Committee colleague, the gentleman from Rochester, New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER). During consideration of the resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

□ 0920

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 26 provides for a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 2 and self-executes an amendment by the majority leader, which is required under the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010. This is routinely required and is similar to many provisions that have been self-executed since the enactment of statutory PAYGO.

The resolution provides for 7 hours of debate on H.R. 2, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of six committees and the majority leader and minority leader.

It also provides the minority a motion to recommit H.R. 2 with or without instructions.

House Resolution 26 provides for consideration of H. Res. 9 under a structured rule that provides an hour of debate and makes in order an amendment, if offered by Representative MATHESON of Utah. It also provides for one motion to recommit H. Res. 9 without instructions.

Lastly, the rule provides for the consideration of a resolution if offered by the majority leader or his designee relating to the status of certain actions taken by Members-elect under a closed rule.

Madam Speaker, it was just before midnight that my great new colleague

Mr. WEBSTER and I were here in this Chamber, and we filed this rule following a lengthy 12-hour hearing upstairs in the Rules Committee, and I have to say that there were many, many discussions that took place on a wide range of issues, but I think it's very important for us to note that there are those who argue that we should not be taking up this issue because of the fact that we should be focusing on job creation and economic growth.

Well, Madam Speaker, we know that the overwhelming message that came from the American people is that we have to get our economy back on track, we have to create jobs, we have to make sure that those people who are struggling to get onto the first rung of the economic ladder are able to do just that. And that's why, when we look at a \$2.7 trillion expansion of the Federal Government, \$2.7 trillion in new spending, we recognize something that is common sense, and that is, if you're going to expand the size and scope and reach of the Federal Government by that magnitude, it clearly is going to kill the effort to create jobs and get our economy back on track.

And so that's why today, Madam Speaker, we are taking the first step in fulfilling a key promise that we have made to the American people. With this rule, we are setting in motion an effort to repeal President Obama's job-killing health care bill and replace it with real solutions, and I underscore that again because all the attention is focused on the fact that we are going to be trying to kill good provisions that are out there. Madam Speaker, we want to start with a clean slate. We are going to repeal President Obama's job-killing health care bill and replace it with real solutions.

This rule takes two important steps. The first is to allow for consideration of a bill to hit the reset button, so to speak, on the very damaging legislation that was passed last year under the guise of health care reform. The second is a resolution directing each of the committees of jurisdiction to craft responsible, effective, and economically viable health care solutions.

Madam Speaker, the resolution lays out very clearly what real reform looks like. Real reform will help, not hinder, in our goal towards creating jobs. Real reform will lower health care premiums by enhancing competition and patient choice. It will preserve the right of patients to keep their existing coverage if they so choose. It will ensure access to quality care for those suffering from preexisting conditions. It will implement meaningful lawsuit abuse reform so that resources can go to patients and doctors and not to trial lawyers. In short, it will increase access to health care for all Americans without compromising quality or hurting the very important small business sector of our Nation's economy.

Madam Speaker, the underlying replace resolution which I've offered will

begin a robust committee process to tackle the difficult but essential work of achieving these goals and crafting true reform for the American people. This will be a process in which each and every Member, Democrat and Republican alike, will have an opportunity to participate.

Madam Speaker, as Speaker BOEHNER said the day before yesterday when he accepted the gavel, we are returning to regular order. Once again, our committees will be the laboratories, the centers of expertise that they were intended to be. Rank-and-file Members of both parties will play an active role in crafting legislation, scrutinizing proposals, offering amendments, participating in real debate. Critical legislation is not going to be written behind closed doors by a select few.

Today's rule sets in motion a process that will be both transparent and collaborative, but we cannot get to that very important step without clearing the first hurdle, which is to undo the damage that has already been done.

Now, we will hear people say why is it you're considering this under a closed rule. Madam Speaker, this was a clear promise that was made throughout last year leading up to the very important November 2 election. Everyone acknowledges that elections have consequences. The commitment was made that we would have an up-or-down vote on repeal, and that's exactly what we are doing. We must repeal last year's bill before we proceed with replacement.

Just as predicted, the so-called reform bill is having very real negative consequences for our economy and our job market. It is putting enormous burdens on job creators, particularly small businesses, at a time that is already one of the most difficult that we have faced, imposing significant new burdens and penalties while the unemployment rate remains above 9 percent. We got the news just a few minutes ago that it's at 9.3 percent. We're encouraged by that positive drop, but only 105,000 jobs were created, not the 150,000 jobs necessary to be created just to sustain the position that we are in right now. So we still are dealing with very, very serious economic challenges, and that's why we need to take a commonsense approach to, first, repeal this measure and then deal with solutions.

Above all, I will say that the onerous, unworkable mandates that have been imposed are adding greater uncertainty, which is job creation's biggest enemy. Anyone who has spent any time talking with small business owners knows this to be the case. While the economic impact is already quite apparent, the fiscal consequences are looming down the road.

While the bill's authors used a host of accounting gimmicks—and I'm going to get into those further, as I'm sure I'm going to be challenged on this, and I look forward to talking about the accounting gimmicks that have been utilized—while the authors used a host

of accounting gimmicks, as I said, to mask the true costs of this measure, an honest and realistic assessment of the impact on the deficit shows a much clearer and, tragically, a far worse picture.

The Budget Committee has demonstrated the real cost of the health care bill, as I said when I opened, is a staggering \$2.7 trillion once it is fully implemented. It will add over \$700 billion to our deficit in the first 10 years. The words "reckless" and "unsustainable" hardly begin to cover it. This bill is an economic and fiscal disaster of unprecedented proportions. The time to undo it before any more damage is done is quickly running out. Republicans promised the American people we would act swiftly and decisively, and that's exactly what we're doing.

So my friends on the other side of the aisle have asked why there will be no amendments to the repeal bill. Frankly, there is nothing to amend. There is nothing to amend, Madam Speaker, to the repeal bill. Either we're going to wipe the slate clean and start fresh or we're not. Now, that's not to say there aren't some good provisions in this measure, but it is so onerous, nearly 3,000 pages, that we believe that the best way to do this is to wipe the slate clean, have an open and transparent process, and do everything we can to ensure that every single American has access to quality health care and health care insurance.

□ 0930

Now, once that slate is completely wiped clean, we will be ready for this open and collaborative process to develop the real solutions that we have talked about. That's what we promised the American people as we led up to last November 2, and that's exactly what we will deliver here today.

Madam Speaker, first, we undo the damage; then we work together to implement real reform and real solutions. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and then, after we've gone through the 3-day layover requirement next week, which is in compliance with another promise that we made to the American people, I urge my colleagues to support the underlying legislation, H.R. 2, which our colleague, the new majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, has offered, and H. Res. 9, which I have introduced, that calls for our committees to work in a bipartisan way to develop solutions to the challenges that we have out there in ensuring that every American has access to quality health care.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my gentleman friend, Mr. DREIER, yielding me time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

What a week it's been. Since being sworn in on Tuesday, the speed in which the Republican Party is working their promises has been dizzying. Speaking of the Republicans' first days

in office, tea party spokesman Mark Meckler summed the week up nicely when he said, “I actually don’t think it would be possible to fall from grace any faster than this.”

In November, the Republican leadership, led by Speaker BOEHNER, traveled to suburban Virginia and made a Pledge to America. Their constituents, including tea party patriots like Mr. Meckler, listened intently as the Republican Party pledged to be fiscally responsible and serve the will of the American people. On page 6 of the Republicans’ Pledge to America, the party states: “With commonsense exceptions for seniors, veterans, and our troops, we will roll back government spending to pre-stimulus, pre-bailout levels, saving us at least \$100 billion in the first year alone and putting us on a path to balance the budget and pay down the debt.”

The pledge was solemnly made by the Republican leadership despite being largely panned as a political stunt. Despite their promise to follow through on their pledge, on Tuesday, aides to the Republican majority said that the pledge to cut \$100 billion was “hypothetical.”

Now today they are moving forward to do the exact opposite of the actions they pledged, as they introduce legislation to repeal the Affordable Care Act. If successful, the Republican legislation will add \$230 billion to the deficit by 2021. This extra \$230 billion won’t be spent rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure, teaching our children, or providing for the millions without jobs. Instead, the \$230 billion will be added to our deficit in order to take health care benefits and protections from those who need them the most.

For example, starting this year, the Affordable Health Care Act will begin to close the doughnut hole for seniors. Under the law, Medicare beneficiaries who fall in the doughnut hole will be eligible for 50 percent discounts on covered brand-name prescription drugs. Repeal this law, and seniors receive no help and will be forced to pay their rising drug costs alone. Those are the types of protections that I fight for today.

Fiscally, Members of Congress face a \$300 billion choice. According to the Congressional Budget Office, we have two options: one, do we keep the Affordable Health Care Act and save \$130 billion by 2021? Or, two, do we repeal the Affordable Health Care Act and add \$230 billion to our deficit by 2021? That may be trouble for some; but for most of us, it is easy. For me, the answer is clear; and I assume to most Americans, it’s clear as well.

Because they can’t win by simply judging apples to apples, the Republican leadership has taken to discrediting the Congressional Budget Office. Yet a quick bit of research will reveal that Republicans have long valued the nonpartisan and reliable work of the Congressional Budget Office and have publicly supported the agency before.

In fact, in 2009 Speaker BOEHNER repeatedly referred to the CBO as a non-partisan institution and relied on their estimates to argue against the Affordable Care Act at the time. But now that the CBO’s estimates are detrimental to their political goals, they have taken to questioning the work.

Republican Senator JOHN CORNYN warned against dismissing the work of CBO just because it’s inconvenient. Two years ago he said, “I believe the professionals at the Congressional Budget Office are doing a difficult but unpopular work. They are speaking the truth to power here in Washington and making the folks who would pass these enormous unfunded bills that impose this huge debt on generations hereafter somewhat unhappy.”

“But I think they are doing an important service by telling us the facts. Last week, I commended the director of the CBO, Dr. Doug Elmendorf, for saying that the CBO will ‘never adjust our views to make people happy.’ God bless Dr. Elmendorf for his integrity and commitment to telling the truth. We need to learn how to deal with the truth, not try to remake it or cover it up.”

Now, I couldn’t agree more with that. The deficit estimates provided by the CBO are the singular authoritative figures upon which we make all of our decisions and have for decades. Even if some don’t like what the numbers tell us, we know that numbers don’t lie.

I will remind my colleagues that today’s actions are not “hypothetical.” We truly face a \$300 billion choice. We can choose to provide invaluable benefits to millions of Americans while paying down our national deficit—remember that it will save \$143 billion over 10 years—or we can choose to end valuable health care protections for millions of Americans and add \$230 billion to the Nation’s deficit.

Madam Speaker, today we are considering the first measure from the Rules Committee of this new Congress, and my Republican friends have already produced one for the record books. Let me give you some of the highlights. First of all, the resolution includes a completely closed process for two separate pieces of legislation. That means we get two closed rules in one. Maybe my Republican friends think they can save taxpayers money by rolling all the closed rules into a single resolution. I think that’s what they meant by bringing efficiency to government.

The first closed rule on the health care repeal bill does most of the heavy lifting. It blocks every single germane amendment submitted to the Rules Committee. Well, that’s not exactly right, though. It actually slips in one change without allowing the House to vote on it. This special amendment, slipped in with the famous deem-and-pass maneuver, is very interesting. It allows the House to pretend that the repeal bill is free, even though the Budget Office says it will raise the deficit by over \$1 trillion. That’s a neat

trick; and now we know the secret weapon for reducing the deficit: a blindfold.

This closed process is especially troubling on the health care repeal because this Republican bill has had no public hearings, no committee consideration, and is not paid for. The second closed rule in this two-for-one package blocks all amendments to another resolution to correct a flaw in the swearing-in process. Apparently the vice chairman of the Rules Committee was conducting legislative business before he was actually a Member of Congress. Maybe amendments are not important here because no Member in the House has seen this resolution, since the rule allows the majority leader to make changes until the moment it is introduced.

But if any of my colleagues are concerned about not having enough time to read this surprise resolution, don’t worry: the rule allows the House to debate it for 4 full minutes, 4 minutes. Have you ever heard of a bill debated for 4 minutes? Fortunately, the rule generously gives the minority 2 of those 4 minutes, and I guess that qualifies as both efficiency and bipartisanship.

Finally, the rule allows the House to consider a sweeping press release from the Republican leadership, a resolution to replace real patient protections with vague rhetoric.

Madam Speaker, this is a very disappointing day for the House Rules Committee. Our first action of the new Congress violates the promises that we heard from our Republican friends: no public hearings, no committee consideration, a completely closed process, legislative text no Member has read, 4 minutes of debate on an important constitutional issue, and so on.

For all those Members who were sent to Washington, like I was, to repair our Nation’s finances, create jobs for millions of the unemployed, help the millions of Americans in need, the decision should be simple. I encourage my colleagues to reject the efforts of Republican leadership, keep our promises to our constituents, and vote to keep the affordable health care law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0940

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to say that Thomas Jefferson said that two thinking people can be given the exact same set of facts and draw different conclusions. Well, I’ve just heard what my friend from Rochester has said. I will say that this is a great day for the people’s House because we are going to, in fact, be implementing the commitment that was made to focus on getting our economy back on track.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to our new colleague from North Charleston, South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), a very hardworking and thoughtful member of the Rules Committee who was with us for 12 hours up until late last night.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, Mr. Chairman, I will say that it's truly an honor to serve on the Rules Committee. My first experience was a 12-hour experience last night and all day yesterday. What a wonderful opportunity to serve the American people.

This is a great opportunity for all of us in America to kill the jobs-killing health care bill that is taking jobs away from the private sector. I simply want to make six quick points.

The first point is that we all recognize that the cost of insurance is only going up, up and up. There is a misnomer that this bill somehow reduces the cost of insurance. It is simply categorically not true. Shifting who pays for the insurance, the health care cost, does not make the health care cost go down; it is simply going to continue to rise.

Second point, when you design a bill that has tax increase after tax increase after tax increase and say that you are reducing the deficit by increasing taxes, it is inconsistent with the reality that the American people want from their Congress.

Third, the individual mandate is simply unconstitutional. And if the individual mandate is not a part of the bill, if we don't force every single American to buy insurance, this Ponzi scheme simply doesn't work.

Number four, bringing 10 years of revenue in and paying out 6 years of benefit and calling that equal, that's a farce.

Number five, the lifetime benefits, challenging the lifetime benefits. We want everyone in America to have the access to health care without any question. The question we ask ourselves is, from an actuarial perspective, can we pay for it, a \$2.7 trillion expansion, a new entitlement when we have a \$76 trillion unfunded liability on the current entitlement?

We simply cannot continue to dig a hole and call ourselves compassionate. There is nothing compassionate about increasing our entitlements by jeopardizing the future entitlements of all Americans.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield my friend an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Finally, the seventh point, we've heard lots of rhetoric about what we're doing to senior citizens and women. What we are facing is an opportunity to stop robbing future generations, to stop the unnecessary impact, the intergenerational cost. Without even taking into consideration the intergenerational costs, we consistently impact unborn Americans with legislation that passed under the former House.

It is good to be in the House with a brand-new Speaker. And thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to be a part of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the American people made it very clear in the last election that they want us to focus on one thing, jobs. But the new Republican majority has instead chosen to reopen an old ideological battle. I think that's a mistake.

But the good news is that the American people will have the opportunity, right at the outset of this new Congress, to see the clear differences between Democrats and Republicans.

Democrats believe that insurance companies should be prohibited from discriminating on the basis of pre-existing conditions. Republicans do not.

Democrats believe that we should close the doughnut hole and reduce prescription drug prices for our seniors. Republicans do not.

Democrats believe that young people should be allowed to remain on their parents' health insurance plan until the age of 26. Republicans do not.

Democrats believe we should provide tax breaks to small businesses and subsidies to low-income Americans to help them pay for health insurance for their workers and their families. Republicans do not.

And Democrats believe that we need to seriously address the budget deficit. Republicans do not, as the Congressional Budget Office made abundantly clear. The CBO told us yesterday that the bill to repeal health insurance reform would add \$230 billion to the deficit over the next 10 years and another \$1.2 trillion in the following 10 years.

As far as I can tell, this is the most expensive one-page bill in American history: 114 words, that's \$2 billion per word.

And rather than address those budgetary facts, the new Republican majority has simply decided to ignore them, to cover their ears and pretend that the laws of arithmetic do not apply to them.

In their first order of legislative business, the Republicans want to take health insurance reform and toss it in the trash. And how many hearings have they held on the impact of this repeal? Zero. How many mark-ups did they have? Zero. And, most shockingly, how many amendments will they consider in this bill? Zero.

The new majority whip, Mr. MCCARTHY, said after the election last November, and I quote: "When you look at the Pledge to America that the Republicans have laid out, there is a cultural change in there. There is something that opens up the floor that hasn't been done for quite some time, where bills won't be written in the back room, where the bills have to be laid out for 72 hours, where bills actually have an open rule, where people can bring up amendments on the floor."

So much for that. And instead of thoughtful, reasoned legislative language that addresses the health care issues, the Republicans' replace part of their repeal-and-replace strategy is just a list of happy-talk sound bites. It's no more than a press release.

So again, Madam Speaker, I believe we should be focusing on jobs and the economy. And in the meantime, I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and the underlying, reckless bill.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, we have 87 new Republicans in the House of Representatives. There's no more impressive group than the four who are serving with us on the House Rules Committee, among them former Sheriff NUGENT. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Brooksville, Florida.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Chairman, we were there last night in the Rules Committee for 12 hours hearing testimony from a number of individuals on the Democratic side and also on the Republican side.

But let me talk to you about this. Over the past year, I've met with thousands of people from throughout Florida's Fifth Congressional District, whether they be small business owners, veterans, or Medicare recipients. They asked me to promise, promise to repeal ObamaCare. It's clear that the American people know more than our Democratic leadership in regards to what Americans want.

ObamaCare eliminates millions of American jobs, cuts hundreds of millions of dollars from Medicare, raises taxes by almost \$500 billion over 10 years for 6 years' worth of coverage.

Everybody knows that the health care system is broken and that reform is needed. However, the unconstitutional, job-killing mandates of ObamaCare are not the answer.

House Resolution 9 is an important step in Congress working with the American public to find real, meaningful solutions to our Nation's health care needs. This is the people's House, and we should be listening to the people.

House Resolution 9 will allow us to foster economic growth, job creation, lower health care premiums and protect Medicare, and reform the medical malpractice system that is bankrupting America. For all these reasons, I'm grateful to my colleague from California, Mr. DREIER, for introducing House Resolution 9; and I'm proud to be an original cosponsor of that resolution.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, the most expensive one-page bill in the history of Congress, and it costs the taxpayers a little over \$200 billion the first 10 years alone, and over \$1 trillion overall.

Not only have the Republicans, as the first bill that we are doing a rule on and facing here on the floor, put forward the most expensive one-page bill in the history of Congress, but it is not paid for, Madam Speaker.

In addition to not being paid for, they have waived many of the notice-for-transparency requirements, the

regular order that they sought to establish with regard to the way that this Congress is run.

Madam Speaker, there were many good ideas and good amendments that were brought forward by Members of both parties yesterday during our session of the Rules Committee. I want to talk about a few in particular.

One, my colleague from Michigan, GARY PETERS, brought a proposal that would have made sure that this biggest one-page expenditure in the history of Congress did not raise taxes on small businesses. Unfortunately, that amendment is not made in order under this rule, and therefore H.R. 2 will be raising taxes on small businesses across the country that are now receiving tax credits for providing health care for their employees.

□ 0950

There was also a lot of discussion, and I think it is important that the American people know, with regard to people with preexisting conditions. Now, we all want to do something for people with preexisting conditions. There was talk yesterday, and, in fact, when we are talking about H.R. 9, there might be discussion in the future with regard to agreeing on high-risk pools for people with preexisting conditions. But what this body is being asked to do today and next week is effectively replace something that works for people with preexisting conditions, namely, eliminating pricing discriminations, with some vague assurance on paper that perhaps some day some committee, some chairman might consider, we ask them kindly to consider something that will do something for people with preexisting conditions. Well, Madam Speaker, that is simply not enough for the people that have the preexisting conditions today, for those who will in the future.

If we want to talk about improving upon health care, there is ample room to do it, but not by eliminating any protections that exist.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am very privileged to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished former chairman of the Republican conference, my friend from Columbus, Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, but I rise from my heart with a deep sense of gratitude to the American people to urge my colleagues in both parties to join us as we keep our promise to the American people and next week vote to repeal their government takeover of health care lock, stock, and barrel.

I know Democrats said at the time that they had made history. I said at the time I thought we broke with history. We broke with some of our finest traditions: Limited government, per-

sonal responsibility, and, most profoundly, the consent of the governed.

On a late Sunday night in March, the last majority had their say. On a Tuesday in November, the American people had their say. And that brings us to this moment.

It is remarkable, though, to hear Members in the minority explaining their opposition to this bill. A year ago, only in Washington, D.C., could you say you were going to spend trillions of dollars and save people money. And this morning, only in Washington, D.C., could you say that repealing a \$2.7 trillion government takeover of health care is actually going to cost money.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PENCE. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I wonder if he might repeat that line. I think he said that only in Washington, D.C., can there be an interpretation that cutting \$2.7 trillion in spending is actually going to end up costing the American people.

Is that what the gentleman was saying? I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman.

Reclaiming my time, yes. It must be mystifying for people looking in this morning to hear about the most expensive one-page bill in American history.

I say again. Only in Washington, D.C., could a Congress vote to repeal a \$2.7 trillion government takeover of health care and the minority says it costs the American people money.

Now, I know they don't like us to call it that, but let me explain. When you mandate that every American buy government-approved insurance whether they want it or need it or not, when you create a government-run plan paid for with job-killing tax increases, when you provide public funding for abortion for the first time in American history, that is a government takeover of health care that violates the principles, the ideals, and the values of millions of Americans, and the American people know it.

Now, look. After we repeal Obamacare next week, we can start over with commonsense reforms that will focus on lowering the cost of health insurance without growing the size of government.

Republicans will waste no time in bringing greater freedoms to the American people to purchase health insurance the way they buy life insurance, the way they buy car insurance. We will deal with responsible litigation reform. We will even use the savings to cover preexisting conditions.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this rule. Join us as we keep our promise to the American people and repeal their government takeover of health care once and for all.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, this is not a dispute between Republicans and Democrats about the \$1.3

trillion. CBO, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, is saying that.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the bill before us. The bill would increase the national deficit by \$230 billion, increase costs to individuals, families, and small business owners, and deny the American public the consumer protections they have been seeking for years.

Repeal of the health care law would also mean that young adults would not be able to stay on their parents' plan. This is something that would have devastating effects on constituents of mine such as Elizabeth. Shortly after graduating college, she was dropped from her parents' plan and soon developed a severe thyroid condition. As a result, she had to purchase her own individual insurance plan, which proved to be a severe financial hardship for her and her parents. Thankfully, she was able to re-enroll under her parents' plan as of January 1 because of this health reform bill.

Repeal would also mean that senior citizens in Sacramento would not see any relief from the Medicare part B doughnut hole. The health reform bill would close the doughnut hole, which is critical to seniors in my district. One such senior, Gary, regularly pays over \$2,000 a month for his prescription drugs. Repeal would mean that Gary and the thousands of other seniors in my district would see no relief from this part D doughnut hole. This is unacceptable.

Madam Speaker, a vote against this rule and against this bill is a vote to protect the American public from unfair insurance company practices, to provide relief to young and old alike, and to stay on the path to a fiscally responsible future. I urge my colleagues to vote down this rule and vote against the underlying legislation.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 1 minute to a hard-working member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, which will be one of those committees, when we pass H. Res. 9, that will be dealing with ensuring that every single American has access to quality health insurance, our friend from Brentwood, Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, today we do begin a very important process, and it is a solid first step. And I stand to support this rule and to support repeal of this law, because we have on the books a law that doesn't improve the quality of health care. It will not reduce the cost of health care, and it is going to add billions to the exploding national debt.

We have listened to the American people. They are smart, and they know that this law is unworkable. It won't deliver on the promises that they made, and the American people voted in overwhelming numbers to repeal it

and replace it. That is the action that we are going to take.

Congress cannot wait any longer to get this irresponsible law out of our doctors' offices, out of our lives, and off the books.

We in Tennessee have lived through the experiment of government-run health care called TennCare. Tennessee could not afford it, and the American people know that this Nation cannot afford a TennCare-type program on a national level.

I support the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan, our ranking member of Ways and Means, Mr. LEVIN.

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

Mr. LEVIN. This is what the Republicans are after, what their repeal would mean: It would take away from millions of Americans coverage for kids with preexisting conditions, coverage for young adults under 26. Recommended preventive care would be taken away. It would take away lower drug costs for seniors. And this is what the Republican repeal would do. It would give back to insurance companies unreasonable premium increases, unjust policy terminations, rescissions. It would take away this. It would give back profits and CEO salaries to insurance companies, not health care benefits.

□ 1000

It would give back annual and lifetime limits on benefits. It gives back to insurance companies discrimination ability against women.

These are concrete reasons to vote "no" on this repeal, a misfortune for the United States of America.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to another hardworking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, our friend from Marietta, Georgia, Dr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, we have heard a lot of arguments on the other side of the aisle in regard to the \$230 billion cost, and on our side of the aisle, of course, only in America can something actually cost \$1.15 trillion and eliminating it then all of a sudden costs \$230 billion. But, yes, Ms. SLAUGHTER, only in America, only in this Congress, numbers do lie.

Let me just say that what we have been talking about on this side of the aisle, of course, is the voice of the American people.

You know, it was about 3,000 years ago that a little shepherd boy walked into that valley of death looking up at all of those Philistines and that 9-foot giant Goliath from Gath. He had that coat of mail, he had the sword, he had the shield, he had the javelin. And what did little David have? He had a little pouch and a handful of stones. But he hit that giant right between the

eyes, brought him to his knees, and then cut off the head of the snake.

That pouch and those little pebbles represent the voice of the American people. That is what we have on this side of the aisle. That is why we are going to pass H. Res. 9 and we are going to pass H.R. 2 next week, and we are going to deliver our promise to the American people to eliminate, to repeal ObamaCare.

The American people spoke loudly. They don't like this bill. The Democratic majority in the Senate and the President have one last chance to make amends. I think they will do it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. This debate is about health care versus don't care.

The Democrats' health care law lowers prescription drug costs, helps middle class families pay for health coverage for their sick children, and expands health care for 32 million more Americans, reducing the deficit by \$143 billion. The Democrats' health care law helps grandma afford her prescription drugs.

The Republicans don't care about grandma. They want to take back the drug benefits in the new law. GOP used to stand for Grand Old Party; now it stands for "grandma's out of prescriptions." The Republicans' "don't care" repeal shows they don't care about sick children with medical bills pushing families into bankruptcy, that they don't care about grandma and grandpa who need help paying for prescription drugs.

Vote down this rule so that we can help grandma, sick children, and middle class families struggling to pay for health care.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this point I am happy to yield 1 minute to another hardworking member of this freshman class, my new friend from San Antonio, Texas (Mr. CANSECO).

Mr. CANSECO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and in support of the underlying legislation, the repealing of the job-killing health care act.

Ten months ago, President Obama and his allies in the Democrat-controlled House and Senate committed legislative malpractice when they jammed through the Congress and into law a Washington takeover of health care. They did so despite the overwhelming opposition of the American people. Since its enactment into law, what was already a unpopular law has only continued to become more unpopular.

There is no doubt that we need to reform health care in America. However, it is not done by assaulting individual liberties guaranteed in our Constitution, bankrupting our children and grandchildren, and putting Washington bureaucrats in the personal relationships between our doctors and our patients.

Repealing the health care bill will also help encourage job growth to get

our economy back on track. Our economy is not suffering from a capital crisis; it is suffering from a confidence crisis.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield my friend an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CANSECO. Policies enacted in Washington, like the health care bill, have injected uncertainty into our economy that has eroded the confidence of Americans to start new businesses or expand current ones to create jobs.

The American people have made it clear they want the health care law repealed and replaced with commonsense alternatives that will lower the cost of health care while also increasing quality and access. After meeting and speaking with thousands of Texans in the 23rd District over the past year, this is their message.

Repealing and replacing the health care bill is one of the promises made to the American people in the Pledge to America. Today, we are making good on that promise as we begin the work of repealing the health care law and replacing it to ensure that the American people can get the health care that they need, when they need it, and at a price they can afford—the Federal Government coming between them and their doctor.

I support the rule.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, this is nothing but a gag rule. I and so many of my colleagues on the Democratic side went up to the Rules Committee yesterday and asked for amendments, and they were almost all excluded from this rule.

The Republican chairman of the committee says there is transparency. He says that there is an opportunity for participation. He can say it as many times as he wants, but it is simply not true.

He also said that this was a commitment to the American people. There is no commitment to the American people here. The only commitment is to the insurance companies. They are the only ones that are going to gain from repeal of this very important legislation, because they want to increase premiums, and they want to institute discriminatory practices again against women, a woman perhaps who has breast cancer and a preexisting condition and can't get insurance, or bring back those lifetime caps, or bring back those annual caps where people lose their insurance if they have had a serious operation and they try to go back again and they don't have insurance, or perhaps the child who is up to 26 and who also will not be able to get on their parents' insurance policy again.

Let me tell you here, the only one who benefits is the insurance company, not the American people.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire of my friend on the other side of the aisle how many speakers she has remaining?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, we have got every minute taken. I am not sure everybody is going to show up.

Mr. DREIER. I am told there are 11 minutes remaining on your side.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the dean of the House and our leader on health care.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, if you listen to the Republicans today, they are telling us don't bother them with the facts. Their minds are made up.

They are unaware of the fact that the Congressional Budget Office says that this is going to create 4 million jobs in the health care legislation. They don't tell us that the same Congressional Budget Office says that passage of H.R. 2 is going to increase the deficit by \$140 billion. And they also are telling us the American people want this repeal. They don't.

They understand what this means. It means that no longer are people going to get the protections that the health insurance bill gives. No more protection, if the Republicans get their way, against preexisting conditions and rescissions denying people health care because of something that happened to them down the road before. No longer will Americans be protected against frivolous and improper behavior by the insurance companies.

This is a bad rule. It is bottomed not on facts, but on fiction. And if this body is to legislate and legislate well, we have to have the facts, not fiction, not deceit, not misleading statements by our Republican colleagues.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

□ 1010

Mr. DOGGETT. If you're hit by a truck this afternoon or your child contracts a dread disease, your future ought not to depend on the fine print in an insurance policy you didn't have anything to do with writing. No insurance monopoly should stand between you and your doctor.

Unfortunately, the Republican Party has become little more than an arm of the insurance monopolies. They ask for a vote to further empower those monopolies, and we ask for a vote to empower American families. A vote to repeal is a vote to maintain health care costs as the leading cause of bankruptcy and credit card debt in this country. It is a vote to require seniors to pay more, more for prescription

drugs, and more for diabetes and cancer screenings.

We can stand with American families today or we can kneel to the insurance monopolies. The choice is clear—let's vote for American families.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont, former member of the Rules Committee, Mr. WELCH.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentlelady from New York.

I say, Madam Speaker, to my Republican colleagues, you campaigned effectively, you beat us good, you ran on the agenda of defeating health care and repealing it. Now you're doing it. Own it. Admit what it is you are doing.

This is not a campaign. We're playing with fire. We're taking away health care benefits that make a real difference to our families.

Number one, this bill will raise the deficit by \$230 billion. Fiscal responsibility, out the window.

Second, things that matter to families; their kids, starting out getting a \$10 an hour job without health care. They have it now on their parent policies. We're taking it away.

Preexisting conditions. You have cancer and you want to buy insurance, you can. Repeal, you can't. You lose it.

Lifetime caps. If you are with cancer or diabetes and you need that insurance, you lose it before you can go without it.

And preventive care we're taking it away from seniors who are trying to take care of themselves, get those free mammograms, keep the cost of health care down. You are taking it away.

Admit it. Own it. State it proudly. It's what you campaigned on. It's what you're doing. But don't try to sugarcoat what this is about.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, the issue facing the country is jobs. Instead of repealing health care, we should bring up a jobs bill like the China currency reform. And so I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill.

Today I speak on behalf of the millions of Americans who are currently benefitting from the law and yet have been shut out of the legislative process. The way in which this legislation has been brought to this floor is a travesty. Before the Affordable Care Act became law, in the House alone we held nearly 80 hearings on the merits of reform. But this bill to repeal this lifesaving law has not had a single hearing. Not one amendment has been allowed for an up or down vote here today. That's probably because the majority knows hearings would show that the law is already a real success.

While we may disagree on the policy, we should be able to agree on the process. And this, my friends, is not the way to move legislation in the House of Representatives. We've all agreed upon that. That is why I urge my colleagues—especially the new Members who ran on the promise of ensuring an open Congress—to vote against this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you.

There is a lot of talk here on the floor about job killers. Actually this bill, the affordable health care bill, creates some 400,000 jobs. The repeal of it is actually a killer of human beings. Some 40,000 Americans die every year for lack of health insurance. That's the reality. Repeal this bill and you're going to find more Americans dying. Also, you're doing away, with this repeal of the Affordable Health Care Act, of the patients' bill of rights. I was the insurance commissioner in California. I know exactly what the insurance companies will do if this repeal goes forward. They will continue to rescind policies. They will continue to deny coverage. They will continue to make sure that those 23-year-old children that have graduated from college will no longer be able to be on their parents' policies.

This repeal is perhaps the worst thing you can do to Americans in their health care. Besides that, you will significantly increase the deficit, by \$230 billion.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD the figures from today's jobs report showing that since the enactment of health reform in March 2010, the economy has created 1.1 million private sector jobs.

UPDATE ON JOB GROWTH UNDER HEALTH REFORM

Today's jobs report exposes the fatal flaw in the Republicans' argument that health reform is "job killing."

Since the enactment of health reform in March 2010, the economy has created more than 1.1 million private-sector jobs.

That's an average of 123,000 jobs created per month in the private sector since the enactment of health reform, compared to an average of 7,000 jobs lost per month in the private sector during the Bush Administration, when our health care system was in a downward spiral and insurers had free rein to raise premiums on families and small businesses by double digits and deny or limit coverage with no accountability or recourse.

12 Straight Months of Job Growth in the Private Sector More Than 1.3 Million Private-Sector Jobs Created in 2010 Unemployment Rate Drops From 9.8% to 9.4%

113,000 private-sector jobs were created in December, the 12th straight month of private-sector job growth.

In all, more than 1.3 million private-sector jobs were created in 2010. That's a dramatic

turnaround from the situation President Obama inherited in early 2009, when we were losing 750,000 jobs a month.

The November private-sector jobs number was revised up 29,000 to 79,000 private-sector jobs created, and the October number was revised up 33,000 to 193,000 private-sector jobs created.

Government employment declined slightly in November; as a result, net payroll growth for the public and private sector combined was 103,000 in December.

The unemployment rate fell to 9.4% in December.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule that we're taking up today instead of focusing on jobs.

The new majority in the House ran on the platform of fiscal responsibility. This bill flies in the face of that promise by adding \$230 billion in the short run and over \$1 trillion in the long run to our deficit.

As important, under repeal, the Medicare trust fund will become insolvent in 2017. That's just 6 years away. Pushing Medicare over the cliff by passing this repeal breaks a sacred trust with our Nation's seniors to help provide health care coverage in retirement after a lifetime of working and paying taxes.

That is why I went to Rules Committee last night with two colleagues and offered an amendment to guarantee that repeal will not go forward unless it is certified that that repeal will not shorten the life of the Medicare trust fund. Sadly, the Rules Committee didn't allow us to help protect America's seniors. They didn't allow that amendment, we will not be able to vote for that amendment on the floor, and I urge a "no" vote on this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, then, in light of that, I am very happy to yield 1 minute to a physician, another hardworking member of this freshman class, the gentlewoman from Mount Kisco, New York (Ms. HAYWORTH).

Ms. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, as a physician, I understand the profound importance of the goals of the health care bill passed last year—to assure that all Americans have affordable, portable health insurance, providing access to good medical care.

I also understand the disruptions that this law is already causing to our economy—the predictable side effects of legislative bad medicine, and the reason we must repeal and replace it. The bill we will be considering is in no way merely symbolic. It represents the true will of the American people, the majority of whom have stated time after time to this day that they reject this law. The House's vote to repeal is the first step towards assuring that all

Americans will have the quality, choice, and innovation in health care that they expect and deserve. We need to proceed expeditiously, according to the rule on which we vote today, with the understanding that we are taking meaningful and crucial action.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentlelady.

The previous speaker is right. This is not symbolic. It's real. In fact, the Republicans are going to allow the return of the worst abuses of the health insurance industry. Preexisting condition exclusions. Taking away your policy when you get sick. Lifetime and annual caps. Throwing your kids off your policies. The Republican repeal of this bill would enable all those things for their, very, very generous benefactors in the insurance industry.

I haven't had a single constituent—and I know you haven't—beg you to bring back these abuses. Is that what you're doing? Is that what they want? You could take steps right now in fact to rein in this industry, and 400 people in this House voted for it last year. Let's take away their unfair exemption from antitrust laws so they can't collude to drive up prices, they can't collude to take away your insurance, they can't collude to throw your kids off; and all the other anticompetitive things that industry does.

I offered that amendment to Rules last night. The Republicans, despite the chairman of the committee and others having voted for it last year, would not allow it. This is an insurance industry bill plain and simple.

□ 1020

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 1 minute to another hardworking physician, a member of this new freshman class, the gentleman from south Pittsburgh, Tennessee, Dr. DESJARLAIS.

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Madam Speaker, today I rise to support the rule and to support the repeal of the Obama health care law. As a physician who has practiced medicine in rural Tennessee under the onerous TennCare law, I know firsthand that this law does not work. It restricts access to health care, it increases the cost, and it does not deliver on the promises the minority made when they passed the law.

The American people have had their say. They do not want this bill. They want it repealed, and they want to see health care reform that will increase access and lower costs.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank my colleague from the Rules Committee for allowing me to speak.

I rise in strong opposition to this rule on H.R. 2, the Patients' Rights Repeal Act. Just yesterday, the Congressional Budget Office said that this re-

peal would cost \$230 billion in additional Federal debt. It's amazing, this is our first major piece of legislation and the Republicans are already adding to the national debt.

The issue facing our country is jobs. Instead of repealing health care, we should be bringing up a jobs bill like the China currency reform. Where is that bill on the floor with the new majority?

Let me tell you what this bill will do. At least in Texas, we will see tragedy happen. 161,000 young adults will lose their insurance coverage through their parents' health care plan—that's only in Texas—and 2.8 million Texans who have Medicare coverage will be forced to pay copays now for preventative services like mammograms and colonoscopies. Medicare will no longer pay for the annual visit of nearly 2.8 million Texans—and many more Americans for Medicare—and 128,682 Texans on Medicare will receive higher prescription costs if this law is repealed.

Madam Speaker, yesterday Congressional Budget Office said "over the 2012–2021 period, the repeal of health care reform on federal deficits . . . will cost \$230 billion."

Texas and the rest of the nation cannot afford to add an additional \$230 billion in deficit spending.

The issue facing the country is jobs. Instead of repealing health care, we should bring up a jobs bill like China currency reform.

The Republicans came into office promising to reduce federal spending and reduce the deficit, but their first act in the Majority is to try to pass a Rule that would exempt H.R. 2 for statutory PAYGO.

In addition to adding billions in dollars to the deficit, consideration of H.R. 2 would jeopardize the current and future health care benefits of my constituents. The negative effects repealing the Affordable Care Act will have on Texas and all Americans.

Up to 161,000 young adults would lose their insurance coverage through their parents' health plans. Nearly 11.8 million residents of Texas with private insurance coverage would suddenly find themselves vulnerable again to having lifetime limits placed on how much insurance companies will spend on their health care.

Insurance companies would once again be allowed to cut off someone's coverage unexpectedly when they are in an accident or become sick because of a simple mistake on an application. This would leave more than 1.1 million people in Texas at risk of losing their insurance.

More than 1.1 million residents of Texas would not know if they are receiving value for their health insurance premium dollars, as insurers in state would no longer be required to spend at least 80 to 85 percent of premium dollars on health care rather than CEO salaries, bonuses, and corporate profits.

Nearly 2.8 million seniors in Texas who have Medicare coverage would be forced to pay a co-pay to receive important preventative services, like mammograms and colonoscopies.

Medicare would no longer pay for an annual check-up visit, so nearly 2.8 million seniors in Texas who have Medicare coverage would have to pay extra if they want to stay healthy by getting check-ups regularly.

A total of 128,682 Texans on Medicare would see significantly higher prescription drug costs. In Texas, Medicare beneficiaries received a one-time, tax-free \$250 rebate to help pay for prescription drugs in the “donut hole” coverage gap in 2010. Medicare beneficiaries who fall into the “donut hole” in 2011 will be eligible for 50 percent discounts on covered brand name prescription drugs.

Madam Speaker, when Texans and all Americans will soon be finally free from worrying that affordable coverage will not be available to them and their families when they need it the most, repealing the Affordable Care Act would be devastating.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote no on the rule to consider H.R. 2.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the ranking member of Government Oversight and Reform.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I rise in fervent opposition to this rule. Despite ardent promises from Republicans that all bills would be considered under regular order, this resolution has neither been debated nor voted on by a single committee of jurisdiction.

Additionally, the recently passed Republican rules package requires that all legislation be fully paid for—and yet the Republican leadership has already publicly declared that they have no intention of paying for what is estimated to be a \$230 billion increase in the deficit that the repeal of health reform would create by 2021, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

Worse than the Republicans’ already broken promises are what this rule and the underlying resolution would do to children, to seniors, and to all Americans who are suffering from illnesses.

I strongly oppose this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 1 minute to another great new Member, the gentlewoman from Archie, Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), my home State.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Members on the opposite side of the aisle said we need to be passing a jobs bill. Well, this is a jobs bill, because I can testify, as a person who’s newly elected and been on the campaign trail for a while, that in the Fourth District we had small businesses that are not hiring and not expanding because of the health care bill. We have got to repeal this so that we can create more jobs.

I am a small business owner myself, and I can tell you, since this has passed, that health insurance premiums have skyrocketed in anticipation of the mandate that is going to be forced on them. So, if we want to get serious about creating jobs, we need to start by repealing this.

This is also a bill to rein in the runaway spending that is devastating our country, and it’s mortgaging our children’s future. As a mother, that’s important to me. This bill put another \$1.2 trillion of debt on our country. We cannot afford that.

Lastly, this is a freedom bill. The people in my district do not want the government telling them they have to buy a private product and then mandating what is in that product. That is unconstitutional. By passing this last year, you have taken away my freedom, the freedom of the people of the Fourth District, and the freedom of this country. We deserve better.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON).

Ms. SUTTON. The issue facing this country is jobs. Instead of rushing to the aid of the insurance industry to reinstate their right to engage in egregious discriminatory practices of discriminating against adults and children alike based on preexisting conditions, instead of allowing the doughnut hole to continue to bear down on our seniors, we should be passing real jobs legislation.

Urgently, we should be bringing up jobs bills that will make a real difference, like putting an end to China’s currency manipulation. We’ve heard the numbers: 2.4 million jobs lost across the country, 92,000 jobs lost in Ohio, and 5,700 jobs have been lost in my congressional district due to China’s deliberate and abusive trade policies. We can do something about this issue today, and we should. It makes a real difference.

I hope that our friends across the aisle will stand with American businesses and American workers and put an end to the abusive practice of China’s currency manipulation.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

Madam Speaker, after Democrats took a shellacking on November 2, I concluded then and now that it was because of the fragile economy and because they thought just perhaps Republicans would have some new ideas about fiscal discipline.

Well here’s what we get. We get a Republican majority that is more concerned about political theatre and messaging to the Tea Party than they are in creating jobs and reducing the deficit. We need a Jobs Bill. Now.

The CBO on yesterday told us what we already suspected. Repeal will increase, yes increase, the deficit by \$230 billion. It will result in 32 million Americans losing their health insurance. And what eclipsed this whole episode was a Republican Rule that exempts Repeal from Pay-as-you-Go rules.

Shame on the Republican majority. Shame on you.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. There are 15 million Americans unemployed as we meet this morning. They do not want us to play politics with health care; they want us to work together to create jobs.

There is a job killer loose in America. The job killer is unfair trade practices that force the outsourcing of our jobs.

There is a proposal that has broad agreement between Republicans and Democrats to bring fair trade back to America. If we defeat the previous question, we will move to amend the rule to make in order the Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act, which simply says this: As the Chinese have been slamming the door shut on our workers and products, we’ve been opening our shelves in American department stores. No more of that. No more outsourcing of jobs. No more unfair trade practices. A fair and level playing field for American workers.

Let’s work together to create jobs and stop the politics and the waste of time of health care. Vote “no” on the previous question.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from New York, Mr. ELIOT ENGEL.

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

Mr. ENGEL. I rise in opposition to this amendment. It seems that the openness the new majority promised us lasted half a day. And the more things change, the more they remain the same. I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

□ 1030

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, if we are able to defeat the previous question, I will move to amend the rule to make in order a bill (H.R. 2378) from the last Congress, the Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act, which invokes our anti-dumping laws and provides relief for American workers and companies injured by unfair exchange rate policies.

I yield to the gentleman from New York for a parliamentary inquiry.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, what is the current whole number of Members of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The whole number of the House is 435.

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. WEINER. Can the Speaker certify that all 435 Members have been correctly and duly sworn and have taken the oath of office as required under the Constitution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is under the information and belief that all 435 Members have been sworn.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, this is the first act of the 112th Congress, and I have to say that I am particularly gratified that we have had six new Members of this 87-Member Republican class participate in this debate because, Madam Speaker, they have come here with a very, very strong, powerful message from the American people.

That message is that we have to make sure that we create jobs and get our economy back on track.

Even though we have gotten this positive news of the reduction of the unemployment rate from 9.8 to 9.3 percent this morning, tragically last month only 105,000 new jobs were created. That is not enough to sustain our economy. You have to create at least 150,000 jobs just to be treading water.

We know that the American people are continuing to suffer, and the message that has come from the American people through these 87 new Members is that we have to have a laser-like focus on creating jobs, getting our economy back on track, and reducing the size and scope and reach of the Federal Government.

My friend Mr. PENCE and I had an exchange in which we said only in Washington, D.C., can saying that cutting a \$2.7 trillion increase—eliminating that, scrapping that—will, in fact, cost money. It's absolutely crazy, but that is what they are arguing; and through their sleight of hand, with the Congressional Budget Office, they are going to continue to claim that it will somehow save money.

Madam Speaker, we are doing what we told the American people we would do. It is very simple. Beginning last year, we said we would have a very clean up-or-down vote:

Should we maintain this \$2.7 trillion expansion with government mandates and increased taxes, or should we repeal it? That's what we are going to be voting on after the 3-day layover next week; and, Madam Speaker, are we, in fact, committing ourselves to doing everything that we possibly can to ensure that every single American has access to quality, affordable health care and health insurance?

That's what the resolution that I have introduced, H. Res. 9, will do. It will direct the six committees of jurisdiction to begin immediately working on ways in which we can drive the cost of health insurance down.

I personally believe that we need to allow for the purchase of insurance across State lines, which is now forbidden under the McCarran-Ferguson Act. I believe that it is very important for us to have associated health plans so that small businesses can come together and get lower rates. We need to

have pooling to deal with preexisting conditions. We need to expand medical savings accounts. And yes, Madam Speaker, the fifth thing we need to do is we need to have meaningful lawsuit abuse reform so that resources can go towards doctors and not trial lawyers.

These are the kinds of things that these new Members are telling us need to be done, and that is exactly what passage of this rule will make happen.

Now, Madam Speaker, let me say I urge support of this rule, and I urge support of the underlying legislation.

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express opposition to the rule and the irresponsible move by the Republicans to dismantle health care reform for millions of Americans. There are a multitude of reasons why I am opposing this rule and why it is an affront to the democratic process, but I will focus on three today.

First, this rule shuts out any attempt to change the Republican proposal. After promising a transparent process and an honest attempt to engage Members across the aisle, Republicans went back on their word and closed the door on any meaningful conversation. Yesterday's Rules Committee meeting serves as an example of the extreme tactics being used by the majority to shut out opposition. Thirty Democratic amendments were submitted for consideration, including several that I co-sponsored, aimed at preserving key consumer protections in the health care reform law. One of the most notable provisions includes prohibiting insurance companies from rescinding an individual's health coverage due to illness or imposing annual or lifetime limits. The Democratic amendments would also preserve access to primary care and the medical loss ratio (MLR) provision. This provision requires insurance companies in the individual and small group markets to spend at least 80 percent of the premiums on medical care and quality improvement activities. Finally, the amendments would prohibit repeal if it increases cost sharing or otherwise reduces access to preventive health benefits such as mammograms, colonoscopies, and diabetes screenings. All 30 Democratic amendments were rejected by the Republicans, leaving no room for dialogue or reform.

My second concern is that Republicans are trying to turn back the clock on the Democratic reforms that have allowed millions of Americans to access affordable quality health care across the country. In my state alone, preliminary estimates suggest that 161,000 young people under the age of 26 will become ineligible to remain on their parents' health insurance, 2.8 million Medicare patients will pay more for preventative services, and 128,682 Medicare recipients will pay higher prescription costs. Moreover, Republicans are ignoring warnings from the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office that repealing the Affordable Care Act will add \$230 billion over the next 10 years to the already massive budget deficit.

Third and most importantly, there is an incredible amount of business to be done, and the American people expect that the Republicans will get to work with Democrats and the President to create jobs and build on the progress of the past two years. Instead of obsessing over the repeal of the health care law, Republicans should focus on revitalizing communities like mine on the border by pass-

ing bills that strengthen infrastructure and security. I urge Republicans to take a look at my PORTS Act as an example of bi-partisan legislation that accomplishes both of these goals and will actually benefit the American people. In short, we need to work together to get it done.

I hope that this rule is not the beginning of a session marked by continual efforts to thwart debate and stifle opposition.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this closed rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the rule for the consideration of H.R. 2, the Repealing the Jobs-Killing Health Care Law Act.

Instead of focusing on job creation and other efforts to grow our economy again, House Republicans have set the tone for the beginning of the 112th Congress by attempting to ram through a repeal of the most comprehensive health care reform legislation in our history.

They want to "repeal and replace" the Affordable Care Act, but have yet to share with us and the American people what exactly they want to replace it with.

"Just trust us," they say. Well, their idea of trust is voting to strip middle class, working poor, and other vulnerable Americans of their access to affordable, quality health care now, and worrying about the costs later.

What they call a "job-killing health care law" actually creates much-needed jobs and cuts the deficit.

In fact, according to a preliminary estimate from Director Elmendorf of the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO), repeal of the Affordable Care Act will explode federal budget deficits by \$230 billion through 2021 and by billions more in the following decade.

The bottom line is that Republicans would rather help themselves by taking away over 32 million Americans' health care than help put our nation back to work.

Simply put, a vote in favor of "repeal and replace" is a vote to:

Take coverage away from young adults looking for jobs, children with pre-existing conditions, and low-income families;

Impose lifetime limits on coverage;

Allow insurance companies to spend more on CEO salaries, bonuses, and corporate profits than health care; and

Increase preventive care and prescription drug costs for seniors under Medicare.

Madam Speaker, yesterday in the Rules Committee, I asked all those in attendance whether their health insurance premiums over the past 20 years had gone down. Not one single person, and that would include my Republican colleagues, raised their hands. Need I say more?

I urge a "no" vote on the rule and underlying bill.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H. Res. 26, a rule to provide for debate on H.R. 2, the Republican attempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

In September 2010, the Republican Party offered a "Pledge to America." They outlined their promises to create a more transparent and open Congress; to bring bills to the floor under regular order, following consideration by committee; to allow a bipartisan debate under

open rules allowing any member to come forward and have an up or down vote on amendments to major pieces of legislation; and to reject bills that increase the deficit. Most importantly, Republicans promised to work in the best interest of American families.

Just two days after Republicans have taken over the majority in the House, we are back to business as usual under Republican control. This hypocritical rule violates each promise made by Republicans during their campaign and in the rules they adopted for the 112th Congress.

The rule brings to the floor a bill that has never been considered in committee but will repeal a law that was discussed and debated for over a year in committees in both houses of Congress. That is not the regular order Republicans promised.

Democrats brought 30 amendments to the House Rules Committee, seeking an up or down vote to preserve provisions of the Affordable Care Act that prevent insurance companies from denying coverage for those with pre-existing conditions, from canceling insurance coverage for young adults up to age 26, from dropping individuals when they get sick, from maintaining the Medicare Part D Coverage gap. Not one amendment was made in order. That is not the open and bipartisan debate Republicans promised.

The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office estimates the bill this rule brings to the floor will increase the deficit by \$230 billion over 10 years, a cost Republicans conveniently excused themselves from ever having to pay in their rules for the 112th Congress. That is not the fiscal responsibility Republicans promised.

The rule will bring to the floor a bill that takes away health insurance from 32 million people, raises health insurance premiums for millions of American families, increases out-of-pocket expenses and prescription drug costs for Medicare beneficiaries, and puts control over health care decisions back in the hands of insurance companies. That is not the best interest of America's families and seniors Republicans promised.

For these reasons, I strongly oppose this rule that violates the promises made by Republicans and the promises we each made to represent the best interest of our constituents. I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and the underlying bill.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 182, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

YEAS—236

Adams Gosar
Aderholt Gowdy
Akin Granger
Alexander Graves (GA)
Amash Graves (MO)
Bachmann Griffin (AR)
Bachus Griffith (VA)
Bartlett Grimm
Bartlett Guinta
Bass (NH) Guthrie
Benishek Hall
Berg Hanna
Biggart Harper
Bilbray Harris
Bilirakis Hartzler
Bishop (UT) Hastings (WA)
Blackburn Hayworth
Bonner Heck
Bono Mack Heller
Boren Hensarling
Boustany Herger
Brady (TX) Herrera Beutler
Brooks Huelskamp
Broun (GA) Huizenga (MI)
Buchanan Hultgren
Bucshon Hunter
Buerkle Hurt
Burgess Issa
Burton (IN) Jenkins
Calvert Johnson (IL)
Camp Johnson (OH)
Campbell Johnson, Sam
Canseco Jordan
Cantor Kelly
Capito King (IA)
Carter King (NY)
Cassidy Kingston
Chabot Kinzinger (IL)
Chaffetz Kline
Coble Labrador
Coffman (CO) Lamborn
Cole Lance
Conaway Landry
Cravaack Lankford
Crawford Latham
Crenshaw LaTourrette
Culberson Latta
Davis (KY) Lee (NY)
Denham Lewis (CA)
Dent LoBiondo
DesJarlais Lucas
Diaz-Balart Luetkemeyer
Dold Lummis
Dreier Lungren, Daniel
Duffy E.
Duncan (SC) Mack
Duncan (TN) Manullo
Ellmers Marchant
Emerson Marino
Farenthold McCarthy (CA)
Fincher McCaul
Fitzpatrick McClintock
Flake McCotter
Fleischmann McHenry
Fleming McKeon
Flores McKinley
Forbes McMorris
Fortenberry Rodgers
Foxy Meehan
Franks (AZ) Mica
Frelinghuysen Miller (FL)
Gallegly Miller (MI)
Gardner Miller, Gary
Garrett Mulvaney
Gerlach Murphy (PA)
Gibbs Myrick
Gibson Neugebauer
Gingrey (GA) Noem
Gohmert Nugent
Goodlatte Nunes

NAYS—182

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay

DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Giffords
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchee
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Inslce
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)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lujan
Lynch
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes

NOT VOTING—16

Austria
Barton (TX)
Black
Boswell
Carson (IN)
Cicilline
Cleaver
Davis (IL)
Grijalva
Honda
Jones
Long

□ 1056

Messrs. RUSH, COURTNEY, HOLT, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Messrs. GENE GREEN of Texas, CONYERS, and PASCARELL changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. LUETKEMEYER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. BLACK. Madam. Speaker, on rollcall No. 9 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 181, answered "present" 2, not voting 15, as follows:

Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio

Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

[Roll No. 10]
AYES—236

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

NOES—181

Ackerman	Braley (IA)	Cleaver
Altmire	Brown (FL)	Clyburn
Andrews	Butterfield	Cohen
Baca	Capps	Connolly (VA)
Baldwin	Capuano	Conyers
Barrow	Cardoza	Cooper
Bass (CA)	Carnahan	Costa
Becerra	Carney	Costello
Berkley	Carson (IN)	Courtney
Berman	Castor (FL)	Critz
Bishop (GA)	Chandler	Crowley
Bishop (NY)	Chu	Cuellar
Blumenauer	Clarke (NY)	Cummings
Brady (PA)	Clay	Davis (CA)

DeFazio	Langevin	Richmond
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Rothman (NJ)
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Deutch	Lee (CA)	Rush
Dicks	Levin	Ryan (OH)
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Doggett	Lipinski	T.
Donnelly (IN)	Loebsack	Sanchez, Loretta
Doyle	Lofgren, Zoe	Sarbanes
Edwards	Lowey	Schakowsky
Ellison	Lujan	Schiff
Engel	Lynch	Schrader
Eshoo	Markey	Schwartz
Farr	Matheson	Scott (VA)
Fattah	Matsui	Scott, David
Finer	McCarthy (NY)	Serrano
Frank (MA)	McCollum	Sewell
Fudge	McDermott	Sherman
Giffords	McGovern	Shuler
Gonzalez	McNerney	Sires
Green, Al	Meeks	Slaughter
Green, Gene	Michaud	Smith (WA)
Grijalva	Miller (NC)	Speier
Gutierrez	Miller, George	Stark
Hanabusa	Moore	Sutton
Harman	Moran	Thompson (CA)
Hastings (FL)	Murphy (CT)	Thompson (MS)
Heinrich	Nadler	Tierney
Higgins	Napolitano	Tonko
Himes	Neal	Towns
Hinchev	Olver	Tsongas
Hinojosa	Owens	Van Hollen
Hirono	Pallone	Velázquez
Holden	Pascrell	Visclosky
Holt	Pastor (AZ)	Walz (MN)
Hoyer	Payne	Wasserman
Inslee	Pelosi	Schultz
Israel	Perlmutter	Waters
Jackson (IL)	Peters	Watt
Jackson Lee	Peterson	Waxman
(TX)	Pingree (ME)	Weiner
Johnson (GA)	Polis	Welch
Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)	Wilson (FL)
Kaptur	Quigley	Woolsey
Keating	Rahall	Wu
Kildee	Rangel	Yarmuth
Kind	Reyes	
Kucinich	Richardson	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Fitzpatrick	Sessions
	NOT VOTING—15

Austria	Davis (IL)	Jones
Barton (TX)	Dold	Maloney
Boswell	Garamendi	Pearce
Cicilline	Hayworth	Roybal-Allard
Clarke (MI)	Honda	Smith (NE)

□ 1104

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.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am standing on the floor of the House of Representatives where Members of Congress get sworn in, and I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, under the rules of the House and the United States Constitution, can a committee of the House be presided over by someone who is not a Member of the House of Representatives and who is not a member of that committee?
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. No. Only sworn Members may serve on committees.

RELATING TO THE STATUS OF CERTAIN ACTIONS TAKEN BY MEMBERS-ELECT

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 26, I send to

the desk as the designee of the majority leader a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. WEINER. I reserve a point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the resolution.
 The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 27

Whereas, Representative-elect Sessions and Representative-elect Fitzpatrick were not administered the oath of office pursuant to the third clause in article VI of the Constitution until after the completion of legislative business on January 6, 2011; and

Whereas, the votes cast by Representative-elect Sessions and Representative-elect Fitzpatrick on rollcalls 3 through 8 therefore were nullities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—
 (1) the votes recorded for Representative-elect Sessions and Representative-elect Fitzpatrick on rollcalls 3 through 8 be deleted and the vote-totals for each of those rollcalls be adjusted accordingly, both in the Journal and in the Congressional Record;

(2) the election of Representative-elect Sessions to a standing committee and his participation in its proceedings be ratified;

(3) the measures delivered to the Speaker for referral by Representative-elect Sessions be considered as introduced and retain the numbers assigned;

(4) any submissions to the Congressional Record by Representative-elect Sessions or Representative-elect Fitzpatrick be considered as valid;

(5) any cosponsor lists naming Representative-elect Sessions or Representative-elect Fitzpatrick be considered as valid; and

(6) any non-voting participation by Representative-elect Sessions or Representative-elect Fitzpatrick in proceedings on the floor be ratified.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

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

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, I make a point of order that the consideration of this resolution is in violation of the House rules that we just passed in which a new section was created to rule XXI that required at least 3 days' notice to consider legislation, that it be posted on the Internet and we have a chance to review it. It is particularly important in this case since we're dealing with a constitutional issue, one that is without precedent, and I insist on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair must observe that the rule cited applies to bills and joint resolutions; and pursuant to House Resolution 26, all points of order are waived.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WEINER. Am I to understand that under the rules that were just passed, they are already exempting this resolution, which is of a question of the interpretation of the Constitution of the United States, that it is already being waived, that that new rule requiring 3 days is already being waived?