

(Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Alabama for yielding me this time. I want to commend her for her leadership and commend the leadership of Representative BACHUS from Alabama.

I remember that day vividly as a young activist at the time. We thought it was unbelievable that this kind of tragedy could take place. But I think it reminds all of us that yesterday is yesterday. We look forward to tomorrow, and I again commend the gentlewoman from Alabama and Mr. BACHUS for reminding us of that time and what can happen when we join hands together.

And so I thank you both.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think many times people wonder why so often we go back and give homage to our past. It's because we still suffer the damages of the past. And we don't forget the families that have given up so much just for us to be able to vote. And we still struggle for that vote. We still struggle for the right to vote, but we must continue. And I want to say to these families, and I know some of them personally, how much we appreciate the fact that they have been loyal to the cause, loyal to this country, loyal to our military, and stand strong today. And so I want to thank you very much for giving honor. I thank my colleague.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by thanking all of my colleagues, especially my colleagues from Alabama, and all of my colleagues who have participated in today's debate. It is indeed an honor and a privilege for me, a native of Selma, Alabama, a 30-year member of Brown Chapel AME Church, to have the humble honor to be a sponsor of this bill.

I know that I drink deep from wells that I didn't dig, my whole generation does. It is a long time overdue, but I just want to say humbly, Thank you, and I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 360. And again, I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS). It has been an honor to serve with you and to share this time with you.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BACHUS. (Mr. Speaker, it is important to remember that the 4 men suspected of the bombing, Bobby Frank Cherry, Herman Cash, Thomas Blanton, and Robert Chambliss, were not immediately prosecuted because authorities believed it impossible to obtain a conviction in the heated racial climate of the mid-1960s. Alabama Attorney General Bill Baxley successfully prosecuted Robert Chambliss 13 years after the bombing. After the indictment and conviction of Robert Chambliss the bombing investigation was closed. The investigation was reopened in 1995 due to the efforts of Federal Bureau of Investigation Special Agent

Rob Langford and local African-American leaders. In 2001 and 2002 a joint Federal and State task force, under the supervision of United States Attorney Douglas Jones and Alabama Attorney General William Pryor, successfully prosecuted Thomas Blanton and Bobby Frank Cherry with the assistance of State and local law enforcement personnel. We in Alabama and the Nation Owe a Debt of Gratitude for the tireless efforts of then Attorney General Bill Baxley, FBI Special Agent Rob Langford, Local African-American leaders, United States Attorney Douglas Jones, and Alabama Attorney General William Pryor as well as those state and local law enforcement personnel who brought these perpetrators to justice.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a supporter of today's legislation that would award a Congressional Gold Medal to commemorate the lives of Addie Mae Collins, Denise McNair, Carole Robinson and Cynthia Wesley.

This year we commemorate the 50th anniversary of the atrocious bombing of the 16th Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama that killed these four little girls on their way to Sunday School. While nothing can bring these innocent victims back, today we honor their legacy with this bill to award them Congressional Gold Medals.

Earlier this year I attended the anniversary of Freedom March in Selma. It was a moving experience. The stories of the struggle for civil rights remind us to continue to fight for the rights and freedoms of all Americans. Today we take another step forward by honoring these four innocent girls who lost their lives on that fateful day, 50 years ago.

□ 1340

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 360, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1549, HELPING SICK AMERICANS NOW ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 175 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 175

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1549) to amend Public Law 111-148 to transfer fiscal year 2013 through fiscal year 2016 funds from the Pre-

vention and Public Health Fund to carry out the temporary high risk health insurance pool program for individuals with pre-existing conditions, and to extend access to such program to such individuals who have had creditable coverage during the 6 months prior to application for coverage through such program. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-8. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleday from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

House Resolution 175 provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 1549. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided by the chair and the ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The rule makes in order two amendments, one Republican, one Democratic, with 10 minutes of debate for each. Further, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying bill. The underlying legislation is a needed piece of relief for the hundreds of thousands of Americans who were promised by their President that they would be covered under the Affordable Care Act's Preexisting Condition Insurance Plan and then were told, as of February 1 of this year, Sorry, we're closed. This is one of the many promises the President made that he has failed to uphold.

In response to the President's failed promise, Chairman JOE PITTS introduced H.R. 1549, the Helping Sick Americans Act, to continue to provide insurance for those Americans who are most in need of immediate care. And to pay to give those most vulnerable patients insurance and care, we use the Prevention and Public Health Fund, an allocation of money that should be going to help patients, but it's instead being used for administrative costs to set up the exchanges that won't be online for some time now and for glossy brochures to extol their virtues. The money could be used to help people now, and that's why Republicans are here today.

The Affordable Care Act created the new Preexisting Condition Insurance Plan, which was, arguably, duplicative of actions taken by 35 States prior to 2010 that were operating risk pools, that were operating re-insurance programs and served over 200,000 Americans.

It has been shown that State-based programs play an important role in lowering costs across markets and then providing coverage options for those with preexisting conditions. In some States, those plans merged with the Federal plan into an existing high-risk pool. In other States, like Texas, the Federal plan operates in parallel to the State's pool.

But whether the States merged their pools, adopted a State-administered preexisting plan, or whether the Federal preexisting plan is the only option, this program is the only answer for those who have found themselves unable to purchase insurance on their own because of a medical condition.

Shortly after the passage of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, the chief actuary for the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services estimated that the creation of this program would result in roughly 375,000 gaining coverage in 2010. However, to date, only 107,000 individuals were enrolled in the program as of January 1 of this year.

On February 15 of this year, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services announced to States that the agency was suspending enrollment in the Preexisting Condition Insurance Program. Very little was said of the fact that

this program was intended to help individuals with preexisting conditions through the 1st of January of 2014.

Despite lower than expected enrollment, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services announced that it will no longer enroll new individuals in the program, and it will bar States from accepting new applications because of their financial constraints.

According to a report from The Washington Post:

Tens of thousands of Americans who cannot get health insurance because of preexisting medical problems will be blocked from the program that was actually designed to help them.

On March 5, along with Republican leadership and the leadership from the Energy and Commerce Committee, we wrote to the President. We let him know that this was not right. We let him know that, while we may have designed the preexisting pool differently, Republicans have supported risk pools, and that he could easily use funds from other accounts in the Affordable Care Act like the Prevention and Public Health Fund. But so far, the response to our letter from the President is zero.

I support prevention activities. As a doctor, I know it's better to keep a person well than to treat an illness; and to anyone across the aisle, we've demonstrated this in the past. If we want to modernize government programs where they have fallen behind private insurers and employers in avoiding disease and getting people more involved in their health care, we're here to talk.

□ 1350

But the prevention fund has been used in a haphazard way, with no unified vision and in many ways that are quite questionable, with the mere hope, with the mere aspiration that 10 years from now we can look back and think that we've made a difference. But it's really something I cannot support when we are \$17 trillion in debt and sick Americans are being turned away from an insurance coverage that they were promised by the President.

As a physician, ensuring those with preexisting conditions have access to quality and affordable health insurance is a priority. As much as I believe that the Affordable Care Act stretched the bounds of constitutionality—and I still do—I was concerned that if the Supreme Court had invalidated the law last summer, those who were in this new Federal preexisting pool would have had the rug pulled out from under them and they could have been barred from merging into their States' pool because of the previously provided coverage.

That's why, to ensure that that did not happen, I was prepared to answer that challenge, had it arisen, by introducing legislation prior to the Court's decision to provide States with the financial backing to decide how best to provide coverage for this population through some type of risk pool, reinsurance, or other innovative method.

I will also note that unlike many of the complaints that the Preexisting Condition Insurance Program has faced, that bill, as well as the bill that we are considering today, did not require those with preexisting conditions to jump through hoops or to remain uninsured for 6 months before being eligible for coverage. On the other hand, instead of making sick Americans a priority, the administration is telling them to just give us 10 more months. Well, what a striking comparison.

There are always stories of those who have done the right thing and insured themselves and then, for whatever reason—falling on bad luck or hard times—have fallen out of the system, usually because of a job loss, they get a medical diagnosis, and when their employment status changes, they find themselves forever locked out of coverage. Those were the stories that people thought of when they did say they wanted something done about this issue.

I might add that when the Affordable Care Act was passed, the administration and congressional Democrats vastly oversold this concept. We were told time and again there were 8 to 12 to 15 million people wandering the country with some type of preexisting condition that were excluded from coverage. It's interesting that now, here we are 3 years later, spending \$5 billion and they've enrolled a hundred thousand people in the program. But it's a hundred thousand people with a very compelling story.

We were told by the American people they wanted us to fix this problem, they didn't want us to screw up the rest of the country's health care, and they wanted some help on cost. But, unfortunately, we failed on every one of those counts.

Since the administration has cut off enrollment, how many people have signed into or aged into the 6-month exclusion that would otherwise be able to sign up? The fact is we don't know. But we had a hearing 4 weeks ago where we heard from some of these people. They do have compelling stories. How many were awaiting coverage but are now told, especially in States where the Federal preexisting program is the only option, you just wait until 2014. So do the best you can with what you've got between now and then.

I will admit that many of the current State-based programs are underfunded and lacking the ability to meet their needs. It is costly to deal with this population of patients. I was prepared in the bill that I offered last summer to authorize \$30 billion to provide coverage. House Republicans supported \$25 billion in our substitute to the Affordable Care Act back in November of 2009.

H.R. 1549 will redirect \$3.5 billion from the Prevention and Public Health Fund and then eliminate the fund in 2016. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that, unlike the authors of the Affordable Care Act, we have provided enough funding to meet the needs

of the program through the end of the year, while ultimately reducing the deficit. Furthermore, once the “train wreck” of failed implementation occurs, the amendment that Mr. PRTTS plans to offer would provide an escape valve for Americans with a preexisting condition by providing States with a block grant to fund State high-risk pools.

The majority is serious about funding these programs and dealing with the issue, and those cost are a drop in the bucket as to what the Affordable Care Act will cost our country in the future. But those efforts recognize that for those who do need insurance and are truly uninsurable in the market, it will be costly but we will make the decisions that set our priorities straight.

Where the President’s response was to tell the people tough luck, not to prepare for needing more money or transfer funds out of other parts of the Affordable Care Act or to look for efficiencies or mismanagement in the pre-existing condition program or even approach Congress for funding, dead silence from the administration. Well, here Republicans will lead and ensure that we help sick Americans now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We begin this week the way we’ve begun every week since January: spinning our wheels.

As we speak, sequestration is hitting communities across our country. Flight delays have started, Head Start programs are turning away children, and unemployment benefits are being curtailed. Despite the calls from me and all my Democratic colleagues to stop the sequestration, the majority refuses to act. In fact, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, Representative VAN HOLLEN, has come four times to the Rules Committee with an amendment that would repeal sequestration, but the majority has rejected it every single time.

The majority has also left the job of passing a budget unfinished. With budgets passed by both the Senate and the House, it is now time to finish the job, and for the majority that constantly calls for regular order and concerns itself with no Senate budget, they now refuse to appoint the conferees. And they must, if we’re going to get the budget.

Instead of taking meaningful action on these two important issues, the majority is proposing a bill that is nothing more than a political gimmick. As everyone knows, there’s no chance that the Senate will consider this bill. Even if it did, the President’s senior advisers have stated that they will recommend the President veto the bill.

In the short history of the 113th Congress, I have been repeatedly dismayed that the leadership of this Chamber has refused to bring forth meaningful legislation that has any chance of becoming

law; and today is a telling example of the majority’s failure to lead.

In news reports earlier this morning, we were told that today’s bill, dubbed by reporters as “CantorCare,” may even be pulled before it gets a vote. One Member of the majority was purported to say that today’s bill does nothing but shift money from a program he doesn’t support to another program he doesn’t support. And, indeed, given the fact that not a single Republican voted for the Affordable Care Act, it seems incongruous to me that they are now here today with great bleeding-heart concerns about the people with previous conditions that keep them from being insured.

So given the multiple reports of dissent within the majority, I have to ask, If no one supports this bill, then what are we doing this afternoon except, as I pointed out earlier, what we do every week? Even if we continue to move forward on the bill, it is already clear the legislation is solely designed for political gain. For while the majority claims that they want to strengthen the Affordable Care Act, their intent is clear: they want to repeal the law.

Last week, Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius testified before the Senate Finance Committee where she was criticized by GOP Senators for using her legal authority to fund the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. As Secretary Sebelius replied in her testimony, Congress’ failure to pass a budget has forced her to take the independent action, which she’s allowed to do, in order to fund the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. It’s as simple as that. In the face of an unproductive Congress, Secretary Sebelius has done everything she can to provide the life-saving health care to the American people.

While reporting on Secretary Sebelius’ testimony, Washington Post columnist Ezra Klein explained the majority’s approach towards the Affordable Health Care Act. In part, Mr. Klein wrote:

“Insofar as the Republican Party has a strategy on ObamaCare, it goes like this: The law needs to be implemented. The GOP can try and keep the implementation from being done effectively, in part, by refusing to authorize the needed funds,” as they did in this case. I think it was \$1.5 billion.

“Then they can capitalize on the problems they create to weaken the law, or at least weaken Democrats up for reelection in 2014. In other words, step one: create problems for ObamaCare. Step two: blame ObamaCare care for the problems. Step three: political profit.”

The legislation before us is little more than a continuation of these games.

□ 1400

If the majority were making a serious attempt to expand health care coverage, they wouldn’t be funding their

proposal with money from a different program in the Affordable Care Act. Specifically, the majority wouldn’t be removing \$4 billion from the Prevention and Public Health Fund. This is a fund that is already helping States research ways to reduce instances of cancer, obesity, and heart disease.

Preventive health measures are vital to reducing the cost of health care in the United States because we know it is always cheaper to prevent disease than to treat it. In an age where more than 33 percent of our population is overweight or obese, when heart disease is the number one cause of death and the number of diabetes cases continue to grow, including children, gutting our Nation’s only Federal preventive health program is not a responsible budget decision; it is simply an underhanded attack to dismantle the Affordable Care Act one program at a time.

Finally, the majority’s newfound concern for people who are uninsured because of preexisting conditions might be more believable if they had allowed one of the numerous common-sense amendments presented to the Rules Committee to come to the floor. Among the amendments were responsible proposals to cover Americans with preexisting conditions by ending tax breaks for Big Oil, ending subsidies for owners of corporate jets, increasing taxes on cigarettes—a preventive health measure in its own right. Proposals like these would expand health care to those who need it while protecting the preventive health measures included in the Affordable Care Act. It is truly unfortunate that, in yet another restrictive process executed by the majority, these amendments were denied a vote on the House floor.

The majority and the press have made it clear that today’s bill is not a serious effort, but a political gimmick that has no chance of becoming law. I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on today’s rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. I rise today in support of the rule, H.R. 1549, the Helping Sick Americans Now Act, and the Pitts amendment.

President Obama’s health care law is a train wreck. We learn more every day about its failures. H.R. 1549 addresses a problem with the law’s provision for those with preexisting conditions. The bill takes millions of dollars that the administration intends to spend on advertising its failed law and instead helps some of the sickest Americans get health insurance. Not only that, the bill will also end the ObamaCare slush fund and reduce the deficit.

H.R. 1549 is a win on all fronts. We should applaud Chairman JOE PRTTS

and Congresswoman ANN WAGNER for bringing this commonsense solution forward.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, we will be doing, as I said, a previous question amendment to this rule to hold a vote on the Put America Back to Work Act, and I would like to yield now 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

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

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentlelady, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the underlying bill and in opposition to this rule and for a “no” vote on the previous question so that we can substitute Mr. CONNOLLY’s bill for this bill, which will mean we will substitute something that will grow jobs from something that will waste time, not because those with preexisting conditions aren’t worthy of our consideration—and, in fact, were considered in the Affordable Care Act and will have, as of January 2014, some real protections, not just high-risk protections, some real protections for them and their families.

The previous speaker said “this train wreck.” This train wreck has already benefited millions of people: millions of seniors, millions of women, millions of people with preexisting conditions, millions of students, millions of young people who couldn’t get insurance but can stay on their family’s policy, millions of people who didn’t have their benefits capped. Millions of people have already benefited.

The Republican Party continues to oppose. They want to see this bill be a train wreck and are doing everything in their power to destroy the tracks, everything in their power to make sure it doesn’t work, make sure that hundreds of millions—yes, hundreds of millions—of Americans won’t be benefited by bringing down cost and making insurance available to millions of people.

Just like the little boy who took the lives of his two parents complained to the court, “Give me mercy because I’m an orphan,” they are destroying the tracks that have been constructed to give Americans health care assurance.

Now, let me say, if we vote against this previous question, we will have an opportunity to consider Mr. CONNOLLY’s bill. That bill will be consistent with the Make It In America agenda—job creation, not wasting time.

We’re going to do a bill on Thursday and Friday that we could do in 10 minutes—totally noncontroversial; it’s about helium. We’re going to take 2 days to do that bill; it could be done in 10 minutes. We are spinning our wheels, as the gentlelady suggested.

One bill that will be something that we can do for America and jobs as part of the Make It In America agenda is

H.R. 535, the Put America Back to Work Now Act, sponsored by my friend from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY). It would permanently extend the Build America Bonds program to help State and local governments leverage private capital to finance infrastructure projects—jobs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Build America Bonds have been strongly supported by mayors, city managers, county legislators, and State officials from both parties—a bipartisan support for this bill. At the local level, it is a bipartisan solution that we know works because these bonds were used effectively in 2009 and 2010 before they expired.

When it comes to making investments in our Nation’s infrastructure, we should be able to support local governments that want to attract manufacturing and invest in making their communities safer, cleaner, and more secure.

By the way, if we create these jobs, the probability is these people who get these jobs will have health insurance and will be served, as the doctor would like, as I would like—hopefully.

But let us not continue to waste time on a bill that we know has a deeply divided Republican Party—as we’re going to see on this vote, I’m sure—and will not get through the Senate and will not be signed by the President. We’re just wasting our time here—political messages.

By the way, you’ve garbled your message pretty badly, as I understand from Club for Growth and Heritage Foundation and FreedomWorks.

So vote against the previous question. Vote for building America and growing jobs.

Mr. BURGESS. I yield myself 1 minute.

You know, on the subject of wasting time, it was 6 or 7 weeks ago that Chairman PITTS sent a letter to the President saying: What are you proposing to do about this? This was not something that was in the plan. You promised something that was different. What are we to tell people who are now calling our committee and asking us how you’re going to respond to this?

The President chose not to respond to that letter—it’s been 6 or 7 weeks—but, boy, it didn’t take him 24 hours to turn around a Statement of Administration Policy that said they would veto this bill should it pass the House. That’s another reason for me to be for it.

But, look, in this Statement of Administration Policy, it says: The Affordable Care Act forces most insurance companies to play by the rules. Well, I think this House has an opportunity today to say to the administration: Play by the rules.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I’m pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD), a member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the ranking member for your hard work on these issues, and I stand before this House to ask that all Members reject this rule.

I had an amendment, which was not approved, which is germane to H.R. 1549 and follows CutGo and would have prevented defunding of the Prevention and Public Health Fund. Unfortunately, the Rules Committee rejected this amendment in order to keep this bill purely about political posturing.

My constituents sent me here to work together to solve problems, not to relitigate legislation which has been adopted by Congress, approved by the President, upheld by the Supreme Court, and the American people support.

□ 1410

The Prevention and Public Health Fund, among other things, helps reduce minority population health disparities and supports health care for chronic and costly conditions such as diabetes, heart disease, and cancer. There are medically underserved communities in my district and across the country that need better access to care.

My amendment would prevent siphoning of resources needed to reduce health disparities among minority populations. During the 112th Congress, the House voted repeatedly to cut this very program. Now the Rules Committee has rejected my amendment.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule. We need an open process, not more political gamesmanship that hurts the American people who need access to quality health care.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

It takes me back to when the Affordable Care Act passed this House and the tumultuous time in March of 2010. I had 18 amendments in the Rules Committee the night before that. The ranking member may remember that. None of those amendments were made in order. Look, if that’s the yardstick by which we’re going to measure, we’ve got a long way to go.

But I need to respond to something that was said by the minority whip. He referenced the Appalachian train wreck. These are not my words. These are words that were used by a senior Democratic committee chairman about this bill. And then just today, breaking news, I’m handed an article from Politico, another senior Democrat, chairman of the Health Committee over on the Senate side, is putting a hold on the administrator for the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services nomination.

And why is that hold being placed? An aide said that the Senator objected because CMS was using Prevention and Public Health Funds to pay for the health law implementation; the very reason we’re here today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my dear friend from New York, the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleague to oppose the previous question so we can bring up a proven jobs bill for consideration, rather than rehash the same old critiques for the 36th time on the Affordable Care Act.

Just last week, the head of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston warned that if job creation doesn't pick up soon, we run the risk of long-term unemployment becoming a structural rather than cyclical problem within our economy. Despite more than 6 million new jobs being created in the last 4 years, the lingering effects of the Great Recession continue to be a drag on the labor market. Unemployment in the construction sector, particularly, is nearly double the national rate, with hiring down 2 million from its peak in 2006.

I have introduced the Put America Back to Work Act, H.R. 535, which would permanently reauthorize the successful Build America Bonds program at a more revenue-neutral rate. In just 2 years, that program, Madam Speaker, supported \$181 billion in community infrastructure projects in every State of the Union and created thousands of new jobs. Every dollar of Federal investment leveraged \$41 in private sector funds to help our State and local governments recover and construct the needed infrastructure throughout the country. Local governments issued more than \$275 million in new bonds, with one of the largest projects completing a missing segment of a cross-county parkway in my district that now links major employment centers.

Reauthorizing Build America Bonds is part of the President's Rebuild America Partnership initiative, and it is part of the Make It In America agenda put forth by STENY HOYER, our minority whip. More important, it has the strong support of investors, local governments, State governments, and construction companies throughout the United States. Build America Bonds helped provide 36 percent of all municipal bond sales back in 2009-2010 when, literally, municipal bonds had stopped being issued.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing the previous question so we can bring up H.R. 535. Let's do something for America, its localities, its States, its crumbling infrastructure. These investments reap large and long-term returns. Look at the interstate highway system, a gift that keeps on giving 65 years later.

Defeating the previous question will allow us to come together finally on a bipartisan basis and do something for our country. Build America Bonds is an idea whose time has arrived.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

There's nothing that has been more damaging to job creation in this country than the first 2 years of the first Obama term. During that time, with vast majorities in both the House and the Senate, the anti-employment, the outright hostility to the productive sector of American society, was palpable. People responded to that in very predictable ways, so they hunkered down.

And then you come throw the wet blanket of the Affordable Care Act. What did that do to job creation? It killed it in this country, and it is killing it today.

If you want job creation in this country, you will provide some stability, some sanity, to allow those people who are still in that hunkered-down modality that they've been in since the first Obama administration was sworn in, allow them a chance for real economic recovery. That's why it's important to divert those funds from the Prevention and Public Health Fund, help those people with preexisting conditions, and, yes, we may get some sanity out of the administration on the implementation of the health care law if we do that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. MATSUI).

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of defeating the previous question. Putting people back to work is our number one priority.

Mr. CONNOLLY's bill, which is part of the Make It In America agenda, will strengthen our economy by creating jobs and spurring innovation throughout the American manufacturing sector.

One area where we must assert world leadership is in clean energy technologies. This is why I have introduced the Clean Energy Technology Manufacturing and Export Assistance Act, legislation that is part of the Make It In America agenda. This bill will help clean energy technology companies access the world market and ensure these companies have the resources they need to export their products. Let's face it, the clean energy technology industry is growing rapidly. New jobs will be created, if not here, then in places like China and Germany.

In my home district of Sacramento, we have over 200 clean energy companies, the majority of which are small businesses. Clean World Partners is a local company that is converting everyday items like food and waste into energy. Alteryg Systems manufactures fuel cell power systems. These small business owners want to expand their manufacturing operations and export their clean energy technologies to foreign markets, but they need our help, and they need it now.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and immediately take up the Connolly bill, which is part

of the Make It In America agenda, to show the American public we are serious about investing in our economy.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

The last Congress we had this debate over and over again, which obviously culminated with the significant findings in our Committee on Energy and Commerce on what happened with the energy company called Solyndra. The moneys that were pushed out the door by the Department of Energy in the first 4 years of the Obama administration, those moneys were poorly spent and unwisely invested. And what did we get for that investment? More debt.

Here we are faced with a condition in the Prevention Fund where these dollars are going to be pushed out the door hiring navigators. Remember, part of the Affordable Care Act was to absolutely remove insurance agents and brokers from the environment, and now we're going to populate the environment with these navigators that are going to help sell people health insurance, and they're going to be paid for out of the Department of Health and Human Services with the prevention fund. It doesn't sound like prevention to me. I think we ought to prevent that from happening.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentlelady from New York for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question.

When I came to the Congress 4 months ago, I didn't really anticipate that we would be arguing over legislation that was passed 3 years ago. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle think it's 2010. They are spending all of their time debating bills from years past.

ObamaCare was passed by the House, passed by the Senate, and signed by the President. That means it's the law. That didn't stop conservatives. They have tried to amend, gut, defund, investigate, and sue ObamaCare into oblivion. And they failed because Americans support progress and reform.

□ 1420

But ObamaCare seems to be on their messaging calendar this week, so we're stuck with it until Friday. But what happened to last week's Republican message or to even last month's messaging?

Just ask yourself: Isn't it odd that the Republicans aren't saying that we need to pass a budget anymore?

Earlier this year, the House majority was going on and on about the need to pass a budget. For months, my colleagues asked: Why hasn't the Senate passed a budget? Why hasn't the Senate passed a budget?

Guess what? The Senate passed a budget.

So why is the House majority refusing to go to conference?

I'm sure Senator REID gets some amusement from calling Speaker BOEHNER's bluff and watching the Republican caucus squirm, but this back-and-forth is a waste of time.

Let's get past debates from 3 years ago and get on with our work. Our time is precious. The House should appoint conferees and pass a final budget and get on with addressing the real crisis our Nation faces—jobs.

Mr. BURGESS. I yield myself 1 minute.

Since the gentleman wasn't here in the spring of 2010 when the Affordable Care Act passed, he probably didn't hear the utterance of the then-Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, who famously, from that chair, stood up and said, "We've got to pass this law to find out what's in it."

Here we are a little over 3 years later, and we're still finding out what's in it. Yes, the law is the law—the law has passed; the law is signed—but what has happened since that time is this torrent of regulations that has come out of the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of the Treasury, the Office of Personnel Management—all of those Federal agencies charged with implementing this failed product. Now, we can argue all we want about settled law being settled law, but rulemaking is going on even as we speak. New rules are coming out. New rules are being promulgated.

Look at the Essential Health Benefit Rule. Why did the administration hide the ball on that one until 2 days after election day? Because they were afraid of what the public's response would be when they saw what that rule actually said. It turns out that most of the Nation's Governors said, We don't want any part of this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as it takes me to read this message. It needs to be answered, and I want everybody in America to listen up. You've been told it's a job-killing bill and that it has caused all this grief. Let me say:

Since the passage of the Affordable Care Act, the United States has added more than 6 million private sector jobs. The health care industry alone, which many opponents of the law predicted would face job-killing new regulation, has added more than 750,000 jobs.

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

Ms. HAHN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of defeating the previous question so that the House may bring up Representative CONNOLLY's Put America Back to Work Act as part of the Make It In America legislative package.

Make It In America is a comprehensive jobs plan that aims to reinvigorate our ailing manufacturing sector and bring innovation and high-skilled, high-wage jobs back to the United States, and it invests in training the skilled workforce needed to support manufacturing in the 21st century.

We have an infrastructure crisis in this country, Madam Speaker, which is

why I introduced the Bridges to Jobs Act as part of the Make It In America package.

Do you know there are about 70,000 bridges that have been classified as "structurally deficient" in our country? Leaving these bridges in their current state of disrepair poses a grave threat not only to our safety but also to our economy. This act provides each State with \$10 million in grants to put Americans back to work by repairing our crumbling bridges. Not only will this legislation put Americans back to work and bolster our ailing economy, it will also ensure the safety of the millions who use these bridges each and every day.

I urge my colleagues to support this crucial investment in our workforce, our economy, and our safety. Let's defeat the previous question so we can bring this bill back up.

Mr. BURGESS. I yield myself 1 minute.

I think it's important for Members of this body to understand one of the things we're talking about today. It's section 4002 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. In my copy, it's found on page 466. This delineates the outline of the Prevention and Public Health Fund.

Section A: The purpose is to establish a Prevention and Public Health Fund.

That all sounds good. It's to be administered through the Office of the Secretary to provide for the expanded and sustained national investment in the maintaining of public health. All good as it sounds.

Then the funding section. The funding section is important because it's unlike other sections of law. Yes, it started small with literally a half billion dollars in fiscal year 2010. It escalated from there, and by next year, this fund will be up to \$2 billion a year. That's self-replenishing in perpetuity. That's until the Earth cools another time or the Second Coming. It's \$2 billion a year forever.

Now, the use of the fund is the next section. That is telling because there is broad authority for the Secretary of Health and Human Services to transfer these dollars to other areas she wants. That is what leads to the problem. That is what leads to the difficulty with this section.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire if my colleague has more requests for time? I have none, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. BURGESS. I will go as long as the gentlelady wants, but I guess I have no more speakers other than myself.

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

First, at the end of my remarks I will insert in the RECORD the Democratic amendments that were disallowed last night from the Rules Committee.

In closing, Madam Speaker, we've heard a lot today, but I think probably

one of the most important things for America to know—because you hear constantly how many jobs this bill is going to be killing—is the fact that we have produced 6 million new jobs, 750,000 in health care alone.

So the most important thing we can do for Americans with preexisting conditions, which is the subject today, and for every American seeking quality and affordable health care is to support the full implementation of the Affordable Care Act. Unfortunately, the proposal put forward by the majority today is an attempt to dismantle a crucial part of that important law.

SUMMARY OF DEMOCRATIC AMENDMENTS NOT MADE IN ORDER BY THE RULES COMMITTEE FOR H.R. 1549—HELPING SICK AMERICANS NOW ACT

(SUMMARIES DERIVED FROM INFORMATION PROVIDED BY SPONSORS)

LISTED IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER—PREPARED APRIL 24, 2013

Amendment #4

Sponsor: Capps (CA)

Description: Removes the public health and prevention trust fund as a pay-for and instead pays for the bill by ending the section 199 domestic manufacturing deduction for oil and gas production.

Amendment #5

Sponsor: Green, Gene (TX)

Description: Makes the same changes to the PCIP program that the underlying bill does, but is paid for by requiring a minimum term and a remainder interest greater than zero for new Grantor Retained Annuity Trusts (GRATs)

Amendment #10

Sponsor: Horsford, Steven (NV)

Description: Requires the HHS Secretary to transfer all of the monies in the Fund for the next four fiscal years to the PCIP program except those monies from the fund that are used for reducing health disparities among minority populations.

Amendment #1

Sponsor: Pallone (NJ)

Description: Makes the same changes to the PCIP program that the underlying bill does, but is paid for through a 4 cent per pack increase in the tax on cigarettes.

Amendment #2

Sponsor: Pallone (NJ)

Description: Makes the same changes to the PCIP program that the underlying bill does, but is paid for by continuing the solvency of the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund by increasing the per-barrel amount that oil companies are required to pay into the fund by four cents.

Amendment #3

Sponsor: Schakowsky (IL)

Description: Extends funding for reopening enrollment under the Preexisting Condition Insurance Program (PCIP)

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question, and I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.



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

Madam Speaker, as the gentlelady mentioned, we've heard a lot today.

I think I've said over and over again how I, unequivocally, oppose the Affordable Care Act and would like to see it forever dismantled and thrown on the dustbin of history. Guilty as charged. That is what I would like to see, but that's actually not what we're talking about today.

We're here today to talk about the President's promise to help people with preexisting conditions obtain health insurance, and it has been one of the few areas of agreement between Republicans and Democrats over the last several years. House Republicans have urged the President to work with us on a solution to this issue, but all we've heard from the White House has been silence. So, today, we are offering a solution:

The bill transfers funds from an unnecessary slush fund and, instead, prioritizes the Nation's most sick and vulnerable who have been denied coverage and who have been the victims of the Affordable Care Act's broken promises. This bill does not provide more money to government health care programs, but instead it helps those who are in desperate need have access to privately run health insurance. Instead of continuing to use the Prevention and Public Health Fund to prop up the Affordable Care Act's flailing exchanges, we would use the money allocated for public health to actually help sick Americans.

If we do not act, the administration will continue to spend this money on heaven knows what: neutering programs, pickle ball—whatever the heck that is—and programs that are rife with potential for fraud and abuse to support their own failing implementation plans. Instead of further increasing this Nation's \$17 trillion deficit, we can pass this bill that will provide health care to the sick and will reduce the deficit at the same time.

In the end, it's not about the money. It's about America's patients. The President should be embarrassed. His political bait-and-switch is not working. Instead of putting the care of the sick first, you tell them, Sorry, Sister, we're closed. Come back in 10 months.

Ten months, a week, a day may be the amount of time some of these patients have to get treatment or else face the consequences of the progression of their illnesses.

□ 1430

America's doctors and hospitals will be there, and they'll always be there. But why deny them the means to get their services paid for with insurance coverage?

Mr. President, your health bill fails this country, and, most importantly, you have failed the thousands of sick Americans who can't get health coverage because you think implementing the health care law is more important

than taking care of the people who you promised to take care of.

So today we can end the use of the slush fund and use it to actually help people. A vote for this bill is a vote to help sick Americans now.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and support the passage of H.R. 1549.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 175 OFFERED BY  
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 535) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the Build America Bonds program. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 535.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT  
IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

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

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

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

Mr. BURGESS. With that, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 175, if ordered, and motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 360.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 192, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 121]

YEAS—228

Aderholt	Bentivolio	Brooks (IN)
Alexander	Bilirakis	Brown (GA)
Amash	Bishop (UT)	Buchanan
Amodei	Black	Bucshon
Bachmann	Blackburn	Burgess
Bachus	Bonner	Calvert
Barletta	Boustany	Camp
Barr	Brady (TX)	Campbell
Barton	Bridenstine	Cantor
Benishek	Brooks (AL)	Capito

Carter	Hurt	Reichert	Kennedy	Moran	Schneider	Hall	McKinley	Royce
Cassidy	Issa	Renacci	Kildee	Murphy (FL)	Schrader	Hanna	McMorris	Runyan
Chabot	Jenkins	Ribble	Kilmer	Nadler	Schwartz	Harper	Rodgers	Ryan (WI)
Chaffetz	Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)	Kind	Napolitano	Scott (VA)	Harris	Meadows	Scalise
Coble	Johnson, Sam	Rigell	Kirkpatrick	Neal	Scott, David	Hartzler	Meehan	Schock
Coffman	Jones	Roby	Kuster	Negrete McLeod	Serrano	Hastings (WA)	Messer	Schweikert
Cole	Jordan	Roe (TN)	Langevin	Nolan	Sewell (AL)	Heck (NV)	Miller (FL)	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Joyce	Rogers (AL)	Larsen (WA)	O'Rourke	Shea-Porter	Hensarling	Sensenbrenner	Sessions
Collins (NY)	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (KY)	Larson (CT)	Owens	Sherman	Herrera Beutler	Miller (MI)	Shimkus
Conaway	King (IA)	Rogers (MI)	Lee (CA)	Pallone	Sinema	Holding	Miller, Gary	Shuster
Cotton	King (NY)	Rohrabacher	Levin	Pascrell	Sires	Hudson	Mullin	Simpson
Cramer	Kingston	Rokita	Lewis	Pastor (AZ)	Slaughter	Huelskamp	Mulvaney	Smith (NJ)
Crawford	Kinzinger (IL)	Rooney	Lipinski	Payne	Smith (WA)	Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Kline	Ros-Lehtinen	Loeb	Pelosi	Speier	Hultgren	Neugebauer	Noem
Daines	Labrador	Roskam	Loefgren	Perlmutt	Swalwell (CA)	Hunter	Noem	Southernland
Davis, Rodney	LaMalfa	Ross	Lowenthal	Peters (CA)	Takano	Hurt	Nugent	Stewart
Denham	Lamborn	Rothfus	Lowe	Peters (MI)	Thompson (CA)	Issa	Nunes	Stivers
Dent	Lance	Royce	Lujan Grisham	Peterson	Thompson (MS)	Jenkins	Nunnelee	Stockman
DeSantis	Lankford	Runyan	(NM)	Pingree (ME)	Titus	Johnson (OH)	Olson	Stutzman
DesJarlais	Latham	Ryan (WI)	Luján, Ben Ray	Pocan	Tonko	Johnson, Sam	Palazzo	Terry
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Salmon	(NM)	Price (NC)	Tsongas	Jones	Paulsen	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	LoBiondo	Maffei	Matsui	Quigley	Van Hollen	Jordan	Pearce	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	Long	Maloney,	McCarthy (NY)	Rahall	Vargas	Joyce	Perry	Tiberi
Duncan (TN)	Lucas	Carolyn	McCollum	Rangel	Vela	Kelly (PA)	Petri	Tipton
Ellmers	Luetkemeyer	Schweikert	McDermott	Richmond	Velázquez	King (IA)	Pittenger	Turner
Farenthold	Lummis	Scott, Austin	McIntyre	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky	King (NY)	Pitts	Upton
Fincher	Marchant	Sensenbrenner	McNeerney	Ruiz	Walz	Kingston	Poe (TX)	Valadao
Fitzpatrick	Marino	Sessions	McCarthy (NY)	Ruppersberger	Wasserman	Kinzinger (IL)	Pompeo	Wagner
Fleischmann	Massie	Shimkus	Meeks	Rush	Schultz	Kline	Posey	Walberg
Fleming	Matheson	Shuster	McIntyre	Ryan (OH)	Sanchez, Linda	Labrador	Price (GA)	Walberg
Forbes	McCarthy (CA)	Simpson	McNeerney	Sánchez, Linda	T.	LaMalfa	Radel	Walden
Fortenberry	McCaul	Smith (NJ)	McNeerney	T.	Watt	Lamborn	Reed	Walorski
Fox	McClintock	Smith (TX)	Meeks	Sanchez, Loretta	Waxman	Lance	Reichert	Weber (TX)
Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Southernland	Meeks	Sarbanes	Welch	Lankford	Renacci	Weber (TX)
Frelinghuysen	McKeon	Stewart	Meng	Schakowsky	Wilson (FL)	Latham	Ribble	Webster (FL)
Gardner	McKinley	Stivers	Michaud	Schiff	Yarmuth	Latta	Rice (SC)	Wenstrup
Garrett	McMorris	Stockman	Moore			LoBiondo	Rigell	Westmoreland
Gerlach	Rodgers	Stutzman				Long	Roby	Whitfield
Gibbs	Meadows	Terry	Cook	Hinojosa	Polis	Lucas	Roe (TN)	Williams
Gibson	Meehan	Thompson (PA)	Culberson	Lynch	Smith (NE)	Luetkemeyer	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (SC)
Gingrey (GA)	Messer	Thornberry	Dingell	Markey	Tierney	Lummis	Rogers (KY)	Wittman
Gohmert	Mica	Tiberi	Flores	Miller, George	Veasey	Marchant	Rogers (MI)	Wolf
Goodlatte	Miller (FL)	Tipton				Marino	Rohrabacher	Womack
Gosar	Miller (MI)	Turner				Massie	Rokita	Woodall
Gowdy	Miller, Gary	Upton				McCarthy (CA)	Rooney	Yoder
Granger	Mullin	Valadao				McClintock	Ros-Lehtinen	Yoho
Graves (GA)	Mulvaney	Wagner				McHenry	Roskam	Young (AK)
Graves (MO)	Murphy (PA)	Walberg				McKeon	Ross	Young (FL)
Griffin (AR)	Neugebauer	Walden					Rothfus	Young (IN)
Griffith (VA)	Noem	Walorski						
Grimm	Nugent	Weber (TX)						
Guthrie	Nunes	Webster (FL)						
Hall	Nunnelee	Wenstrup						
Hanna	Olson	Westmoreland						
Harper	Palazzo	Whitfield						
Harris	Paulsen	Williams						
Hartzler	Pearce	Wilson (SC)						
Hastings (WA)	Perry	Wittman						
Heck (NV)	Petri	Wolf						
Hensarling	Pittenger	Womack						
Herrera Beutler	Pitts	Woodall						
Holding	Poe (TX)	Yoder						
Hudson	Pompeo	Yoho						
Huelskamp	Posey	Young (AK)						
Huizenga (MI)	Price (GA)	Young (FL)						
Hultgren	Radel	Young (IN)						
Hunter	Reed							

## NAYS—192

Andrews	Clyburn	Frankel (FL)	[Roll No. 122]					
Barber	Cohen	Fudge	YEAS—225					
Barrow (GA)	Connolly	Gabbard						
Bass	Conyers	Gallego	Aderholt	Campbell	Farenthold	Andrews	Doyle	Larsen (WA)
Beatty	Cooper	Garamendi	Alexander	Cantor	Fincher	Barber	Duckworth	Larson (CT)
Becerra	Costa	Garcia	Amash	Capito	Fitzpatrick	Edwards	Edwards	Lee (CA)
Bera (CA)	Courtney	Grayson	Amodei	Cassidy	Fleischmann	Beatty	Ellison	Levin
Bishop (GA)	Crowley	Green, Al	Bachmann	Chabot	Fleming	Becerra	Engel	Lewis
Bishop (NY)	Cuellar	Green, Gene	Bachus	Chaffetz	Forbes	Bera (CA)	Enyart	Lipinski
Blumenauer	Cummings	Grijalva	Barletta	Coble	Fortenberry	Bishop (GA)	Eshoo	Loeb
Bonamici	Davis (CA)	Gutiérrez	Barr	Coffman	Forbes	Bishop (NY)	Esty	Loefgren
Brady (PA)	Davis, Danny	Hahn	Barton	Cole	Fox	Blumenauer	Farr	Lowenthal
Braley (IA)	DeFazio	Hanabusa	Bentley	Collins (GA)	Franks (AZ)	Bonamici	Fattah	Lujan Grisham
Brown (FL)	DeGette	Hastings (FL)	Bentivoglio	Collins (NY)	Frelinghuysen	Brady (PA)	Foster	(NM)
Brownley (CA)	Delaney	Heck (WA)	Bilirakis	Conaway	Gardner	Braley (IA)	Frankel (FL)	Fudge
Bustos	DeLauro	Higgins	Bishop (UT)	Cotton	Garrett	Brown (FL)	Gabbard	Fudge
Butterfield	DelBene	Himes	Black	Cramer	Gerlach	Brownley (CA)	Gabbard	Gabbard
Capps	Deutch	Holt	Blackburn	Crawford	Gohmert	Bustos	Galleo	Gallego
Capuano	Doggett	Honda	Bonner	Crenshaw	Gingrey (GA)	Butterfield	Garamendi	Garamendi
Cárdenas	Doyle	Horsford	Boustany	Daines	Gohmert	Capps	Garcia	Garcia
Carney	Duckworth	Hoyer	Brady (TX)	Davis, Rodney	Goodlatte	Capuano	Grayson	Grayson
Carson (IN)	Edwards	Huffman	Bridenstine	Denham	Gosar	Cárdenas	Green, Al	Green, Al
Cartwright	Ellison	Israel	Brooks (AL)	Dent	Gowdy	Carney	Green, Gene	Green, Gene
Castor (FL)	Engel	Jackson Lee	Brooks (IN)	DeSantis	Granger	Carson (IN)	Grijalva	Grijalva
Castro (TX)	Enyart	Jeffries	Broun (GA)	DesJarlais	Graves (GA)	Cartwright	Gutiérrez	Gutiérrez
Chu	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)	Buchanan	Diaz-Balart	Graves (MO)	Castor (FL)	Hahn	Hahn
Cicilline	Esty	Johnson, E. B.	Bucshon	Duffy	Griffin (AR)	Castro (TX)	Hanabusa	Hanabusa
Clarke	Farr	Kaptur	Burgess	Duncan (SC)	Griffith (VA)	Chu	Hastings (FL)	Hastings (FL)
Clay	Fattah	Keating	Calvert	Duncan (TN)	Grimm	Cicilline	Heck (WA)	Heck (WA)
Cleaver	Foster	Kelly (IL)	Camp	Ellmers	Guthrie	Clarke	Higgins	Higgins

## NOT VOTING—12

□ 1458

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Mr. FATTAH changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 189, not voting 18, as follows:

## NAYS—189

Andrews	Doyle	Larsen (WA)
Barber	Duckworth	Larson (CT)
Barrow (GA)	Edwards	Lee (CA)
Beatty	Ellison	Levin
Becerra	Engel	Lewis
Bera (CA)	Enyart	Lipinski
Bishop (GA)	Eshoo	Loeb
Bishop (NY)	Esty	Loefgren
Blumenauer	Farr	Lowenthal
Bonamici	Fattah	Lujan Grisham
Brady (PA)	Foster	(NM)
Braley (IA)	Frankel (FL)	Luján, Ben Ray
Brown (FL)	Fudge	(NM)
Brownley (CA)	Gabbard	Maffei
Bustos	Gallego	Maffei
Butterfield	Garamendi	Maloney
Capps	Garcia	Carolyn
Capuano	Grayson	Maloney, Sean
Cárdenas	Green, Al	Matheson
Carney	Green, Gene	Matsui
Carson (IN)	Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)
Cartwright	Gutiérrez	McCollum
Castro (FL)	Hahn	McDermott
Castro (TX)	Hanabusa	McGovern
Chu	Hastings (FL)	McIntyre
Cicilline	Heck (WA)	McNeerney
Clarke	Higgins	Meeks
Clay	Himes	Michaud
Cleaver	Holt	Moore
Clyburn	Honda	Moran
Cohen	Horsford	Murphy (FL)
Connolly	Hoyer	Nadler
Conyers	Huffman	Napolitano
Cooper	Israel	Neal
Costa	Jackson Lee	Negrete McLeod
Courtney	Jeffries	Nolan
Crowley	Johnson (GA)	O'Rourke
Cuellar	Johnson, E. B.	Owens
Cummings	Kaptur	Pallone
Davis (CA)	Keating	Pascrell
Davis, Danny	Kelly (IL)	Pastor (AZ)
DeFazio	Kennedy	Payne
DeGette	Kildee	Pelosi
Delaney	Kilmer	Perlmutt
DeLauro	Kind	Peters (CA)
DeBene	Kirkpatrick	Peters (MI)
Deutch	Kuster	Peterson
Doggett	Langevin	Pingree (ME)



Pocan  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Richmond  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Salmon  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider

Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)

Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)

Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Conaway  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Cotton  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Daines  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellmers  
Engel  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farenthold  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Foxy  
Frankel (FL)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grijalva  
Grimm  
Guthrie  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hall  
Hanabusa  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck (NV)  
Heck (WA)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins

Himes  
Holding  
Holt  
Honda  
Horsford  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huffman  
Neal  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Jenkins  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kline  
Kuster  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Lankford  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
Latta  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebsock  
Lofgren  
Long  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham (NM)  
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lummis  
Maffei  
Maloney, Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Meng  
Messer  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)

Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Southerland  
Speier  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stockman  
Stutzman  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi

Tipton  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt

Waxman  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—18

Bass  
Carter  
Cook  
Culberson  
Dingell  
Flores

Hinojosa  
Lynch  
Markey  
Meng  
Miller, George  
Polis

Rangel  
Roybal-Allard  
Smith (NE)  
Tierney  
Veasey  
Yarmuth

□ 1505

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.

**AWARDING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO ADDIE MAE COLLINS, DENISE McNAIR, CAROLE ROBERTSON, AND CYNTHIA WESLEY**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 360) to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Addie Mae Collins, Denise McNair, Carole Robertson, and Cynthia Wesley to commemorate the lives they lost 50 years ago in the bombing of the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church, where these 4 little Black girls' ultimate sacrifice served as a catalyst for the Civil Rights Movement, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.  
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.  
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 123]  
YEAS—420

Aderholt  
Alexander  
Amash  
Amodei  
Andrews  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barber  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barrow (GA)  
Barton  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Benishek  
Bentivolio  
Bera (CA)  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black

Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Bonner  
Boustany  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cantor

Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Carter  
Cartwright  
Cassidy  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Coffman  
Cohen  
Cole

Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Conaway  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Cotton  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Daines  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellmers  
Engel  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farenthold  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Foxy  
Frankel (FL)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grijalva  
Grimm  
Guthrie  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hall  
Hanabusa  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck (NV)  
Heck (WA)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins

Himes  
Holding  
Holt  
Honda  
Horsford  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huffman  
Neal  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Jenkins  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kline  
Kuster  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Lankford  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
Latta  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebsock  
Lofgren  
Long  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham (NM)  
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lummis  
Maffei  
Maloney, Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Meng  
Messer  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)

NOT VOTING—12

Cook  
Dingell  
Flores  
Hinojosa

Lynch  
Markey  
Miller, George  
Polis

Smith (NE)  
Tierney  
Veasey  
Walorski

□ 1514

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COOK. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 121 on the ordering of the previous question for H. Res. 175, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."  
On rollcall No. 122 on adoption of H. Res. 175, the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1549, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."  
On rollcall No. 123 on final passage of H.R. 360, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

**AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 2013, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING IN JOINT MEETING HER EXCELLENCY PARK GEUN-HYE, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA**

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, May 8, 2013, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in Joint Meeting Her Excellency Park Geun-hye, President of the Republic of Korea.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?  
There was no objection.

**CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL LEGISLATION IN HONOR OF VICTIMS OF SIXTEENTH STREET BAPTIST CHURCH BOMBING PASSES UNANIMOUSLY**

(Ms. SEWELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)  
Ms. SEWELL. Madam Speaker, today I just want to thank this body for passing this profound Congressional Gold