

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, we have a growing epidemic in our military that requires our immediate action.

I rise today to highlight a bipartisan, bicameral piece of legislation that will stem the growing cancer of sexual assault on men and women in the military.

This is absolutely unacceptable. In every branch of the military, from day one our servicemembers are instilled with the values of honor, respect, and integrity. It's what makes us proud to wear the uniform, and it's what makes our military strong. However, this epidemic completely undermines what these values and our servicemembers represent.

This morning I joined a strong, committed group of legislators to introduce the Military Justice Improvement Act, which provides a uniform and fair process, ensuring that sexual predators are exposed and punished accordingly.

We in Congress and leaders of the Department of Defense must keep the pressure on. Together, we must foster a respectful, productive environment for our military men and women. The success of our Armed Forces—and the security they provide our Nation—depends on it.

□ 1240

#### REPEAL OBAMACARE

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there's an article I missed that came out March 15, 2013, from Healthcare IT News—rather interesting. It talks about a lawsuit against the IRS because the IRS, it says, stole health records of some 10 million Americans, including the medical records of all California State judges. Knowing California, I bet most of them are Democrats. They took their medical records.

So, the allegation, the lawsuit, is over that. Ten million Americans' records. It doesn't matter what party they are. It doesn't matter what their political beliefs are. They have a right to have their own records kept private until ObamaCare fully kicks in.

I don't know why the IRS would take those medical records so prematurely, because when ObamaCare kicks in, the Federal Government has everybody's records already.

It's time to repeal it.

#### SNAP CUTS IN FARM BILL

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today not to offer my own words about the Republicans' major cuts to food stamps.

Instead, I want to let my constituents speak directly to the House Republican leadership. In this stack of plates sent to me, one of my constituents asked:

"How would I live if food stamps were cut?"

Others have said:

"There are a lot of people who would go hungry without food stamps."

"If the help I receive now for food stamps was cut, it will affect me and my kids while I'm trying to finish my college degree."

"In these hard times, food pantries get me through the week."

"To see your own kids starve and not be able to feed them is one of the worst pains a parent can experience."

"If food stamps were cut off, my 4-year-old brother and I would have to go to sleep hungry. We would also have to miss meals. This will be unfair considering he's only 4—and I'm 15."

These stories are heartbreaking and serve as evidence why cutting the food stamp program will really affect people's lives.

To my colleagues, I leave you with this last one: "Please don't stop helping people."

Please don't stop helping people.

#### COMMEMORATING THE FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE END OF THE CIVIL WAR IN SRI LANKA

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the fourth anniversary of the end of the civil war in Sri Lanka on May 18, 2009.

The last stages of the war were met with grave allegations of war crimes, including the Sri Lankan Government's treatment of Tamil civilians within no-fire zones—attacks that were a blatant violation of human rights.

As a result of the ensuing international outrage, Sri Lanka established a commission of inquiry to investigate the events of the 26-year civil war. However, this commission had no accountability and yielded little explanation for the families, the victims, or the international community.

We are left with the task of identifying what really happened during the last years of this terrible civil war and to hold accountable those who have committed war crimes. We also face the challenge of brokering peace in a country torn apart by civil war.

I urge the Government of Sri Lanka to demonstrate commitment towards reconciliation and promote human rights, particularly before hosting the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting in November.

#### DON'T REPEAL OBAMACARE

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, 3 years after the Affordable Care Act was signed into law, a law that is already helping millions of Americans, our friends on

the other side of the aisle are wasting time again on a pointless symbolic vote that will never become law and takes us backwards.

For the 37th time, our colleagues are forcing us to vote on repealing the Affordable Care Act when they know—they know—it has no chance of succeeding.

For the 37th time, they are voting to allow insurance companies to deny coverage to children with preexisting conditions.

For the 37th time, they are voting to roll back our efforts to not allow insurance companies to charge women more just because they are women.

And for the 37th time, they are voting to strip small businesses of protections against the skyrocketing insurance premiums we faced long before the ACA.

Einstein used to say: Insanity is when one attempts to do the same thing over and over again—expecting a different result.

This is wrong for the 37th time and a waste of our time.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise for a point of order.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I realize that H.R. 45 and its rule have not been brought up for consideration, but I wish to object to the consideration of H.R. 45 as well as consideration of the rule governing debate on the bill because it violates rule XII, clause 7, section (c), which states, "A bill or joint resolution may not be introduced unless the sponsor submits for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement citing as specifically as practicable the power or powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the bill or joint resolution."

The constitutional authority statement submitted with H.R. 45, argues that Congress is granted the authority to enact this legislation because of the Tenth Amendment.

The Tenth Amendment does not grant Congress the authority to act; it limits Congressional power. It states, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." Citing the Tenth Amendment does not satisfy the rule.

Experts at the Congressional Research Service agree. In a recent report, they stated, "The Tenth Amendment is not an affirmative grant of authority to Congress; rather, it is a limitation or disability on Congress's authority to legislate. Hence, because the House rule requires a statement citing the power or powers granted to Congress—not merely a statement of constitutional provisions—citations to the Tenth Amendment do not appear to satisfy the requirement of the House rule."

Mr. Speaker, the constitutional authority statement for the bill before us today does not comply with the House rules, and I ask that the bill and the rule not be considered until this problem is fixed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's point of order is not timely. Neither House Resolution 215 nor H.R. 45 is pending at this time.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill's constitutional authority statement cites the Tenth Amendment, and as such fails to live up to the rule of the House, and tries to perpetuate the false myth that the Affordable Care Act is unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has heard the case. They have made their decision. The Affordable Care Act is constitutional. And Speaker BOEHNER has said, it is the law of the land. The constitutional authority statement for this bill is completely inaccurate.

It is the 37th time we are voting to repeal or defund the Affordable Care Act, but apparently we still can't get the paperwork right. How does a Member correct the statement of constitutional authority?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not been recognized to engage in debate.

Does the gentleman have a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. POLIS. Has the House ever voted to repeal in whole or in part another piece of legislation 37 times, like we are doing here today—in this case, a piece of legislation that makes it illegal for insurance companies to discriminate against a woman if she becomes pregnant and makes sure that children under the age of 26 can stay on their parents' health care plan?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry, and the Chair does not place proceedings in a historical context.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. POLIS. Is it correct that the House Republican budget maintains \$1.2 trillion of tax increases included in the Affordable Care Act and \$716 billion in cuts of Medicare; and, in fact, this very budget that we operate under would not have balanced without including these savings in taxes from ObamaCare?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's parliamentary inquiry is not

relevant to any business pending before the House.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. POLIS. Is the House here this week spending millions of dollars of taxpayer money to repeal the Affordable Care Act because it actually believes that that will occur while Barack Obama is in the White House or because freshman Republicans want to score political points back home?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not respond to political commentary under the guise of parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. I trust the American people will respond to these questions.

□ 1250

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 45, REPEAL OF PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 215 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 215

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 45) to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act 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 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, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlelady 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.

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. House Resolution 215 provides for a rule to consider the full repeal of the flawed, ill-conceived and inappropriately named Affordable Care Act, a bill whose final language was written by staff on the Senate Finance Committee and the actual legislative text of which received not a single committee hearing or markup in this body. While many hearings and markups were held on other iterations of other health care bills, the legislation that was signed by the President received not a single moment of scrutiny in this House and contained none of the bipartisan amendments that were accepted during the markups of other health care bills, including H.R. 3200, which passed the House but was never considered by the Senate. As such, only a full repeal is acceptable, and that is what this rule provides for.

The rule provides for 2 hours of debate, controlled by the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce. Further, the rule self-executes the Bachmann amendment, which provides for a clean repeal of the entire ACA, consistent with the provisions of the opening day rules package of this Congress. The rule further provides the minority one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

This approach, a full repeal, will give the House, particularly Members who were not here in the past two Congresses, an opportunity to have an up-or-down vote, an affirmation or a denial, of the Affordable Care Act.

Americans should have the freedom to make their own health care decisions. In March of 2010, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act was signed into law. It was drafted quickly and behind closed doors at the end of 2009—behind closed doors in the other body, in fact. It included secret deals, loopholes, drafting errors, and allowed entirely new Federal agencies to be created without congressional knowledge or oversight.

The bottom line: it was not the way to achieve meaningful reform. In addition, the Supreme Court ruled last June that the law is, in fact, a tax. This is after President Obama continually told the American people that it was not a tax.

The health care system in America needs reform, and it needs improvement; but the law that was passed will cost American taxpayers and patients millions of dollars. It will not improve care, and it will not make care more affordable. We need to start fresh and address the issues with commonsense improvements that will focus on the real issues at hand—creating a health care system that is focused on patients instead of payment, quality instead of quantity, affordability instead of cheapness, and innovation instead of stagnation. The first step is eliminating bad legislation that simply does not work and that today stands in the way of any real improvement. That is why, today, I strongly support the repeal of the President's health care law.