

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.

The President did repeatedly tell us that the penalty associated with the individual mandate was not a tax. It was repeated several times in the run-up to this bill's being signed. In June, the Supreme Court affirmed that the only way that this bill could remain law was that it was, indeed, a tax, and Congress has the infinite power to tax. In fact, Congress can tax morning, noon, and night. It can tax the American people back to the stone age if that's what it wishes, and that's what the Affordable Care Act does. When millions are unemployed, this is, indeed, the last thing we need.

It's not just the tax. It's the effect on premiums. Up on the Energy and Commerce Web site this week is a study showing how the Affordable Care Act is going to affect premiums in the individual market, in the small-group market, and in the large-group market; and almost uniformly those premiums are going up, and in some cases they are going up a staggering amount.

Last summer, the Supreme Court's decision leaves in place a costly and unworkable health care scheme that is hurting America's families, that is hurting America's workers, that is hurting America's job creators, and that is damaging America's patients. We will all have to live with that ruling. If we do not repeal, then we will have to live with the law as written. The time has come to step up and do the right thing. I urge support of the rule.

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.

Mr. Speaker, before I discuss the value of the Affordable Care Act, commonly referred to as ObamaCare, I must acknowledge the sad fact that this will be the 37th time in 29 months that the majority has voted to repeal or defund the law, and they know it will not happen. Recent estimates are that each vote to repeal or to defund the Affordable Care Act has cost \$1.45 million in taxpayer money. So today's debate will bring the total cost of repeal votes to—wake up there—\$53 million and counting.

Now, while the majority wastes our tax dollars, think what we could do with \$53 million. The agriculture bill we were all talking about this morning is ready to take \$20 billion out of food stamps, feeding poor people, while we waste that kind of money here doing a bill month after month after month that we know is not going anywhere. Yet we don't have any positive agenda to put forward here. For the last 2 or 3 months, all we've done are one-House bills that everybody knows are not going to get passed, and it really is a tragedy because a CBS study says it costs \$25 million a week just to run the Congress—and how deplorable that kind of waste is with all the problems we have in the country.

We are told that the freshman Republicans would like, once again, to have

an opportunity to vote to kill health care. I wonder if the freshman Republicans, as I know the freshman Democrats do, wouldn't like to vote to repeal the sequester or to maybe do a jobs bill, which we haven't had in 2½ years. We are not going to do anything about the budget either when we've heard all the time, Why doesn't the Senate do a budget? The Senate has done a budget. The Senate has asked over and over again for the House to appoint conferees so that we can get the budget put together and pass it into law. No action there either. Then, because of the sequester cuts, at least 70,000 children have been denied access to early education, and thousands of cancer patients have been denied their regular cancer treatments.

The majority says it is holding today's vote, as I said, so that the freshmen can repeal the Affordable Care Act. I wish to goodness that they would give them something that would really pass and something good to vote on.

Instead of voting to repeal the sequester, the majority is voting for the 37th time to repeal a law—and this is very important—that has already done so much already. It has given 100 million Americans access to free preventative health care, procedures such as mammograms and colonoscopies. That's 100 million already. They are voting for the 37th time to repeal a law that saves seniors \$6.1 billion in prescription drug costs already. They are voting for the 37th time to repeal a law that has provided 3.1 million young adults with health insurance already that they otherwise could not afford.

The Affordable Care Act has been particularly beneficial for America's women. Did you know that prior to the passage of this law in eight States and in the District of Columbia, domestic violence was classified as a preexisting condition and you could be denied insurance? They were denied insurance because they had been abused and because, perhaps, they would be again.

□ 1300

Did you know that thanks to a practice called "gender rating," women were charged as much as 46 percent more in premiums for the same level of insurance as a man? Maybe you didn't know that. But lots of women in the country are getting rebates for that very reason.

Because of the Affordable Care Act, both of these discriminatory practices have been outlawed. In addition, the Affordable Care Act has already returned money to the pockets of millions of women thanks to the rebates required by insurance companies under the health care law.

Finally, the Affordable Care Act outlawed lifetime and yearly limits, insidious insurance practices that capped the amount of health care an insurance company would provide. But because of health care reform, Americans no longer have to worry that they will be denied health care that they need sim-

ply because insurance companies refuse to pay for their continued care.

And did you know that 85 percent of your premium dollar will go to health care and not to other things that the insurance company wants to spend it on?

The majority has claimed that the Affordable Care Act is bad for America's small businesses. The truth is that for any small business that has less than 50 employees, it requires them to do nothing different, nothing at all from what they're doing today. But small businesses with less than 25 employees are eligible for a tax credit of 35 percent right now. And on January 1, that tax credit will increase to 50 percent. You will get a tax credit on half of the health insurance you pay when you have under 25 employees.

The majority has also claimed and will continue to claim that the Affordable Care Act was passed in the dark of night through a closed-door process that denied their side of the aisle the opportunity to participate in the legislative process. This charge is categorically untrue. The Affordable Care Act was the product of nearly 100 hearings and 83 hours of committee markups, including both Republicans and Democrats making amendments. The House heard from 181 witnesses, both Democrat and Republican. There were 239 amendments considered in House committees and 121 that were adopted.

And while some on the other side of the aisle charge that the final version of the law was rushed through the House, the final bill was available for 72 hours before any Members were asked to vote on it.

In contrast, the Patients' Rights Repeal Act, which we're doing again today as I said for the 37th time, is being considered after no committee hearings, no committee markups, and under a closed rule. That means there will be no amendments on this bill. Even if one were sympathetic toward the majority's goal, the complete abuse of the legislative process should give every Member of this Chamber pause.

Mr. Speaker, today's vote is just the latest in the majority's all-out effort to undermine the process of implementing the health care law. Their efforts have taken many forms, but central to it all is their refusal to provide the necessary funding to fully implement the law and a gleeful willingness to criticize an implementation process that is underfunded and undermined at every single turn.

Despite their best efforts, I believe that in the years to come, the majority will find that they stood on the wrong side of history, just as they stood on the wrong side of history when Social Security was passed and when Medicare came into being.

Indeed, the opponents of the Affordable Care Act have already had their day in court. Last summer, the Supreme Court affirmed the constitutionality of the Affordable Care Act, putting to rest any false legal concerns that opponents had.

With the constitutionality of the law no longer in question, one might expect opponents to criticize the law's impact on our Nation's finances. But here again, the facts will stand in the way. Over the last 3 years, U.S. health care spending grew at 3.9 percent. That, Mr. Speaker, is the lowest growth rate in 50 years. And according to the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office, repealing the Affordable Care Act would actually increase our Nation's deficit by more than \$100 billion over the next 10 years. Please think of that and understand what they are trying to do away with today—the things that help you.

Mr. Speaker, providing safe, secure, and affordable health care for our citizens has been the goal of both Republican and Democrat lawmakers for generations. As far back as Theodore Roosevelt, we have acknowledged the need to provide our citizens with a health care system that puts their health before industry profits, that has as good outcomes as other parts of the world provide for their citizens. We need to treat health care as a right for all, not a privilege for the lucky few.

Under the leadership of a Democratic Congress, we managed to realize at long last this long-awaited goal by passing the Affordable Care Act through an open, deliberative, and thorough legislative process. And from reducing our Nation's health care spending to expanding health care to millions of Americans who could not afford it, the Affordable Care Act is succeeding.

It is in this light that the majority's 37th vote in 29 months to repeal health care should be judged. And it's hard to judge their politically driven vote as anything other than a disservice to the American people, a waste of taxpayer money and a way to spread misinformation.

I urge my colleagues to reject today's rule and the underlying legislation. And I reaffirm my pride in supporting the law that is already helping to save lives and already providing American people with secure and affordable health care. And after it is fully implemented next year, all Americans will benefit.

I reserve the balance of my time

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, now I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, a member of the Budget Committee, ROGER WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of freedom and free enterprise, the hallmarks of our great American democracy. A government that places high value on these principles does not force its citizens to hand over their hard-earned money for a mandatory product, in this case health insurance. This is not how it's done in America.

Mr. Speaker, NANCY PELOSI and her Democratic colleagues rushed this bill through Congress more than 3 years ago. Democrats and Republicans can

agree on one thing, that this is very flawed and is not even what Americans asked for in the first place. Even President Obama has signed into law seven bills that dismantle provisions of his health care law.

Defying common sense, the President and Democrats and Congress continue pushing forward with implementation of this disastrous law. And who wants it? Members of Obama's own party are now doubting how the law will work. Some of the key players who wrote the bill don't even want it. Senator MAX BAUCUS said the health care law is a train wreck, and Senator JAY ROCKEFELLER said that it's overly complicated and beyond comprehension.

Architects of this law don't want it, insurance companies don't want it, the majority of the public doesn't want it, organized labor doesn't want it, and as a small business owner of nearly 42 years, I can tell you that small businesses don't want it.

No business owner would run their business like the President is running this government and this massive health care overhaul. I can say from firsthand experience that small businesses—the backbone of our economy—are literally hurting.

As a job creator, I know how businesses can no longer hire. They can't take risks that would grow the economy. I've heard from people all over my district who have work available and positions ready to fill, but they can't hire anyone or else they risk going over the number of 50 employees and being subject to the ObamaCare employee mandate. Everybody wants to be at 49.

How is this good for Americans and America?

The struggling economy has already forced families to cut back and tighten their budgets. How does the President expect these hardworking taxpayers to pay an additional \$3,000 each year for ObamaCare?

I've had employees come to me in tears wondering how they're going to provide coverage for their families. And even the few Americans able to keep their current insurance will see their premiums rise by an average of 73 percent.

Again, I ask, how is that good for America?

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to quote Patrick Henry. He claimed:

The Constitution is not an instrument for the government to restrain the people. It is an instrument for the people to restrain the government—lest it come to dominate our lives and interest.

Let's put an end to the chaos and do what's right for our families, our businesses, and our tax dollars. Repeal ObamaCare today—the quicker the better.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying legislation.

Well, here we go again. In fact, I've lost count of how many times we've had to vote on a bill to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

The underlying legislation before us today would deny my constituents and the American people access to affordable health care. It would increase health costs and reduce benefits for millions of American families.

It's particularly ironic that during Older Americans Month, we are here voting on a bill that will eliminate benefits to seniors, including preventive services and savings on prescription drugs.

It would allow insurance companies to deny coverage to Americans with preexisting conditions, drop coverage when people get sick, reinstitute lifetime limits on coverage and charge people more based merely on gender.

□ 1310

The Affordable Care Act has already created long-lasting benefits for many of my constituents, including Theresa, a single mother of four whose youngest child is 20 and lives with a preexisting condition. Prior to the Affordable Care Act, Theresa was personally spending over \$10,000 a year to pay for her care. Her daughter's medical condition prevented her from attending college. But thanks to the Affordable Care Act, she was able to be added back on to her mother's health plan. This has meant tremendous savings for Theresa, who was worried she might lose her home, along with the care her daughter desperately needed.

A vote against this rule and against the underlying legislation is a vote to protect our constituents from unfair insurance company practices, to provide relief to Americans, young and old alike, to protect job growth and creation, and for a fiscally responsible future. It is time for this Congress to move forward, not backwards.

I urge my colleagues to vote down this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

I rise in strong support of this rule. And as a proud cosponsor of this bill to repeal ObamaCare, I think it is very important that we in this House have this vote. Yes, we've had this vote many times. I think it's important to have it again this Congress because so much more has come to light since the last time that this vote was held in the last Congress. What are some of those things? Well, of course, when NANCY PELOSI was Speaker, she famously said, "You have to pass the bill to find out what's in it."

Well, we're seeing more and more every day just how many devastating things are happening in our economy because of ObamaCare. In fact, how bad is it? It's so bad that one of the Senate architects of the bill, Senator MAX

BAUCUS, said: "I see a huge train wreck coming down."

Now, when they were in the back room writing this bill, he was the guy with the pen. He wrote the bill in the Senate, and he said it's a train wreck coming down.

Why would we want to do this to the American people? The system of health care that we have today has some problems, but why would you want to destroy the things that work? You fix the things that work.

This bill, ObamaCare, is actually scheduled to increase health care costs dramatically for American families. In fact, what will it do to our health care system? And this is what families are finding out, all across not just southeast Louisiana, the area that I represent, but all across the country. This chart shows all of the different Federal agencies that come in between a patient and their doctor in health care. It used to be the patient talking to the doctor, and they made the health care decision. That was the sacred relationship in health care. Now you've got all of these Federal agencies.

And who's at the top? The IRS. The IRS is the enforcement arm of ObamaCare. And, of course, just in the last few days we've seen the corruption at the IRS where they've literally gone and picked winners and losers, picked partisan fights, and literally tried to enforce the Obama administration's will, punishing the enemies of the Obama administration. This is not the agency that should be running health care.

We need to repeal this law and fix the real problems in health care.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and for her extraordinary leadership. I rise today, Mr. Speaker, in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act and in opposition to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when the American people would like Congress to focus their attention on increasing and growing the economy and job growth, we are instead, for the 37th time, involved in partisan politics.

It is especially troubling that our Republican colleagues have chosen to celebrate National Women's Health Week by attempting to undo the important gains that were made for women's health in the Affordable Care Act. A study issued by the Joint Economic Committee while I was chair found that across this country, under the old status quo, an estimated 64 million women lacked adequate health insurance, and 39 percent of all low-income women had no health insurance coverage at all.

A repeal now of the Affordable Care Act could mean that millions of American women could find it nearly impossible to gain insurance if they had a preexisting condition, such as preg-

nancy. A repeal now would take away benefits women are already receiving such as free mammograms. A repeal now would mean the end of lower-cost prescription drugs for our seniors. A repeal now would yank young people between the age of 23 and 26 off their parents' policies. A repeal now would send us back to the bad old days, to the days of preexisting conditions, gender ratings, and lifetime caps. It would mean that in this next year alone, over 1.9 million people would not have access to quality, dependable health insurance coverage.

Vote "no" on this repeal.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I now am pleased to yield such time as she may consume to the author of the bill and a true leader in this effort, in this fight, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to listen to the clear, distinct voice of the American people. They have spoken loudly. They have spoken clearly. They heard the words of then-Speaker of the House NANCY PELOSI when she famously said we must pass ObamaCare before we can know what's in it. As my colleague, STEVE SCALISE, said, now we know what's in the bill, and now we know why ObamaCare is less popular today than even before it was passed for the first time. Because you see, Mr. Speaker, the more we learn about ObamaCare, the more unpopular it becomes.

Even a Democrat, MAX BAUCUS, who helped write ObamaCare said:

I just tell you, I see a huge train wreck coming down.

Well, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, 7 months from now when ObamaCare comes fully online, when people's health care premiums will soar through the roof, in some cases increasing 417 percent, what then, Mr. Speaker?

We see this coming, just like the *Titanic*. We see the iceberg, only it's not just in a mist, shortly in front of our eyes. We have time to turn. That's why we're here. We're here to make the turn from a train wreck.

So why not repeal that bill today? Repeal it in the House, but repeal it in the U.S. Senate, and force the President of the United States to repudiate his signature piece of legislation under his watch, which his own party calls a train wreck. It's now. Now is the time to listen to the American people.

You see, Mr. Speaker, President Obama told us, he promised us that ObamaCare would fund insurance for people with preexisting conditions. As a compassionate people, we want to help people in this very difficult situation. But ObamaCare, the truth is that it is so poorly thought out that the funding for preexisting conditions has already run out. You heard me right, Mr. Speaker: less than 1 percent of the American people with preexisting conditions got the funding and now the door has been slammed in their face.

And so I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what now? What are the remaining 99 percent of the American people with preexisting conditions supposed to do now? Now they're told we've already run out of money, and the bill hasn't even fully come into effect, the centerpiece of compassion under this bill.

And now we've learned that the IRS, the Internal Revenue Service—and I used to be a Federal tax litigation attorney, and our client was the IRS. I was involved with this agency. Now we've learned that the IRS, which is tasked with enforcing this very unpopular bill of ObamaCare, the IRS admitted they targeted Americans. They targeted conservative groups. They targeted Christians. They targeted pro-Israel people. They targeted people who are pro-business who are against accumulating debt. And, yes, they targeted Tea Party groups based upon their political and religious beliefs.

And so this gargantuan government expansion known as ObamaCare will allow bureaucrats access to our most intimate, personal health care information. It will be a huge database that government is putting together and building right now.

Under ObamaCare, the average American will pay more, they'll get less, and now they have to worry that their government may punish them because of their beliefs.

□ 1320

This is America. We don't do that in this country.

We want real solutions. We want cures for Alzheimer's. We can have it. We want cures for Parkinson's disease. It's within our grasp. We want cures for juvenile diabetes.

Spend our money there. We deserve better. The American people deserve better solutions and real reform in health care. Now is the time. Listen to the American people, and let's give them what they deserve.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentlelady for yielding and for her extraordinary leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act and the underlying rule.

More than 3 years ago, following months of vitriolic debate and perpetual Republican talking points on socialized medicine and government-sponsored death panels, Congress passed, and the President signed into law, a historic health care reform bill that was designed to extend health care to millions of Americans and, over time, bring down the costs of health care.

Opponents of this new law didn't give up. They took their case all the way to the Supreme Court, and they lost. In the House, they held 36 votes to repeal or defund this law, and they failed.

According to an analysis from CBS News, these empty attempts at repeal

have cost taxpayers a total of \$52.4 million, even as my Republican friends argue for cutting important programs like Head Start and critical nutrition programs for those most in need.

Yet here we stand, about to vote, for a 37th time, on repealing a bill that is already providing real benefits for our country.

Contrary to what my friends on the other side of the aisle may argue, we've already seen a slowdown in the overall growth of health care spending since the enactment of this law.

And just in my home State of Rhode Island, more than 170,000 women have guaranteed access to preventive services without cost-sharing; 374,000 Rhode Islanders no longer have to worry about lifetime limits on their coverage; and 9,000 young adults have gained access to health care coverage because of this law.

Let's reject this proposal, stop playing these political games, and get back to the really serious and urgent work of creating jobs, preventing gun violence, fixing our broken immigration system, passing a budget by regular order, and ending the sequester.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 17 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, President Obama and his legislative supporters promised us many things in ObamaCare. Some folks might call this misinformation, but today I call them whoppers.

Whopper No. 1: we were promised ObamaCare will reduce the deficit. Instead, according to the report from the nonpartisan GAO, ObamaCare will increase the Federal deficit by \$6.2 trillion.

Secretary Sebelius, whopper No. 2: health insurance for all. She has now admitted up to 24 million Americans will lose their current health insurance.

No. 3: we were promised it will not fund abortions. Yet for the first time in decades, Americans will be forced to fund abortions through Federal insurance subsidies.

Whopper No. 4: it will create jobs. A recent nonpartisan study concluded that ObamaCare's employer mandate can put up to 3.2 million American jobs at risk.

No. 5: we were promised it will strengthen Medicare but, instead, ObamaCare contains \$700 billion in cuts to Medicare and allows a bureaucratic, unelected, unaccountable panel to make these massive cuts to Medicare.

Whopper No. 6: we were promised that ObamaCare respects religious liberty. Nineteen courts disagree because the HHS mandate requires all employers to pay for insurance, including abortion drugs, irrespective of any moral objections.

Whopper No. 7: health insurance will go down, they promised. But instead, every estimate, every estimate provided by insurance providers indicates premiums will increase anywhere from 20 to 400 percent.

Whopper No. 8: it is not a tax. If it's not a tax, why does the IRS need 2,000 more agents just to implement ObamaCare? Because of the 21 tax hikes included in the bill.

And last of all and, most importantly, the biggest whopper of all: if you like your health care plan, you can keep it. My constituents, your constituents have shared real life story after story about how they will lose the coverage they like once the individual mandate goes into effect. And the CBO estimates up to 7 million Americans may lose their employer-sponsored health insurance plan.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to stop telling whoppers and start speaking the truth. It's time to repeal ObamaCare now.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act. This is the Republicans' 37th callous attempt to derail health care reform.

Rather than work to create jobs and to improve our economy, Republicans are focused on taking away key patients' rights and benefits that are already improving countless American lives.

With this vote today to repeal the Affordable Care Act, House Republicans are saying that they don't mind if insurance companies drop patients as soon as they get sick, or if our seniors can't afford their prescription drugs to stay healthy.

Three years after the Affordable Care Act was passed by Congress, signed into law by the President, and upheld as constitutional by the Supreme Court, millions of Americans, particularly our Nation's women, are seeing meaningful protections for their health and well-being.

As a cancer survivor and as a mother of three young children, this law isn't about politics for me. It's personal.

When I was diagnosed with breast cancer at the age of 41, 5 years ago, it was like my world was coming down around me all at once.

My colleagues must understand, and we were reminded again this week, there is nothing in the world more gut-wrenching as a parent than not being able to assure your children that their mom is going to be okay, or that they won't have to worry about getting cancer someday themselves.

I was fortunate to have exceptional health care coverage, but too many women in our country have never had the ability to see a doctor, and so many face true financial hardship with a diagnosis like mine.

Over the past 5 years, I've had so many women come up to me and con-

fess that they haven't had a mammogram in years because they can't afford the expensive co-pays or they fear the prohibitive cost of treatment. That is unacceptable in the United States of America.

Imagine how many millions in our country face terrifying health care decisions every day. This Congress has the power to protect them from uncertainty, instability, and financial ruin. That power lies in the provisions of the Affordable Care Act, tools like free preventative care and cancer screening services that help save women's lives.

We cannot waste another minute with more of these meaningless attempts to repeal a law that has already made a difference for so many of our constituents. For our children, and all families across this Nation, we must come together and work to implement this historic health care reform that is the law of the land and that is not going to be repealed.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT).

Mr. HURT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the full repeal of the President's health care law. I believe we must repeal this law and replace it with patient-centered, market-oriented reforms that will improve patient care, broaden patient access, and reduce patient costs.

From the beginning, the President promised that his health care law would improve the quality of health care for all Americans. He said if you wanted to keep your doctor, his plan was for you. If you wanted to keep your health care plan, his law was for you. He said that if you wanted lower insurance premiums, his law was for you.

Well, the bill passed, and the people of Virginia's Fifth District are getting a full dose of it, and they don't like what they see. As I've traveled across Virginia's Fifth District, I've heard from our constituents, our Main Street businesses, our local governments, and our health care providers that this law is not living up to the President's promises.

In fact, people are not able to keep the health care plans that they've always counted on. People are being hit with spikes in insurance premiums, and people are having to take second jobs because they can't afford to live on a 29-hour workweek.

This repeal bill is important because it is an expression of the sentiment of the people I represent. They want real health care reform, not government mandates.

I encourage my colleagues to support the rule and support this bill.

□ 1330

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL).

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I rise in opposition to the Patients' Rights

Repeal Act, the 37th such time that the Republican House leadership has had us consider this.

Before I came to Congress, I was a prosecutor. And as a prosecutor, I would take my case, present evidence to the jury; the jury would reach a verdict, and the case would be closed. The same has occurred with the Affordable Care Act.

In 2009 and 2010, this body debated the Affordable Care Act. Evidence that the Affordable Care Act would increase access to quality care was presented. Evidence about eliminating preexisting conditions was presented. The law was passed by a majority of democratically elected Representatives. It was signed into law by the President of the United States, and recently it was upheld by the Supreme Court. We had an election where the President and the candidate who ran against him talked about these, and they had two very different positions, and this President who signed it into law was reelected. The verdict on the Affordable Care Act is in. The case is closed.

Mr. Speaker, the benefits are also real. In California, 5.6 million people will have access to health care.

There are very serious issues facing our country: growing and lifting our economy, having a green energy policy that makes us independent from other foreign sources of oil, and passing comprehensive immigration reform. But this House Republican leadership is acting like a frivolous litigant wasting our time voting over and over and over—37 times—to repeal the Affordable Care Act. The 37th time will not be a charm.

The definition of “insanity” is doing the same thing over and over and over and expecting a different result. I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 45, and I urge the House Republican leadership to stop the insanity, and let’s move forward on the issues that will grow our economy, make us independent from foreign sources of oil in how we find our energy, and fix a broken immigration system.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend, Dr. BURGESS, for his leadership on this issue and for yielding me this time.

We just heard the speaker talk about the definition of “insanity,” and Americans woke up the last few weeks and realized the definition of “insanity” is giving massive amounts of information to thousands of new Internal Revenue Service agents who can use it as leverage over our lives.

I hope that, despite the fact that this bill is increasing costs on individuals and businesses, at least we ought to agree we don’t want to hire thousands of new Internal Revenue Service agents and give them all of this information that they can use as an abusive process over our lives. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced the Prevent

IRS Overreach Act which would at least take the Internal Revenue Service out of this provision.

I hope that we’ll adopt this rule and we’ll support the underlying bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I’m pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlelady for her leadership.

I rise today in opposition to the Patients’ Rights Repeal Act. I want you to see the face of those who have been served across America. They are, yes, low-income, some are impoverished, but many are middle income. In fact, there was an article in the Texas newspaper that said, part of what drives the need for health care are Medicaid, expanded Medicaid, which is part of this great bill, the Affordable Care Act, is the fact that people are impoverished.

And so here is what my friends want to do today for the 37th time. They want to take away from 13 million Americans the health insurance that they need, that they were able to secure with rebates from the health insurance companies. They want to take away from 105 million Americans, 71 million Americans in private plans, who have received free preventative services. They want to be able to tell the women who needed mammograms and additional tests for breast cancer that you can’t go in and get the preventative care that you need to save lives. Oh, yes. They want to tell 17 million children with preexisting disease you cannot go in anymore and be covered.

The conversation over here is plain foolish. They’re only talking about their economics—their economics of wealth. Yes, maybe their districts have not felt the pain of racial disparities which they’re going to eliminate if they get rid of this bill. Maybe they are not in one of these States, 10 States like Texas that has 28.4 percent uninsured, along with the Louisiana, Arkansas, Georgia and many others, Florida, that have uninsured people who need this. Maybe they’ll tell the 6.6 million children that have taken advantage of the law today to obtain health insurance for preexisting disease that they cannot do that, or maybe they’ll tell the seniors that you can go back into the doughnut hole again.

I don’t know why we’re doing this, but I will tell you that I see that lives are saved.

I introduced an amendment to make sure that we didn’t lose the federally qualified health clinics. When you repeal this bill, you will dash the hopes of those who have been walking into their neighborhoods, going into federally qualified health clinics and getting the good care that they need.

All this is is spoiled grapes. That’s what this is. Drink the wine and leave

us alone, and make sure that we keep the Patients’ Bill of Rights and Affordable Care Act.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. PAUL BROUN.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Dr. BURGESS, thank you for yielding.

The ObamaCare law must be ripped out by its roots, and it needs to be replaced with something that makes sense for my patients and my colleagues so that we can deliver good quality health care.

ObamaCare is a destroyer. It’s going to destroy the doctor-patient relationship. It’s going to destroy the quality of health care in America. It’s going to destroy budgets: personal budgets, family budgets, business budgets, State budgets, and even the Federal budget. It’s a big spending bill. We’ve got to stop this outrageous spending.

I just got off the phone with our Governor, Nathan Deal, and he told me that the cost of health care for State employees in Georgia has gone up 12 percent because of ObamaCare, and it’s going higher. I just got an email from a businessman in Georgia who said that his premiums have doubled since last year because of ObamaCare.

We must rip it out by the roots and replace it with my Patient OPTION Act that’s a market-based, patient-centered health care plan that will literally make health care cheaper for everybody in this country. It will provide coverage for all Americans, and it’s going to save Medicare from going broke. ObamaCare is going to break the bank for everybody, and it just must be repealed and replaced with my Patient OPTION Act.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, let me yield myself 30 seconds to respond to the previous speaker.

I feel very badly about his constituent whose health care price has gone up, but I want to say that that’s because the insurance companies raise those prices. ObamaCare is not yet in effect for small businesses.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I’m sorry, I haven’t got the time. It’s all allocated. But I will talk to you later about it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. It’s ObamaCare that’s running the cost up, not the insurance companies.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. No, it’s not. It’s the insurance coverage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the Patients’ Rights Repeal Act and the rule.

Now, there’s nothing wrong with working to improve the Affordable Care Act. We should work to make quality health care more affordable and more available to all Americans. But repeal is not a solution and has real and serious consequences for folks in Connecticut. Even worse, this vote is a tremendous waste of time when we

have serious work to do for our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the 37th time—the 37th time—Congress is voting to repeal health care reform.

Five months after the tragic attack in Newtown in my district, House Republican leaders continue to refuse to allow a single vote—a single vote—on commonsense gun legislation to reduce gun violence. Instead of voting on enhanced background checks, a reform supported by over 90 percent of the American people, Congress has now devoted 15 percent of its time to trying to repeal health care.

Mr. Speaker, it's time for Congress to stop wasting time on pointless political gamesmanship and to get to work for the American people.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa, STEVE KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And as I listen to the gentlelady talk about enhanced background checks, it just occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, that if we repeal ObamaCare, we can save more lives by bringing real health care reform to this country and restoring the doctor-patient relationship, providing incentives for research and development, and letting our health care system continue to modernize instead of freezing its development and atrophy, as it will, under a government-controlled program.

As I listened to the gentlelady earlier offer her opening remarks on the rule for the Affordable Care Act, it occurred to me, Mr. Speaker, that it really isn't the name of it. It is the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, that long lingo that nobody knew what it was, so it was market tested and reduced down to the Affordable Care Act.

□ 1340

We know it's the Unaffordable Care Act, that's why we call it ObamaCare. It was passed by legislative shenanigans, and it passed in the dark of the night. They had to split some of it out and pass it by reconciliation because even the voters in Massachusetts, to replace Teddy Kennedy's seat, elected a Republican to put a block to ObamaCare. That's an extraordinary event to happen in America. Eighty-seven new freshman Republicans came into this Congress as a result of it; the Blue Dog Democrats became essentially politically extinct because of ObamaCare; and the promises that were made were obviously not kept.

We remember the President's promises. There were three big promises that he made: if you like your doctor, you can keep him—or her. No, we all know that's not true.

If you like your insurance and your insurance premium, you get to keep it. Your premiums aren't going to go up. We know that's not true. The costs have gone up. The premiums are going up. There was a discussion about a 73 percent—apparently an average num-

ber that the earlier gentleman spoke about—premium increase with ObamaCare. I can tell you that those numbers that say up to 400 percent, they are real.

Two and a half months ago, I sat down with the health insurance underwriters. They gave an example of a 28-year-old woman who's satisfied with her share of her individual policy premium today at \$200 a month. If she smokes, she would see the premium go up from \$200 to \$800 a month. It is a malignant tumor that's metastasizing on American liberty. It must be ripped out by the roots and completely repealed.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act.

Doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result, that's insanity. This week, House Republicans are trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act for the 37th time. Thirty-six failed attempts weren't enough?

More than 105 million Americans have had arbitrary lifetime coverage caps lifted because of this law. Up to 17 million children with preexisting conditions can no longer be denied coverage. And more than 6.5 million children up to the age of 26 now have coverage on their parents' plan, about half of whom would otherwise be uninsured.

Why would anyone want to roll all of this back? Why would anyone waste 43 days—as Republicans have done so far—to repeal a bill that does so much for the American people? It's not smart; it's not logical. More importantly, it's not right.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I'd now like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I think there is one thing America needs to know that simplifies this debate very clearly. The only people exempt from ObamaCare is the President, the Vice President—the committee staff that wrote the bill exempted themselves from the bill, and the Federal agencies that are implementing ObamaCare are exempt from the very law that they're shoving down the throats of the American people.

The Democrat majority that passed this bill over the objections of the overwhelming majority of the Nation didn't even bother to read it. Speaker NANCY PELOSI said we have to pass the bill to see what's in it. They have no concept of what was in it.

I had the chance to ask the financial genius Charles Schwab recently what are two things we could do to really create jobs and grow the economy. He said: repeal Dodd-Frank and repeal ObamaCare—two of the most destructive pieces of legislation ever passed by the United States Congress, done by a Democrat majority that didn't even bother to read it and exempted them-

selves from it. The committee staff that wrote the bill exempted themselves from it. The Federal agencies that are implementing it are exempt from ObamaCare, but they stuck it on all the American people, including the Members of Congress. We're all under it, but President Obama and Vice President BIDEN are not. And that's all you need to know.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. To respond to what we just heard—and none of us are exempt; I don't know what in the world that's all about—I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. The House deserves a vigorous debate on any question. It also deserves the factual record.

The President, the Vice President, and the employees of the executive branch are subject to the law in the following way: because they receive coverage through their employer, their employer is subject to the rules of the law.

The second thing I want to make very, very clear: no Member of the House of Representatives is exempt from this law in any way, shape, or form. None. As far as the committee staffs are concerned, the committee staffs that you refer to are members of the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program. Nothing in the law changes that. Just as any other person in America who is insured by their employer, they have to live by these same kinds of rules. This just isn't true.

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. The committee staff is exempt. The President of the United States is exempt.

Mr. ANDREWS. No, they're not.

Reclaiming my time, this is just not correct. There is no one exempt from this coverage.

Does the gentleman agree that he is not exempt from this coverage? Are you exempt?

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman 30 seconds.

Mr. ANDREWS. I would yield to the gentleman. Are you exempt from this law, sir?

Mr. CULBERSON. Members of Congress are covered, but the committee staff that wrote the bill are exempt.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey controls the time.

Mr. ANDREWS. The committee staffs who were involved in writing the bill are Federal employees subject to the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act.

There have been many distortions about this law; this is just one of them.

I want to point out that one of the earlier speakers said that there's a GAO study that says this increases the deficit by some imaginary number. The scorekeeper around here for deficits is the Congressional Budget Office. They say it reduces the deficit by \$100 billion.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the status of time for both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2½ minutes to the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), for his consideration.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, today we're having a vigorous debate about President Obama's health care bill. The reason why we're doing this is that there have been seven or eight different provisions already that have been repealed from this bill in the last 2 years because either it was fraud, it was onerous, or it would not work.

The reason why we are on the floor today is not to waste time, but to give the American people, through representative government, an opportunity to say we now know more about that bill that was not read.

Here's what we know: we know that it is a trillion-dollar-plus spending bill—trillion dollars that would have been in Americans' pockets to make their own decisions about their health care, but now it is flowing to the Federal Government. And what it is doing is arbitrarily causing our country—and this is based upon the laws that are already in place in this country of what will happen to the debt of our country. President Obama and Democrats have led us to trillion-dollar deficits every single year the President has been in office.

This is just the beginning. At some point our country will cease to become what it is—a great Nation—because we will join the likes of Eastern Europe. And it is directly because of tax increases and ObamaCare, which limits the size of small business and businesses that want to get under this threshold of 50 employees. So it arbitrarily will diminish the dreams of Americans who want to build their business from a small business to a larger business simply to avoid the IRS, who will be in their business about health care.

So the Rules Committee is, rightfully so, bringing this bill to the floor—another time—for the American people who are saying—not only publicly in polls, but through their Representatives—this is not a pathway we want to keep going on.

We have to stop the bankruptcy of American business. We need to go back to where we have a vibrant economy, where college graduates at least stand a chance to be able to have a job and to move our country forward.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for the time.

□ 1350

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to this rule that will allow the House to vote on what the country really needs right now: a bill to create more American jobs. The SEAM Act would help to not only create more jobs, but more American-made products, by creating tax credits for productive American manufacturers in the energy innovation industry.

I ask the majority to stop these political games—this bill has had no committee action and no discussion; it is simply brought back over and over—and work with us for a change to put some smart policies forward.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA).

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I do not believe that the Affordable Care Act is perfect. I also do not believe that Congress serves the American people by engaging in a partisan fight on this floor for the 37th time.

Is the law perfect? No.

Can we—and should we—come together, stop fighting, and get back to the work of the people? Yes.

There is broad agreement in our country that the Affordable Care Act is not perfect. So let's start there. Instead of fighting, Congress should work together to fix this law and make it work for Americans.

Today, I believe our time is best served by working together to create that which our country so badly needs—jobs. Hardworking families are waiting for us to deliver on a promise that brought many of us to this Chamber—a jobs bill that puts Americans back to work.

My amendment, the Security in Energy and Manufacturing Act, creates high-paying clean-energy jobs. It supports American businesses that create innovative energy products and hire workers here in America. This is a jobs proposal to help American businesses grow and stay competitive in a global marketplace. I want businesses in my community to put their innovative energy products right into our economy.

Energy innovation is quickly becoming one of the world's largest industries. Countries all over the world purchase billions of dollars worth of innovative products. I want to see those products made in America, not China. I want Arizona and America to be globally competitive.

By defeating the previous question, we have the opportunity to restore U.S. manufacturing jobs. Our constituents sent us here—Democrats and Republicans alike—to work together and get Americans back to work. My proposal does just that.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE).

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to start out by saying I ran a small business for 25 years before entering Congress, and I always carried health insurance on my employees. But the required coverages under ObamaCare are far in excess of the coverage I ever carried. We never carried mental health coverage. We didn't carry substance abuse coverage. We didn't carry vision or dental.

Guess what, employers? You won't have that choice anymore. The Federal Government will dictate to you what coverages you must carry on your employees.

My colleagues across the aisle speak about jobs. This act has had a horrible stifling effect on hiring in this economy. Seventy percent of small businesses indicate this act has created doubt as to whether or not they will hire additional employees. Small businesses are cutting hours of their employees from 40 back to 30 so that they won't be considered full-time employees under this act.

Hardworking Americans are suffering today because of this act. Doctors, physicians, are already dropping out of the system. It's been estimated that up to 15 percent of hospitals will close if this act is ultimately implemented.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if my colleague has any more speakers? If not, I am prepared to close.

Mr. BURGESS. I have an additional speaker, and then my close.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Then I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I'm from northern California, which is the land of the original 49ers. That was based on the Gold Rush of about 160 years ago.

Now I see we are creating a new group of 49ers, and it is certainly not heading towards a gold rush for the country. These new 49ers are the people that have to limit the jobs of their small business to 49 or less in order to stay out of the clutches of ObamaCare.

We also are creating a group called 29ers, who have to see their hours cut to less than 30 hours because their employer is out of options; again, because of ObamaCare.

As a farmer, I know that when things aren't going right with the farm you have to learn to cut your losses. In this situation here, we need to have the good sense to not spend good money after bad. It is time that we take a good, hard look at this Obama health care takeover and decide to repeal it.

In California, we seem to have a lot of boondoggles, to include the high-speed rail project, which prices could quadruple over its original cost. We are seeing the same type of boondoggle with this Obama health care takeover.

Let's do the right thing to preserve jobs and preserve people's health care plans as they are and not have this boondoggle upon our entire country.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to be very succinct. What you have heard today is probably the same kind of debate that took place in this Chamber on both Social Security and Medicare. Those two programs, Medicare operates with a 2 percent overhead. Most private insurance operates between 20 and 25 percent. It is a bargain, and it has lifted millions of seniors in this country out of poverty.

This bill will provide for us the type of health care that we deserve and that we need based on outcomes and not on a plethora of tests each doctor gives.

I am absolutely astonished on what we have heard today, but there are a couple of things I really want you to remember. One, today we have spent \$53 million on this debate on just to repeal this law—\$53 million. If you are frugal at all—and I am—believe me, that burns me up. I can think of many, many things we can use that for.

Almost 7 million jobs have been created in health care since this bill passed—7 million. Four million more are to come. The two things that we really want to do is provide good health care and good jobs in this economy.

For heaven's sake, let's not see this bill up again. Take a good, hard look at it. See all the benefits in it for all of your constituents. You don't want to go home and tell the women and tell the seniors and tell the people with preexisting conditions that you don't care about them.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Vote "no."

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

It was, indeed, a very dark day 3 years ago in March when this bill was brought to the House floor, 11 o'clock at night, 11:30 at night, and passed this House of Representatives after members of the Democratic conference, the majority Democratic conference, were lied to by the administration about an executive order to prevent the funding for abortion. That is what tipped the balance. That is what brought those last few wavering votes.

How did we get to that point? Well, throughout 2009, throughout the year, the House had, indeed, considered the health care question. My Committee on Energy and Commerce did have a markup on H.R. 3200. They took a lot of amendments. Some amendments I offered; some amendments were bipartisan. All of those amendments that were accepted by the committee at some point evaporated at the opening of day, whatever happened over in the Speaker's Office, and they were gone. The health care bill which the Energy and Commerce Committee passed out at 1,000 pages grew to 2,000 pages in the Speaker's Office, and all the Republican amendments were stripped out.

And then what happened? Well, H.R. 3200 died. It is gone. Nobody has ever seen or heard of it since. That was the House health care product.

What, in fact, happened was, down at the White House in July of 2009, there were secret meetings that took place. There were six special interest groups that met with the President's folks down at the White House—Nancy-Ann DeParle, Rahm Emanuel's brother. These are the folks that constructed the basis of what has now become known as ObamaCare.

The insurance companies don't hate this law. They like this law. Look what has happened to their insurance stock since the law has passed. They have doubled or tripled in value. That is because they had a seat at the table when this thing was crafted, and it was crafted according to their liking. But who really wrote the nuts and bolts of the bill was the staff on the Senate Finance Committee between Thanksgiving and Christmas.

□ 1400

H.R. 3590, which passed the floor of this House 3 years ago, was a bill that had never had a single hearing in the House of Representatives. It had never had a markup in a single House committee. H.R. 3590 had passed under suspension in the House of Representatives in July of 2009 as a housing bill. It went over to the Senate to await further action. The further action was an amendment offered by HARRY REID to "strike all after the enacting clause and insert," and the health care language was inserted. It came back over here and languished for 3 months. Nobody read it. Then the Speaker forced it through the House of Representatives a few minutes before midnight on March 18 of 2010.

That's why we're having this debate today. Sure, there have been other efforts to repeal this. There was a full repeal in January of 2011, remember? Republicans won 84 House seats, so it was natural to have a repeal vote. After the Supreme Court had their ruling, it was important to reiterate that position. Now we're doing it again.

The other repeal votes that have happened, many of them have been bipartisan. The 1099—you guys liked that? Do you want that paperwork requirement to come back? The President signed the 1099 repeal. What about the CLASS Act? You all voted for that. I didn't. The CLASS Act was repealed on the fiscal cliff vote. The President signed it. The repeal votes that have happened in between have been relatively minor in scope, perfecting amendments, if you will.

The fact of the matter is you can't perfect this thing. It was a dog at the beginning, and it's a dog at the end. We ought to do the right thing. Let's bring up the bill. Let's pass it. Let's send it over to the Senate.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Rule and the underlying legislation because this bill would repeal the Affordable Care Act. The American people have been engaged in a debate over universal healthcare for six generations.

In 1949, Harry Truman became the first sitting President to propose universal healthcare for all Americans as part of the "Fair Deal."

On March 23, 2010, with the stroke of President Obama's pen, the American people received this part of the "Fair Deal." This bill did not become law in the dead of night, but in the full process this body affords serious consideration of legislation. There were committee hearings, staff and member meetings, amendments and a final vote in both the House and the Senate before it was sent to the President's desk.

The Affordable Care Act has been affirmed to be law by every means provided by our nation's constitution:

On March 21, 2010, the House passed the Affordable Care Act following Senate Consideration of the bill.

On March 23, 2010, President Obama signed the Affordable Care Act into law.

On June 28, 2012, the United States Supreme Court issued an opinion in *National Federation of Independent Businesses v. Sebelius*, affirming the constitutionality of the law—leaving intact the majority of the incentives to expand healthcare coverage to millions of Americans.

The Affordable Care Act was a central issue in the Presidential election of 2012. The candidate who signed the Affordable Care Act into law won the election by 51.1 percent of the popular vote and 62 percent of the electoral vote.

Why are we here for the 37th time in three years to again vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act?

It is difficult to recall any series of actions within a short time period that have overcome every hurdle that our system of government has to establish and affirm that a law—is the law of this nation.

I believe Mr. Speaker it is important to remind new members of this body and those who are closely watching this debate that the Affordable Care Act is law. People living in each of the Congressional Districts represented in this body are benefiting from the Affordable Care Act.

The leadership of this Congress may want to give new members of Congress the opportunity to tell the people back home that they voted to repeal "Obamacare." Unfortunately, they are also toying with the emotions of people who know that without the Affordable Care Act they have no other option for healthcare.

Because of the Affordable Care Act, Americans are already seeing lower costs, better coverage, and patient protections that Republicans want to repeal:

13 million Americans benefited from \$1.1 billion in rebates sent to them from their health insurance companies last year.

105 million Americans have access to free preventive services, including 71 million Americans in private plans and 34 million seniors on Medicare.

Millions of women began receiving free coverage for comprehensive women's preventive services in August 2012.

100 million Americans no longer have a lifetime limit on healthcare coverage.

Nearly 17 million children with pre-existing conditions can no longer be denied coverage by insurers.

6.6 million young adults up to age 26 have health insurance through their parents' plan, half of whom would be uninsured without this coverage.

6.3 million Seniors in the 'donut hole' have already saved \$6.1 billion on their prescription drugs.

3.2 million Seniors have access to free annual wellness visits under Medicare, and

360,000 small employers have already taken advantage of the Small Business Health Care Tax Credit to provide health insurance to 2 million workers.

Because of the Affordable Care Act 3.8 million people in Texas—including 2.2 million seniors on Medicare now receive preventative care services. Over 7 million Texans no longer have to fear lifetime limits on their healthcare insurance. Texas parents of 300,731 young adults can sleep easier at night knowing that their children can remain on their health insurance until age 26.

The protection provided by this law is a guarantee to 5 million Texas residents that their insurance companies will spend 80 percent of their premium dollars on healthcare, or customers will get a rebate from their insurance company.

In my state, there are 4,029 people who had no insurance because of pre-existing conditions, but today the Affordable Care Act has provided them with access to coverage. The Affordable Care Act means that many Texans are free of worry about having access to healthcare insurance.

However, the list of benefits from the Affordable Care Act is not completed. In 2014, the Affordable Care Act's final provisions will become available to our citizens. Insurance companies will be banned from:

- discriminating against anyone with a pre-existing condition
- charging higher rates based on gender or health status
- enforcing lifetime dollar limits
- enforcing annual dollar limits on health benefits

In 2014, access to affordable healthcare for the self employed or those who decide to purchase their own coverage will be easier because of Affordable Insurance Exchanges. There will be a one stop marketplace where consumers can do what Federal employees have done for decades—purchase insurance at reasonable rates from an insurer of their choice. This will assure that health care consumers can get the care that they need from the medical professionals they trust.

I do not believe that the healthcare law is perfect—but what is worse—is the imperfection of the House Leadership in allowing this continued rehashing of a debate over a law that is not going away.

Congress should be working to mend the Affordable Care Act where we believe it can be improved, and not end healthcare security for millions of our constituents. Healthcare is the difference between life and death for too many of our constituents. The bill that needs to be amended or rejected is the one before us: H.R. 45.

For this reason, I offered amendments before the Rules Committee to address minority health disparities, medical payments to small physician owned hospitals, and a plan to study the impact of the healthcare law.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 1 would have removed all of the bill text following the enacting clause of the legislation, which would have ended this exercise to repeal the Affordable Care Act. This legislation is so bad it cannot be salvaged and the United States would be better off without it.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 2 would have ensured full Medicare reimbursement to

all hospitals including physician owned hospitals with at least 100 beds, provided they could produce reliable records to document their claims for reimbursement.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 3 would have authorized additional funding to establish Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHCs). These centers are the last line of defense provided in the bill to make sure those living on the margins of society—the poorest of the poor had access to reliable healthcare. FQHC programs would be based in clinics, community based health care centers and pro-active outreach programs that target the homeless or marginally housed with information on how to get access to good healthcare.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 4 would have expanded state use of the Medicaid option of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care law when the uninsured rate of qualifying residents of a state exceeds 20 percent. States wishing to opt-out of Medicaid would have the option of submitting a plan to reduce the rate of uninsured to 20 percent or less to the Secretary of Health and Human Services. This amendment would have benefited Texas enormously since it leads the nation in uninsured residents at 28.8 percent. In fact Texas has held this number 1 ranking, of the state with the highest number of uninsured residents, for the last five consecutive years.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 5 would have established a program to conduct studies of minority health disparities. The Amendment directed the Secretary of Health and Human Services to submit an annual report of findings regarding minority health disparities and make recommendations on how disparities may be reduced.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 6 expressed the Sense of the Congress that the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is law in the United States of America. The amendment enumerated each step that made it the law including a decision by the United States Supreme Court. The amendment then directed the Secretary of Health and Human Services to report to Congress on the impact of the law on those it is intended to help. The Amendment would have not allowed this Congress to revisit repeal until it had research on the impact of the law to guide its further deliberation of repeal.

This Congress has work that needs to be done, and it has work that should be taken up to restore workers, their families and communities to sound economic health.

The healthcare law has many benefits—but I will redouble my efforts to mend the parts that need additional work and educate my constituents so that they can take advantage of the benefits of having access to healthcare.

For all of these reasons, I urge my Colleagues to join me in voting no on the Rule and the underlying legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 215 OFFERED BY
MRS. 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. 1424) to require the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor to establish the Make It In America

Incentive Grant Program, and for other purposes. 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 among 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. 1424.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). 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. Mr. 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 adopting House Resolution 215, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 193, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 150]

YEAS—228

Aderholt	Cook	Graves (MO)
Alexander	Cotton	Griffin (AR)
Amash	Cramer	Griffith (VA)
Amodei	Crawford	Grimm
Bachmann	Crenshaw	Guthrie
Bachus	Culberson	Hall
Barletta	Daines	Hanna
Barr	Davis, Rodney	Harper
Barton	Denham	Harris
Benishek	Dent	Hartzler
Bentivolio	DeSantis	Hastings (WA)
Bilirakis	DesJarlais	Heck (NV)
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart	Hensarling
Black	Duncan (SC)	Herrera Beutler
Blackburn	Duncan (TN)	Holding
Bonner	Ellmers	Hudson
Boustany	Farenthold	Huelskamp
Brady (TX)	Fincher	Huizenga (MI)
Bridenstine	Fitzpatrick	Hultgren
Brooks (AL)	Fleischmann	Hunter
Brooks (IN)	Fleming	Hurt
Broun (GA)	Flores	Issa
Buchanan	Forbes	Jenkins
Buchson	Fortenberry	Johnson (OH)
Burgess	Fox	Jones
Calvert	Franks (AZ)	Jordan
Camp	Frelinghuysen	Joyce
Cantor	Gardner	Kelly (PA)
Capito	Garrett	King (IA)
Carter	Gerlach	King (NY)
Cassidy	Gibbs	Kingston
Chabot	Gibson	Kinzinger (IL)
Chaffetz	Gingrey (GA)	Kline
Coble	Gohmert	LaMalfa
Coffman	Goodlatte	Lamborn
Cole	Gosar	Lance
Collins (GA)	Gowdy	Lankford
Collins (NY)	Granger	Latham
Conaway	Graves (GA)	Latta

LoBiondo	Pittenger	Simpson
Long	Pitts	Smith (NE)
Lucas	Poe (TX)	Smith (NJ)
Luetkemeyer	Pompeo	Smith (TX)
Lummis	Posey	Southerland
Marchant	Price (GA)	Stewart
Marino	Radel	Stivers
Massie	Reed	Stockman
Matheson	Reichert	Stutzman
McCarthy (CA)	Renacci	Terry
McCaul	Ribble	Thompson (PA)
McClintock	Rice (SC)	Thornberry
McHenry	Rigell	Tiberi
McKeon	Roby	Tipton
McKinley	Roe (TN)	Turner
McMorris	Rogers (AL)	Upton
Rodgers	Rogers (KY)	Valadao
Meadows	Rogers (MI)	Walberg
Meehan	Rohrabacher	Walden
Messer	Rokita	Walorski
Mica	Rooney	Weber (TX)
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Webster (FL)
Miller (MI)	Roskam	Wenstrup
Miller, Gary	Ross	Westmoreland
Mullin	Rothfus	Whitfield
Mulvaney	Royce	Williams
Murphy (PA)	Runyan	Wilson (SC)
Neugebauer	Ryan (WI)	Wittman
Noem	Salmon	Wolf
Nugent	Sanford	Womack
Nunes	Scalise	Woodall
Nunnelee	Schock	Yoder
Olson	Schweikert	Yoho
Palazzo	Scott, Austin	Young (AK)
Paulsen	Sensenbrenner	Young (FL)
Pearce	Sessions	Young (IN)
Perry	Shimkus	
Petri	Shuster	

NAYS—193

Andrews	Fudge	McIntyre
Barber	Gabbard	McNerney
Barrow (GA)	Gallo	Meeks
Bass	Garamendi	Meng
Beatty	Garcia	Michaud
Becerra	Grayson	Miller, George
Bera (CA)	Green, Al	Moore
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Moran
Bishop (NY)	Grijalva	Murphy (FL)
Blumenauer	Gutierrez	Nadler
Bonamici	Hahn	Napolitano
Brady (PA)	Hanabusa	Neal
Braley (IA)	Hastings (FL)	Negrete McLeod
Brown (FL)	Heck (WA)	Nolan
Brownley (CA)	Higgins	O'Rourke
Bustos	Himes	Owens
Butterfield	Hinojosa	Pallone
Capps	Holt	Pascarelli
Capuano	Honda	Pastor (AZ)
Cárdenas	Horsford	Payne
Carney	Hoyer	Pelosi
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Perlmutter
Cartwright	Israel	Peters (CA)
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Peters (MI)
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Peterson
Chu	Johnson (GA)	Pingree (ME)
Cicilline	Johnson, E. B.	Pocan
Clarke	Kaptur	Polis
Clay	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Cleaver	Kennedy	Rahall
Connolly	Kildee	Rangel
Conyers	Kilmer	Richmond
Cooper	Kind	Roybal-Allard
Costa	Kirkpatrick	Ruiz
Courtney	Kuster	Ruppersberger
Crowley	Langevin	Rush
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)	T.
Davis, Danny	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
DeFazio	Lewis	Sarbanes
DeGette	Lipinski	Schakowsky
Delaney	Loeb	Schiff
DeLauro	Lofgren	Schneider
DelBene	Lowenthal	Schrader
Deutch	Lowe	Schwartz
Dingell	Lujan Grisham	Scott (VA)
Doggett	(NM)	Scott, David
Doyle	Luján, Ben Ray	Serrano
Edwards	(NM)	Sewell (AL)
Ellison	Lynch	Shea-Porter
Engel	Maffei	Sherman
Enyart	Maloney,	Sinema
Eshoo	Carolyn	Sires
Esty	Maloney, Sean	Slughter
Farr	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Fattah	McCollum	Speier
Foster	McDermott	Swalwell (CA)
Frankel (FL)	McGovern	Takano

Thompson (CA)	Veasey	Watt
Thompson (MS)	Vela	Waxman
Tierney	Velázquez	Welch
Titus	Visclosky	Wilson (FL)
Tonko	Walz	Yarmuth
Tsongas	Wasserman	
Van Hollen	Schultz	
Vargas	Waters	

NOT VOTING—12

Campbell	Duffy	Markey
Clyburn	Johnson, Sam	McCarthy (NY)
Cohen	Keating	Quigley
Duckworth	Labrador	Wagner

□ 1430

Mr. LANGEVIN changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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. Mr. 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 226, nays 192, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 151]

YEAS—226

Aderholt	Farenthold	Kinzinger (IL)
Alexander	Fincher	Kline
Amash	Fitzpatrick	LaMalfa
Amodei	Fleischmann	Lamborn
Amodei	Fleming	Lance
Bachmann	Flores	Lankford
Bachus	Forbes	Latham
Barletta	Fortenberry	Latta
Barr	Fox	LoBiondo
Barton	Franks (AZ)	Long
Benishek	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Bentivolio	Gardner	Luetkemeyer
Bilirakis	Garrett	Lummis
Bishop (UT)	Gerlach	Marchant
Black	Gibbs	Marino
Blackburn	Gibson	Massie
Bonner	Gingrey (GA)	Matheson
Boustany	Gohmert	McCarthy (CA)
Brady (TX)	Goodlatte	McCaul
Bridenstine	Gosar	McClintock
Brooks (IN)	Gowdy	McHenry
Broun (GA)	Granger	McIntyre
Buchanan	Graves (GA)	McKeon
Buchson	Graves (MO)	McKinley
Burgess	Griffin (AR)	McMorris
Calvert	Griffith (VA)	Rodgers
Camp	Grimm	Meadows
Cantor	Guthrie	Meehan
Capito	Hall	Messer
Carter	Hanna	Mica
Cassidy	Harper	Miller (FL)
Chabot	Harris	Miller (MI)
Chaffetz	Hartzer	Miller, Gary
Coble	Hastings (WA)	Mullin
Coffman	Heck (NV)	Mulvaney
Cole	Hensarling	Murphy (PA)
Collins (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Neugebauer
Collins (NY)	Holding	Noem
Conaway	Hudson	Nugent
	Huelskamp	Nunes
	Huizenga (MI)	Nunnelee
	Hultgren	Olson
	Hunter	Palazzo
	Hurt	Paulsen
	Issa	Perry
	Jenkins	Petri
	Johnson (OH)	Pittenger
	Jones	Pitts
	Jordan	Poe (TX)
	Joyce	Pompeo
	Kelly (PA)	Posey
	King (IA)	Price (GA)
	King (NY)	Radel
	Kingston	Reed

Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford

NAYS—192

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al

NOT VOTING—15

Brooks (AL)
Campbell
Clyburn
Cohen
Duckworth

Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shinkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton

Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
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)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

□ 1440

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.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, as many of you know, this is National Police Week. Law enforcement officers throughout our country are gathered here in our Nation's Capital to remember those who have fallen in the line of duty. As a former sheriff and police officer, I couldn't be more proud to be part of this family.

Unfortunately, last year, we lost 120 brave men and women, and this year we've already lost 41.

When tragedy strikes, as it recently did in Boston, we're reminded of these officers' selfless courage. Yet we often forget that these men and women are at risk every time they report for duty. Every time they kiss a loved one goodbye, they never know if it's going to be for the last time. Day in and day out, they put their lives on the line to keep us—our communities, our towns, and our cities—safe. For this, we owe them a debt of gratitude.

So in honor of these law enforcement officers who made the ultimate sacrifice to keep us safe, may we please have a moment of silence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will rise and the House will observe a moment of silence.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 277, nays 132, answered “present” 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 152]

YEAS—277

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici

Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito

Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman
Collins (NY)

Conyers
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Lofgren
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Gerlach
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy

Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney
Carolyn
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pascarell
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)

NAYS—132

Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxy
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Graves (GA)

Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shinkus
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Takano
Thornberry
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Vela
Walberg
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan