

fighters should mean something. We should fight to improve the lives of our constituents, not to win political battles.

Growing up in Louisiana, I am a direct beneficiary of Billy Guste's courage to do what was truly right and truly compassionate. In that tradition, Mr. Speaker, I say we must honor Mr. Guste's legacy by doing the same.

HONORING SENATOR BOB DOLE AND HIS LEGACY

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a truly great Kansan, a Jayhawk, and an American hero who embodies every sense of the term "public servant."

Senator Bob Dole has spent his life as a servant to the American people: as a soldier wounded in combat during World War II; he served as a Member of this House, the Senate, and ran for President.

We in Kansas are so very proud of Senator Dole's legacy as our native son. Ten years ago, the University of Kansas, my alma mater, completed construction and opened to the public the Robert J. Dole Institute of Politics on KU's beautiful west campus.

The Dole Institute's official mission is to "promote political and civic participation as well as civil discourse in a bipartisan, balanced manner." This is precisely what Senator Dole stood for in his career, and it is what his legacy, the Dole Institute, promotes today.

We all congratulate the University of Kansas on the 10-year anniversary of the Dole Institute, and congratulate and continue our appreciation for Senator Dole and all the work he does for his native State of Kansas and for his country.

TENNESSEE NATIONAL GUARD

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the President filed his budget yesterday, and what a budget it is. It is going to increase spending by \$791 billion—that is right, billion with a "b." You would think we had all this money to spend. And when you look a little deeper, you see that the priorities are all askew in this budget.

I want to point out just one to my colleagues, and it deals with the Tennessee National Guard and the way they are being adversely impacted by what this budget is bringing to bear, what the President would want to bring to bear.

The Tennessee Guard has flown the Kiowa Warrior helicopters all throughout Iraq and Afghanistan. They used them in our natural disasters like Hurricane Katrina and the Tennessee

flood. And today, due to that budget that I have mentioned that the President filed yesterday, he would like to put them on the chopping block. All 30 Kiowa helicopters, 692 soldiers, and 113 workers are all on the chopping block.

Let's talk about priorities. It is our responsibility in the House to get this right.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3826, ELECTRICITY SECURITY AND AFFORDABILITY ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4118, SUSPENDING THE INDIVIDUAL MANDATE PENALTY LAW EQUALS FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 497 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 497

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3826) to provide direction to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency regarding the establishment of standards for emissions of any greenhouse gas from fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, 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 and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-40. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4118) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to delay the implementation of the penalty for failure to comply with the individual health insurance mandate. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). 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 gentlewoman 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 may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 497.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 497 provides for consideration of two bills, one of which addresses the country's worsening health insurance situation due to the Affordable Care Act; the other addresses the Environmental Protection Agency's attempts to cripple our economy with costly regulations which have dubious health benefits.

The rule before us today provides for 1 hour of debate for each bill, controlled by the primary committee of jurisdiction. The committee made in order every amendment submitted for consideration to H.R. 3826, the Electricity Security and Affordability Act, including three amendments offered by Democrats and five amendments offered by Republicans. Finally, the minority is afforded the customary motion to recommit on each bill, allowing for yet another opportunity to amend the legislation. This is a straightforward rule for consideration of two very important bills.

H.R. 3826, the Electricity Security and Affordability Act is a bipartisan response to the Environmental Protection Agency's wrongheaded approach to our energy future. It was carefully crafted by Democratic Senator JOE MANCHIN from West Virginia and the Republican chairman of the Energy and Power Subcommittee, ED WHITFIELD from Kentucky. The bill requires the Environmental Protection Agency to acknowledge within its greenhouse gas regulations that different sources of fuel—such as natural gas, such as

coal—require different approaches to the regulatory sphere. Further, it prevents the Environmental Protection Agency from unilaterally imposing new regulations on existing power plants—those power plants that are already up and running, providing heat to our Nation, which is currently under the throes of a significant cold snap. This limitation exists until Congress has weighed in and passed a law specifying an effective date for the regulations to begin.

Finally, as is just good government, the bill requires strengthened reporting requirements from the Environmental Protection Agency.

One of the most frustrating parts of the EPA's new venture in regulating our existing energy infrastructure is that the EPA has actively blocked proper congressional oversight from receiving the science and calculations used in crafting these new costly regulations. That simply must end. If the Environmental Protection Agency is proposing new regulations because they believe they will truly make Americans healthier, let them share the data. Let them share the data with the United States Congress so it can be peer reviewed. Both the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Science Committee have continually been ignored when requesting such data. That is unacceptable. That must end. This legislation is a step toward bringing accountability to an agency that for too long has run roughshod over our economy.

The second bill contained in this rule, H.R. 4118, Suspending the Individual Mandate Penalty Law Equals Fairness Act, addresses the disparity that President Obama and Secretary Sebelius have created between big businesses, which have been given a reprieve from having to comply with the mandates in the Affordable Care Act, and individual Americans, who have been given no such help by this President. Just this week, the press reported that the administration will delay yet another provision of the Affordable Care Act by allowing insurers to continue offering health plans that do not meet the Affordable Care Act's minimum coverage requirements. It is becoming so commonplace for this administration to waive or ignore provisions—by their own admission, this is their signature law, and they continue to waive provisions. The American people cannot seem to get an even break, and no one even seems to notice anymore. There is little doubt that this is exactly what the President is hoping for.

In the last 8 months, the President has delayed or modified over 22 provisions in his signature health care law. We are all familiar—we have all seen the headlines: delays in the pre-existing program; delays in the employer mandate; delays in the reporting requirement; changing the rules under which Congress has to buy insurance; delay, delay, delay, in his own

law. The President has been quick to fix parts of the law that have political consequences for his allies and to protect his own talking points.

Yet, where is the President's protection for the American people?

Under the health care law, Americans who don't have health insurance and refuse to purchase a government-approved insurance policy will face an annual fine—an annual fine—that increases every year.

However, purchasing a government-approved plan also means you have to pay big premiums. You are forced to navigate a dysfunctional Web site. You may lose the doctor you like and place your personal information in jeopardy on an unsecure Web site.

Today, Republicans are offering a legislative solution to help Americans get out from under the crushing weight of the so-called Affordable Care Act. H.R. 4118, also known as the Simple Fairness Act, will give hardworking Americans the same relief that the President has already given to big businesses across the country.

The administration has no problem delaying the employer mandate, not just once for 2014, but a second time for another full year for employers with 51–100 employees. Shouldn't that same relief be provided to rank-and-file Americans?

The President has refused to work with Congress to change the law so today, we are moving ahead and doing what is right for the American people. The Simple Fairness Act will eliminate the penalty for 2014 for those individuals who chose not to purchase a government-approved health care plan.

It is clear that H.R. 4118 offers the only feasible lifeline to millions of Americans who are faced with purchasing an expensive health care plan that does not meet their needs. It is Congress' job to protect the American people. I urge my colleagues to pass this rule so Washington can stop making decisions about American's health care and instead individuals can be free to decide for themselves. I encourage my colleagues to vote “yes” on the rule and “yes” on the underlying bills.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is just not an ordinary day, this is a very important thing that is happening here, particularly for those of you who watch Congress a lot and want to know what it is we are about. This is a very special occasion here. As you can see by this poster on my right, we are celebrating a double golden anniversary. Today, the majority is holding the 50th vote to repeal or to otherwise undermine the Affordable Care Act under the 50th closed rule.

Now, to people who don't understand what a closed rule is, that means this rule is coming to the floor to debate

these bills, and it will not allow them to be amended. That is not exactly an open Congress in a great democracy.

The majority has defied all expectations in reaching those milestones today, and as one often does when celebrating a colleague's 50th birthday or acknowledging a friend's 50th wedding anniversary, I want to take a moment to reflect on all that the majority has done to achieve this great honor.

Indeed, many Americans, including myself, were doubtful we would ever see the majority hold their 50th vote to repeal a good health care law that is already benefiting more than 9 million Americans because, why would Congress want to take health care away from people?

I remember back in 2012, when CBS News reported that the majority had spent 80 legislative hours—costing approximately \$48 million—to hold 33 votes to repeal the ACA. That is just the amount of money spent on floor time and committee time. They had held 33 votes at that time to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Given the incredible waste of time and taxpayer money, I was hopeful that the 33rd vote might be the last. But the majority has persevered, and continued to ignore the Nation's pressing priorities to make it to today's 50th vote.

Of course, getting this far wouldn't have been possible without the help of a closed legislative process—a process that has allowed the majority to pursue a 50th vote without pause.

Last year, the majority presided over the most closed session in history, and repeatedly passed closed rules that shut out the voices of the nearly 200 duly elected Members of Congress who sit on my side of the aisle. Now today, the majority is presenting their 50th closed rule in order to hold a 50th go-nowhere vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

It is truly amazing that the majority has managed to hold the same vote 50 times while so many Americans and so much of the world cries out for help. As we know, there are global crises from Ukraine to Afghanistan. At home, there are millions still looking for work; millions more are working for a minimum wage upon which they cannot survive.

In fact, just this week the number of Americans whose emergency unemployment insurance has expired will surpass 2 million individuals, including almost 200,000 veterans. We could have averted the crisis weeks ago, and we have tried numerous times to do that, but the majority has repeatedly said “no.” Indeed, some of our colleagues have said it would be immoral to help out those who have no money coming into their home.

Meanwhile, the Center for American Progress released a report today that found that raising the minimum wage to \$10.10 an hour would reduce Federal spending on food stamps by \$4.6 billion a year. Despite a similar estimate from the Congressional Budget Office declaring that raising the minimum wage

would lift 900,000 people out of poverty, the majority refuses to join my Democratic colleagues and me to give America a raise.

Mr. Speaker, there are dozens, if not hundreds of bills that deserve our consideration, but today's attempt to repeal a good health care law is not one of them. In fact, I have a list of 50 votes that we could be taking today instead of another vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act—everything from rebuilding our crumbling bridges and roads to creating American manufacturing jobs.

Of particular importance is a bill that I authored called the Preservation of Antibiotics for Medical Treatment Act that will address the immediate crisis of antibiotic-resistant diseases and help to save lives. Despite the urgent need to protect public health, we have been unable to even get a hearing on this important legislation.

The majority's refusal to take action on any of these pressing issues is truly an achievement, not one to be proud of. I hope I have made it clear that we cannot celebrate that achievement.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that the milestone the majority is reaching today will be the end of the line for their tired political game. We have far too many issues that need our attention, and it is well past time that we got to work. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on today's rule and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

50 THINGS THE HOUSE COULD BE DOING INSTEAD OF UNDERMINING THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

1. Comprehensive Immigration Reform
2. Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2013 (H.R. 3546)
3. Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2013 (H.R. 1010)
4. Preservation of Antibiotics for Medical Treatment Act of 2013 (H.R. 1150)
5. Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 377)
6. Make It in America Manufacturing Act of 2013 (H.R. 375)
7. Advancing Innovative Manufacturing Act of 2013 (H.R. 1421)
8. American Manufacturing Competitive-ness Act of 2013 (H.R. 2447)
9. Economy, Energy and Environment Initiative to Support Sustainable Manufacturing (E3) Act (H.R. 2873)
10. Multimodal Opportunities Via Enhanced Freight Act of 2013 or the "MOVE Freight Act of 2013" (H.R. 974)
11. American Textile Technology Innovation and Research for Exportation (ATTIRE) Act (H.R. 937)
12. Clean Energy Technology Manufacturing and Export Assistance Act of 2013 (H.R. 400)
13. Put America Back to Work Now Act (H.R. 535)
14. Build America Bonds Act of 2013 (H.R. 789)
15. The Customs Training Enhancement Act (H.R. 1322)
16. American Export Promotion Act of 2013 (H.R. 1420)
17. Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act (H.R. 1276)
18. Global Free Internet Act of 2013 (H.R. 889)
19. New Alternative Transportation to Give Americans Solutions (NAT GAS) Act (H.R. 1364)

20. Invest in American Jobs Act of 2013 (H.R. 949)
21. Enforcing Orders and Reducing Customs Evasion (ENFORCE) Act (H.R. 1440)
22. Export Promotion Reform Act (H.R. 1409)
23. Bridge to Jobs Act (H.R. 1419)
24. Reducing Waste and Increasing Efficiency in Trade Act (H.R. 3004)
25. Research and Development Tax Credit Extension Act of 2013 (H.R. 905)
26. The Bring Jobs Home Act of 2013 (H.R. 851)
27. Patriot Corporations of America Act of 2013 (H.R. 929)
28. Market Based Manufacturing Incentives Act of 2013 (H.R. 615)
29. Advanced Vehicle Technology Act of 2013 (H.R. 1027)
30. American Jobs Matter Act (H.R. 1332)
31. Small Business Start-up Savings Accounts (H.R. 1323)
32. Securing Energy Critical Elements and American Jobs Act of 2013 (H.R. 1022)
33. Resource Assessment of Rare Earths (RARE) Act of 2013 (H.R. 981)
34. Congressional Made in America Promise Act (H.R. 194)
35. Security in Energy and Manufacturing (SEAM) Act (H.R. 1424)
36. SelectUSA Authorization Act of 2013 (H.R. 1413)
37. Partnering with American Manufacturers for Efficiency and Competitiveness Act (H.R. 1418)
38. The Innovative Technologies Investment Incentives Act (H.R. 1415)
39. Cooperative Research and Development Fund Authorization Act of 2013 (H.R. 1711)
40. Advanced Composites Development Act of 2013 (H.R. 2034)
41. All-American Flag Act (H.R. 2355)
42. GREEN Act of 2013 (H.R. 2863)
43. Workforce Investment Act (H.R. 798)
44. American Manufacturing Efficiency & Retraining Investment Collaboration (AMERICA Works) Act (H.R. 497)
45. Strengthening Employment Clusters to Organize Regional Success (SECTORS) Act (H.R. 919)
46. Job Skills for America's Students Act of 2013 (H.R. 1271)
47. National Fab Lab Network Act (H.R. 1289)
48. Workforce Development Tax Credit Act of 2013 (H.R. 1324)
49. Job Opportunities Between our Shores (JOBS) Act (H.R. 1436)
50. Broadband Adoption Act of 2013 (H.R. 1685)

□ 1245

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes for a response.

Mr. Speaker, there have been 36 changes to the Affordable Care Act since it was signed into law. It has been a little over 3 years since the bill was signed into law. Thirty-six changes means one a month.

How does the breakdown of those 36 changes occur? According to the Galen Institute published this morning, 15 times, Congress has passed and the President signed legislation changing the Affordable Care Act. Twice, the Supreme Court modified the Affordable Care Act, but 19 times, President Obama made a change unilaterally.

We are here today debating a delay on the penalties under the individual mandate, but it might interest the Congress to know that the President himself delayed the individual mandate. The administration changed the

deadline for the individual mandate by declaring that customers who had purchased insurance by March 31 will avoid the tax penalty.

Previously and by law, they were required to purchase that insurance by Valentine's Day, February 14, so there has already been a 6-week delay. We are simply trying to place in code what the President is doing unilaterally.

You want to talk about a closed process where people don't have an opportunity to participate? That is governing by executive fiat. That is what we are trying to stop today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) will control the time for the minority.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Well, I want to come to the floor to wish the Republicans a happy anniversary. I brought a gold ring. This is the 50th repeal of ObamaCare. I want to wish my colleagues a happy 50th anniversary for the appeal of ObamaCare.

Like any marriage that lasts 50 years, it takes a lot of work. The American people have shown that they want this marriage to last. They have shown that by reelecting Barack Obama as President. They have shown that by electing a Senate that won't even consider a repeal of the Affordable Care Act; but also like any marriage, it takes work along the way to improve it, to work at it, to make changes to it.

Democrats stand ready to work with President Obama, to fine-tune this wonderful marriage celebrating the 50th anniversary of its repeal here today, to make sure it endures for another 50 repeal votes by the House Republicans here in the coming months. We are ready to make the changes that we need to, to ensure that the Affordable Care Act works for every American.

There are issues in the implementation in my district. Two of my counties, Summit and Eagle County, have among the highest insurance rates in the exchange in the entire country, these two counties. That is due to a problem that the State had in implementing it, but we would love to work with Republicans on a Federal fix for Eagle and Summit County, and the other Colorado counties that are affected by it.

I would be proud to work with my colleagues to replace the revenue and the medical and device tax with other sources of revenue to ensure that the Affordable Care Act works.

There are a lot of great ideas, and perhaps it is time that, rather than continue to celebrate anniversaries of repeal, that we enter couples counseling sessions today, and we work together in trying to find common ground.

Rather than talking about repealing ObamaCare and going back to a system we know wasn't working, in which 40 million Americans didn't have health care insurance, in which Americans and my constituents and yours were frustrated that, year after year, rates were going up 10, 15, 20 percent—rather than going back to a formula we know didn't work, let's enter couples counseling and work together to make health care work in our country, to talk about a path forward, with the President, with Democrats, with Republicans, with Independents, to ensure that these cost increases that have been epidemic the last couple of decades come to an end, that we can extend coverage to more American families, that we can ensure that the quality of health care that is our Nation's pride can continue to be available to Americans, regardless of their economic background.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Again, Mr. Speaker, I would just emphasize there have been changes by administrative action, some 19 that President Obama has done all on his own, without any influence from Congress.

Now, if the gentleman were truly interested about an offset for repealing the medical device tax, perhaps he might look more favorably on the bill before us today, H.R. 4118. The Congressional Budget Office scores a significant savings by passing H.R. 4118.

Perhaps there are some other things that could be done with that money as well; but nevertheless, the President has, on his own, delayed employee reporting, delayed subsidies through the Federal exchange. He closed the high-risk pool.

He has doubled the allowable deductibles. He has required self-attestation and eliminated the reporting requirements under the law that he signed in March of 2010.

He last fall said: Okay. I give up. Insurance can offer plans that we just told you were illegal, that they were crummy insurance, and now, we are going to allow them to be offered again.

All of these were actions taken by the executive under a closed process. With no input or oversight by the people's House—by the United States House of Representatives.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Isn't that wonderful? Isn't this great that the President has made 19 changes to improve the Affordable Care Act to make it work?

You know what? That is what a marriage takes. That is what has helped the Affordable Care Act withstand the 50th vote to repeal it here in the House. Had the President been inflexible—just like in a marriage, if one partner is inflexible, it would have been a lot harder to survive 50 votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Here, we are celebrating the golden anniversary of repeal votes, 50 votes.

But thanks to the President's flexibility with 19 changes, hopefully, there are more along the way to ensure that all Americans have access to affordable health care:

That no American faces pricing discrimination or is kept out of a plan because of a preexisting condition;

That people can move between employers;

That somebody can leave a large company to be an entrepreneur and have a startup without worrying about losing their health care if they have a preexisting condition;

Making sure that young Americans, as they are trying to find a job or working part time, can stay on their parents' plan;

Making sure that Americans have a real choice in the exchanges that choose between multiple providers.

These were some of the elements that I think the American people want to keep and one of the reasons that this health care act has not only withstood 50 votes to repeal and is celebrating its golden anniversary, but will survive the next 50 votes if the House Republicans choose to have them to try to appeal the Affordable Care Act.

The American people want to see changes to make it work. We applaud the President for the 19 changes he made. We encourage him to use the discretion that we rightly give him under the Affordable Care Act to help make it work.

We encourage the discretion at the State level that many Governors, like the Governor of Kentucky and others, have shown to make the Affordable Care Act work in their State.

We applaud the fact that there are over \$200 billion of deficit reduction in the Affordable Care Act. If we can find additional savings and replace lost revenue, we are certainly open to that discussion. So I rise in celebration of having withstood 50 repeal votes. We are ready for the next 50.

We use these opportunities to highlight the American people on the benefits of the Affordable Care Act and to say that we are ready to have a real discussion with Republicans, to exert our legislative privilege, to make changes, and in the absence of that, we applaud the President in using the abilities that we give him under the act to help make sure the Affordable Care Act truly makes health care more affordable for American families.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, here is the Affordable Care Act. The President says it is the law of the land. How does it describe the effective date for the individual mandate? Under section 1501, subparagraph D, effective date:

The amendments made by this section shall apply to the taxable years ending after December 31, 2013.

Pretty unambiguous, pretty easy to understand. It doesn't seem to have a lot of flexibility or wiggle room written into it.

How does the language read that describes the effective date for the em-

ployer mandate? Well, that reads under section 1513, subparagraph D, effective date:

The amendments made by this section shall apply to the months beginning after December 31, 2013.

It doesn't sound as if there is a lot of flexibility; yet the President, on his own, found the flexibility only within the executive branch to say that effective date is no longer valid.

We are simply saying for Mr. and Mrs. American—for the average American, we should be able to delay the effective date of the penalty because this law has been a disaster from start to finish. Stories about the Web site are now legion.

We should give the same relief to the average American that the President gave to his friends in Big Business.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill—this 50th anniversary—golden anniversary of ObamaCare repeals here in the House—50th vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act, gutting mental parity, health parity, gutting protection for Americans with pre-existing conditions, went through no hearings, no markups, no amendments that we are allowed to discuss or debate or vote on here on the floor of the House. This is not the process for improving the quality of health care for American families.

The American people have made it clear they want this marriage to last. They want to make it work. They know it requires hard work. The President has made 19 wonderful changes to the law.

I am not a constitutional lawyer. If there are folks on the other side who want to sue the President, who think that he did something contrary to the law we passed, they are certainly welcome to sue. I believe that the President was given broad discretion under the law to make it work.

I hope that this legislative body takes up the gauntlet and makes the changes we need to make the Affordable Care Act work. Any marriage takes effort. Here, we have a marriage between the Affordable Care Act and the American people, and 50 votes to repeal it are not going to break up that marriage.

It is a stronger marriage than that because the American people have voted on it. They didn't elect a Presidential candidate who wanted to repeal the Affordable Care Act. They didn't elect a Senate that wanted to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

So here we are, and we are welcome to have another 50, 100, 200 votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act; or we can get to work on an open process, letting Members of both parties offer floor amendments. This rule allows no floor amendments.

Having a markup in committee, having hearings in committee about how we can deliver better health care value to the American people will make sure

affordable care is available to every American family and affordable for small businesses, to make America more competitive.

But instead of going through an open process, encouraging ideas from Republicans and Democrats to make health care work in our country, we are presented with the 50th vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

In the absence of meaningful improvements and legislation, the President is using the authority that we gave him under this bill to make the changes that he needs to make, to make sure the Affordable Care Act works.

This body can reassert itself and take back its prerogative whenever we want by passing commonsense bipartisan bills to improve the Affordable Care Act, but it truly is hypocritical to criticize the President out of one side of one's mouth for making changes that actually improve the law and make it work better, when here in this body we are refusing to make some of those same commonsense changes.

I hope that if people think that there was authority of the law that exceeded, they are welcome to work that out in the courts. That is what the court is for, to settle the differences of separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches; but I hope, more important, because the American people care about affordable health care, that this body is willing to take up some of those improvements that we can make, to make sure that this marriage can endure for the next 50 votes as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

It sounds as if the gentleman is going to vote for the bill under consideration today because, after all, it is an opportunity to give long-suffering Americans an opportunity to be out of the penalty part of the Affordable Care Act.

Let's be honest, I mean this thing is one of the most coercive pieces of legislation that has ever been passed by the United States Congress. I might just remind people here in the House of Representatives that this law, which was H.R. 3590, was actually not subject to any hearings or any markups in the United States House of Representatives. Maybe it was when H.R. 3590 first passed the House when it was a housing bill in July of 2009.

But remember, what became the health care bill was a housing bill that was amended. The amendment read over in the Senate: "strike all after the enacting clause and insert."

And what was inserted was language written by special interests over in the Cloakroom of the Senate Finance Committee, was passed by the Senate on Christmas Eve, and then thrown back over here to the House.

□ 1300

Since the House had passed H.R. 3590 as a housing bill, not as a tax bill like

the Affordable Care Act was but as a housing bill, the question before the House then became: Will the House now concur in the amendments to H.R. 3590? It took 3 months for the Speaker to cobble together the 217 votes that she needed to pass this thing, but H.R. 3590 was never heard as a health care bill in my committee, the Committee on Energy and Commerce. It was never heard in the Ways and Means Committee. It was never heard in the Education and Labor Committee. That was H.R. 3200. H.R. 3200 is long gone—no one has seen it for years—but H.R. 3590 is what is embodied in the President's health care law.

So, really, to say that everyone had a chance to participate in this and to debate it, that is, in fact, hypocritical. What is really hypocritical is that H.R. 3590, when it came back to the House, was presented to this House under a closed rule. That is a fact, and that is a fact that should be recognized by the minority. This bill was the product of a closed rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, make no bones about it. The individual mandate is a linchpin of RomneyCare—or whatever you would like to call it—modeled on, in fact, the insurance reforms in Massachusetts. This component is critical to ensuring that people with preexisting conditions are not discriminated against in pricing in the exchange. It is important to make sure that we have a younger, healthier risk pool in the exchange to bring down rates for all Americans.

If this bill were to become law, which it won't—it is simply the 50th repeal of the Affordable Care Act, the golden anniversary of repeals—the entire affordable care structure, including the pricing in the exchange, would go up for American families, and it would devastate health care reform. This is not a bill that has support from the President. It is not a bill that has support from the proponents of the Affordable Care Act. It doesn't make the Affordable Care Act better. It is, in fact, the 50th repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

I was on the Education and Labor Committee, as it was called at the time, two Congresses ago. My colleague from Texas talked about the process under which the health care bill was written. We did have a substantial markup. There were other committees: the Ways and Means Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee. My committee was one of the committees that it was reported out of, and there were other committees it was not reported out of.

This was an amazing process of writing this bill over the period of a year. In fact, in our Democratic Caucus meetings, we even, essentially, functioned as a committee of our entire Caucus, where we went through the bill page after page, and we made suggestions. There were a number of bills that were written by Republicans that

were included in the Affordable Care Act, and there were amendments that I was involved with that were included. Like in any legislative process, some that I advocated for were not included in the final bill.

Unlike this bill, which had no hearing and no markup in any form—because the gentleman from Texas is right. This bill number came from the Senate, and that is the normal process around here. We sometimes have bills from the Senate we approve, and sometimes they originate here and go over there. So this bill number and this title came from something else, and they approved it in reconciliation.

Yet the Affordable Care Act—the bill that led to it—went through my committee. I remember being up until, really, I think, 7 o'clock in the morning. We went straight through the night, under Chairman MILLER, offering a number of amendments, some passing and some not. Sometimes I was on the prevailing side, sometimes not. We had a lively discussion over amendments from Democrats and Republicans, some of which made it into the final bill and some of which didn't. That is the legislative process.

To somehow compare that to the legislative process around this bill is like night and day. So, although the gentleman from Texas is technically correct—the bill number was a reconciliation from the Senate that the House concurred in and sent back with some changes—the work that went into forming that bill had countless hearings and had several markups, including one that I participated in and offered amendments in and voted for and against amendments from both sides of the aisle in.

We are where we are. We would love to see the Affordable Care Act go through a process now. Again, why not allow amendments under this rule? Why not allow Republicans or Democrats, who have ideas to make health care more affordable, to offer them now to the floor? If they would pass, then they would move on to the Senate.

Instead, we have a narrowly focused Affordable Care Act repeal that makes health care less affordable for American families by leading to a risk pool in the exchanges that is less healthy and older. We need to ensure that young people are part of the exchanges. Young people want to have insurance, and they want to have affordable insurance. Let's make sure they have a way to do that in the exchanges. This bill would repeal that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, seeing no other speakers on my side, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. To the gentleman from Texas, I say it is possible I will have one more speaker. If I see her arrive, I will yield to her. Otherwise, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this week, the number of people who lost their unemployment benefits as a result of Congress' failing to extend the Emergency Unemployment Compensation program has climbed to 2 million Americans. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation that would restore unemployment insurance and provide much-needed relief to countless families across the country as well as to stimulate our economy.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I do urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question and to vote "no" on the underlying bills.

We could be doing a lot of important work here in the House rather than to have, I think, what both sides would agree is a purely symbolic 50th vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act, unless there are, perhaps, some who think "50" is the magic number. I think anybody who has a degree of political sense realizes, if the other 49 didn't go anywhere, this one is very unlikely to go anywhere. Rather than proceed with something that isn't going anywhere and that gives the Democrats once again the opportunity to talk about how important it is to make health care more affordable—and the American people overwhelmingly want health care to be fixed, not repealed—we could be doing a lot of important things that the American people actually want this body to do.

Let's talk about immigration reform.

There is a bill that passed the Senate with Democrats and Republicans—68 votes. It is rare for more than two-thirds of the United States Senate to come together around a commonsense solution. How did they do that? They did that because the American people want this problem solved. They are sick and tired—and they should be; I am, too—of having over 10 million people illegally in this country. In my district, there are tens of thousands of people who are there illegally. We don't even know because there is no way to even count. President Obama has deported over 2 million people at an enormous cost to taxpayers—\$10,000 to \$20,000 per deportation. That is how much it costs taxpayers—you and me, Mr. Speaker.

Guess what? There is a bipartisan solution supported by the law enforcement community, supported by the business community, supported by the technology industry, supported by both the agriculture industry—farmers and farmworkers—and supported by business and labor, supported by the faith-based community, supported by over 75 percent of Americans across the polit-

ical spectrum, supported by a majority of Republicans and a majority of Democrats and a majority of Independents. That bill is ready.

There is a bipartisan House version, H.R. 15. Let's bring that forward under a rule. That bill would have the votes to pass tomorrow if we brought it forward. We could send it to the President. We could reduce the deficit by over \$100 billion, increase our GDP, create hundreds of thousands of jobs for American citizens, as the bill has been scored. Finally, we could secure our borders so we could have control over who comes and goes, both people and illicit products. That is what the American people want. Let's get that bill through rather than celebrate yet another empty anniversary for the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

I strongly suggest that my colleagues start bringing forward bills that the American people want to see pass. If we can bring forward immigration reform with bipartisan support and get it out of this body and to the President's desk, the American people will start to improve their opinions of this institution. When I see the polls and they say, oh, 15 percent approval is what Congress has—or 12 percent—it is really no wonder because it is a little bit like a broken record around here. They are, frankly, sick and tired of our every week, it seems like, repealing the Affordable Care Act and making health care more expensive for the American people. They don't want to see us talking about golden rings and 50th anniversaries of votes. They want to see us solving problems.

We offer the Speaker and the majority leader the opportunity to do that. We welcome the Republican immigration principles. There are ample grounds to work on a bipartisan solution based on H.R. 15 or on another bill that encapsulates those principles that the Republicans laid down on which we can find common ground so as to solve a very real problem, to grow our economy, to reduce our deficit, to secure our borders, and to ensure that America remains competitive in the global economy. I challenge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reach a solution on that issue and to really move forward with regard to making health care more affordable.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this closed process—this closed rule—that allows no Republican ideas and no Democratic ideas to come forward, to enter this discussion. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so the Democrats can bring forward the unemployment insurance bill, and I also encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Talk about doing the will of the people. There was an election in Texas yesterday. There was a question on the ballot—to support or oppose the President's takeover of the health care in-

dustry in this country. Ninety-two percent of the people were recorded as being in opposition to the President's takeover of health care. So, in fact, in the district I represent, that is a significant amount.

Today's rule provides for the consideration of two bills to provide relief for hardworking Americans who are faced with the administration's expensive and restrictive mandates both in the health insurance and energy sectors.

I want to thank my colleagues LYNN JENKINS from Kansas, the Republican Conference vice chair, as well as the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Energy and Power, Mr. WHITFIELD from Kentucky, for their thoughtful pieces of legislation.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bills.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 497 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 3. 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. 3546) to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, 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 and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. 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. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3546.

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

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

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

Mr. POLIS. 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 adoption of House Resolution 497, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 938.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 184, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 93]

YEAS—221

Aderholt	Graves (GA)
Amash	Graves (MO)
Amodei	Griffin (AR)
Bachmann	Griffith (VA)
Bachus	Grimm
Barletta	Guthrie
Barr	Hall
Barton	Hanna
Benishek	Harper
Bentivolio	Harris
Bilirakis	Hartzler
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)
Black	Heck (NV)
Blackburn	Hensarling
Boustany	Herrera Beutler
Brady (TX)	Holding
Bridenstine	Hudson
Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)
Broun (GA)	Hultgren
Buchanan	Hunter
Bucshon	Hurt
Burgess	Issa
Byrne	Jenkins
Calvert	Johnson (OH)
Camp	Jordan
Campbell	Joyce
Cantor	Kelly (PA)
Capito	King (IA)
Carter	King (NY)
Cassidy	Kingston
Chabot	Kinzinger (IL)
Coble	Kline
Coffman	Labrador
Cole	LaMalfa
Collins (GA)	Lamborn
Collins (NY)	Lance
Conaway	Lankford
Cook	Latham
Cotton	Latta
Cramer	LoBiondo
Crenshaw	Long
Culberson	Lucas
Daines	Luetkemeyer
Davis, Rodney	Lummis
Denham	Marchant
Dent	Marino
DeSantis	Masse
DesJarlais	McAllister
Diaz-Balart	McCarthy (CA)
Duncan (SC)	McCaul
Duncan (TN)	McClintock
Ellmers	McHenry
Farenthold	McKeon
Fincher	McKinley
Fitzpatrick	McMorris
Fleischmann	Rodgers
Fleming	Meadows
Flores	Meehan
Forbes	Mica
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)
Fox	Miller (MI)
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary
Frelinghuysen	Mullin
Gardner	Mulvaney
Garrett	Murphy (PA)
Gerlach	Neugebauer
Gibbs	Noem
Gibson	Nugent
Gingrey (GA)	Nunes
Gohmert	Nunnelee
Goodlatte	Olson
Gowdy	Palazzo
Granger	Paulsen

NAYS—184

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

Gallego	Lynch	Ryan (OH)
Garamendi	Maffei	Sánchez, Linda
Garcia	Maloney,	T.
Grayson	Carolyn	Sanchez, Loretta
Green, Al	Maloney, Sean	Sarbanes
Grijalva	Matheson	Schakowsky
Gutiérrez	Matsui	Schiff
Hahn	McCollum	Schrader
Hanabusa	McGovern	Schwartz
Hastings (FL)	McIntyre	Scott (VA)
Heck (WA)	McNerney	Scott, David
Higgins	Meeks	Serrano
Holt	Meng	Sewell (AL)
Honda	Michaud	Sherman
Horsford	Miller, George	Sinema
Hoyer	Moore	Sires
Huffman	Moran	Slaughter
Israel	Murphy (FL)	Smith (WA)
Jackson Lee	Nadler	Speier
Jeffries	Napolitano	Swalwell (CA)
Johnson (GA)	Neal	Takano
Kaptur	Nolan	Thompson (CA)
Keating	O'Rourke	Thompson (MS)
Kelly (IL)	Owens	Tierney
Kennedy	Pallone	Titus
Kildee	Pascarella	Tonko
Kilmer	Payne	Tsongas
Kind	Pelosi	Van Hollen
Kirkpatrick	Perlmutter	Vargas
Kuster	Peters (CA)	Veasey
Langevin	Peters (MI)	Vela
Larsen (WA)	Peterson	Velázquez
Lee (CA)	Pingree (ME)	Visclosky
Levin	Pocan	Walz
Lewis	Polis	Wasserman
Lipinski	Price (NC)	Schultz
Loeb sack	Quigley	Waters
Lofgren	Rahall	Waxman
Lowenthal	Rangel	Welch
Lowe	Richmond	Wilson (FL)
Lujan Grisham	Roybal-Allard	Yarmuth
(NM)	Ruiz	
Luján, Ben Ray	Ruppersberger	
(NM)	Rush	

NOT VOTING—25

Chaffetz	Himes	Negrete McLeod
Courtney	Hinojosa	Pastor (AZ)
Crawford	Johnson, E. B.	Schneider
DeGette	Johnson, Sam	Shea-Porter
DeLauro	Jones	Smith (NJ)
Duffy	Larson (CT)	Southerland
Esty	McCarthy (NY)	Wagner
Gosar	McDermott	
Green, Gene	Messer	

□ 1337

Mr. NADLER, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. GARCIA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. WEBER of Texas changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 93 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Stated against:

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for the vote on the Previous Question, rollcall vote 93, I would have voted “no.”

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 182, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 94]

AYES—228

Aderholt Griffin (AR) Petri
 Amash Griffith (VA) Pittenger
 Amodei Grimm
 Bachmann Guthrie
 Bachus Hall
 Barber Hanna
 Barletta Harper
 Barr Harris
 Barton Hartzler
 Benishek Hastings (WA)
 Bentivolio Heck (NV)
 Bilirakis Hensarling
 Bishop (UT) Herrera Beutler
 Black Holding
 Blackburn Hudson
 Boustany Huelskamp
 Brady (TX) Huizenga (MI)
 Bridenstine Hultgren
 Brooks (AL) Hunter
 Brooks (IN) Hurt
 Broun (GA) Issa
 Buchanan Jenkins
 Bucshon Johnson (OH)
 Burgess Jordan
 Byrne Joyce
 Calvert Kelly (PA)
 Camp King (IA)
 Campbell King (NY)
 Cantor Kingston
 Capito Kinzinger (IL)
 Carter Kline
 Cassidy Labrador
 Chabot LaMalfa
 Coble Lamborn
 Coffman Lance
 Collins (GA) Lankford
 Collins (NY) Latham
 Conaway Latta
 Cook LoBiondo
 Cotton Long
 Cramer Lucas
 Crenshaw Luetkemeyer
 Culberson Lummis
 Daines Marchant
 Davis, Rodney Marino
 Denham Massie
 Dent McAllister
 DeSantis McCarthy (CA)
 DesJarlais McCaul
 Diaz-Balart McClintock
 Duncan (SC) McHenry
 Duncan (TN) McIntyre
 Ellmers McKeon
 Enyart McKinley
 Farenthold McMorris
 Fincher Rodgers
 Fitzpatrick Meadows
 Fleischmann Meehan
 Fleming Messer
 Flores Mica
 Forbes Miller (FL)
 Fortenberry Miller (MI)
 Foyx Miller, Gary
 Franks (AZ) Mullin
 Frelinghuysen Mulvaney
 Gardner Murphy (PA)
 Garrett Neugebauer
 Gerlach Noem
 Gibbs Nugent
 Gibson Nunes
 Gingrey (GA) Nunnelee
 Goodlatte Olson
 Gowdy Palazzo
 Granger Paulsen
 Graves (GA) Pearce
 Graves (MO) Perry
 Peterson Young (IN)

NOES—182

Barrow (GA) Cárdenas
 Bass Carney
 Beatty Carson (IN)
 Becerra Cartwright
 Bera (CA) Castor (FL)
 Bishop (GA) Castro (TX)
 Bishop (NY) Chu
 Blumenauer Cicilline
 Bonamici Clark (MA)
 Brady (PA) Clarke (NY)
 Braley (IA) Clay
 Brown (FL) Cleaver
 Brownley (CA) Clyburn
 Bustos Cohen
 Butterfield Connolly
 Capps Conyers
 Capuano Cooper

Costa
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 Delaney
 DelBene
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Duckworth
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel

Eshoo
 Farr
 Fattah
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Garcia
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hanabusa
 Hastings (FL)
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Holt
 Honda
 Horsford
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Kuster
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal

Chaffetz
 Courtney
 Crawford
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 Duffy
 Esty

NOT VOTING—20

Gohmert
 Gosar
 Green, Gene
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Larson (CT)
 McCarthy (NY)
 Negrete McLeod
 Pastor (AZ)
 Schneider
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McNeerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Michaud
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Nolan
 O'Rourke
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascarell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Pingree (ME)
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Richmond
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz

□ 1344

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.

Stated against:

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for the vote Agreeing to the Resolution, rollcall vote 94, I would have voted "no."

UNITED STATES-ISRAEL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 938) to strengthen the strategic alliance between the United States and Israel, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

YEAS—410

Aderholt
 Amash
 Amodei
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barber
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Benishek
 Bentivolio
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Broun (GA)
 Buchanan
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Camp
 Campbell
 Cantor
 Capito
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Chabot
 Coble
 Coffman
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Cook
 Cotton
 Cramer
 Crenshaw
 Culberson
 Daines
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Enyart
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foyx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gingrey (GA)
 Goodlatte
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kirkpatrick
 Kline
 Kuster
 Labrador
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Langevin
 Lankford
 Larsen (WA)
 Latham
 Latta
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Long
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lummis
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Marino
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McAllister
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNeerney
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Meeks
 Meng
 Messer
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (PA)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nolan
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 O'Rourke
 Olson
 Owens
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Pascarell
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Peterson
 Petri