

Pingree (ME)	Sanchez, Loretta	Tiberi
Pittenger	Sanford	Tierney
Pitts	Sarbanes	Tipton
Pocan	Schalis	Titus
Poe (TX)	Schakowsky	Tonko
Polis	Schiff	Tsongas
Pompeo	Schock	Turner
Posey	Schrader	Upton
Price (GA)	Schwartz	Valadao
Price (NC)	Schweikert	Van Hollen
Quigley	Scott (VA)	Vargas
Rahall	Scott, Austin	Veasey
Rangel	Scott, David	Vela
Reed	Sensenbrenner	Velázquez
Reichert	Serrano	Visclosky
Renacci	Sessions	Wagner
Ribble	Sewell (AL)	Walberg
Rice (SC)	Shea-Porter	Walden
Richmond	Sherman	Walorski
Rigell	Shimkus	Walz
Roby	Shuster	Wasserman
Roe (TN)	Simpson	Schultz
Rogers (AL)	Sinema	Waters
Rogers (KY)	Sires	Waxman
Rogers (MI)	Slaughter	Weber (TX)
Rohrabacher	Smith (MO)	Webster (FL)
Rokita	Smith (NE)	Welch
Rooney	Smith (NJ)	Westrup
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (TX)	Westmoreland
Roskam	Smith (WA)	Whitfield
Ross	Southerland	Williams
Rothfus	Speier	Wilson (FL)
Roybal-Allard	Stewart	Wilson (SC)
Royce	Stivers	Wittman
Ruiz	Stockman	Wolf
Runyan	Stutzman	Womack
Ruppersberger	Swalwell (CA)	Woodall
Rush	Takano	Yarmuth
Ryan (OH)	Terry	Yoder
Ryan (WI)	Thompson (CA)	Yoho
Salmon	Thompson (MS)	Young (AK)
Sánchez, Linda	Thompson (PA)	Young (IN)
T.	Thornberry	

NAYS—1

Massie

NOT VOTING—19

Chaffetz	Green, Gene	Larson (CT)
Courtney	Hastings (WA)	McCarthy (NY)
Crawford	Himes	Negrete McLeod
DeLauro	Hinojosa	Pastor (AZ)
Duffy	Johnson, E. B.	Schneider
Esty	Johnson, Sam	
Gosar	Jones	

□ 1355

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for rollcall vote 95 on passage of H.R. 938, I would have voted "aye." I am proud that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle came together in support of continuing our nation's strong relationship with Israel and promoting Israel's right to defend itself against threats and unprecedented challenges in the Middle East.

#### SUSPENDING THE INDIVIDUAL MANDATE PENALTY LAW EQUALS FAIRNESS ACT

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 497, I call up 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, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4118

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Suspending the Individual Mandate Penalty Law Equals Fairness Act" or as the "SIMPLE Fairness Act".

#### SEC. 2. DELAY IN IMPLEMENTATION OF PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH INDIVIDUAL HEALTH INSURANCE MANDATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5000A(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(5) DELAY IN IMPLEMENTATION OF PENALTY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, the monthly penalty amount with respect to any taxpayer for any month beginning before January 1, 2015, shall be zero."

(b) DELAY OF CERTAIN PHASE INS AND INDEXING.—

(1) PHASE IN OF PERCENTAGE OF INCOME LIMITATION.—Section 5000A(c)(2)(B) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking "2014" in clause (i) and inserting "2015", and

(B) by striking "2015" in clauses (ii) and (iii) and inserting "2016".

(2) PHASE IN OF APPLICABLE DOLLAR AMOUNT.—Section 5000A(c)(3)(B) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking "2014" and inserting "2015", and

(B) by striking "2015" (before amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting "2016".

(3) INDEXING OF APPLICABLE DOLLAR AMOUNT.—Section 5000A(c)(3)(D) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking "2016" in the matter preceding clause (i) and inserting "2017", and

(B) by striking "2015" in clause (ii) and inserting "2016".

(4) INDEXING OF EXEMPTION BASED ON HOUSEHOLD INCOME.—Section 5000A(e)(1)(D) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking "2014" (before amendment by subparagraph (B)) and inserting "2015", and

(B) by striking "2013" and inserting "2014".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Kansas.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 4118.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), the illustrious chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

□ 1400

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Kansas for yielding.

I rise today in support of H.R. 4118, the SIMPLE Fairness Act, which would give Americans some much-needed relief from the added costs of ObamaCare.

I don't need to remind the American people about the failed launch of the health care law, but a failed Web site is the least of Americans' health concerns.

Millions of Americans, including over 200,000 in my home State of Michigan, went out to the mailbox and found that the health care plan they had and liked was canceled.

Millions of Americans are having their hours and wages cut as employers try to struggle with this complex law. Many find that they can no longer access the care that they relied on from their local doctor or hospital. Millions of Americans are left wondering what happened to their promised \$2,500 reduction in premiums. And next year, millions more will see their premiums skyrocket again due to the administration's failure to meet their own enrollment goals.

The American people have paid over and over for this health care law. They have paid higher premiums, and they have paid by having their hours cut back and their paychecks decreased. The last thing this law should do is penalize Americans for being unable to purchase a plan on healthcare.gov either because of multiple Web failures or that they were unable to find an affordable plan.

The Obama administration unilaterally exempted businesses from the employer mandate tax for 2014. SIMPLE Fairness demands that Congress provide the same relief to hardworking Americans.

When Congress can act to provide some relief for hardworking Americans, we should. Every Member here has heard from a frustrated constituent. This shouldn't and need not be a partisan fight. Granting relief to hardworking Americans is only fair. Voting "yes" on H.R. 4118 is the right thing to do for the people we represent.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I shall consume.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Well, here they go again. But this time, it is the 50th time that House Republicans have brought up legislation to repeal or to undermine the Affordable Care Act. But this 50th time is no golden anniversary. It is a House Republican goose egg for millions of Americans. Just look at this—fifty votes, but zero votes to raise the minimum wage, zero votes to renew unemployment insurance, zero votes to guarantee paycheck fairness, and zero votes to pass immigration reform.

So let's spend a minute looking exactly at what would be the impact of this if it became law. In 2014, we would see an additional 1 million uninsured—1 million. In 2015, 2 million more people

would be uninsured than if the individual mandate stayed in effect, and in 2016, another million people.

The irony of this, and I think my colleagues on the Democratic side will speak to this, the irony is the individual mandate was a Republican idea. It was born out of the conservative Heritage Foundation in the eighties. And throughout the nineties, Republicans argued its merits. It was one of the foundations of the Massachusetts law. Its parent, at least in good measure, was Governor Mitt Romney.

I met an hour or so ago with representatives of a major insurance carrier in Massachusetts, and one explained how it is working—97, 98 percent of the people are covered. That law has sparked an improvement in the delivery of health care and in the restructuring of health care delivery systems. So here we are, instead of constructive action, essentially, we have a Republican demolition squad.

Can any law be made perfect? Yes, including this. But that isn't what the Republicans are after today. They have never come up with their own plan. Indeed, they are a wrecking crew. America deserves much better.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the enforcement of the individual mandate penalty tax is an important issue, an issue of basic fairness, and I look forward to debating this legislation on the House floor.

On February 10 of this year, the Department of the Treasury announced that it would delay enforcement of the employer mandate penalty tax for businesses with 51 to 100 employees until 2016. This delay in the President's health care law comes on the heels of a similar delay the administration announced last July, which exempted all large businesses from the employer mandate penalty until 2015.

Amidst all of these delays, it is easy to forget that the employer mandate, like the individual mandate, was required by the Affordable Care Act to be in effect right now. The President has now acted unilaterally on two separate occasions to give Big Business relief from this tax burden. However, he has not leveled the playing field for the millions of individuals and families who are forced to comply with the individual mandate tax.

Aside from the fact that it is fundamentally unfair to give businesses special treatment that is not extended to these individuals, American families have also been forced to deal with a botched rollout of healthcare.gov and a series of confusing administration delays of the law issued via blog post. This has led to confusion, frustration, and, ultimately, difficulty complying with the law.

Nowhere is this more evident than the fact that only 4 million Americans have enrolled in health coverage on the healthcare.gov Web site. This means

that with less than a month to go in this initial open enrollment period, we are still 3 million enrollees short of the original CBO projection of 7 million enrollees—one that even the administration once touted as its goal. Enrollment is still 2 million enrollees short of CBO's new projection of 6 million enrollees.

These millions can be added to the tens of millions of other American individuals and families who will now likely be forced to pay the individual mandate penalty. In my State, Kansas, the latest census information estimates that 356,000 folks are uninsured. At the last count, only 22,000 of those individuals have enrolled on healthcare.gov.

Unlike businesses, the President has offered no relief for these individuals who do not or are unable to comply with the law's mandates. I believe that this is simply not fair and that the House must act to provide parity for these folks. That is why I have introduced this bill under consideration today.

H.R. 4118 would eliminate implementation of the individual mandate penalty by 1 year. This means that the individual mandate penalty would be zeroed out this year. It would rise to \$95 or 1 percent of income in 2015, to \$325 or 2 percent of income in 2016, and \$695 or 2½ percent of income in 2017 and thereafter. I believe this is a simple concept, and considering the circumstances, I applaud this committee for taking up this legislation to provide fairness to all Americans under the President's health care law.

In closing, I would ask this: If the President can delay the employer mandate, where is the relief for everyone else? It is time to give relief to hard-working individuals and families and work toward a legislative solution to eliminate these tax penalties for everyone. Congress must pass this bill today and create simple fairness for all.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, it is now my special pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) with whom those of us on Ways and Means have worked all of these years on health care reform. He is one of the authors of this bill and the ranking member of Energy and Commerce.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The truth of the matter is no matter how many votes the Republicans cast to repeal the Affordable Care Act and no matter how many distortions they spread about the law, there are some facts they cannot change.

They cannot change the fact that, because of the Affordable Care Act, nobody in America can ever again be denied health insurance because they have a preexisting condition. They cannot change the fact that a woman can never be charged more than a man for the same coverage. They cannot

change the fact that a family will never again be left without coverage just because their child's hospital bills got too high.

These facts are stubborn and they are inconvenient for my Republican colleagues, so they ignore them and they deny them. Republicans have voted—or will today—50 times to try to take away the basic security and freedom guaranteed by the Affordable Care Act. They offer absolutely no solutions for the tens of millions of Americans who need health care coverage that is secure and affordable. They have voted to repeal the law, but they have never once voted for a replacement.

Madam Speaker, if the Republicans have a solution that will expand coverage, that will end discrimination by insurance companies, and that will reduce the deficit, they need to bring it up for a vote. But they do not have solutions. What they want to do is deny health insurance coverage to millions of Americans. That is a shame, and I think we are wasting our time today voting again to turn our backs on a bill that will offer so much to the American people.

Don't we have anything else to do? All we seem to do is deny science, which is the bill that will be coming up next, when the Republicans want to stop EPA from dealing with the climate change issue or denying the rights of people to get health insurance, which the Republicans have voted over and over again to do.

I urge that we vote "no" on this bill.

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Chairman KEVIN BRADY, our chair of the Ways and Means Health Subcommittee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the SIMPLE Fairness Act and thank the leadership of the gentlelady from Kansas in this area.

Back home, my people are frightened about the Affordable Care Act. They don't think it is a waste of time to be trying to fix and repeal and stop this. They are paying a very steep price for it.

President Obama made them some big promises when he sold them this health care plan. He promised Americans could keep the plan they like. He promised lower health care costs. He promised a functioning Web site that he said would work as well as Amazon. The White House hasn't delivered on any of these promises.

Where I am from, if you make a mistake, if you don't keep your promise, you step up and fix it. You don't blame those you have hurt. No American should have to pay a penalty because ObamaCare fell short of its promises. No American should have to pay a penalty because the Web site couldn't even accept their application or deliver the correct information. No American should be penalized for trying days on end to purchase a plan only to decide it wasn't worth the effort because it was

too expensive. No American should be penalized because they are concerned about the security of their private information on this government Web site, and no American should be penalized by the IRS because of sticker shock or deciding not to purchase a plan that is so much more expensive than what was promised.

President Obama gave Big Business a break; he deserves to give average Americans the same type of break, as well. SIMPLE Fairness requires that we do the same for the American people. That is all this is about. It is all we are doing today, treating average Americans who are hurt by the Affordable Care Act the way the White House helped Big Business with the same exact problems. The American people deserve the same relief. We ought to give it to them. That is why this bill is called the SIMPLE Fairness Act, and it deserves our support.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

I also ask unanimous consent that the balance of my time be managed by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), the ranking member on the Health Subcommittee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOX). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

□ 1415

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, my colleagues, there is a cancer growing in the Republican Party in the House of Representatives, and as much of a Democrat as I am, I hate to see this happen because our government is based on a two-party system. Now this cancer, this small group of people in the Republican Party in the House, have already torn down the credibility of the entire House of Representatives because they are doing the same insane thing 50 times without getting any results, and they are not doing anything else. It is bad enough that all of us have to go down in political favoritism, or our reputations go down, but this small group of people have gone far enough now that the national Republican Party has no credibility.

I will not embarrass anybody by asking them just who do you think nationally should serve our country from, pardon the expression, the Republican Party. You have none. Somewhere along the line, this insanity has to stop because you are not beating up on Democrats, you are beating up on people who have no health insurance.

If you don't like the President, if you don't like this bill, let's talk about the millions of people who have no health insurance instead of just for the 50th time saying you don't like the bill. It is the law. The House and the Senate have signed it. The Supreme Court has verified it. The President can veto anything you do if something did happen.

Why don't we talk about immigration reform? Rebuild the integrity of

your great party from past years. Why don't we talk about the minimum wage, where all candidates will say if you work hard in America and do the right thing, then you can achieve anything you want. If you are middle class, you can achieve poverty. If you are in poverty, you can't even get a decent wage for working. There are so many things we can do.

Don't you remember the days before the Affordable Care Act when you had constituents coming in saying: I can't get insurance? How about the days when people would say: My husband was in the hospital and they cut off insurance. Or even worse: I tried to get insurance and they told me I was so sick, so I can't get any more insurance. Or the guy who is working and he is on his parents' insurance, and he is 26 years old. Don't you have any of these people in your congressional districts? Are all of your people well and can do without health insurance?

How do you go home and explain that we do have a bill and instead of perfecting it, supporting it, educating your people how they can get health insurance, that you have tried not once, you have tried 10 times, 20 times, 30 times, 40 times, now 50 times to derail and destroy it.

I don't know how you get away with it. I don't know what you put in the water that you feed your constituents, but it certainly doesn't make sense that you can try to destroy and at the same time not to substitute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI), our colleague and friend on the House Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4118, the SIMPLE Fairness Act.

According to a recent Gallup poll, 51 percent of Americans disapprove of the President's health care law, and for good reason.

The rollout of the failed, misguided law was nothing short of disastrous. Its plagued Web site prevented many Americans from purchasing health insurance on the Federal and State exchanges. Though the President promised lower costs, many are facing the reality of higher premiums and a steep penalty if they cannot afford the plans that are offered.

Recently, the administration delayed the employer mandate for a second time, leaving intact the mandate that requires individuals to purchase health insurance or pay a fine.

The bill before us today would ensure that no American will be forced to pay the individual mandate penalty tax in 2014. It is evident to this Chamber and Americans across the country that the President's health care law is too complex, too costly, and completely unworkable. Ultimately, this law should be fully repealed, but I am here today

because I believe that all hardworking Americans deserve relief from the President's health care law.

Congress should afford individuals the same advantage the administration is giving to businesses and delay the individual mandate. It is simply common sense. I ask my colleagues to come together and pass this important bill and send it to the President to be signed into law.

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

Madam Speaker, today is a little like "Groundhog Day." The Republican leadership has come out here and tried to decide what the weather is going to be, and they are going to get the same answer that they have gotten 49 times before. They can pass it from here, but it is not going to change anything. We have seen this poorly designed, sadly staged GOP political theater before—50 times. This is the 50th vote of this Tea Party, Koch brothers-led Congress to crash the Affordable Care Act.

It is a waste of time and resources, and ignores the facts. Americans want affordable health care, and ACA delivers it to them. ACA has saved lives and brought down our spending. New fraud measures, including new authorities imposing payment suspensions and more rigorous-provider enrollment procedures put into law by ACA, helped the Federal Government recover \$4.3 billion in taxpayer money from individuals and companies that tried to defraud the health care programs. The ACA is delivering historic results for the American people, and yet the Republican leadership is hell-bent on a 50th stroke.

Regardless of the fact that our economic system remains stuck in neutral, nothing has been done about jobs, unemployment insurance, raising the minimum wage, and so forth.

If that was all that was going on here, this would still be insulting and absurd. The bill under consideration today, H.R. 4118, is virtually identical to H.R. 2668, a bill passed on the 17th of July, 2013. The Republicans have already passed this bill to delay the individual mandate, something the CBO knows will result in higher insurance premiums. So beyond wasting time and engaging in stunts designed to make the producers of FOX News happy, Republicans want to return Americans to the days before ACA, when a cancer victim couldn't get covered and seniors couldn't get their prescriptions; to the day when wage workers who had paid hundreds of dollars out of pocket went without; to the days of ever-changing lists of preexisting conditions when companies tried to drop coverage.

The real business of the Congress should be to stand up for those Americans and millions more like them. That is what the American people want. That is what the American people deserve. That is why they want us to vote "no."

Jim McCrery, in March, 2000, said in an article in Atlantic Monthly that an

employer mandate and an individual mandate was essential.

I can't understand the Republicans saying we don't want everybody to play. We don't want everybody according to their ability to be in. Why are you so eager to let people out the door because they are going to wind up in the emergency room? Have no doubt, they will be getting health care, but they won't be paying for it. You are saying: That's okay with us, we like people who are free riders. That is not America. We are all supposed to do our part, and that is why everyone here should vote "no."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), our friend and colleague on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Madam Speaker, as we approach the deadline for enrolling in ObamaCare-sanctioned insurance, it has become clear the system is not working as its supporters intended. For months, we have been learning about Web site problems, spiking premiums, and lost coverage. For months, we have seen an underwhelming number of signups, not even close to matching the stated enrollment goals of this administration. For months, we have heard heart-wrenching stories from our districts about the negative impact this botched rollout has had on hardworking American families.

Unfortunately for those families, the White House and those who helped bring us this law have consistently turned a deaf ear to Americans' concerns. Meanwhile, at the urging of the business community, we had the White House delay the employer mandate tax—twice. What must the constituents in our districts do to be heard by ObamaCare supporters? Should they form trade organizations and hire a lobbyist so maybe President Obama and champions of this law will listen?

Well, guess what? My constituents did hire someone to lobby on their behalf when they elected me to Congress. It is simply not fair when businesses get a break but the people who work at those businesses do not. I am all for delaying the employer mandate tax because it is confusing and it is cumbersome for our businesses. I also feel very strongly that the individual mandate tax is just as cumbersome for individuals and families as the employer mandate tax is for our businesses. I believe that individuals and families deserve the same sort of delay. So on behalf of my constituents in Indiana's Ninth District, and on behalf of all of yours, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this bill and to support simple fairness.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS).

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4118, the 50th vote to re-

peal the Affordable Care Act, which, if passed and implemented, would increase premiums, decrease coverage, and increase the number of people who are not insured by as much as 11 million people in this country. It is unbelievable that we would be on the floor voting for the 50th time to try and turn back the clock on millions of Americans who have been denied health insurance coverage because of a pre-existing condition, didn't have enough money, or did not have accessibility to facilities.

In Illinois, over 256,000 individuals benefit from the Affordable Care Act. Nationally, more than 4 million Americans have enrolled in private plans, with 82 percent receiving premium tax credits to make health insurance more affordable. More than 3.1 million young adults have access to health insurance by remaining on their parents' plans until age 26. Millions more Americans have secured new coverage through Medicaid expansion.

Rather than decreasing or taking away, the Republican leadership and all of us ought to be increasing and providing. We ought to be affording individuals the opportunity to get insurance because they are unemployed—to get a check. So it is amazing that rather than giving, we would be talking about taking, taking away, when the law says and all of us know that everybody ought to have access to quality health care.

I oppose this legislation.

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), my friend and colleague.

□ 1430

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding to me.

I rise in support of the SIMPLE Fairness Act and a level playing field for all Americans.

In the span of about 7 months, the Obama administration has taken action twice to provide big businesses with relief from the President's disastrous health care law. Working families, however, are still being forced to comply with the individual mandate.

Over the last year, President Obama's broken promises on health care become almost too numerous to count. Americans were told that if they liked their health care plan, they could keep it. Tell that to the 82,000 Tennesseans who were forced out of their coverage by ObamaCare.

Americans were told that ObamaCare would lower the cost of insurance. Explain that to the 11 million people that CMS has determined will have their premiums increase.

We were told by the Democratic leader that ObamaCare would create jobs. I invite her to have a conversation with the workers at Mountain States Health Alliance in my district who lost their jobs. Even the CBO agrees that this law is discouraging work.

Throughout the implementation of ObamaCare, the one thing the President has held firm on is that working families must buy insurance—or else. He has promised a veto on this commonsense legislation simply because it delays individual mandate penalties for 1 year.

Here in the people's House, we should stand for their interests and treat people the same as big businesses. It is only fair.

Madam Speaker, I would argue that if this bill is doing so well, why would only 34 percent of the people in this country approve of it?

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to follow my good friend, Dr. PHIL ROE, on the floor because we spent last weekend—speaking of health care—along with Mr. MCDERMOTT—in Houston, Texas, at a fabulous conference by the nonpartisan Commonwealth Fund to be able to deal meaningfully with health care problems and bring people together on a bipartisan basis to discuss them.

I know some things we have to do and have got to come to the floor to repeal this 50 times, but I would hope that, sooner rather than later, we reach a point where we can focus on things that bring Americans together, not divide them, something that will improve the quality of health care and actually has nothing to do with spending money, new mandates, or ObamaCare.

I am referring to the legislation that I am pleased to have cosponsored with my good friend, Dr. ROE, H.R. 1173, the Personalize Your Care bill. It has over 50 bipartisan cosponsors. It would enable, for the first time, to provide voluntary consultation on advanced care planning for Medicare and Medicaid.

Every 5 years or when somebody becomes first eligible, it would provide grants to establish and expand programs for physician-ordered life sustaining treatment. It would require that certified electronic health records could display current advanced directives and physician orders for sustaining treatment.

Bear in mind, right now, every day, there are people who are getting health care at their most critical vulnerable moments, at the end of life, that is not necessarily what they want.

The majority of Americans would rather spend their last hours or days surrounded by their families at home, but very few Americans actually are able to do that. They end up in an ICU, not necessarily because that is their choice, but because their choices haven't been recorded and haven't been respected.

It is fascinating to me that Dr. Billy Graham, in his recent book, talks about the Christian responsibility to spare one's family from impossible decisions like that, that it is a Christian

responsibility to have that conversation in advance, execute the appropriate papers, and make sure nobody has to guess about whether a loved one wants to be in an ICU or at home.

Dr. Bill Frist, a fellow Tennessean of my friend Dr. ROE, had an op-ed in *Politico* a few months ago talking about his experience. Dr. Frist was a former Republican majority leader in the Senate, but he is also a respected physician.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. He is also a respected heart surgeon who has faced families in this circumstance, and he knows that they need information, that they need help, and that their wishes need to be respected.

Now, maybe instead of repealing ObamaCare the 51st or the 58th or the 100th time—legislation is not going to go any place—maybe we could take a little bit of a time out and consider the legislation that Dr. ROE and I have worked on that is not partisan, that doesn't have anything to do with ObamaCare, that would enable families in their time of need to know what their choices are and to make sure that their choices, whatever they might be, are respected, they are respected in their city, they are respected across State lines, that they protect their family, and that they get the care they want and they need as they approach end of life.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will find time this year from passing post office renaming and whatnot, this is a piece of legislation that could come to the floor on the suspension calendar and would make a difference for families all across America.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia, ERIC CANTOR, our current Republican House majority leader.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady and congratulate her on her leadership for this bill and making sure that we reinsert a notion of fairness back into the law for the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the SIMPLE Fairness Act.

For the past few months, the President's health care law has been wreaking havoc on the American people. After the administration's disastrous launch of the exchanges, ObamaCare has been anything but what the President had promised it would be. It has become very clear that this law is doing more harm than good.

We now know that ObamaCare has pushed up to 5 million people off the health care plan they liked, and many are now being denied the care they had. To make matters worse, many of these new plans will force Americans to pay higher premiums and higher deductibles. This leaves them with a limited number of options for health care coverage.

Many folks are also finding out that they cannot keep the doctor or the pediatrician that they want to go to and trusted. To put it simply, this is not how America should work. The American people deserve better.

Yet, time and again, the Obama administration has shown its true colors by putting politics first and unilaterally delaying parts of the law to avoid political repercussions. This has become most evident by the administration's delay in the employee mandate for big businesses and its refusal to delay the individual mandate for working Americans.

Just yesterday, it was reported the administration will announce another major unilateral delay on their minimum coverage requirements to—and I quote the publication *The Hill*—“ease election pressure on Democrats.”

Doesn't it say something that the authors of this legislation are worried that it is being implemented before they face voters again?

And I ask: Will future Presidents, perhaps of our party, be able to simply delay or cancel all or part of ObamaCare? Will my colleagues on the other side of the aisle withhold complaint then?

There is no greater indictment of this law or proof of its failure than the fear that full implementation invokes in its authors.

It is not fair to pick and choose which parts of an unpopular law should be enforced at the expense of working individuals for political expediency, and it is just not fair that businesses and insurance companies get delays and exemptions and not hardworking Americans. It is not fair.

Millions of Americans all over the country are already living paycheck to paycheck. The last thing they need is another brazen attack on their pocketbooks from a health care law they don't want, they didn't ask for, and that doesn't work for them.

Through this administration's ad hoc implementation of ObamaCare, some people won't have to pay the penalty, but others will. Here is who I am concerned about and who the bill before us today protects, the single mom, who for whatever reason ended up without insurance for several months.

She doesn't need a new tax bill from Uncle Sam for hundreds of dollars because she can't access the coverage that Washington says she must. She could use that money to pay the heating bill or to buy groceries for her children.

All Americans—not just some—but all Americans deserve a delay from the punishing financial penalties of the President's health care law. This is our chance to make it happen. With the legislation before us today, no one in this country would be forced to pay the individual mandate tax in 2014.

This is an opportunity to stop the political games and put working Americans first. Let's stand together and support the SIMPLE Fairness Act in

bipartisan fashion and give our constituents some relief from the financial burdens of ObamaCare.

I would like to thank Chairman DAVE CAMP and Representative LYNN JENKINS for their hard work on this issue and on behalf of working Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 12 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Kansas has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, STEVE SCALISE, the chairman of the Republican Study Committee.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from Kansas for yielding and for her leadership on this bill that I am proud to cosponsor.

The SIMPLE Fairness Act is about just that, providing fairness for hardworking taxpayers. If you look at how the President's health care law is being implemented, Mr. Speaker, you have got the President literally saying he is going to give exemption after exemption after exemption to the political class, to the select few who have special interest protections here in Washington.

The President, by the way, has said: Big businesses can get exemptions from ObamaCare. The President has said: Insurance companies can get exemptions from ObamaCare.

But then, when it comes to hardworking taxpayers, families out there who are struggling under the weight of this law, the President says no, you can't have that same exemption that he has given to everybody else.

So what we are saying here, Mr. Speaker, is if these exemptions are good enough for big businesses and if these exemptions are good enough for insurance companies, shouldn't they also be good enough for hardworking taxpayers who are struggling in this bad economy that the President has given us and under the weight of this unworkable law, that the President himself is acknowledging is unworkable, by giving all these exemptions away to everybody else?

Now, if you look at the law, Mr. Speaker, the President doesn't have the legal authority to just waive a law—to literally take out a pen and change the law.

What the President does have is the ability to work with us in Congress in a bipartisan way, which when you look at the vote on this bill, it will be bipartisan in support of giving these hardworking taxpayers that same exemption.

But this law, ObamaCare, is built on a foundation of broken promises. If you like what you have, you can keep it, of course, is probably the most broken promise in political history; but there is more. The President said insurance

costs will be lower. Insurance costs are higher for families.

The President even said he will meet with anybody who has a better idea. Well, we do have a better idea, Mr. Speaker. Over 120 Members of Congress, including medical doctors, have cosponsored the American Health Care Reform Act.

We took the President up on his promise, now almost 3 months ago, and the President has refused to fulfill that promise of meeting with anybody who has a better idea. He won't even sit down and talk with us about a better idea to put patients back in charge of health care.

There is a better way. We ought to treat people fairly. This bill does it. I urge adoption.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Is the gentlelady from Kansas ready to close?

Ms. JENKINS. I see no other speakers, so I am prepared to close.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I let one Member who is in transit, but let me say a few things until he gets here.

□ 1445

I have been in Congress for 25 years, and I have listened to the Republicans talk about what we ought to do about health care. They have never brought a bill to the committee—a chairman's mark—for us to mark up and bring out on the floor.

Now, if you have a solution for the fact that health care costs are the biggest costs driving bankruptcy in this country, where is it since you don't like what we have here?

When I was younger, I lived through the implementation of Medicare. The American Medical Association—everybody—was just up and down, and it was the worst thing. If we put in Medicare, it was going to be the end of the world, and we would never have health care again in this country. We went on and on and on like that. They so poisoned the well that, when people went out to actually recruit people to get into the Medicare program, people said: I am not going to have any of that socialistic medicine in my house.

That is what it was called. That is what people were doing in 1964 and 1965. This is a rerun of that very same movie. The Republicans want to kill the idea and leave the American people out there on their own. It is probably the single best example of the difference between the Republicans and the Democrats.

The Democrats have put something out here, and we are trying to help all Americans. Is it perfect? There isn't anybody on my side who would say it is. If we had had some hearings in the Ways and Means Committee, the subcommittee could have done a whole bunch of things—there are all kinds of problems out there—but there haven't been any hearings on this bill, on how to fix it.

I talked to Bill Frist some months ago. He said: Jim, there is no reason to

repeal it. You ought to fix it. Make it work. Make it work for the American people.

One of the interesting things that I hear over and over again—and it must be confusing to folks at home—is that the President said: If you like your health care, you can keep it. Now, implicit in that is that it will still exist. The President didn't say: I am going to tell the insurance companies you have got to keep those plans out there.

That wouldn't be the free enterprise system, what you have. You don't like the free enterprise system.

As soon as the President passed this bill, immediately, we had people in the insurance industry pulling down plans all over the country, sending out mailings, saying: You have lost your health care coverage.

I sometimes wonder if global warming—or climate change—is really not because of Obama's health care. I hear that it is the cause of every evil—of people losing jobs. I don't know. Whatever is going on in the country, it is because of ObamaCare. That is foolishness. When you are trying to change a program for 20 or 30 million people, you are bound to have some problems. We are having them, and we are working them out. It was awful at the beginning, and it is better now. It is better today than it was 3 months ago, and it will be. It will continue to improve because the American people need it. They absolutely need it even with the foolishness coming out of here, of trying again to convince the American people to get rid of this.

I had a woman in my district who was an opera singer. She went to Germany, and she got into the German health care system. Instantly, boom, you are in. Anybody who goes to Germany is in. Her daughter got leukemia. Her daughter was treated for leukemia, and she went into remission. The mother finished her contract and came home to the United States. She could not find an insurance company anywhere in this country that would give her insurance for her daughter—none.

Now, that is what you want to go back to. You want to go back to the time when a parent can't find an insurance company that will take care of his kid, and that is the kind of thing that we have been watching for as long as I have been in Congress and before that, and this bill has begun to stop that.

We had lifetime limits. Some cancers eat up a lot of money real quickly. Bone marrow transplants are \$125,000 or more, and people wind up being unable to purchase the medication. All of that is covered by this bill, and you are saying to people: No, we want to go back to 1930. We like the Dust Bowl. We like the hard times of the thirties. We don't want any of this stuff.

In my view, this is a perfect place for Democrats to vote “no,” and Republicans, of course, will vote “yes,” and the American people will make a judgment in the next election.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, in closing, this bill is about fairness and about providing relief to all hard-working Americans just as the administration keeps giving to businesses. It is about leveling the playing field for the millions of individuals and middle class families who are forced to comply with this health care law.

Just last week, a stunning poll found that only 6 percent of Americans claim ObamaCare is working and want it kept intact. Opposition to this law is at an all-time high, and even the President admitted that the launch of this law was fumbled. Add that to the millions of Americans who are losing their health insurance that they like, are losing access to the doctors they have always seen, are submitting their personal data to an unsecured system, are paying higher premiums they can't afford, and clearly, we have a law that is not working and is not fair to the American people.

The court of public opinion is a powerful thing. The House will listen, and it will continue to listen, and it will continue to provide relief and fairness to middle class families. I hope the Senate and the President will also do the right thing for the American people.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have always said that Congress would need to pass fixes to improve the Affordable Care Act. The original version of the bill that passed the House in 2009, and included my provision to repeal the anti-trust exemption enjoyed by the insurance industry, was much better than the Senate version that ultimately became law. Unfortunately the House Leadership has not allowed us the opportunity to vote on real fixes to the ACA. Instead the Republican leadership continues to engage in an ideological exercise of repeatedly bringing up bills that will never move beyond the House. H.R. 4118 is no different. It won't be taken up by the Senate. The President has threatened to veto it. It is not a real fix.

Instead of bringing up bills that will never become law, Congress should be working on fixes to the Affordable Care Act that will actually help our constituents. Oregonians who want to buy insurance continue to face a state exchange website that does not function. Because of this problem I fought hard to let Oregonians to keep their current insurance plan if they wanted to. Small businesses in Oregon can't use tax credits to help them provide insurance to their employees on the SHOP small business exchange because there still is no SHOP exchange in Oregon, so I am asking for small business tax credits to be available outside of the SHOP exchange.

Americans who want to take personal responsibility for all of their healthcare costs would benefit from an alternative to the individual mandate that I have proposed. My proposal would allow people to opt out of buying insurance without facing a tax penalty as long as they commit to taking full responsibility for any healthcare costs they incur.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition once again to an attempt by the majority to defeat the Affordable Care Act.

This begins the third year that the majority has attempted to put an end to affordable, available and accessible health care for all Americans.

They have ignored the law, a Supreme Court decision and a national presidential election that affirmed the establishment, legality, and popularity of the Affordable Care Act.

I oppose this bill for three reasons: there are much more pressing issues facing our nation, this bill is wrong on the facts, and the Affordable Care Act is working.

There are much more pressing issues facing our nation: unemployment, food security, housing security and access to job training that leads to employment.

We should be debating a bill to restore emergency supplemental unemployment benefits.

We should be restoring cuts the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program that was cut by nearly \$20 billion dollars over several years.

We should be voting to raise the minimum wage to \$10.10 an hour over several years and link future increases of the minimum wage to inflation.

We should be taking up the budget process with eagerness to avoid another government shutdown.

In 2013, we had a Federal government shutdown because we lost precious legislative time voting to repeal or seriously diminish the ability of the Affordable Care Act to do what it is currently doing—providing health insurance to millions of Americans.

Every wasted vote—moves this Congress another step closer to another Federal government shutdown.

The budget process takes months of work by over a dozen committees to complete.

Each vote that stops our legislative work and bring us to the floor for a debate on legislation that will not go anywhere—is time taken away from our work to avoid another government shutdown.

The American people were unaware of the cost of over 40 votes to end Obamacare until millions of citizens were put out of work when the government shutdown last year.

They are watching what is happening in Congress very closely and the consequences will fall heaviest on those who were hurt by the last government shutdown.

The 113th Congress has 70 legislative working days left on the calendar before September 30, 2014—the end of the fiscal year for 2014 and the beginning of the fiscal year for 2015.

I call on my colleagues to bring to the floor bills like H.R. 3773, the Unemployment Jobhunters Protection and Assistance Act, a bill I introduced that would extend emergency unemployment compensation (EUC) payments for eligible individuals to weeks of employment ending on or before January 1, 2015.

This Congress would find a better use of its time if it would take up consideration of H.R. 3888, New Chance for a New Start in Life Act of 2014, that would authorize the Secretary of Labor to make grants to States, units of local government, and Indian tribes to carry out employment training programs to assist long-term unemployed job hunters to obtain the skills and training they need to reenter the workforce and fill jobs in high-growth sectors of the economy.

These are just two bills that would improve the lives of people who we all serve, but there

are dozens of others introduced by members who came to the Congress to serve the will of the people and not their own will.

I oppose this bill because it is wrong on the facts.

Republicans are claiming that this bill is simply logical because the Administration has already delayed the employer responsibility provision for one year.

This claim is inaccurate and disingenuous.

Nonpartisan experts agree that there is no comparison between the impacts of a delay in the employer responsibility and individual responsibility provisions.

For example, in a report in July, the non-partisan Urban Institute concluded, “Delaying or eliminating the individual mandate would significantly decrease insurance coverage relative to the full Affordable Care Act’s implementation, whereas delaying or eliminating the employer mandate will have essentially no effect on coverage.”

The Affordable Care Act is good for the American People

The Obamacare is popular and growing in greater popularity everyday as consumers get past the rhetoric and experience the reality of the peace of mind that health insurance for their families and themselves brings.

Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, in Texas:

5,198,000 individuals on private insurance have gained coverage for at least one free preventive health care service such as a mammogram, birth control, or an immunization in 2011 and 2012. In the first eleven months of 2013 alone, an additional 1,683,800 people with Medicare have received at least one preventive service at no out of pocket cost.

The up to 10,695,000 individuals with pre-existing conditions such as asthma, cancer, or diabetes—including up to 1,632,000 children—will no longer have to worry about being denied coverage or charged higher prices because of their health status or history.

Approximately 5,189,000 Texans have gained expanded mental health and substance use disorder benefits and/or federal parity protections.

4,889,000 uninsured Texans will have new health insurance options through Medicaid or private health plans in the Marketplace.

As a result of new policies that make sure premium dollars work for the consumer, not just the insurer, in the past year insurance companies have sent rebates averaging \$95 per family to approximately 726,200 consumers.

In the first ten months of 2013, 233,100 seniors and people with disabilities have saved on average \$866 on prescription medications as the health care law closes Medicare’s so called “donut hole.”

357,000 young adults have gained health insurance because they can now stay on their parents’ health plans until age 26.

Individuals no longer have to worry about having their health benefits cut off after they reach a lifetime limit on benefits, and starting in January, 7,536,000 Texans will no longer have to worry about annual limits, either.

Health centers have received \$293,038,000 to provide primary care, establish new sites, and renovate existing centers to expand access to quality health care. Texas has approximately 400 health center sites, which served about 1,079,000 individuals in 2012.

Every day more uninsured Americans are signing up for plans as the website gets faster

and more people with insurance are benefiting from the law.

I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to not spend any more precious legislative work on efforts to end the Affordable Care Act or ignoring the number of people continuing to vote in favor of the new law with their insurance enrollment dollars.

Mr. Speakers, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this bill.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, when the health care law was passed on a party line vote people were assured they could keep their current doctors and insurance plans, it would cost them less, it was not a tax, and there would be no rationing of medical care. Those are not my words. They are the words from the supporters of the bill in the Congress and the Obama Administration.

The stark reality is very different for many of my constituents and hundreds of them have shared with me how this health care law has adversely impacted them. I’d like to share just a few of these comments with you. They are from real people, hardworking Americans who I have the privilege of representing and they are begging for relief:

“My group rate insurance increased 100% and my deductible went from \$2,500 to \$7,500” wrote Preston in Brevard, and Margaret says her “insurances costs jumped 300%.”

Paul in Brevard writes, “It has created a situation where I can’t retire safely.”

Norma in Indian River County says her “premiums increased \$600 per year. That’s a lot for someone on a fixed income.”

Tom in south Brevard wrote that the law “increased premiums and inserted unneeded benefits into our policy.”

Rob in Melbourne fears for his kids, writing: “My kids cannot find a job and the cost of healthcare is three times more for them than it was previously.” And another constituent wrote: “My grandchildren lost their insurance due to the exorbitant increase in monthly premiums by their employer.”

A friend wrote: “My best friend’s hours got cut so the company would not have to provide healthcare for him and his family.” And, Ed in Titusville wrote of the impact on his daughters: “Both of my daughters have had their work hours cut [so their employers could avoid providing health insurance].”

Christine in Vero shared: “With no change in my health, my premiums went up 21% with a \$2500 deductible.”

Rob in Melbourne says his insurance costs “doubled”.

Ralph in Brevard says “I lost my doctor and am paying for things I don’t need.”

Chris in Palm Bay says he “lost his job and was forced to move and pay higher insurance costs.”

Paul in Palm Bay says: “The policy increased from \$50 a month to \$350 a month.” Terri shares that her doctors won’t take her private insurance.

Dave in central Brevard shared that: “It has DOUBLED my premiums!! I am very upset about Obamacare! FIX IT!”

John says he lost his plan, and Norma writes: “I have to die, because my medical bills will not be covered.”

I could go on.

This bill simply delays the individual mandate tax penalty for a year so that Americans can pick a plan that they want and that they

can afford, rather than one that the government in Washington tells them they must sign up for.

The President has already given large multinational corporations and labor unions the same waiver. We are simply extending this same flexibility to average Americans who want nothing more than to be treated equally.

Ultimately, when you have to pass a bill to find out what's in it, there's a good chance that you're not going to like what it says. The only way to fix this situation is to repeal this law and replace it with a plan that restores individual freedom and makes health insurance more affordable.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the Simple Fairness Act and eliminate the individual mandate tax penalty under the Affordable Care Act for a year.

Many of my constituents in the 24th District of Texas have lost their health insurance and access to doctors they liked due to the President's healthcare law. The law is hurting millions of Americans.

The President has recognized as much, as he recently issued another delay that protects businesses from his employer mandate tax. In fact, the President has delayed provisions in his own healthcare law over 20 times in the past year.

It is simply not fair for the President to give businesses a one-year delay on the tax penalty, but not give hardworking individuals and families the same relief.

My constituents, and all Americans, deserve the same thing: fairness.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting the Simple Fairness Act.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th time this House of Representatives has tried to repeal, defund or dismantle the Affordable Care Act.

What a sad Golden Anniversary moment for the GOP.

The Affordable Care Act, which has already helped millions of Americans, is the law of the land. Instead of playing politics, let's instead work together to address concerns over its implementation while upholding its mission: to provide quality, affordable healthcare access for all Americans.

With Americans facing so many real, pressing issues every day, I urge this Congress to focus on achieving results and serving our constituents.

Two million Americans, including about 110 thousand Floridians have lost their unemployment insurance. Our immigration system is in dire need of common sense and comprehensive reforms. Women still make less than men while working equal jobs.

The list goes on. We have work to do. We have a duty and responsibility to serve the interests of the American people. These pointless partisan attacks on the Affordable Care Act must stop.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 497, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HORSFORD. I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Horsford moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4118 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following new section:

#### SEC. 3 PROTECTING CONSUMERS FROM PREMIUM INCREASES AND DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF PRE-EXISTING CONDITIONS.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to alter, impact, delay, or weaken—

(1) section 1402 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act that reduces out-of-pocket costs and cost-sharing for individuals and families,

(2) sections 1001 and 1401 of such Act that provide tax credits and rebates for health insurance, or

(3) section 1201 of such Act that prohibits discrimination on the basis of pre-existing conditions and gender.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

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

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nevada is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

This Republican bill represents the 50th attempt to undermine and repeal the Affordable Care Act. The Democratic motion to recommit lowers out-of-pocket costs, secures tax credits and rebates, and ensures no discrimination against those with preexisting conditions.

The bill would delay the individual responsibility provision of the Affordable Care Act to purchase health care by 1 year, which would directly impact the out-of-pocket costs of consumers and threaten the ability of millions of Americans with preexisting conditions to have health coverage.

The nonpartisan CBO estimates that the enactment of the Republican H.R. 4118 would increase the number of uninsured by 1 million in 2014, by 2 million in 2015, and by 1 million in 2016. That is 4 million Americans who would not have access to health insurance otherwise.

The White House pointed out this morning that the individual shared responsibility provision is essential to ensuring that 129 million Americans with preexisting conditions can get coverage without being charged more or losing coverage when they get sick.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is just another example of House Republicans playing political games rather than working together to get things done for the American people. This is no longer

about helping people. It never really was for the Republicans. These repeal votes are about ideological purity. They are about politics for the sake of politics. That is why people across America are frustrated and disappointed by this Congress—because this Chamber has become a bubble, and Republicans have stopped listening and have stopped working on anything productive.

It is not just on health care. It is on giving Americans a raise by increasing the Federal minimum wage. It is the refusal to bring up comprehensive immigration reform even though there are votes in the House to pass it. It is on unemployment insurance and on the failure of this Congress to extend benefits to now more than 2 million Americans who have lost coverage. It is about creating jobs and helping to improve and grow our infrastructure.

Now, this vote may seem routine. It may seem like this is just Congress' continuing Groundhog Day, but this is the 50th time that we have done this. We are wasting time, and we have a full docket of things that we need to be doing. This vote is a symptom of something very wrong in Washington, and it is time to wake up and to do something more than play Tea Party politics in this House. The bill offered by my colleagues on the other side would increase out-of-pocket costs to American consumers. It would increase health premiums and the number of uninsured Americans, and it hurts those with pre-existing conditions.

Last year, I underwent a six-way bypass. Open heart surgery—no question—was terrifying, and when you are on an operating table in an emergency room, the last thing you should be focusing on is becoming medically bankrupt. You should be focusing on taking care of yourself and your family and on getting them the best care that you can. Whether it is heart disease, cancer, diabetes, or any other preexisting condition, people shouldn't go bankrupt because of an illness or a disease in this country.

Thankfully, my surgery went well. I was able to afford it. My heart condition is now a preexisting condition. There are thousands of my constituents who are in the same or worse boat but who are not financially well off. If we repeal or delay the Affordable Care Act, what are they supposed to do? There is no solution being offered by the House Republicans. It is not repeal and replace. It is repeal and return to a broken health care system. That is it. That is the Republicans' plan.

Last year, they passed H.R. 2668, a virtually identical bill to the one we are considering today. They have run out of ways to repeal this law, so now we are stuck on repeat. We should, instead, be focusing on renewing unemployment insurance benefits for 2 million struggling Americans, on passing comprehensive immigration reform so that we can fix the system that has got families torn apart, and on giving 30 million Americans a raise.



My motion to recommit would protect three of the most important provisions of the Affordable Care Act that are overwhelmingly supported by the American people: lower out-of-pocket costs for consumers, tax credits and rebates to purchase health care, and ensuring that no one in America can be denied coverage due to a preexisting condition in America.

It is time for this Congress to wake up and to do the right thing—to protect Americans and their health care.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order and seek time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn.

The gentlewoman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, once again, the Democrats are simply missing the point. The President is the one who has delayed the employer mandate, the President has said this law is not ready, and the President has declined to extend the same flexibility to individuals.

This is about basic fairness. It is only fair that hardworking taxpayers are given the same treatment as businesses.

Like so many other provisions of the law that have been delayed, repealed, or declared unworkable, this is just another example that, despite the administration's promises, ObamaCare is not working for the American people.

I reject this motion.

Please support H.R. 4118, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. HORSFORD. 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 the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 4118, if ordered, and the motion to suspend the rules with regard to H.R. 2126.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 185, nays 227, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

YEAS—185

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

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

NAYS—227

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

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

NOT VOTING—18

Chaffetz	Frankel (FL)	Jones
Courtney	Gosar	Larson (CT)
Crawford	Green, Gene	McCarthy (NY)
DeLauro	Himes	Negrete McLeod
Duffy	Hinojosa	Pastor (AZ)
Esty	Johnson, Sam	Schneider

□ 1529

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Messrs. FARENTHOLD, FRANKS of Arizona, REICHERT, PEARCE, and TERRY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Messrs. BRADY of Pennsylvania, GRIJALVA, and SWALWELL of California changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for the vote on the Motion to Recommit with Instructions, rollcall vote 96, I would have voted “aye.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 250, nays 160, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

YEAS—250

Amash	Black	Camp
Amodei	Blackburn	Campbell
Bachmann	Boustany	Cantor
Bachus	Brady (TX)	Capito
Barber	Bridenstine	Carter
Barletta	Brooks (AL)	Cassidy
Barr	Brooks (IN)	Chabot
Barrow (GA)	Brownley (CA)	Coble
Barton	Buchanan	Coffman
Benishek	Bucshon	Cole
Bentivolio	Burgess	Collins (GA)
Bera (CA)	Bustos	Collins (NY)
Bilirakis	Byrne	Conaway
Bishop (UT)	Calvert	Cook

Cotton  
Cramer  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Daines  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duckworth  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Enyart  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (OH)  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)

King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Kuster  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Lankford  
Latham  
Latta  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Maffei  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
Matheson  
McAllister  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris

Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Royce  
Ruiz  
Runyan  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shea-Porter  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southerland  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stockman  
Stutzman  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Vela  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IN)

Larsen (WA)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis  
Loebach  
Loftgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham (NM)  
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Michaud  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Nadler

Aderholt  
Chaffetz  
Courtney  
Crawford  
DeLauro  
Duffy  
Esty  
Frankel (FL)  
Gosar  
Green, Gene  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones

NOT VOTING—20

□ 1538

So the bill was passed.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:  
Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 97, H.R. 4118 would increase the number of uninsured. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for the vote On Passage of H.R. 4118, rollcall vote 97, I would have voted “no.”

ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENT 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. 2126) to facilitate better alignment, cooperation, and best practices between commercial real estate landlords and tenants regarding energy efficiency in buildings, 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 Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) 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 375, nays 36, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]  
YEAS—375

NAYS—160  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (FL)  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn

Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Fattah  
Foster  
Fudge  
Grayson

Green, Al  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Holt  
Honda  
Horsford  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kilmer  
Kilmer  
Kilmer  
Kirkpatrick  
Langevin

Amodei  
Bachus  
Barber  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barrow (GA)

Napolitano  
Neal  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Pingree (ME)  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Richardson  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Larson (CT)  
McCarthy (NY)  
Negrete McLeod  
Pastor (AZ)  
Ruppersberger  
Schneider  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Cassidy  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chabot  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Coffman  
Cohen  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cook  
Cooper  
Costa  
Cotton  
Cramer  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Daines  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DelBene  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Duncan (TN)  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellmers  
Engel  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Farenthold  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Goodlatte

Gowdy  
Graves (MO)  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Griffin (AR)  
Grijalva  
Grimm  
Guthrie  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hall  
Hanabusa  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck (NV)  
Heck (WA)  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins  
Holding  
Holt  
Horsford  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huffman  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Jenkins  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kline  
Kuster  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Latham  
Latta  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebach  
Loftgren  
Long  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham (NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lynch  
Maffei  
Maloney  
Maloney, Sean  
Marino  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McAllister  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley

McMorris  
Rodgers  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
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  
Noem  
Nolan  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
O'Rourke  
Olson  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters (CA)  
Peters (MI)  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pingree (ME)  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Pocan  
Poe (TX)  
Polis  
Pompeo  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (SC)  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruiz  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanford  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schock  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions