

not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. 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. 1076.

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. COLLINS of Georgia. 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 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3762, RESTORING AMERICANS' HEALTHCARE FREEDOM RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 579 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 579

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3762) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on the Budget or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget or their respective designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. Section 3(b)(1) of House Resolution 5 is amended by striking "the first session of".

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), 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. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 579 provides for the consideration of the Senate-amended version of H.R. 3762, Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that, on October 23 of last year, the House passed our reconciliation bill, which went through the process, which went through regular order. The Senate amended that bill in December. It is now back in the House for further consideration.

This rule today also provides an extension of deposition authority, Mr. Speaker, for staff members who serve the Committees on Energy and Commerce; Financial Services; Science, Space, and Technology; and Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great way to start 2016. There is a new sheriff in town, as you know, who has a commitment to regular order, and the process we have today is regular order at its finest.

We are here today on a reconciliation provision that came from the United States Senate. It came from the United States Senate because it was first passed by the United States House. It was passed by the United States House because, for the first time in over a decade, we had a conferenced budget agreement coming to balance, to govern these United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, for 5 years, I have been in this institution. For 5 years, I have served on the Budget Committee. For 5 years, I have served on the Rules Committee. Never before has this House considered a reconciliation measure that will, with its passage today, go to the President's desk tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I do not care where you are on the policy. This is an issue of repealing the President's healthcare bill and the damaging impact it has had on my constituents across the district. I doubt seriously there is a Member in this body who has not made up his or her mind on where he or she is on this issue.

I will try to persuade no one on the merits today. What I will do, Mr. Speaker, is tell you that, when you get the process right, you have an opportunity to get the policy right, too.

This bill eliminates the penalty for noncompliance with the individual mandate, that individual mandate that changed the nature of the relationship between the governed and the governing. This bill would eliminate the penalty for noncompliance with the employer mandate.

It would eliminate the controversial reinsurance program. It would repeal the IRS' ability to provide insurance premium tax credits and cost-sharing subsidies. It would repeal the costly Medicare expansion. It would increase our investment in community health centers. All told, this bill would save the American people \$500 billion.

I am not so naive as to believe that this bill is going to be the end of the story today, Mr. Speaker. But I celebrate the fact that, with the passage of this rule, we will have an opportunity to vote and an opportunity to act in ways that we have not year, upon year, upon year. I do not believe our mandate in this House is to agree. I think our mandate in this House is to decide, and we cannot decide with a process that is broken. We must have a process that is open, as this process has been.

Mr. Speaker, the President raised the American consciousness as it relates to the discussion of health care in this country. He persuaded the American people that preexisting conditions have no place in the American body politic. I believe he was right on that. I don't believe that will ever change.

He persuaded the American people that insurance policies shouldn't have lifetime caps, that when you are facing your deepest and your worst fears in your family—when those have come true—that you ought not get bad news from your insurance company on that same day. I agree with him on that. I don't think we will ever change that.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, there are folks in my district who had policies that they counted on but that were canceled. There are businesses in my district that had a commitment to take care of their employees, but they have now been priced out of the market. There are folks who wanted to exercise their choices and not the President's choice.

If you go to the most recent Rasmussen polls, the American people prioritized lowering costs over universal coverage. I am committed to providing health care to those who cannot afford it, but I am committed to lowering costs for those who can.

The free market is the mechanism that we will use to lower costs. With this repeal today, we have an opportunity to begin that discussion in earnest for the first time in 5 years.

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

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 2, 2015.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chair, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, your committee's authority to conduct staff depositions pursuant to section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 (114th Congress) expires at the end of the legislative session. I am currently considering whether to recommend to the Committee on Rules an extension of that authority for the remainder of the 114th Congress.

In order to ensure that the Rules Committee has all of the information necessary to fully consider whether to grant an extension of this authority, I would appreciate it

if you could provide responses to the following items no later than 5 p.m. on December 8, 2015:

1. How many depositions has your committee conducted pursuant to the authority granted by section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 (114th Congress) during this legislative session?

2. Was having this authority helpful in obtaining voluntary interviews of one or more individuals in the course of your committee's oversight or in obtaining cooperation with document requests? How many times would you estimate that this authority resulted in voluntary interviews compliance with investigative requests that might not have been possible otherwise?

3. Please provide your rationale, including any relevant examples, for why the Rules Committee should extend this authority for your committee for the remainder of the Congress.

Thank you for your assistance in providing this information so the Committee on Rules can fully consider an extension of this authority. Should you or your staff have any questions, please feel free to contact either myself or the Rules Committee's staff director, Hugh Halpern.

Sincerely,

PETE SESSIONS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, December 9, 2015.

Hon. PETE SESSIONS,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SESSIONS: Thank you for the opportunity to discuss our interest in the authority provided by Section 3(b) of H. Res. 5, providing staff deposition authority to the Energy and Commerce Committee, among other committees of the House.

We have appreciated your support of our efforts to conduct thoughtful and effective oversight of the laws passed by Congress. As you well know, such oversight activities are an integral part of our Article I responsibilities. This is especially true at a time when the policy objectives of the Executive branch have regularly led it to exceed clear statutory direction, and its representatives are regularly recalcitrant in providing us with explanations for those actions.

My goal has been, wherever possible, to work cooperatively with the subjects of our oversight work to accomplish the committee's objectives. The Congress's oversight tools are overwhelmingly powerful, and in order to maintain public trust in our stewardship of those tools, I have felt that it is important for us to use the use of our authority in a way that is prudent and proportional.

But there are clearly times when the legitimate Congressional oversight prerogative requires the threat of compulsion. This is why we believe the authority provided to the committee in H. Res. 5 has been valuable to the committee's oversight objectives. While the committee has not yet been required to conduct depositions under this new authority, we believe the availability of this authority has facilitated our efforts to obtain significant voluntary cooperation in several important investigations. For example, in the matter related to videotapes showing procurement of donated fetal tissue, Planned Parenthood Federation of America and a number of its affiliates, as well as several tissue procurement organizations, have voluntarily provided thousands of pages of relevant documents. In a matter related to allegations of contamination at a National Institutes of Health drug manufacturing facility, the committee has received detailed information concerning the impact of such contamination on hundreds of patients in ex-

perimental drug trials. And, in the recent matter related to "defeat devices" installed by Volkswagen in thousands of its diesel-engine cars, the committee has begun to receive detailed information regarding internal corporate deliberations and interactions with Federal and state regulators. In each of these cases, we believe these significant voluntary productions of documents and information are due in large part to an understanding that the committee has the authority to compel such information, including now through compulsory depositions.

We also believe that the authority to compel staff depositions will be an especially important tool in investigations of the executive branch. In an ongoing matter regarding the Administration's justification for subsidies paid under a provision of the Affordable Care Act (ACA), senior executive branch representatives have repeatedly ignored requests by our committee and the Ways and Means committee for relevant information. The committees recently wrote to Secretaries Burwell and Lew requesting interviews with specific senior executive branch officials. I expect that these requests will almost certainly involve invocation of authority provided by Section 3(b) of H. Res. 5. Similarly, as the committee continues its oversight of other aspects of the ACA, including the failure of state exchanges and cooperatives, it is becoming aware of serious issues of waste and negligent program administration. As the current Administration enters its eighth and final year, and works feverishly to implement its policy objectives, I expect there will be other areas where we will need every oversight tool available, including staff deposition authority, to ensure that the Administration is faithfully executing the laws enacted by Congress, and holding itself accountable for the prudent and efficient expenditure of taxpayers' dollars.

Thank you again for your work to provide us with the tools to do effective oversight and ensuring that these tools continue to be available.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 2, 2015.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chair, Committee on Financial Services,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, your committee's authority to conduct staff depositions pursuant to section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 (114th Congress) expires at the end of the legislative session. I am currently considering whether to recommend to the Committee on Rules an extension of that authority for the remainder of the 114th Congress.

In order to ensure that the Rules Committee has all of the information necessary to fully consider whether to grant an extension of this authority, I would appreciate it if you could provide responses to the following items no later than 5 p.m. on December 8, 2015:

1. How many depositions has your committee conducted pursuant to the authority granted by section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 (114th Congress) during this legislative session?

2. Was having this authority helpful in obtaining voluntary interviews of one or more individuals in the course of your committee's oversight or in obtaining cooperation with document requests? How many times would you estimate that this authority resulted in voluntary interviews compliance with investigative requests that might not have been possible otherwise?

3. Please provide your rationale, including any relevant examples, for why the Rules

Committee should extend this authority for your committee for the remainder of the Congress.

Thank you for your assistance in providing this information so the Committee on Rules can fully consider an extension of this authority. Should you or your staff have any questions, please feel free to contact either myself or the Rules Committee's staff director, Hugh Halpern.

Sincerely,

PETE SESSIONS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, December 9, 2015.

Hon. PETE SESSIONS,
Chairman, House Committee on Rules,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SESSIONS: This is to request that the Committee on Rules extend the authority of the Committee on Financial Services (Committee) to conduct staff depositions pursuant to section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 which expires at the end of the present legislative session. Your letter of December 2, 2015, asks the Committee to provide the Committee on Rules with the following three categories of information in support of the Committee's request to extend deposition authority:

1. The number of depositions the Committee conducted pursuant to the authority granted by section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 (114th Congress) during the present legislative session;

2. Whether having deposition authority was helpful in obtaining voluntary interviews of individuals in the course of the Committee's oversight or in obtaining cooperation with document requests, and the estimated number of times that this authority resulted in voluntary interview compliance with investigative requests that might not have been possible otherwise; and

3. A rationale, including any relevant examples, for why the Committee on Rules should extend this authority to the Committee for the remainder of the Congress.

The Committee has conducted no depositions pursuant to the authority granted by section 3(b) of H. Res. 5. However, having deposition authority was and continues to be an invaluable tool in securing interviews and compliance with document requests. In the course of a single investigation, Committee staff conducted sixteen informal interviews of officials at three different agencies. As part of the same investigation, the Committee also sent interrogatories to a former government official and received a sworn written response in lieu of an interview. These interviews and interrogatories elicited crucial information that will be included in a Committee staff report that is expected to be released in early 2016.

The Committee's deposition authority has been a useful tool in securing agency compliance with the Committee's subpoenas and information requests. During the First Session of the 114th Congress the Committee sent four subpoenas duces tecum to four federal agencies. Three of these agencies ignored the Committee's subpoena until the Committee threatened to conduct transcribed interviews or depositions with agency officials responsible for delaying the production of the subpoenaed records, and the fourth will be sent a similar request for depositions or transcribed interviews in the near future.

Deposition authority continues to be critical to the Committee's oversight of an Administration that has been markedly indifferent to the Committee's subpoenas and voluntary information requests. The Committee also anticipates that it will be necessary to use its deposition authority in the near future as part of its oversight of independent

federal agencies under its jurisdiction. The Committee will likely continue to face obstruction from this Administration concerning future information requests and, accordingly, will need to utilize its deposition authority to effectuate full and prompt compliance with respect to these future requests.

Lastly, the Committee's deposition authority should be modestly expanded to cover individuals who have recently left the federal government in order to prevent agency officials from sidestepping congressional investigations by resigning from their government positions. Under the Committee's current deposition authority, agency officials involved in wrongdoing or otherwise under investigation can effectively avoid the Committee's efforts to interview or depose them by resigning from their government posts. If key officials should leave their positions before being deposed or interviewed, those officials involved in possible wrongdoing in connection with their government employment could strategically avoid being held accountable by Congress and, as a result, several of the Committee's investigations may be significantly hampered by such departures.

Several federal employees previously under investigation by the Committee have already left government service and it is likely that other officials will follow suit, particularly because the Administration's last year will coincide with the Second Session of this Congress. Accordingly, expanding the Committee's deposition authority to include former agency officials provided that (1) such officials served in the federal government within two years of being served with a deposition subpoena and (2) the purpose of the deposition relates to their government employment, would greatly strengthen the Committee's ability to conduct effective oversight of the Administration's last year, as it would allow the Committee to investigate and conduct effective oversight of officials who have recently left or might otherwise choose to leave their positions as the Administration winds down.

Should you need additional information, please have your staff contact the Committee's Chief Oversight Counsel, Uttam Dhillon. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 2, 2015.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chair, Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, your committee's authority to conduct staff depositions pursuant to section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 (114th Congress) expires at the end of the legislative session. I am currently considering whether to recommend to the Committee on Rules an extension of that authority for the remainder of the 114th Congress.

In order to ensure that the Rules Committee has all of the information necessary to fully consider whether to grant an extension of this authority, I would appreciate it if you could provide responses to the following items no later than 5 p.m. on December 8, 2015:

1. How many depositions has your committee conducted pursuant to the authority granted by section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 (114th Congress) during this legislative session?

2. Was having this authority helpful in obtaining voluntary interviews of one or more individuals in the course of your committee's oversight or in obtaining cooperation with document requests? How many times would you estimate that this authority resulted in voluntary interviews compliance

with investigative requests that might not have been possible otherwise?

3. Please provide your rationale, including any relevant examples, for why the Rules Committee should extend this authority for your committee for the remainder of the Congress.

Thank you for your assistance in providing this information so the Committee on Rules can fully consider an extension of this authority. Should you or your staff have any questions, please feel free to contact either myself or the Rules Committee's staff director, Hugh Halpern.

Sincerely,

PETE SESSIONS.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 7, 2015.

Hon. PETE SESSIONS,
Chairman, House Committee on Rules,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SESSIONS: Thank you for your letter concerning the Committee on Ways and Means' authority to conduct staff depositions pursuant to section 3(b) of H. Res. 5. Staff deposition authority is a powerful tool that has been extremely effective in gaining access to information that the Administration has been reluctant to provide. Reauthorization of this authority is essential for the Committee to exercise its oversight responsibility and ensure that the Administration is held accountable to the American people. Over the past year, this authority has been a valuable tool that has enhanced our oversight of the Administration and regulated entities.

The Committee has not yet needed to exercise compulsory process to depose individuals, as the deposition authority has been a successful means of encouraging voluntary compliance with the Committee's requests. It may become necessary in the near future to exercise staff deposition authority to obtain information from an Administration that is increasingly obstructing the Committee's oversight work. I appreciate your interest in how this authority has aided our oversight work, and I have provided answers to your questions below.

1. How many depositions has your committee conducted pursuant to the authority granted by section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 (114th Congress) during this legislative session?

Response: The Ways and Means Committee has not needed to compel depositions in 2015, largely because the threat of using this authority has been successful in urging voluntary cooperation with the Committee's oversight. However, the Committee is in the process of requesting interviews with eight Administration officials in the course of its investigation of the Administration's decision to pay Cost Sharing Reduction subsidies, despite the fact that Congress did not appropriate funds for that purpose. The Committee has notified the Administration that if these eight officials are not produced for interviews willingly, the Committee will use compulsory process. More information on this investigation is provided in response to Question 3.

2. Was having this authority helpful in obtaining voluntary interviews of one or more individuals in the course of your committee's oversight in obtaining cooperation with document requests? How many times would you estimate that this authority resulted in voluntary interviews compliance with investigative requests that might not have been possible otherwise?

Response: Staff deposition authority was effective in facilitating voluntary interviews in the course of the Committee's oversight work. We estimate that the Committee has

gained access to two Administration officials in the course of two separate investigations into the Administration's funding of the Cost Sharing Reduction program and the IRS's obstruction of tax exempt applications by conservative organizations. In the course of the Committee's Cost Sharing Reduction investigation the Committee also sought and obtained document productions from nine insurance companies and a national insurance trade organization. Several of those companies were reluctant to produce documents, and oral reference to the Committee's authority to subpoena documents and depose the companies' employees encouraged voluntary compliance with our requests. More information about each of these successes is provided below.

3. Please provide your rationale, including any relevant examples, for why the Rules Committee should extend this authority for your committee for the remainder of the Congress.

Response: Staff deposition authority has been a key factor in several investigations conducted by the Oversight Subcommittee. Three examples illustrate this fact:

During the course of the Committee's investigation on the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) unfairly targeting conservative organizations applying for tax-exempt status, the Administration was reluctant to cooperate with requests to produce certain witnesses for interviews. One such witness was Hannah Stott-Bumsted, who served as legal counsel to the U.S. Department of the Treasury. During the course of the investigation, staff discovered that the Administration knew that some of Lois Lerner's e-mails were missing months before the IRS informed the Committee. From our interviews, Committee staff knew that an IRS employee, Catherine Duval, likely told her friend, Stott-Bumsted, that the e-mails were missing and that Stott-Bumsted then informed others in the Administration. The Committee requested an interview with Stott-Bumsted to confirm this information, but the Treasury Department dragged out the request for months. When staff suggested that the Committee would depose Stott-Bumsted if Treasury would not produce her voluntarily for an interview, Treasury agreed to produce her.

The Ways and Means Committee, along with the Energy and Commerce Committee, is investigating the Administration's decision to fund several programs established by the President's health care law, including Cost Sharing Reduction subsidies and the Basic Health Program, through an appropriation reserved specifically for tax refunds. The Committees believe that the method the Administration has used to fund the Cost Sharing Reduction program and the Basic Health Program may violate the Anti-Deficiency Act and Article I, Sec. 9, Clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution establishing Congress's appropriation authority. The Treasury Department and the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) have refused to produce documents in response to the Committees' inquiries. The Committees are in the process of requesting interviews of Treasury and HHS employees. The Committees already have interviewed a senior HHS official regarding the Basic Health Program, and staff believes it was unlikely that the Administration would have produced that official for an informal interview if the Committees did not have deposition authority. As the Administration continues to ignore Congress's requests for information, deposition authority will be a crucial tool in order to proceed with these investigations.

While investigating the Administration's funding of the Cost Sharing Reduction program, the Committee determined that insurance companies might possess relevant infor-

mation. The Committee sought information and documents from nine insurance companies and the trade organization America's Health Insurance Plans. Although some companies complied willingly with the request, others were reluctant to search for or produce documents. During negotiations with those companies, the Committee was able to persuade those companies to produce documents by threatening to issue subpoenas and depose employees. Fearing the reputational and financial consequences of receiving a publicized subpoena or deposition notification, the companies complied with the Committee's requests.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter, and for giving the Committee the opportunity to highlight the value of deposition authority in its oversight work. If you have any additional questions about the Committee's use of staff deposition authority, please do not hesitate to contact Tegan Gelfand with the Ways and Means Committee staff.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY,

Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means.

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 2, 2015.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chair, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, your committee's authority to conduct staff depositions pursuant to section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 (114th Congress) expires at the end of the legislative session. I am currently considering whether to recommend to the Committee on Rules an extension of that authority for the remainder of the 114th Congress.

In order to ensure that the Rules Committee has all of the information necessary to fully consider whether to grant an extension of this authority, I would appreciate it if you could provide responses to the following items no later than 5 p.m. on December 8, 2015:

1. How many depositions has your committee conducted pursuant to the authority granted by section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 (114th Congress) during this legislative session?

2. Was having this authority helpful in obtaining voluntary interviews of one or more individuals in the course of your committee's oversight or in obtaining cooperation with document requests? How many times would you estimate that this authority resulted in voluntary interviews compliance with investigative requests that might not have been possible otherwise?

3. Please provide your rationale, including any relevant examples, for why the Rules Committee should extend this authority for your committee for the remainder of the Congress.

Thank you for your assistance in providing this information so the Committee on Rules can fully consider an extension of this authority. Should you or your staff have any questions, please feel free to contact either myself or the Rules Committee's staff director, Hugh Halpern.

Sincerely,

PETE SESSIONS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, December 8, 2015.

Hon. PETE SESSIONS,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SESSIONS: On December 3, 2015, I received your letter regarding the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology's authority to conduct staff deposi-

tions pursuant to section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 (114th Congress). As you indicated, the Committee's deposition authority expires at the end of this session. I appreciate the opportunity to highlight the many positive results the Committee has obtained utilizing its deposition authority. I believe the following responses to questions posed in your letter reaffirms that deposition authority is a necessary tool for conducting robust oversight of the executive branch and limiting the overreaches of the Administration in its final year.

1. How many depositions has your committee conducted pursuant to the authority granted by section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 (114th Congress) during this legislative session?

On September 17, 2015, the Committee conducted a deposition of National Weather Service (NWS) contract specialist Mark Miller, who facilitated an inappropriate contract that cost taxpayers nearly half a million dollars. In 2009, then-National Weather Service Deputy Chief Financial Officer Peter Jiron prepared to retire from the NWS. Mr. Jiron's supervisor, then-Chief Financial Officer Robert Byrd, suggested Mr. Jiron return to the NWS post-retirement as a consultant. One month before officially retiring from the NWS, Mr. Jiron negotiated the terms of his consultancy, drafted and edited the associated Statement of Work, drafted terms and conditions of his contract with NWS as a consultant, and eventually signed the consulting agreement. The contract Mr. Jiron drafted for himself increased his salary and provided for housing at the expense of American taxpayers. This contract is a violation of federal laws and regulations because Mr. Jiron used his influential position at NWS to obtain the consulting position.

According to a report by the Department of Commerce Office of Inspector General, Mr. Miller had no concerns with Mr. Jiron becoming a consultant immediately after his retirement from the agency and had heard of other employees doing the same thing. Mr. Miller's statement raises questions about whether this type of contract misconduct occurs regularly. Indeed, the OIG found the "lack of understanding about applicable laws and regulations on the part of multiple NOAA officials" so concerning that the OIG is "taking steps to ascertain whether this matter is indicative of more systemic 'revolving door' contracting problems within the agency. Unfortunately, several former senior officials refused to speak to the Committee voluntarily. After the Department of Commerce failed to adequately respond to multiple letters from the Committee requesting information, the Committee determined the best course of action was to interview Mark Miller because of his role facilitating Mr. Jiron's contract.

Because Mr. Miller is not a senior official at NWS and there is no evidence indicating he intentionally committed wrongdoing, the Committee requested to speak with him in a private setting. Through his attorney, Mr. Miller refused to voluntarily speak with Committee staff. Consequently, the Committee issued a subpoena compelling Mr. Miller's testimony in a deposition. During the deposition, Mr. Miller invoked his 5th Amendment right. While Mr. Miller did not speak on the record, the deposition made it possible for the Committee to pursue immunity for Mr. Miller. Majority staff is currently in discussions with Minority staff about moving forward with immunity for Mr. Miller. This is significant because the Committee not only has the opportunity to learn what happened during the creation of Mr. Jiron's contract, but also gives the Committee an opportunity to determine whether it is a common occurrence for departing NWS officials to draft their own consulting

contracts and whether legislation is necessary to remedy the issue. Given Mr. Miller's knowledge of the agency's contracting methods, he is in a unique position to provide information regarding whether such incidents are a systemic problem. The Committee is continuing to move forward with this issue in large part because of deposition authority, including the ability to recall Mr. Miller to continue his deposition.

2. Was having this authority helpful in obtaining voluntary interviews of one or more individuals in the course of your committee's oversight or in obtaining cooperation with document requests? How many times would you estimate that this authority resulted in voluntary interviews compliance with investigative requests that might not have been possible otherwise?

Yes, during this session there are numerous instances of the Committee obtaining documents and voluntary interviews because of its deposition authority. In fact, as the following examples show, many key interviews and documents would likely not have been obtained without the Committee's ability to compel on-the-record interviews in a private setting.

NWS: CONTRACTING MISMANAGEMENT

Earth Resources Technology (ERT), the consulting firm who employed former National Weather Service (NWS) Deputy Chief Financial Officer Peter Jiron after he drafted his own post-retirement contract, was reluctant to speak with Committee staff. The company is a women-owned small business that apparently did not intentionally facilitate the inappropriate contract. Appearing at a public hearing would likely have been embarrassing for the company's CEO, Dr. Jingli Yang. As a result, after reviewing the Committee's rules regarding compulsory process for depositions, Dr. Yang's representative agreed to make her available voluntarily.

During the Committee's questioning of Dr. Yang, she acknowledged flaws in the contracting system that allowed Mr. Jiron's contract to move forward. For instance, there was not a safeguard in place to ensure that new ERT contractors were not current government employees. ERT relied on each new contractor to receive permission from ethics officials at individual agencies, but did not keep track internally. As a result of the Committee's questioning, ERT is implementing a plan to include additional steps in its contracting process when hiring new contractors, including paperwork to ensure contractors are not currently government employees. Additionally, ERT provided e-mails to the Committee regarding the facilitation of Mr. Jiron's consulting contract.

Furthermore, during the Committee's investigation of contracting misconduct at NWS, the agency initially refused to provide documents or make agency officials available to the Committee. After the Committee considered the use of compulsory process for agency officials to appear for interviews, the agency agreed to provide several key officials voluntarily, including Laura Furgione, the Deputy Assistant Administrator of NWS. Moreover, after the Committee requested to speak with additional NWS employees, the agency voluntarily began producing documents and information. Among the documents produced were e-mails between Mr. Jiron and Mr. Byrd, the former Chief Financial Officer at NWS, discussing Mr. Jiron's improper consulting contract.

NOAA: QUESTIONABLE CLIMATE STUDY

This past summer, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) released a study refuting the long-established findings that warming of the earth experienced a hiatus during much of that past two

decades. This study has large implications because it changes historical temperature data to show increased warming and is therefore used to justify costly regulations and further action on climate change. Shortly after publication of the study, the Committee began investigating the circumstances surrounding its release, sending a letter to NOAA requesting documents and information related to the publication of the study. After NOAA's unwillingness to produce communications related to the study, the Committee issued a subpoena in October 2013. The Committee continues to investigate the publication of this study, especially in light of whistleblower allegations that divulged potential political interference with the scientific process and that NOAA scientists were uncomfortable with the study's methodology and conclusions. While NOAA has still not produced all requested and subpoenaed communications, NOAA agreed to make the authors of the study available voluntarily for questioning by Committee staff.

Additionally, following the Committee's subpoena in October 2013 to NOAA for communications related to the study refuting a hiatus in the rise of earth's temperature, NOAA officials refused to comply with the subpoena. Shortly thereafter, the Committee informed NOAA of its need to interview agency officials who had a significant role in the agency's publication and release of the study. Following conversations with NOAA officials informing the agency of the Committee's ability to compel testimony, NOAA has agreed to arrange for the requested individuals to meet voluntarily with Committee staff.

NIST: MANUFACTURING ILLEGAL DRUGS

On July 18, 2015, National Institute of Standards (NIST) Police Officer Christopher Bartley caused an explosion on the NIST campus while attempting to manufacture the illegal drug methamphetamine. The Committee sent a letter requesting documents and information on July 22, 2015. NIST officials initially insisted that the matter was being managed by the Department of Commerce Officer of Inspector General and law enforcement officials. After considering the use of compulsory process to obtain interviews with agency staff regarding NIST's unresponsiveness, NIST agreed to voluntarily make Willie Mays, the Director of NIST, available to Committee staff.

During questioning by Committee staff, Director May acknowledged for the first time the existence of building records revealing the names of each individual NIST employee that entered the building where the explosion occurred. After obtaining the building records, Committee staff was able to track the movements of Mr. Bartley and who he interacted with leading up to the explosion. Despite telling Committee staff that four officers are on duty at all times at NIST, the building records reveal that only two officers were on duty during the explosion. The Committee continues to investigate misconduct and mismanagement at NIST Police Services.

EPA: PEBBLE MINE

During the course of the Committee's ongoing investigation into EPA's actions to limit the Pebble Mine in Bristol Bay, Alaska, the Committee learned information concerning an EPA regional administrator's involvement in spearheading the EPA's actions to stop construction of the mine. When the Committee spoke with EPA officials, explaining the Committee's need to interview the regional administrator and explaining the Committee's ability to compel testimony, the EPA responded that it would make the regional administrator available

to the Committee voluntarily to answer questions from Committee staff and for testimony at a congressional hearing.

EPA: REGULATORY OVERREACH

During the Committee's ongoing oversight of the EPA's regulatory and policy agenda, the Committee sent letters on three separate matters in May of this year, requesting documents concerning the agency's coordination with outside environmental groups, proposed Waters of the United States rule, and the agency's efforts to solicit public comments on EPA regulations during the notice and comment period for proposed rulemakings. In the face of the agency's continued slow rolling of its response to each of the three letters, Committee staff spoke with agency officials, explaining the Committee's authority to compel testimony from agency officials directly relevant to each of the three inquiries. Following the Committee's conversations with the EPA explaining its authority, the agency began producing documents responsive to the Committee's requests. Additionally, the EPA agreed to make an agency official directly relevant to the Committee's inquiries available voluntarily for a briefing.

In September 2015, the Committee wrote to the EPA concerning its plans to issue a proposed rule for ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards and requesting interviews with two agency officials relevant to the Committee's inquiry. During follow-up conversations with the EPA concerning the Committee's request for interviews and following significant push back from the EPA to making the individuals available, Committee staff explained the Committee's authority to compel testimony. Following these discussions, the Committee expects that the EPA will voluntarily provide a briefing on the matter with individuals relevant to the Committee's inquiry.

3. Please provide your rationale, including any relevant examples, for why the Rules Committee should extend this authority for your committee for the remainder of the Congress.

As evidenced by the many examples discussed in this letter, the Committee's deposition authority has been a critical tool used to further the Committee's oversight. The Committee's authority to compel testimony has proven to be a key resource in obtaining compliance from Executive Branch departments and agencies with outstanding document and information requests, as well as with obtaining access to government officials essential to the Committee's inquiries for questioning by Committee staff.

As the Obama Administration comes to an end in the next year, the administration is working vigorously to finalize more expansive regulations than ever to fulfill its environmental agenda. Because of the administration's tireless efforts, it is even more imperative for the Committee to conduct robust oversight of the administration's environmental initiatives by exercising oversight of agencies directly within the Committee's jurisdictional authority, including NOAA, NIST, and the EPA.

Further, a recent article in the Washington Post outlining a few of the Committee's oversight initiatives this year acknowledged that the Committee has taken on an "aggressive role in oversight." The Committee's ability to compel testimony has proven to be a central component of the Committee's ability to advance its investigations, while also enhancing Congress' role as an institution to serve as a check on the administration's policies.

Thank you for the opportunity to share the Committee's experience utilizing deposition authority. If you have any questions, please

do not hesitate to contact me or my staff about this matter.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as we begin the second session of the 114th Congress, there is a long list of important issues that we could be talking about today.

We could be talking about ways to support job creation, to grow the economy, to improve gun safety, to strengthen national security, to pass an immigration reform bill, and many other important priorities.

Instead, we are talking about H.R. 3762, the latest attempt by House Republicans to defund Planned Parenthood and to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

As our economy continues to recover, we should be focused on expanding opportunity and helping more Americans get ahead. Instead, we are starting the new year by debating a bill that, if it ever became law, would put the health care of 22 million Americans in jeopardy and would further restrict women's access to vital healthcare services.

This is yet another blatant political move by Republicans to appeal to and to appease their right-wing base. Republican leaders have said it themselves. Senate Republican Whip JOHN CORNYN called this a "political exercise." He said, "I think we all recognize the President isn't likely to sign this bill so it's not going to become a law." Then, why on earth are we wasting the American people's time with this terrible bill?

This month we have heard that Speaker RYAN "will push to turn the House into a platform for ambitious Republican policy ideas." The 62nd vote to repeal or to undermine the Affordable Care Act. The 11th vote to attack women's health. Really? That is the platform for ambitious Republican policy ideas? I think the American people should sue Republicans for malpractice.

When Speaker RYAN took the gavel last fall, there was so much talk about a new chapter and fresh ideas. Instead, we are starting 2016 with more of the stale and politically motivated bills we have become accustomed to in this Republican-controlled Congress. We are constantly being told by Republicans that they have better ideas and that they have a better approach to health care. Really? Where is it?

I would remind my Republican friends that, in 2011, you passed a bill that actually tasked you to come up with an alternative to the Affordable Care Act. You came up with nothing. Just last year you passed another bill

to come up with an alternative, and, once again, you came up with nothing.

Now here we are again with a bill that repeals the Affordable Care Act and that tasks the Republicans to come up with an alternative. I am curious. Where is your alternative? Maybe it is in your notes. Is it hidden in some secret room in the Capitol? Maybe Donald Trump has it. Perhaps we should alert the Capitol Police. Better yet, maybe we could call the FBI to locate the Republican plan on health care.

I remind my friends that you are in charge. You run this place. You can bring whatever you want to this House floor. Maybe you should bring a bloodhound to the House floor to try to find your alternative healthcare plan.

Governing is something that my friends on the Republican side are not very good at. They are very good about saying no to everything, but they can't say yes to anything. The Republican plan on health care is, essentially, a sound bite. Their prescription is "take two tax breaks and call me in the morning."

Not only have the Republicans done nothing to expand health care for the American people—and, again, they are in charge—but they have actually consistently tried to undermine health access for millions of Americans, to take health care away from people in this country.

□ 1400

If the Republicans had it their way and actually repealed the Affordable Care Act, millions of young people under the age of 26 would be thrown off their parents' health plans, being a woman would once again be a pre-existing condition, and much more of the progress made by the ACA would be rolled back.

Mr. Speaker, contrary to what we often hear from Republicans, the Affordable Care Act is not killing the economy. I know facts get in the way of their arguments, but the fact is that America has seen a record 69 straight months of job growth and all signs point to this historic growth continuing.

In September 2012, when unemployment was at 8.1 percent, the Republican presidential nominee, Mitt Romney, claimed that the unemployment rate would stay at 8 percent if President Obama were reelected President. Well, President Obama was reelected President, and Mitt Romney was wrong. What actually happened? The unemployment rate has steadily dropped each year and is now at a 7-year low of 5 percent, with employers adding about 210,000 jobs a month through last November as more Americans get back to work.

One of the frequent Republican claims that we have heard is that businesses would shift to part-time workers to avoid the Affordable Care Act's requirement to provide healthcare coverage to full-time employees. A new

study released this week shows that the ACA resulted in little change in the number of hours worked, including the first 6 months of 2015 when the employer mandate first took effect for larger companies.

As Politico noted, this study "pokes a major hole in a beloved conservative talking point—that ObamaCare will force employers to cut employees' hours." The truth is that researchers found no major changes in the probability of people working fewer hours in 2013, 2014, or 2015.

We have also heard Republicans' claim that the ACA's expansion of Medicaid would decrease employment among low-income workers, but another study released this week showed no major changes in the way low-income workers fit into the labor market during the first 15 months of Medicaid expansion under ACA. Contrary to conservative talking points, the new coverage didn't push low-income adults to switch jobs, move from full-time to part-time work, or rush to find new jobs.

In fact, the expansion of Medicaid under the Affordable Care Act has made a tremendous difference in increasing access to health care for America's most vulnerable families. Since October of 2013, more than 12.3 million Americans have been able to get coverage thanks to the expansion of Medicaid. As a result of marketplace coverage and Medicaid expansion, hospital uncompensated care costs were reduced by an estimated \$7.4 billion in 2014, resulting in huge savings for consumers across this country.

That is the difference between us. Democrats believe health care is a right and my Republican friends believe it is a privilege.

To make matters worse, the bill before us today would also defund Planned Parenthood, which would put millions of low-income women—and men, I would add—at risk of losing access to critical health services. The fact is that one in five women has relied on a Planned Parenthood health center for care in her lifetime, and Planned Parenthood serves 2.7 million patients each year.

Additionally, Planned Parenthood clinics often serve as one of the few affordable care options available for many women and men. Cutting off access to the critical health services Planned Parenthood provides to some of our most vulnerable citizens is simply wrong. It is unconscionable. Sixty-three percent of voters, including 72 percent of independents, agree. This whole effort to defund Planned Parenthood fits the Republican pattern of targeting poor people, and, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, it is outrageous.

While our Nation's community health centers do incredible work, the Republican claim that community health centers by themselves could suddenly pick up all the slack if Planned Parenthood is defunded is just not true, and my Republican friends

know that. The idea that our community health centers could overnight suddenly step up and step in and cover millions of new patients is absurd. In fact, in 21 percent of the counties with a Planned Parenthood health center, Planned Parenthood is the only safety net family planning provider.

Finally, let me just also voice my strong objection to the provision in this rule which extends for another year the unrestricted authority for four House committees to conduct staff depositions at any time, on any subject, for any reason. Some committees have barely used this authority in the past year, and, when they have, it has often been abused with the threat of subpoena held over people's heads.

The power to compel American citizens to provide testimony under oath should be rarely used and specifically authorized. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think the American people are tired of the partisan witch hunts that we have grown accustomed to under this Republican leadership in this House.

We are starting the new year, not by working in a bipartisan way to do the people's business. Unfortunately, we are starting the new year debating the same old same old, bills that put politics ahead of people. Mr. Speaker, that is truly sad.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE).

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is intrusive, it is expensive, and it is full of broken promises. Its biggest failure is the simple fact that it makes life more difficult for hardworking Americans. In my district, I have heard countless horror stories from parents, from seniors, from businessowners, all of which underscore that there is simply nothing affordable about the perversely named Affordable Care Act.

There is the story of Morris from Rowlett, Texas, who is the sole breadwinner for his family. Now, the least expensive plan that Morris could find on healthcare.gov costs him \$854 per month, plus a \$12,700 deductible. ObamaCare is preventing Morris from investing in things that really matter, like his son's college education.

Take Heather from Pottsville, who on a \$700-per-month income simply can't afford the \$287 per month that ObamaCare costs her. With health problems of her own, ObamaCare is preventing Heather from taking care of her 13-year-old daughter and a father with multiple sclerosis.

Then there is Bryan, a small-business owner in my district who has seen a 50 percent increase in his monthly healthcare payments and deductible under ObamaCare. On top of that, Bryan can't grow his business beyond 50 employees because he can't afford to comply with the employer mandate or face its penalties.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of the stories that demonstrate the very

real problems that ObamaCare is creating for hardworking Americans and why a better name for this law would be the Unaffordable Care Act. It is why I stand in support today of a reconciliation bill that will dismantle ObamaCare and defund Planned Parenthood for the next year.

I promised my constituents that I would do more than just vote to repeal ObamaCare, that I would help send a bill to the Oval Office that actually will get rid of this terrible law. Today, I am keeping that promise.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and the reconciliation bill, just another budget measure being used as a vehicle to defund Planned Parenthood.

This is the 11th Republican attack on women's health in this Congress, including four prior votes to defund Planned Parenthood. While House Republicans have already passed 10 antiwomen health measures and are now voting on their 11th, they have not passed a single measure that helps women get the reproductive health care that they need.

So here we are—Happy New Year and with a new House Speaker—facing the same old story: Republican attacks on women's access to health care in the very first week. The news this morning reported Republicans are saying this bill will show the American people the difference between the political parties in this election year. For me, that is a shameful admission. The difference is clear: My Republican colleagues remain willing to play partisan politics at the expense of women's health care. The women of America are watching, and they don't like what they see.

Last fall, House Republicans threatened to shut down the government if must-pass omnibus legislation did not defund Planned Parenthood. Now, that effort was stopped, but only by promises to include a defunding provision in this budget reconciliation bill and by the creation of a select panel to investigate Planned Parenthood.

Never mind the fact that three House committees have already investigated Planned Parenthood following the release of selectively edited videos manufactured by an antiabortion group and that none of these committees found any evidence of wrongdoing.

Apparently, uninterested in the facts, Republicans have continued to make inflammatory and baseless claims. They also push forward on their new select investigative panel, meaning even more taxpayer dollars will be spent targeting the Nation's reproductive healthcare providers instead of improving America's access to critical healthcare services.

Having established this select panel, House Republicans have now refused to wait for the panel to hold even its first meeting before voting, once again, to defund Planned Parenthood. In this at-

mosphere, it is hard to imagine that any investigation will be fair and objective. Members have already declared the organization guilty as charged, and there is no reason to believe that they will be more openminded with regard to others who provide safe and legal reproductive healthcare services in this Nation.

Facts matter. The truth matters. Despite our objection to the creation of the select panel, as its ranking member, I will work to ensure that the investigation is as fair and transparent and as objective as possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. The relentless attacks on Planned Parenthood and other healthcare providers must stop and they will stop. Planned Parenthood serves almost 3 million American women, and there is no evidence of wrongdoing by Planned Parenthood to possibly justify the defunding of the Nation's leading provider of reproductive health care whose work helps to avoid thousands and thousands of abortions because they provide planned parenthood.

We should stop this latest effort to defund Planned Parenthood—and we will because this bill is going nowhere—and instead take affirmative steps to improve women's access to health care in this great Nation. Enough is enough.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the vice chairwoman of the Rules Committee.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, this rule and the underlying motion to concur with the Senate amendment to H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act, mark a significant achievement for Americans who value life and economic liberty.

After years of work and dozens of votes in the face of acerbic rhetoric hurled at us from across the aisle, this House will send to the President's desk legislation to remove the heavy hand of the Federal Government from Americans' health care and end the stream of taxpayer dollars that flows to an organization that brutally kills precious unborn lives.

When the so-called Affordable Care Act was passed in 2010, Republicans warned that the law would cause significant increases in the cost of health care and health insurance, reduce full-time jobs and work-hours available, and strain the safety net until it breaks.

The American people were sold a bill of goods that has proven to be only a list of empty promises. Most of us recall clearly these assurances: that we could keep our insurance plans, that we could keep our doctors, and that our out-of-pocket costs would go down.

Mr. Speaker, the letters, emails, and telephone calls from my constituents

tell me clearly that the Affordable Care Act has proven to be anything but affordable for North Carolinians, and the law has limited access to care and wasted billions of taxpayer dollars. It is time to undo this harmful law.

Also included in the Senate amendment is a provision first passed by this House to stop the flow of Federal mandatory funds to Planned Parenthood. While Planned Parenthood does not receive direct Federal funding for abortions, these actions are warranted, as a recent report from the Government Accountability Office shows that the organization receives an average of 500 million taxpayer dollars each year for other lines of business.

Money is fungible and the Federal funds that Planned Parenthood receives ultimately subsidize their abortion services. Fortunately, there are many more options for women's health care than the discredited abortion provider, Planned Parenthood.

While Planned Parenthood has only approximately 665 clinics, federally qualified health centers, FQHCs, and rural health centers, RHCs, have more than 13,000 publicly supported locations providing alternatives for women's health care. This means there are 20 federally funded comprehensive care clinics for every one Planned Parenthood. This bill does not change the availability of funds for women's health. It simply establishes a safeguard so that the Nation's largest abortion chain is not the one providing such services.

When Federal taxpayers have legitimate concerns that their hard-earned dollars are flowing to organizations that sanction the dismemberment of unborn children and that our system of law has loopholes allowing these atrocities to continue, we, as their elected representatives, are responsible for ensuring these concerns are heard and responded to.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, our freedom rests on the cornerstone right we all have to life, and I fear we have lost sight of that.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying motion to protect innocent lives and restore our liberty.

□ 1415

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO).

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and join in strong opposition to this rule that will bring forward dangerous legislation that harms women, seniors, and families across America.

In our first week back in this session, it is appalling that the Republicans believe defunding Planned Parenthood, rolling back women's access to health

screenings, or raising prescription drug prices for seniors is a top priority.

This latest attempt to defund Planned Parenthood and repeal the ACA is nothing short of an attack on women and low-income Americans. Seventy-five percent of Planned Parenthood patients are low-income and often have nowhere else to go. Eliminating funding will have devastating consequences on the health of young women and men, Latinas, and LGBT Americans.

This isn't just dangerous public policy. It is completely out of touch with the vast majority of Americans.

When I meet with my constituents across Phoenix, I hear families worried about affording college, students struggling to pay their tuition and the amount of debt they have, and hard-working Americans who can't afford the skyrocketing costs of prescription drugs. But I also hear relief: relief that came from the ACA, relief from young women who no longer have to pay for copays for birth control when they go to the pharmacy, relief that their annual exams no longer come with cost sharing, relief from seniors whose prescription drug costs are lower because we got rid of the Medicare doughnut hole, relief from parents that their child with chronic disease can't be denied insurance coverage—all thanks to the Affordable Care Act.

Women and all Americans deserve better than playing the same politics over their bodies and their health care. I urge my colleagues to defeat this dangerous rule and oppose the reconciliation package on behalf of millions of families who can't afford to lose care once again.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE), a strong member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my Committee on Rules colleague for yielding, and I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying legislation.

This is a monumental vote. For the first time since Republicans took control of this House in 2011, we are in a position to send a bill to the President's desk that would dismantle ObamaCare and eliminate Federal funding for Planned Parenthood, who we know sold body parts from aborted babies. This piece of legislation is about listening to the American people and working to advance their concerns right here in the people's House.

ObamaCare is fundamentally broken. It is not making health care more affordable. In fact, it is doing just the opposite. As The New York Times pointed out just the other day, many Americans find it cheaper to pay the tax penalty and remain uninsured instead of signing up for a healthcare plan they simply cannot afford. That is exactly the opposite of how this law was supposed to work.

My colleagues on the other side say that Republicans want to take away

people's health care. Let me tell you what took away people's health care: this law did.

I hear stories every time I go to the grocery store or hold a townhall meeting from people who had a healthcare plan that they liked, a plan they could afford, a plan that worked for them. Now, the President said over and over again, "If you like your healthcare plan, you can keep it." That was not true.

The people of the United States suffer today because they lost their healthcare plans or they simply can't afford the cost and the new healthcare plan that has been forced on them. If you want to talk about taking away people's health care from someone, that is what this law did. That is what the President of the United States did and what he continues to do with this law.

We need to move past this government-mandated healthcare plan and instead empower the American people and their doctors. The people don't want the Federal Government to tell them what type of health insurance they need or what doctors they should see. That is simply not the role of the Federal Government. We should get rid of this awful law and, instead, move forward with healthcare reform that puts the interests of the patient first, not the interests of the Federal Government.

Let's pass this bill and send it to the President's desk, and then he gets to make a choice. He can stand with the American people or he can stand against the American people. If he chooses to veto this bill, then the American people will have seen a clear choice between two different Americas: an America where the government knows best or an America where the people, the hardworking people who have made our country great, where the people are empowered.

Let's make the President decide. Let's hold him accountable. Let's do the work of our constituents, and let's pass this bill on behalf of every American who lost their healthcare plan or saw their healthcare costs increase. Let's do this for them.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama says this is a monumental vote. Let me get this straight. A bill that is going to the White House that will get the fastest veto that we have ever seen ever happen in this country is somehow a monumental vote? I would suggest to my Republican colleagues, if they think this is a monumental vote, they have low standards.

This is a political sound bite. This is a waste of taxpayer money. This is just a waste of everybody's time. We ought to be talking about how to strengthen this economy, about how to get more people health care, not these political sound bites that really waste precious resources here in the Congress and, by the way, cost taxpayers money. All this wasted debate here, all this wasted time is costing taxpayers money.

Let's find ways to make the Affordable Care Act even better. Let's find ways to make sure that 100 percent of the people in this country have the health care that they need, not be debating a sound bite, by the way, that, if it ever passed, would throw 22 million people off of health care. How can you go back to your districts and be proud of that?

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for the time.

Here we go again. Congress reconvenes and the majority is starting out the new year doing the same old thing. We come back from the holidays, a time for family, for reflection, and we begin this new year with a vote to cripple the health care of our families. The vote today would defund Planned Parenthood, and it would repeal essential pieces of the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, I really don't know how else to put this except to say that the Affordable Care Act works. It actually works for the people that I represent, for Californians, and for Americans, especially those who never had health care before.

Not only has this law been affirmed constitutionally by our Supreme Court, it has survived countless votes to dismantle it in this Chamber and the other. But thanks to the Affordable Care Act, the folks in my district have seen massive improvement in their community. From 2012 to 2014, more than 60,000 people at home in my area now have health insurance, and they never had it before.

This is just about partisan politics today. You are right, Mr. MCGOVERN, it is just about partisan politics. Instead of focusing on the issues that are important to our families—immigration reform, addressing climate change, creating jobs—no, here we go back again.

Mr. Speaker, let's cut the partisan politics. Let's do what families need. Let's vote against this.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to yield 2 minutes to a new Member from the great State of Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying bill, and I commend the months of hard work from my colleagues to put together this historic piece of legislation. I likewise thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the other side of the aisle acts as though words are meaningless. The truth is the President promised the American people that, if they liked their insurance, they could keep it. He promised. He promised also that this would be more affordable health care.

The reality, Mr. Speaker, is none of those promises were true. In fact, now we have millions of Americans who have lost their insurance because of

this bill. We have millions of Americans now who are in a situation having to decide between drastically increasing health insurance costs that they have to pay or facing penalties and consequences for not participating.

Mr. Speaker, the President also promised that this healthcare law, ObamaCare, would boost the economy. In fact, it has discouraged businesses from hiring more than 50 people and from having more than 30 hours a week for their workers to work.

The President also told the American people that ObamaCare would not increase the deficit. As has already been mentioned here today, that is absolutely wrong. The CBO has clearly identified how the cost is going to increase tremendously.

This reconciliation package remedies the harm and the devastation of the broken promises of this President. It repeals the very foundation of ObamaCare and places a 1-year moratorium on funding Planned Parenthood.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, this is Alice in Wonderland. First the verdict, then the trial. The Republicans have declared the verdict against Planned Parenthood before ever holding the trial. With no shred of evidence aside from a series of blatantly manipulated videos, without a single House committee finding any wrongdoing, without the select committee ostensibly set up to look at Planned Parenthood holding a single meeting, they have decided in this bill to cut off all Federal funding, including Medicaid reimbursement, for one organization.

The legislation we are voting on today targets one organization and cuts it off from all Federal funding, including reimbursement for Medicaid services provided, for no justifiable legislative reason beyond punishment for offering a constitutionally protected medical procedure.

This smacks of a clearly unconstitutional bill of attainder. The prohibition on bills of attainder exists to prevent just this kind of targeted attack on a single group. You cannot use legislation to punish a single organization without any evidence or fair legislative process simply because you don't like it.

While the legislation never mentions the words "Planned Parenthood," we have heard and will hear here today Planned Parenthood's name over and over again from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle during this debate. No one can say this bill is not aimed directly at one organization.

Of course, if the Republicans in Congress had any evidence that Planned Parenthood broke the law, they would have taken it to the Attorney General or the FBI, but they didn't. If they had any faith in the extremists who made

these accusations against Planned Parenthood, they would have brought them before Congress to testify, but they didn't. The truth is this attack on Planned Parenthood is knowingly based on a whole series of lies.

The longer the Republicans keep up this pretense in order to stoke the flames with their inflammatory rhetoric, the longer they put patients and providers at risk of unstable people committing murder, as we have seen at abortion clinics. Bulletproof glass and safe rooms should not be necessary for women to access basic health care like cancer screenings or contraception, but if this farcical attack on Planned Parenthood doesn't stop, that would be the norm for women around the country. You want a breast exam, you want contraception, you put your life at risk.

Do not be fooled by claims that this funding will go to other healthcare providers and Planned Parenthood's patients will follow it. It is simply not true. More than half of Planned Parenthood's patients rely on Medicaid. Most States do not have enough providers, particularly specialists like OB/GYNs, taking Medicaid patients to absorb Planned Parenthood's patients.

By voting to defund Planned Parenthood today, you are leaving 2.7 million women, men, and families with no access to health care. Enough is enough. It is time for my Republican colleagues to accept what they know is true. Planned Parenthood has done nothing more than provide compassionate, comprehensive care for millions of Americans in a safe, legal manner.

Stop the rhetoric. Stop the lies. Don't deprive people of abortion services, of healthcare services, of contraception services, of breast exams. Vote "no" on this rule, vote "no" on the underlying bill, and don't violate the Constitution with a bill of attainder.

□ 1430

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support this rule and final passage of H.R. 3762.

Since I was first sworn in to the House, my top priority has been to repeal this disastrous healthcare law we call ObamaCare. Finally, today we have an opportunity to send to the President's desk legislation that repeals ObamaCare.

Today we are going to end the individual mandate, stop the employer mandate, and repeal dozens of taxes and provisions that prevent people from actually getting affordable health coverage. I have always said we should incentivize health savings accounts, not tax them, and this bill repeals the tax on HSAs.

It is obvious that ObamaCare has done nothing to reduce healthcare costs. I hear from many of the local business owners and constituents in my district every day about their struggle to comply with the law, let

alone provide health coverage for their employees and their families.

Manufacturers, construction companies, and retail store owners are facing dramatic increases to their administrative and healthcare costs. This leaves them in the dangerous position of ObamaCare driving them out of business by making those decisions.

Since signing it into law, the President has delayed or repealed parts of ObamaCare for political reasons. This was a bad law to begin with because it is fundamentally unworkable and unaffordable. It is time to repeal it once and for all.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and support the passage of this bill.

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

I would just say that this debate is astonishing to me. What is so controversial on the Republican side is that millions and millions more Americans have health care. I heard someone over there say that fewer people have health care. They can't produce any validators to support that statement. CBO and a whole bunch of other validators have actually said more people have health care.

If they get their way, 22 million people will lose their health care. That is what this is about. This is about whether or not people in this country deserve health care or whether or not they don't, whether or not you think health care is a right or whether, as my Republican friends say, it is a privilege. We think it is a right.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his leadership, and I thank him for yielding.

Well, Mr. Speaker, here we go again and again and again. Once more, politicians are invading the bedrooms of the American women.

I stand with Planned Parenthood. We will not go back.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Senate amendment to H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015. This bill guts ObamaCare, eliminating many of the penalties and programs that have been implemented over the last several years by this administration.

Americans have been saddled with the burden of a healthcare insurance system that restricts what doctor they can see, what services they can receive, and has even limited them to who they can have as their pharmacist.

If the President signs this bill into law, we can return the power of our healthcare system back to the American people. Americans should be in charge of their healthcare system, not Washington, D.C.

With this bill, Congress will eliminate the individual mandate, the em-

ployer mandate, and repeal all future appropriated funds to the Prevention and Public Health Fund that has supported the failing ObamaCare law for the last several years.

It repeals the medical device tax, the excise tax on high-cost health insurance plans, and the \$2,500 limit on flexible spending accounts. It also repeals ObamaCare's Medicaid expansion eligibility pathway, which has left many States suffering with budget problems, and it restricts Federal funding to Planned Parenthood and its affiliated clinics for a period of 1 year, with appropriate funds being redirected to Community Health Centers to better serve women and their health.

This bill returns to the American people a system that is driven by the market, not by artificial formulas and percentages created by Washington bureaucrats.

As a pharmacist and former owner of three independent pharmacies, I can assure you the only way to lower costs and create an opportunity for everyone to participate is by allowing the free market to work as it was meant to.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and this bill so that we can eliminate this burdensome healthcare plan and bring greater opportunities for Americans to receive affordable health care.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU).

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans have unveiled their new ideas for moving America forward, which include trying to repeal or undermine for the 62nd time the Affordable Care Act and for the 11th time attacking women's health care, both of which are guaranteed to be vetoed by President Obama.

So one definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again, expecting a different result. There will be no different result today.

The Affordable Care Act will remain the law of the land, and Planned Parenthood will not be defunded. The Republicans know this. Because if the Affordable Care Act were actually to be repealed, over 22 million Americans would lose their health coverage, including 3.5 million Californians, and the Republicans have no plan for how they will fix this immediate healthcare crisis. In addition, millions more will lose healthcare access if Planned Parenthood were to be defunded.

If you want to look at hyperpartisan bills that waste time, squander taxpayer resources, and are going nowhere, look at the GOP agenda. If you want ideas that will move America forward, such as investing in education, reducing carbon pollution, and creating jobs, look at the Democratic agenda. At least we are not insane.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I thank my friend from Georgia for yielding.

For months now, Americans have—in horror—watched gruesome undercover videos detailing Planned Parenthood's barbaric practice of harvesting little baby body parts for profit. In one heartbreaking story, a whistleblower described how Planned Parenthood carved up the face of a baby boy whose heart was still beating and then harvested his intact brain.

As a father of four beautiful children by adoption, I listened to this gut-wrenching recollection only to think about millions of destroyed lives that won't be given the chance at life my kids received.

It is time to stop funneling millions of taxpayer funds to this abortion giant that prides itself in snuffing out the lives of innocent babies and then profiting off their little victims.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 3762.

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

I would just respond to the gentleman that the overwhelming majority of the American people actually support Planned Parenthood. That is in spite of all the attacks and all the accusations that have no basis and that have been hurled at them by my Republican friends.

I just want to remind my colleagues that Planned Parenthood provides a number of services to patients, such as family planning counseling and contraception. They provide pregnancy tests and Pap tests. They provide lifesaving breast exams.

This is an organization that provides for the health and well-being of millions of people in this country, mostly poor women. Maybe that makes it easier for my friends on the other side to attack this program and this organization—because they primarily provide help to poor women—but that is what Planned Parenthood is about.

And so this is an important organization, a good organization. That is why a majority of Americans support it. My friends are on the wrong side of public opinion on this.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, taxpayer money should not be used for abortions, period. Taxpayer money should not be used to support abortion providers, period.

As Americans, we are proud to support life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Yet, in the last fiscal year, \$554 million of taxpayer money went to support Planned Parenthood. In the same year, it was responsible for the death of 323,999 innocent babies, even dismembering and selling baby parts. These lost children are a deep scar on our Nation.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have countered that Planned Parenthood does more than provide

abortions. Well, let's take a look at the facts. According to Planned Parenthood's own 2014–2015 annual report, cancer screenings are down 27 percent, family planning and contraceptive services are down 18 percent, and STD prevention and treatments are down 6 percent. Planned Parenthood's services declined in the same year that they received a nearly 5 percent increase in Federal funding.

Mr. Speaker, we are accountable for American taxpayer dollars. H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act, defunds Planned Parenthood and shifts those same taxpayer dollars to the much larger network of community health clinics that do not provide abortions. This legislation will increase access to healthcare services for women while upholding and strengthening the value of life.

H.R. 3762 also defunds the unmitigated disaster known as ObamaCare. President Obama said you can keep your health plan. Well, we found out millions can't. President Obama called this affordable. Well, it's not. Premiums have gone up.

Americans deserve the freedom to choose the health plan that is right for them, not the one selected by President Obama.

Please join me in supporting H.R. 3762 to protect taxpayer dollars from being spent on abortions while increasing access to healthcare services for women, as we also defund ObamaCare and its legislation.

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

I just have to correct the record. The gentleman said that taxpayer money should not be spent on abortions. It can't be. That is the law. I don't know what he is talking about.

I also should point out to the gentleman that more than 90 percent of what Planned Parenthood does is preventative care.

So I get it. It is the political rhetoric that people get carried away with. But let's at least try to stick to facts at least a little bit. Let's also understand—so my colleague has no confusion here—that the law here is that no taxpayer money can be spent for abortions. So let's clear that up.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise, obviously, to support the rule, but I also rise in strong support of the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act, a crucial piece of legislation with bicameral support.

This bill continues our efforts to protect patients, families, taxpayers, and communities across the Nation. It will lift the burdens of the President's healthcare law and give back the power over healthcare decisions to individual patients and families.

This bill gives us the opportunity to take crucial steps toward a more pa-

tient-centered healthcare system. It gives us the opportunity to reduce our Nation's deficit by repealing the majority of the burdensome healthcare taxes and ending harsh penalties.

This legislation also gives us the opportunity to save lives. In light of Planned Parenthood's unethical and potentially illegal activity, I firmly believe our taxpayers should not be forced to pay for such organizations. We must protect the rights of taxpayers and, more importantly, the rights of the unborn.

□ 1445

As I have said before, I remain dedicated to giving a voice to our most fragile Americans who cannot speak for themselves. I am proud this legislation helps us protect those who need protection most.

I urge my colleagues to support this good bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let's be clear. Other than a verbal assault against Planned Parenthood and a verbal assault against the Affordable Care Act, this bill will do nothing. It is going to be vetoed really quickly. Maybe it is red meat for the political base, but if that satisfies your political base, great. I would say they are a cheap date if this is what it takes to satisfy them.

But we ought to be dealing with some serious issues here, and I am going to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. If we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up bipartisan legislation that would close a glaring loophole in our gun laws allowing suspected terrorists to legally buy firearms.

The bill would bar the sale of firearms and explosives to those on the FBI's terrorist watch list. I don't know why that is so controversial, but some of my friends find that to be a controversial issue.

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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure for many different reasons, but let me just touch on three.

One, Gordon Sullivan was former Chief of Staff of the United States Army, and he once observed that hope was not a method.

Irregardless of the good intentions behind the Affordable Care Act, I think that, from an actuarial standpoint, if you really look at it, you would have to say that hope was, indeed, part of the method.

I say that because if you look at the number of young people that were anticipated to sign up, already 7.5 million folks have said: No, I am not signing up, I would rather take the penalty than sign up. And what that creates is a big liability for the taxpayer.

Two, I would make the point that there have been real implications for the small-business person. We have a company back home in Charleston by the name of East Bay Deli. The owner came to me just a number of weeks ago and said: Look, I was going to open up a couple of more shops but, given the cost that I have seen with the Affordable Care Act for my small business, I am not going to do that. Ninety employees that won't have jobs as a consequence.

Finally, our healthcare system has been predicated on a doctor-patient relationship. That Hippocratic Oath, that direct tie between doctor and patient, is part and parcel to the whole system. Yet the Affordable Care Act, again, in the whole, begins to undermine that.

So for many different reasons, those three among them, I rise in support of this measure.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am almost embarrassed to get up here and discuss this legislation and believe that its sponsors really think that it is going to become law. That is what the reputation of the Congress is supposed to be all about.

But even when it is such an important decision, we like to talk about things that we are doing as a matter of life and death, but we don't really mean it. It is just a political expression.

But when you are talking about health care and realize that this is the only industrialized country left that has not seen fit to believe that health care is a matter of right, it goes beyond politics when we pass a bill so that people throughout the United States will be able to enjoy health care, that we don't find one Member of the opposition party joining in that legislation.

It is beyond belief that people can complain that not enough young people are signing up, or that employers are skeptical, or that there are people who lack confidence in this bill, when the majority party in this Congress has condemned this bill with such utter contempt that, for over 50 times, they would come and attempt to repeal it, and then expect that everybody should have confidence in it.

Why are we doing this? How can any party dislike, hate, or disagree with the President so much that they would spend millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to attack a national healthcare-providing bill and not have the least idea as to whether or not,

first of all, they know it is not going to become law, but not enough common sense and decency to provide an alternative.

We all know that 7 years ago, when President Obama was first elected, that the leaders of the Republican Party said that their first job would be to get rid of President Obama.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 20 seconds.

Mr. RANGEL. I thank the gentleman.

I close by saying, everybody here knows this will never become law. It is a political statement. As a politician, there is nothing wrong with political statements. But to have one that is so wrapped up with hypocrisy and hatred is very awkward for us to continue in this body and believe that anything we attempt to do to send to the President would have anyone believing that we are doing it because it is the right thing to do.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule for the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015.

This important legislation would repeal the employer and individual mandates, the ObamaCare slush fund, and the numerous harmful taxes on everything from medical devices to health insurers to the insurance plans themselves.

Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is an unpopular, failed law. Polls have shown it, elections have demonstrated it, and rising premiums have proven it.

I wasn't in this body when this law passed. I was watching in horror with the rest of the American people as the legislative process was railroaded to push it through.

But let's consider the contrast today to what we have before us, a bill that both the House and the Senate came together to guide through the normal legislative process.

Let's start 2016 the right way and make President Obama own this law in a way that he has not had to do yet. Let's continue to work here in Congress toward a commonsense plan to replace this damaging law.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, a picture is always worth a thousand words, and this is a picture of words. It is very clear that the Affordable Care Act has been a lifesaver for many Americans. And this budget reconciliation act is obviously misdirected, wrong directed, and the 62nd time this body has tried to gut ObamaCare.

Thank you, Mr. President, for vetoing it, no matter whether it came from the Senate or the House.

We worked, without ceasing, to get a bill that would cover millions of Amer-

icans. It was a deliberative process, and everyone had a right to vote.

The Republicans refused to vote for good health care, and here we are, 13 million Americans benefitted from \$1.1 billion in rebates for health insurance; 105 million Americans, including 71 million Americans in private plans and 34 million in Medicare.

Last August, millions of women began receiving free coverage for comprehensive women's care; 17 million children with preexisting conditions have insurance; 6.6 million young people have insurance; 6.3 million seniors.

And, of course, they want to attack Planned Parenthood, which provides vulnerable women with health care.

I don't know what they view the budget reconciliation act, but I call it the Anti-New Year's Celebration. Now that we have a new year, we have this horrible bill. Vote against it, and vote for a thousand words right here.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule for H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015.

I oppose the rule for H.R. 2762 for three reasons: 1. The rule only allows one hour of debate equally divided between the supporters and opponents of the rule; 2. This is not an open rule that would allow for amendments that could have been offered improve the bill; and 3. The President has communicated to the House that he will veto this bill if it is not amended.

The House needs more time to debate this bill because it could mean a return to the days when nearly 20% of Americans had seriously deficient healthcare coverage or none at all.

Unfortunately this rule for the underlying bill is the latest GOP attempt to end the Affordable Care Act guarantee of access to health insurance for millions of Americans and not an attempt to improve the lives of working men and women or their families.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that H.R. 3762, would result in 22 million Americans losing their health coverage after 2017.

The impact of the bill should it become law is significant and should have more than an hour of debate prior to a vote.

The worse thing about this bill is that the authors are well aware of the public reaction should it become law, and this is why it would not go into effect during 2016, but 2017 after the general election and would remove health coverage for those who are the most vulnerable such as those who have coverage under the Medicaid expansion.

I also object that this is a closed rule that does not allow amendments that could provide support for bipartisan efforts to improve the bill.

Instead of attempting to repeal and undermine this law, we should use our time to work together to make improvements where necessary such as ending the so called "Cadillac Tax" and making sure that health insurance is focused on providing the care prescribed by doctors and not health insurance plans.

Finally, I oppose the rule and the underlying bill because the Administration has made it clear that this bill will be vetoed if presented for signature by the President.

The House has important work it should be doing such as voting on legislation to create

new infrastructure to support the 21st century need for universal high-speed broadband access and; closing the gap in STEM employment opportunities and skills that has over 1 million positions that are going unfilled; and strengthening gun safety by increasing the number of agents at the ATF to ensure that all gun dealers are following the law; and promoting greater access to mental health services.

Instead we continue to waste time on fighting the Affordable Care Law in ways that would hurt Americans who need affordable, assessable and available healthcare we could be engaged in productive legislative work.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues reject this bad rule and the flawed underlying legislation.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of my friend from Massachusetts if he has any further speakers remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Right now, just me.

Mr. WOODALL. I am going to ask the good doctor to close us today. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have great affection for my friends on the other side of the aisle, but I don't understand their obsession with trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act or their obsession with trying to defund Planned Parenthood. I mean, if they get their way on the Affordable Care Act, they would throw 22 million people out of their health insurance plans; 22 million people would lose their coverage.

Young people who are 26 years old and under would lose their healthcare benefits. Right now they can stay on their family's healthcare plans up to 26. They would lose that.

It used to be that if you are a woman it would be considered a preexisting condition and your insurance rates would be higher. The Affordable Care Act prevents that.

The doughnut hole in the prescription drug plan, the cost to senior citizens, is closing. Ultimately, we will eliminate that doughnut hole because of the Affordable Care Act. That is all good.

Medicare's solvency has been expanded because of this. Millions more people have health insurance as a result. That is a good thing. But they want to take it away.

On Planned Parenthood, I mean, most of what they do is provide preventative care to women. They want to take that away. It is cruel. It is a cruel thing to do.

I can't believe that there isn't bipartisan consensus in this place that health care is something that people need and we ought to make sure they have access to it.

My friends have been in charge of this Congress for a long time. They can't even offer an alternative. They can't tell us what they are against, but they can't tell us what they are for. They have done nothing to help expand the ability of people to get health insurance in this country. All they do is

come to the floor and talk about repealing bills that will make it more difficult for people.

I can't understand how you get up every morning and go to work and that is your mission, to make it more difficult for people in this country, to throw 22 million people off the health insurance rolls, to make it more difficult for vulnerable women to get preventative care at Planned Parenthood.

That is the mission. That is how we are beginning this new year. And it really is sad, and it is really disheartening, I think, for a lot of us who came here to try to make a difference in people's lives, to try to help improve the quality of life for people.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this terrible, terrible bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Lewisville, Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a good doctor who doesn't just talk about health care, but who does get up every morning to provide that health care to Americans.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, since this bill passed the House in March of 2010, probably half of the Congress has changed. So for the benefit of people who were not here in March of 2010, who did not see this debate in its full-throated entirety in 2010, I want to just revisit a couple of the salient pieces that led up to the passage of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

People may ask themselves, why doesn't this law enjoy more popularity? In fact, the night it was passed, as reported on CNN, the American people were opposed to the passage of this law by about 52 percent. That number is essentially unchanged almost 6 years later.

And what was the promise of the Affordable Care Act? Well, let me remind people. And don't take my word for it. This is in the inestimable words of Jonathan Gruber, an economics professor from MIT who published a graphic novel about the Affordable Care Act.

Yay. Hooray. Everyone will be able to afford insurance. You won't have to worry about going broke if you get sick. We will start to bring the cost of health care under control, and we will do this all while reducing the Federal deficit.

Why wasn't it more popular when it was passed?

Well, Mr. Speaker, here we are, about 2 weeks after Christmas Eve, and it was Christmas Eve of 2009 when this bill passed the Senate.

And I would remind people in this body, it was not a House bill that passed the Senate. Well, I take that back. It was a House bill. It was H.R. 3590. That was a bill dealing with veterans' housing that had passed this House July of 2009 and had nothing to do with health care.

But because this bill, this law, was a massive piece of tax policy, it had to originate in the House. Except it

didn't, but the bill number originated in the House.

So the bill that was passed by the Senate on Christmas Eve in 2009, with a big snowstorm bearing down on Washington, D.C., every Senator wanting to get out of town and get home to their district, the bill that was passed read as follows: "Strike all after the enacting clause and insert—"

That means it took out all the housing language and put in all the healthcare language and, more importantly, all of the tax policy.

□ 1500

That bill passed the Senate with 60 votes. Of course at that time, Democrats held a 60-vote majority in the Senate, and it allegedly was to come back to a conference committee with the House except that the Senate lost a Democratic Senator in that timeframe. HARRY REID told the then-Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, that he no longer had 60 votes and there was simply nothing more he could do. It was up to the Speaker of the House to pass the Senate bill with no changes because he could not bring it back before the Senate because he no longer had 60 votes.

So the next 3 months, literally, were consumed with arm-twisting, kneecapping, and trying to convince people to vote for something that was against their fundamental best interest. So is it a surprise that it did not enjoy popular support on the day it was passed and it has not achieved popular support even with all the giveaways and even with all the Federal money pumped into it since that time?

The reason, Mr. Speaker, is very simple. At the heart of this—at the heart of this—is a very coercive—really, it is unique in Federal policy. The Federal Government tells you what you have to do. You have to buy a healthcare policy. Then they seek to regulate it under the Commerce Clause.

It was the most convoluted logic anyone had ever seen. But it was coercive, and that coerciveness led to the corrosiveness that has underlain the Affordable Care Act ever since.

No wonder people look at this. It was conceived—it was conceived—in a falsehood and then delivered to the American people under a false promise. Indeed, it has harmed—as we have heard over and over again from people that it has harmed—individuals in individual districts across this country.

Mr. Speaker, I stand today in support of the rule and in support of the reconciliation bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 579 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That 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. 1076) to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General

to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist. 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 the Judiciary. 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. 2. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1076.

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. WOODALL. 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. MCGOVERN. 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 on House Resolution 579 will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 579, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 580; and adoption of House Resolution 580, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 175, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 2]
YEAS—239

Abraham	Coffman	Fortenberry
Aderholt	Cole	Fox
Allen	Collins (GA)	Franks (AZ)
Amash	Collins (NY)	Frelinghuysen
Amodei	Comstock	Garrett
Babin	Conaway	Gibbs
Barletta	Cook	Gibson
Barr	Costello (PA)	Gohmert
Barton	Cramer	Goodlatte
Benishek	Crawford	Gosar
Bilirakis	Crenshaw	Gowdy
Bishop (MI)	Culberson	Granger
Bishop (UT)	Curbelo (FL)	Graves (GA)
Black	Davis, Rodney	Graves (LA)
Blackburn	Denham	Graves (MO)
Blum	Dent	Griffith
Bost	DeSantis	Grothman
Boustany	DesJarlais	Guinta
Brady (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Guthrie
Brat	Dold	Hanna
Bridenstine	Donovan	Hardy
Brooks (AL)	Duffy	Harper
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Harris
Buchanan	Duncan (TN)	Hartzler
Buck	Ellmers (NC)	Heck (NV)
Bucshon	Emmer (MN)	Hensarling
Burgess	Farenthold	Herrera Beutler
Calvert	Fincher	Hice, Jody B.
Carter (GA)	Fitzpatrick	Hill
Carter (TX)	Fleischmann	Holding
Chabot	Fleming	Hudson
Chaffetz	Flores	Huelskamp
Clawson (FL)	Forbes	Huizenga (MI)

Hultgren	Mica	Scalise
Hunter	Miller (FL)	Schweikert
Hurd (TX)	Moolenaar	Scott, Austin
Hurt (VA)	Mooey (WV)	Sensenbrenner
Jenkins (KS)	Mooney	Sessions
Jenkins (WV)	Mulvaney	Shimkus
Johnson (OH)	Murphy (PA)	Shuster
Johnson, Sam	Neugebauer	Simpson
Jolly	Newhouse	Smith (MO)
Jones	Noem	Smith (NE)
Jordan	Nunes	Smith (NJ)
Joyce	Olson	Smith (TX)
Katko	Palazzo	Stefanik
Kelly (MS)	Palmer	Stewart
Kelly (PA)	Paulsen	Stivers
King (NY)	Pearce	Stutzman
Kinzinger (IL)	Perry	Thompson (PA)
Kline	Peterson	Thornberry
Knight	Pittenger	Tiberi
Labrador	Pitts	Tipton
LaHood	Poe (TX)	Trott
LaMalfa	Poliquin	Turner
Lamborn	Pompeo	Upton
Lance	Posey	Valadao
Latta	Price, Tom	Wagner
LoBiondo	Ratcliffe	Walberg
Long	Reed	Walden
Loudermilk	Reichert	Walker
Love	Renacci	Walorski
Lucas	Ribble	Walters, Mimi
Luetkemeyer	Rice (SC)	Weber (TX)
Lummis	Roby	Wenstrup
MacArthur	Roe (TN)	Westerman
Marchant	Rogers (AL)	Westmoreland
Marino	Rogers (KY)	Whitfield
Massie	Rohrabacher	Williams
McCarthy	Rokita	Wilson (SC)
McCaul	Rooney (FL)	Wittman
McClintock	Ros-Lehtinen	Womack
McHenry	Roskam	Woodall
McKinley	Ross	Yoder
McMorris	Rothfus	Yoho
Rodgers	Rouzer	Young (AK)
McSally	Royce	Young (IA)
Meadows	Russell	Young (IN)
Meehan	Salmon	Zeldin
Messer	Sanford	Zinke

NAYS—175

Adams	Doggett	Loeb sack
Aguilar	Doyle, Michael	Lofgren
Ashford	F.	Lowenthal
Bass	Duckworth	Lowey
Beatty	Edwards	Lujan Grisham
Becerra	Ellison	(NM)
Bera	Engel	Lujan, Ben Ray
Beyer	Eshoo	(NM)
Bishop (GA)	Esty	Lynch
Blumenauer	Farr	Maloney,
Bonamici	Fattah	Carolyn
Boyle, Brendan	Foster	Maloney, Sean
F.	Frankel (FL)	Matsui
Brady (PA)	Fudge	McCullum
Brown (FL)	Gabbard	McDermott
Brownley (CA)	Gallego	McGovern
Bustos	Garamendi	McNerney
Butterfield	Graham	Meeks
Cole	Capps	Meng
Collins (AZ)	Capuano	Moore
Collins (NY)	Cardenas	Green, Al
Frelinghuysen	Carney	Green, Gene
Garrett	Carson (IN)	Grijalva
Gibbs	Cartwright	Gutierrez
Gibson	Hahn	Napolitano
Gohmert	Castor (FL)	Hastings
Goodlatte	Castro (TX)	Heck (WA)
Gosar	Chu, Judy	Higgins
Gowdy	Cicilline	Himes
Granger	Clark (MA)	Honda
Graves (GA)	Clarke (NY)	Hoyer
Graves (LA)	Clay	Israel
Graves (MO)	Clyburn	Jackson Lee
Griffith	Cohen	Jeffries
Grothman	Connolly	Johnson (GA)
Guinta	Conyers	Kaptur
Guthrie	Cooper	Keating
Hanna	Costa	Kelly (IL)
Hardy	Courtney	Kildee
Harper	Crowley	Kilmer
Harris	Cuellar	Kirkpatrick
Hartzler	Cummings	Kuster
Heck (NV)	Davis (CA)	Langevin
Hensarling	Davis, Danny	Larsen (WA)
Herrera Beutler	DeFazio	Larson (CT)
Hice, Jody B.	DeGette	Lawrence
Hill	Delaney	Lee
Holding	DeBene	Levin
Hudson	DeSaulnier	Lewis
Huelskamp	Deutch	Lieu, Ted
Huizenga (MI)	Dingell	Lipinski

Schrader	Swalwell (CA)	Velázquez
Scott (VA)	Takano	Visclosky
Scott, David	Thompson (CA)	Walz
Serrano	Thompson (MS)	Wasserman
Sewell (AL)	Tonko	Schultz
Sherman	Torres	Waters, Maxine
Sinema	Tsongas	Watson Coleman
Sires	Van Hollen	Welch
Slaughter	Vargas	Wilson (FL)
Smith (WA)	Veasey	Yarmuth
Speier	Vela	

NOT VOTING—19

Byrne	Kennedy	Rush
Cleaver	Kind	Ryan (OH)
DeLauro	King (IA)	Takai
Hinojosa	Miller (MI)	Titus
Huffman	Nugent	Webster (FL)
Issa	Payne	
Johnson, E. B.	Rigell	

□ 1530

Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Messrs. FARR and BEYER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SESSIONS was allowed to speak out of order.)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 1644, SUPPORTING TRANSPARENT REGULATORY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIONS IN MINING ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee issued a Dear Colleague outlining the amendment process for H.R. 1644, the STREAM Act. An amendment deadline has been set for Monday, January 11, 2016, at 10 a.m. Amendments should be drafted to the text of the bill as reported by the Committee on Natural Resources and as posted on the Rules Committee’s Web site. Please feel free to contact either me or the Rules Committee’s staff with any questions a Member or staff may have.

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

There was no objection.

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. MCGOVERN. 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 237, noes 177, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]
AYES—237

Abraham	Blum	Chabot
Aderholt	Bost	Chaffetz
Allen	Boustany	Clawson (FL)
Amash	Brady (TX)	Coffman
Amodei	Bridenstine	Cole
Babin	Brooks (AL)	Collins (GA)
Barletta	Brooks (IN)	Collins (NY)
Barr	Buchanan	Comstock
Barton	Buck	Conaway
Benishek	Bucshon	Cook
Bilirakis	Burgess	Costello (PA)
Bishop (MI)	Byrne	Cramer
Bishop (UT)	Calvert	Crawford
Black	Carter (GA)	Crenshaw
Blackburn	Carter (TX)	Culberson

Curbelo (FL) Joyce
 Davis, Rodney Katko
 Denham Kelly (MS)
 Dent Kelly (PA)
 DeSantis King (NY)
 DesJarlais Kinzinger (IL)
 Diaz-Balart Kline
 Dold Knight
 Donovan Labrador
 Duffy LaHood
 Duncan (SC) LaMalfa
 Duncan (TN) Lamborn
 Ellmers (NC) Lance
 Emmer (MN) Latta
 Farenthold LoBiondo
 Fincher Long
 Fitzpatrick Loudermilk
 Fleischmann Love
 Fleming Lucas
 Flores Luetkemeyer
 Forbes Lummis
 Fortenberry MacArthur
 Foxx Marchant
 Franks (AZ) Marino
 Frelinghuysen Massie
 Garrett McCarthy
 Gibbs McCaul
 Gibson McClintock
 Gohmert McHenry
 Goodlatte McKinley
 Gosar McMorris
 Gowdy Rodgers
 Granger McSally
 Graves (GA) Meadows
 Graves (LA) Meehan
 Graves (MO) Messer
 Griffith Mica
 Grothman Miller (FL)
 Guinta Moolenaar
 Guthrie Mooney (WV)
 Hanna Mullin
 Hardy Mulvaney
 Harper Murphy (PA)
 Harris Neugebauer
 Hartzler Newhouse
 Heck (NV) Noem
 Hensarling Nunes
 Herrera Beutler Olson
 Hice, Jody B. Palazzo
 Hill Palmer
 Holding Paulsen
 Hudson Pearce
 Huelskamp Perry
 Huizenga (MI) Pittenger
 Hultgren Pitts
 Hunter Poe (TX)
 Hurd (TX) Poliquin
 Hurt (VA) Pompeo
 Jenkins (KS) Posey
 Jenkins (WV) Price, Tom
 Johnson (OH) Ratcliffe
 Johnson, Sam Reed
 Jolly Reichert
 Jones Renacci
 Jordan Ribble

NOES—177

Adams Cohen
 Aguilar Connolly
 Ashford Conyers
 Bass Cooper
 Beatty Costa
 Becerra Courtney
 Bera Crowley
 Beyer Cuellar
 Bishop (GA) Cummings
 Blumenauer Davis (CA)
 Bonamici Davis, Danny
 Boyle, Brendan DeFazio
 F. DeGette
 Brady (PA) Delaney
 Brown (FL) DelBene
 Brownley (CA) DeSaulnier
 Bustos Deutch
 Butterfield Dingell
 Capps Doggett
 Capuano Doyle, Michael
 Cárdenas F.
 Carney Duckworth
 Carson (IN) Edwards
 Cartwright Ellison
 Castor (FL) Engel
 Castro (TX) Eshoo
 Chu, Judy Esty
 Cicilline Farr
 Clark (MA) Fattah
 Clarke (NY) Foster
 Clay Frankel (FL)
 Clyburn Fudge

Rice (SC) Lee
 Roby Levin
 Roe (TN) Lewis
 Rogers (AL) Lieu, Ted
 Rogers (KY) Lipinski
 Rohrabacher Loeb
 Roke Lofgren
 Ros-Lehtinen Lowenthal
 Roskam Lowey
 Ross Lujan Grisham
 Rothfus (NM)
 Rouzer Lujan, Ben Ray
 Royce (NM)
 Russell Lynch
 Salmon Maloney, Carolyn
 Sanford Maloney, Sean
 Scalise Matsui
 Schweikert McCollum
 Scott, Austin McDermott
 Sensenbrenner McGovern
 Sessions McNeerney
 Shimkus Meeks
 Shuster Meng
 Simpson Moore
 Smith (MO) Moulton
 Smith (NE) Murphy (FL)
 Smith (NJ) Nadler
 Smith (TX) McHenry
 Stefanik Napolitano
 Stewart Neal

Brat Kind
 Cleaver King (IA)
 DeLauro Miller (MI)
 Hinojosa Nugent
 Issa Payne
 Johnson, E. B. Rigell
 Kennedy Rooney (FL)

NOT VOTING—19

Kind
 King (IA)
 Miller (MI)
 Nugent
 Payne
 Rigell
 Rooney (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1540

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 for:
 Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 3, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 712, SUNSHINE FOR REGULATORY DECREES AND SETTLEMENTS ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1155, SEARCHING FOR AND CUTTING REGULATIONS THAT ARE UNNECESSARILY BUREAUCRATIC ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 580) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 712) to impose certain limitations on consent decrees and settlement agreements by agencies that require the agencies to take regulatory action in accordance with the terms thereof, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1155) to provide for the establishment of a process for the review of rules and sets of rules, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.
 The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 176, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]
 YEAS—241

Abraham Graves (MO) Pearce
 Aderholt Griffith
 Allen Grothman
 Amash Guinta
 Amodei Guthrie
 Babin Hanna
 Barletta Hardy
 Barr Harper
 Barton Harris
 Benishek Hartzler
 Bilirakis Heck (NV)
 Bishop (MI) Hensarling
 Bishop (UT) Herrera Beutler
 Black Hice, Jody B.
 Blackburn Hill
 Blum Holding
 Bost Hudson
 Boustany Huelskamp
 Brady (TX) Huizenga (MI)
 Brat Hultgren
 Bridenstine Hunter
 Brooks (AL) Hurd (TX)
 Brooks (IN) Hurt (VA)
 Buchanan Jenkins (KS)
 Buck Jenkins (WV)
 Bucshon Johnson (OH)
 Burgess Johnson, Sam
 Byrne Jolly
 Calvert Jones
 Carter (GA) Jordan
 Carter (TX) Joyce
 Chabot Katko
 Chaffetz Kelly (MS)
 Clawson (FL) Kelly (PA)
 Coffman King (NY)
 Cole Kinzinger (IL)
 Collins (GA) Kline
 Collins (NY) Knight
 Comstock Labrador
 Conaway LaHood
 Cook LaMalfa
 Costello (PA) Lamborn
 Cramer Lance
 Crawford Latta
 Crenshaw LoBiondo
 Culberson Long
 Curbelo (FL) Loudermilk
 Davis, Rodney Love
 Denham Lucas
 Dent Luetkemeyer
 DeSantis Lummis
 DesJarlais MacArthur
 Diaz-Balart Marchant
 Dold Marino
 Donovan Massie
 Duffy McCarthy
 Duncan (SC) McCaul
 Duncan (TN) McClintock
 Ellmers (NC) McHenry
 Emmer (MN) McKinley
 Farenthold McMorris
 Fincher Rodgers
 Fitzpatrick McSally
 Fleischmann Meadows
 Fleming Meehan
 Flores Messer
 Forbes Mica
 Fortenberry Miller (FL)
 Foxx Moolenaar
 Franks (AZ) Mooney (WV)
 Frelinghuysen Mullin
 Garrett Mulvaney
 Gibbs Murphy (PA)
 Gibson Neugebauer
 Gohmert Newhouse
 Goodlatte Noem
 Gosar Nunes
 Gowdy Olson
 Granger Palazzo
 Graves (GA) Palmer
 Graves (LA) Paulsen

NAYS—176

Bishop (GA) Bustos
 Blumenauer Butterfield
 Bonamici Capps
 Boyle, Brendan Capuano
 F. Cárdenas
 Brady (PA) Carney
 Brown (FL) Carson (IN)
 Brownley (CA) Cartwright