

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY STRIKE

(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of International Women's Day, A Day Without a Woman strike. Today we are here and are joined by many of our sisters around the Nation to declare, once and for all, that women's rights are human rights. We are here to stand in solidarity with women across the country to send a clear message: We will not rest until we create a society where all women—all women—have equal rights under the law.

We are resisting and letting President Trump and the Republicans know that we will not go back. We stand with the millions around the Nation who have walked out today, and today we are walking out for them. We are raising our voices for the millions of women who can't because they might get fired or because they can't afford to lose their meager wages.

I encourage all of my Democratic colleagues to join us, along with Leader PELOSI, the Democratic Women's Working Group, Congresswoman KATHERINE CLARK, and so many others, for a walkout following these 1 minutes and attend the press conference on the House steps right outside in solidarity and in honor of all of the women in the world who are marching today and striking today for equal rights.

PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF WOMEN

(Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, it is ironic today that we are celebrating the international success and celebration of women when we are also working to repeal affordable quality health care for women and families.

I am reminded, in fact, of my own mother, who fought during a time in the 1960s and 1970s to ensure that my sister, who was very sick and disabled, would have access to a quality public education and also to affordable health care. Quite frankly, it was not available. My mother and father were financially destitute. Today, as a result of trying to provide that health care, I am my mother's caregiver.

Today, I am reminded of all of the women primarily—49 million of us—providing more than \$500 billion worth of long-term care and caregiving support to our families, that this is a day to really celebrate that leadership, that support, and the efforts made by women. Congress, as a body, should do much, much more to preserve and protect those rights of women and their families all across America.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1301, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 174 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 174

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1301) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. The chair of the Committee on Appropriations may insert in the Congressional Record not later than Wednesday, March 8, 2017, such material as he may deem explanatory of H.R. 1301.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILL). The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. CHENEY. 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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 174, which provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 1301, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal 2017. I would like to thank, in particular, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, Chairman GRANGER, and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY for their hard and dedicated work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, we have no higher obligation as elected representatives of the people of this great Republic than ensuring for the security and defense of our Nation. We are gathered here at a tremendous time of action and achievement across an array of crucial policy areas, regulatory relief for the citizens and businesses of our Nation, restoration of authority to our States and local communities, tax reform, ObamaCare repeal and replacement, and the list goes on.

President Trump is doing what he promised during his campaign, and it is an honor to serve the people of Wyo-

oming at this historic moment. But, Mr. Speaker, it is no exaggeration to say that if we fail to provide the resources our military needs to defend our Nation, if we fail to do what is necessary to ensure America's Armed Forces remain superior to all others in the world, if we fail to provide the support our men and women in uniform need to recover from 8 years of devastating policies, nothing else we are doing in this body will matter.

Mr. Speaker, the need is urgent. As we meet today to debate the 2017 Defense appropriation, our Nation faces a more complex and grave threat environment than we have faced at any time since World War II, and possibly, Mr. Speaker, more than at anytime in our history. For 8 years, our adversaries' strength has grown, while our relative capabilities have stagnated and, in some instances, declined.

□ 1230

North Korea continues its ballistic missile launches as it threatens our allies and interests.

The Iranian nuclear agreement has bought time for Iran to continue to advance its nuclear weapons program, as it reaps the windfall of at least \$1 trillion of U.S. taxpayer funds provided to it by the Obama administration. Iran continues to threaten U.S. naval vessels in the Strait of Hormuz, support terrorism across the Middle East, and test ballistic missiles despite its U.N. obligations.

China is rapidly building up its military, and it is targeting, in particular, technologies to try to level the playing field with our capabilities. It continues to threaten freedom of navigation and trade in the South China Sea, and to conduct cyber operations against the United States.

Russia has invaded Ukraine, threatens Eastern Europe and the Baltics, is violating INF Treaty obligations, and openly threatening the use of nuclear weapons.

Al-Qaida today exists in more countries than ever before, and ISIS continues to recruit and hold territory as it plans and launches attacks against the West.

Most of the actors I just mentioned are also responsible for cyber attacks against the United States.

Against this backdrop, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. military is vastly under-resourced. At a recent House Armed Services Committee hearing, the vice chief of staff of the Army told members that of the 58 brigade combat teams, only three are ready to "fight tonight." The vice chief of naval operations, Admiral William Moran, recently testified that more than half of all Navy aircraft are grounded due to maintenance issues and an inability to acquire the necessary parts. Our nuclear force is aging, even as our adversaries continue to make advancements in their own nuclear forces and capabilities. Our Air Force is the oldest, smallest, and least ready it has ever been.

These stories and shortfalls, Mr. Speaker, exist across nearly every aspect of our military. America's fighting men and women are the greatest fighting force and the greatest force for good our world has ever known. They deserve the resources to do their job.

We have prevailed over great challenges in the past, from our unlikely and miraculous founding, through our Civil War, two world wars, the Cold War, and the early years of the war on terror. We must, Mr. Speaker, marshal our forces to do so again. To prevail, Congress—this Congress—must do its job.

That job begins with passing this 2017 Defense Appropriations bill. Then, Mr. Speaker, we must repeal the Budget Control Act and end sequestration. There is a rational and responsible way for us to undertake defense budgeting. The process in place today is neither.

The last time our military was able to assess the threats we face and then recommend the necessary funding levels to defeat those threats was fiscal year 2011, over 6 years ago. We must return to this standard budgeting process. In describing the effects of sequestration several years ago, our current Defense Secretary put it this way: "No foe in the field can wreak such havoc on our security as mindless sequestration is achieving today." We must end this practice with all speed.

This should not be a partisan issue, Mr. Speaker. It has not been in our past. Since World War II, every American President, Republican and Democrat alike, has understood the importance of American military superiority of ensuring a world in which America and our allies set the rules.

Threatened by the Nazis and the Japanese, Franklin Roosevelt and George C. Marshall knew America had to be the "arsenal of democracy." At the beginning of the Cold War, Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, and John F. Kennedy roused the Nation to defeat freedom and liberty against communism. John F. Kennedy knew America had to be "the watchmen on the walls of freedom." In the 1980s, President Reagan oversaw the defense build-up we are still benefiting from today. He knew that "war comes not when the forces of freedom are strong, it is when they are weak that tyrants are tempted." And in the aftermath of 9/11, it was George Bush and Dick Cheney who kept us safe, who knew we could not win this war on defense, who understood we had to have a military strong and capable enough to deny terrorists the safe havens from which they plot and plan and launch attacks against our fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, now it is our turn. Across the globe, our adversaries challenge us, from China to North Korea, to Iran, to Russia; across the Middle East, in Syria, Iraq, and Afghanistan. Thirty-four years ago, Ronald Reagan described our duty at another time, against another enemy, this way:

It is up to us in our time to choose, and choose wisely, between the hard but nec-

essary task of preserving peace and freedom, and the temptation to ignore our duty and blindly hope for the best while the enemies of freedom grow stronger day by day.

Mr. Speaker, we can no longer ignore our duty while our enemies grow stronger. We must take the first step today to begin rebuilding our military. H.R. 1301 is that first step. It increases defense spending, provides a full pay raise for our servicemen and -women, and begins to address our readiness shortfalls. This bill provides funds based on our military's priorities for fiscal year 2017 and gets us off the cycle of continuing resolutions, which are doing real damage to our readiness and capacity.

Therefore, I urge support for the rule to allow for consideration of H.R. 1301, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY) for the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to Defense Subcommittee Chairmen GRANGER and FRELINGHUYSEN, and Ranking Member VISLOSKY, for their hard work in bringing this bill to the House floor today. The Defense Subcommittee is known for its ability to work in a bipartisan manner, and this bill demonstrates that this tradition continues.

Last year, the House approved its version of the FY 2017 Defense Appropriations bill. It was a deeply flawed bill filled with funding gimmicks, including a funding cliff that cut off funding for the war budget in order to boost base defense spending by \$18 billion. The Senate version of the Defense Appropriations bill did not contain such gimmicks and was marked up by the Senate Defense Subcommittee, the full committee, and reported out of the Senate Appropriations Committee, but it never went to the Senate floor for consideration.

The FY 2017 Defense Appropriations bill that the House will consider later today is not, therefore, a conference report. It is being treated as if it were a conference report, namely by having a closed rule, but let us be perfectly clear that this is not a conference report.

Let me also be clear, Mr. Speaker, that we could have had this type of final bill come before us last December, just as we could have brought up all of the pending FY 2017 appropriations bills before the House last December for final action. Instead, Republican leadership chose to keep nearly the entire Federal Government, including the Pentagon, operating at FY 2016 levels without any clarity about what their annual budgets might be.

So when we hear talk about problems with military readiness or shortfalls in defense budgets, I suggest the Republican leadership hold a mirror up to

their faces and take some responsibility.

This bill is 5 months late. It could also have been taken care of 3 months ago in December, and, in fact, it should have been taken care of in December. It is now making its way through another convoluted process today. But we still have no idea about the fate of the other pending ten appropriations bills that the Republican leadership failed to complete last December.

And I say convoluted, Mr. Speaker, because when the House votes on H.R. 1301 today, it still needs to go back to the Senate, and we really have no idea what they are going to do with it. Are they going to pass it without any changes and send it to the President for signature? Or are they going to use it as a vehicle to attach the other ten appropriations bills and send it back to us as the FY 2017 omnibus that we should have completed in December? Perhaps they might consider holding on to it until the President gets around to sending Congress his request for the FY 2017 supplemental so that we finally know how much Congress is actually being asked to approve for Pentagon spending in FY 2017?

So hold on to your hats because we are not done today with the defense spending bills for fiscal year 2017, one way or the other.

Mr. Speaker, I know that everyone in this House wants to make sure that our men and women in uniform are well staffed, trained, and equipped to carry out the missions and duties that we have asked them to carry out. In these areas, in particular, there is much to recommend in this latest version of the FY 2017 defense bill. The same is true for the funding included in H.R. 1301 for suicide prevention, sexual assault, and medical research.

I would also like to point out that H.R. 1301 totals \$577.9 billion. This includes \$516.1 billion in the base bill and \$61.8 billion in the overseas contingency operations account to fund the many wars in which we are engaged. Coupled with the \$5.8 billion FY 2017 supplemental Congress approved last year, total defense spending for FY 2017 currently stands at \$583.7 billion; and that is before we receive still another FY 2017 supplemental from the President.

Mr. Speaker, that is well over half a trillion dollars for the Pentagon, more than the combined total military spending of the next seven greatest military powers in the world. So for those who bemoan how underfunded the Pentagon is, I would argue it is more a matter of failing to set priorities and tens, if not hundreds, of billions of dollars of waste, fraud, and abuse. Every report on every attempted audit of the Defense Department reveals that the Pentagon doesn't have a clue about where the money goes. Billions and billions of dollars cannot be accounted for. No other agency in the U.S. Government gets so much money or is allowed such sloppy

accounting, yet the White House and the Congress can't wait to throw even more billions at the Pentagon, rather than demanding accountability and setting clear spending priorities.

There are also other matters of concern with this bill, Mr. Speaker. H.R. 1301 not only continues, but adds to the prohibitions regarding the detention facility at Guantanamo. This is all an effort to prevent Guantanamo from shutting down, which hurts America's ability to do human rights work around the world and remains a stain on our own values and ideals.

This bill continues to spend billions of dollars on the insane trillion-dollar effort to modernize and produce new generations of nuclear weapons when what we should be doing is continuing to reduce our nuclear arsenal and enter hard negotiations with other nations that have nuclear weapons to eliminate them altogether.

Finally, H.R. 1301 continues to provide so-called emergency funding through the OCO account to continue wars in Iraq, Syria, Yemen, and elsewhere. These wars are hardly unexpected or an emergency and should, therefore, be fully incorporated into the base budget for the Pentagon. They are also wars for which Congress has not debated or approved any authorization for the use of military force.

We do not have an AUMF to deploy our military forces against the Islamic State, yet we have deployed military forces in the air, at sea, and on the ground in Iraq, in Syria, and elsewhere in the region.

We do not have an AUMF to deploy our military forces in the civil war in Yemen, yet we have deployed them to Yemen where one of our Navy SEALs was killed in combat and several others wounded in January.

The Republican leadership continues to fail at its constitutional responsibilities by not bringing any AUMF before the House for consideration, despite promises to do so. So here we are in the 115th Congress, following in the failed footsteps of the 113th and 114th Congresses, getting ready to vote on tens of billions of dollars for wars that Congress has failed to authorize.

I am proud of the courage demonstrated every single day by our men and women in uniform. I wish I could say the same thing about Congress and this House.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, while I am glad that at least one of the pending appropriations bills is going to see some action today, I wonder about the fate of the other ten.

When will we see those bills, Mr. Speaker?

In fact, speaking of urgent pending matters, when will we see a jobs bill?

□ 1245

When are we going to see legislation to repair and modernize America's infrastructure? Will extra funds be included in the fiscal year 2017 Transportation—HUD Appropriations bill, in

the Energy and Water Appropriations bill, in the Interior Appropriations bill for similar improvements on Federal lands?

We have all read about the replacement proposed by the Republican leadership for the Affordable Care Act, and correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Speaker, but I am having trouble remembering how many hearings were held on that proposal so that Congress could benefit from experts in the healthcare field about whether this replacement bill will provide health care to even more Americans at less cost than the ACA. Oh, that is right, Mr. Speaker. The proposal is being marked up today without any hearings or expert testimony whatsoever.

Especially for the new Members of this body, it is important to remember that, when the Democrats drafted the Affordable Care Act, there were dozens of hearings and 30 days prenotification before Energy and Commerce held its markup, a markup that continued over many days. And then the bill, as reported out of committee, was posted for over 2 months online before coming before the full House for debate on amendments and final passage.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, if a replacement bill to the ACA is not able to make sure that more Americans have health insurance at a lower cost, then what is the point other than politics?

We don't need to see any bill that covers fewer people and forces workers, families, and individuals to pay even more for their healthcare coverage and get even less in terms of healthcare protections. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Republican replacement bill is being marked up in committee without a score by the Congressional Budget Office; and without a CBO score, then no one in this Chamber, in this city, in this Nation has any idea, has any clue how much this replacement bill will cost the taxpayer, let alone who will benefit and who will suffer under its provisions.

That is simply a scandal, Mr. Speaker, completely unacceptable. It is a cruel joke on American families, American workers, and the States, local communities, hospitals, doctors, nurses, and healthcare providers who will have to struggle with the consequences of people losing their health insurance.

Mr. Speaker, let's see America's priorities taken care of: a jobs bill, an infrastructure bill. Let's make sure we don't weaken healthcare protections for people in this country, and let's see all of the FY 2017 appropriations bills come before the House in the next few days so that we can complete the work that should have been done last December.

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), the vice chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and, frankly, I want to thank her for taking on this rule and the role she plays in this House. She came to Congress with an extraordinary expertise in national security, probably unsurpassed by any new Member. So she is not only a valuable member of the Rules Committee, she is an important voice for the security of the United States of America in a very dangerous era.

Before I begin, I want to actually agree with my friend from Massachusetts on a couple of very important points that he made. First, I want to agree with him that this should have been done earlier. My friend is exactly right about this. This could have been done, in my view, in November and December. We should have gotten it done then. We would have avoided a lot of problems that come with a continuing resolution.

I am very pleased that we are moving it now, but earlier would have been better, no question about it. And that is true with every other bill, and my friend made that point as well. We really should make sure that each of the appropriations bills are passed. All of the problems associated with the continuing resolution are so evident for our military, are evident, frankly, in every other department. So I would hope my leadership continues to do what they are doing today and that is move these bills forward.

My friend is also right, in my opinion, about the authorization of the use of military force. This is something we have agreed on, even when we disagree on other things. This is a congressional responsibility. The President has announced he is going to announce a new strategy going forward on ISIS. I would suggest to my side of the aisle and to the administration, now would be a great time to come to the Congress so we could have this robust debate on deploying and using our military and discharge our constitutional responsibilities.

I am less persuaded by my friend's arguments about the spending levels here. I just point out for the record this is well below what former Secretary of Defense Gates, when he was Secretary in the Obama administration, recommended we should be doing at this time. Frankly, that is because the last administration dropped the ball and simply didn't listen to its own experts as to what the appropriate level of our forces should be.

The underlying legislation here is an excellent bill. My friends have already talked about it in detail. I am going to take a 30,000-foot look at the bill and remind our listeners and our colleagues, there are three important objectives that this bill achieves:

The first is stopping the erosion in end strength, something that went on for years under the last administration that somehow thought we would be safer if our military got smaller. That was a bad assumption.

The second is to restart the procurement cycle. We have fallen far, far behind what we should be doing in terms of replacing, upgrading, and improving the weapons systems and the communication systems, every system that we move into war with and that we ask our men and women to use.

And finally, this actually begins to address a problem that my friend from Wyoming discussed in great detail: readiness. We simply are not ready now to fight with the effectiveness. Now, I don't have any doubt, if we had to deploy massively, that our forces would do well and they would win, but a lot of people would die because they hadn't had the appropriate training, the appropriate time on task to get ready.

The other great objective that this bill meets is that we finally match up spending with the authorization. Last year, we had an excellent authorization bill out of the House Armed Services Committee. Unfortunately, that doesn't get you very far if the money doesn't match the policies and the recommendations that they advanced. This now takes care of that problem.

I also remind our colleagues that passing this bill is only a first step. As my friend from Wyoming pointed out, we are going to need a supplemental later this year, just for this year. We are going to need a robust increase in the fiscal year 2018 authorization and appropriation, something that the President has committed to and something I hope we can advance on a bipartisan basis.

Finally, again, as my friend pointed out, real military buildups take years, not months and weeks. We are going to have to be at this task for several years to restore and strengthen, frankly, what we allowed to decline, what the last administration allowed to decline over several years.

So this is an extraordinary first step, but it is only a first step; and I would hope my colleagues would join us on a bipartisan basis, while we have differences, but come together and put the defense of the country in a very dangerous time ahead of all else that we do.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the bill and the underlying legislation, and I urge the passage of the rule.

Again, I want to thank my friend from Wyoming. I want to thank my friend from Massachusetts. We sometimes disagree, but he makes very valuable and very important points in some of the critiques he offers, and I hope that we heed them well.

With that, again, Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of the underlying legislation and the adoption of the rule.

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

I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for his kind words and for understanding that it is inappropriate for Congress to continue these wars without having a vote on an AUMF. I hope that that changes, but I appreciate his support, and there is bipar-

tisan support for having this body actually do its job. That shouldn't be a radical idea, but, unfortunately, nowadays, doing our job seems to be something that a lot of people don't want to do.

Mr. Speaker, at the very beginning of the year, the Republican majority adopted a rule to explicitly exempt the cost of any bill that repeals or amends the Affordable Care Act from a requirement that it not increase spending by \$5 billion. They effectively adopted a legislative blindfold to completely ignore the cost of repeal.

Let me show you the poster of the language, and I am happy to provide this to my colleagues on the Republican side. I will even give you my bifocals if you want to read it, because I think it is important that people understand what it says. It says:

Point of order: It shall not be in order to consider any bill that would cause a net increase in direct spending in excess of \$5 billion.

Limitation: This subsection shall not apply to any bill repealing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, as you can see, with this act, the majority declared that they were not going to let the rules of this House, which are purportedly in place to ensure fiscal discipline, stand in the way of repealing the Affordable Care Act no matter how much it would cost American families.

But, Mr. Speaker, it gets even worse. As we stand here today, Republicans have taken their head-in-the-sand approach to the Affordable Care Act to a new low. Right now, both the Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means Committees are considering Republican legislation to repeal healthcare reform without providing any analysis from the nonpartisan experts at the Congressional Budget Office on the cost of their legislation.

So let me put this another way. Earlier this year, the Republicans said: It does not matter how much it will cost to take health care away from millions of Americans. Now they are saying they don't even want to know how much it will cost or what impact it will have on American families.

Mr. Speaker, we have over 200 employees at the Congressional Budget Office. That office costs nearly \$50 million a year. We pay them to advise us precisely at times like this. Republicans have talked about repeal and replace for 7 years. Acting like they had not enough time to weigh the cost of their actions would be laughable if it were not so irresponsible.

Now, we Democrats care about health care and we care about costs and we demand to know what the impact of this repeal bill will be. Members should not be asked to vote on this legislation until they know the full weight of their decision.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that would require a CBO cost estimate to be made publicly

available before any legislation that amends or repeals the Affordable Care Act may be considered in the Energy and Commerce or Ways and Means Committee or on the House floor.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA), who has been a leader on this issue, and he will explain this even further.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding time.

The issue before us is far more basic than one's view on the Affordable Care Act. I recognize that there is a philosophical difference about the Affordable Care Act: on our side of the aisle, we think it is good legislation; on the opposite side of the aisle, they have concerns. But the issue is whether the American people, whether taxpayers, ought to know the cost of the repeal legislation, whether they have the right to know how much a legislation introduced in this House costs.

Now, here is the irony: the Speaker of the House, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, made his entire career demanding that we know numbers behind legislation. That was his mantra in his time of service in the House.

You talk to Doug Elmendorf, who was the former Congressional Budget Office Director, and he said that the one thing he respected about the Speaker is that he would actually insist on the numbers, that he would want to know how much we are adding to a \$20 trillion deficit. That is why it is incomprehensible to me that, in this Congress, under this Speaker, we would ever be asked to vote on legislation without knowing the financial impact of that legislation.

These are basic issues:

How much is the repeal legislation going to add to our deficit?

How much is it going to finance tax cuts for the wealthy?

How many people will it leave out of insurance or how many people would it add to insurance?

There just ought to be a transparent discussion.

Now, it is not just Democrats who want this transparent discussion; actually, a Republican, the gentleman from Ohio, a founder of the Freedom Caucus, has expressed similar concerns. He has expressed concerns that this repeal legislation will balloon the deficit and explode the deficit, and he wants to know the numbers.

We can have as much respectful disagreement about how to cover people and whether the Affordable Care Act is

a good piece of legislation or not, but what we should not be debating is the public's right to transparency. That is why I urge my colleagues to reject the previous question so that we can hold an immediate vote on requiring the Congressional Budget Office to score the repeal legislation and provide the American people with the basic financial costs of the legislation.

□ 1300

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

What is incomprehensible to me is that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem so fundamentally confused about what the actual issue before us today is. The issue before us today is whether or not this House is going to undertake its fundamental, most important, most sacred obligation under our Constitution and provide for the defense of this Nation.

Now, they can choose to dedicate their time to another very important topic. It is a hugely important topic and one that we will have many days to debate and discuss on this floor. Unlike under the previous leadership, Speaker PELOSI, our leadership, Speaker RYAN, has not told us we have to pass the bill before we know what is in it.

Today, the issue before us in this House is whether or not we are going to provide for the defense of this Nation.

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

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I am so grateful that our colleagues across the aisle have become so interested in the impact of the national debt on the American people. I only wish that, during their time in control of the White House, we had not doubled the national debt.

I am similarly grateful that Members on the other side of the aisle would say that we should know the impact of legislation before we vote for it because, after all, it was former Speaker PELOSI who said: Let's vote for it so that we know what is in the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because following an 8-year cycle of abandonment, it is time we do right by our military members and their families. I rise in support of the brave warriors stationed at Eglin Air Force Base, Naval Air Station Pensacola, and all across the globe. The 2.1 percent pay raise we provide in this appropriation is a modest downpayment on what is owed to those who put themselves in harm's way for our freedom.

Our current state of military readiness is not acceptable. Half of the planes in our Navy cannot fly. Pilots are leaving. Marines are harvesting parts out of museums. Soldiers downrange don't have the unrivaled equipment they need to match their unrivaled patriotism.

This \$583 billion appropriation is a first step. It means 74 new F-35 aircraft. The F-35 is the most capable air-

craft in the sky. Pilots have greater survivability in the F-35. This matters so much to me. In my district, we are training the next generation of F-35 pilots to fight and win against any enemy we encounter in the skies.

This legislation also reflects our values by investing in cancer research and traumatic brain injury research.

Now, some say we cannot focus on defense; we should focus on other domestic priorities. I would simply say our adversaries are not waiting. Our warfighters and military families are tired of waiting and so am I.

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

I appreciated the gentleman from Florida's comments, but I would just ask him: Why is the Republican leadership 5 months late in bringing a defense appropriations bill to the floor?

We could have done this months ago. So if there was this urgency, it seems to escape the Republican leadership.

I want to take issue with the gentleman from Wyoming when she says that what is important today and what we are debating today is only this Defense Appropriations bill.

As you know, we are currently debating the rule, and the rule is a tool used to set the House agenda and to prioritize consideration of legislation. For that very reason, this is, in fact, the appropriate time for us to explain to the American people what legislation we would like to prioritize, what is of grave concern to us, and what agenda we would like to pursue in this House.

The fact of the matter is that, as we are speaking, the House Ways and Means Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee are marking up TrumpCare, which we know, in all likelihood, is going to result in millions of Americans losing their health insurance. We also are concerned that it is going to cost the American taxpayer a boatload of money.

What we are simply saying here today is that the Congressional Budget Office, which we fund and we rely on, ought to be able to give us a cost estimate, ought to tell us how much this is going to add to our deficit, how much it is going to cost the American people, how many people are going to lose their health care.

Why in the world would you rush a major piece of legislation through committee and onto the floor without even knowing what you are talking about?

I mean, this process constitutes mindless legislating. This is not doing your job, and that is all we are requesting.

We can argue over whether or not you like the Affordable Care Act or you don't. But whatever you are going to do, we ought to bring it to the floor with everybody's eyes wide open and knowing what the impacts are going to be.

Talk about lack of transparency, this TrumpCare bill was under lock and key until just a couple of days ago. It was

the best-kept secret in the world. For 7 years, my friends have been talking about a replacement bill. No one ever saw it. But all of a sudden, it is brought out before the American people at a press conference and, again, in a way that doesn't answer a lot of questions. It is being rushed through committee, and it is going to be rushed onto the House floor. That is not a good process.

I will remind my colleagues that when the Affordable Care Act was considered here in the House, the House held 79 bipartisan hearings and markups on the health insurance reform in 2009 and 2010. You have held no hearings. None. There has been no expert testimony, no healthcare professionals, no doctors, no patients, no nurses, no families, nothing. There have been no hearings. The bill went right to markup.

House Members spent nearly 100 hours in hearings, heard from 181 witnesses from both sides of the aisle, considered 239 amendments, both Democratic and Republican, accepted 21 amendments. Again, there have been no hearings.

In markup, the Energy and Commerce Committee adopted 24 GOP amendments. In markup, the Education and the Workforce Committee adopted six GOP amendments. The original House bill was posted online for 30 days before the first committee began their markup and more than 100 days before the tricommittees formally introduced their merged bill in the House.

House Democrats posted their first House bill online for the promised 72-hour review. The Senate bill voted on in the House was online for 3 months, and the reconciliation bill was online for 72 hours of review before the final vote.

House Democrats heard and answered questions from constituents at more than 3,000 healthcare townhalls and public events. Tens of thousands of emails, calls, and letters were logged in congressional offices to register public comment. My friends are busy trying to avoid public town meetings.

I am just simply saying that we are raising this issue because we are deeply concerned about the prospect of millions of Americans losing health care and about you adding God knows what to our deficit. I don't think it is too much to come together in a bipartisan way to say: Let us know what the costs are going to be, let us know what the impacts are going to be. And if you still want to vote for TrumpCare, you can vote for it, but you ought to know what you are voting for.

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

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

I would say that not knowing what they are talking about is something with which our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are quite familiar. Accounts of public input really bear little

relationship to what actually happened when ObamaCare itself was drafted in the dark of night.

Imagine what it must be like if you are tuning in to this conversation and this discussion thinking that the U.S. House of Representatives is taking up the rule to debate, discuss, and pass our FY17 Defense Appropriations. Instead, what we are hearing is a list of when bills were posted online—a list—which, as I said, bears little reality to what actually happened when ObamaCare was passed.

Now, those are hugely important issues. I am incredibly proud of the job we are doing as Republicans in this body to help save a collapsing healthcare system.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is no higher duty and obligation we have than to ensure that our military is second to none. No matter what kind of a job we do, as important as that is to repeal and replace ObamaCare, if we fail to address this fundamental issue and fail to provide the resources our military needs, nothing else we do in this body matters.

I believe, frankly, that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle owe our men and women in uniform, they owe the policymakers at the Pentagon, they owe those people who are serving this Nation the respect of talking about the resources they need to do their job and focusing on the true issue before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for H.R. 1301, which will fund our national defense for fiscal year 2017. This bill is a vital first step as we begin to work on rebuilding our military. The best way to look at defense spending over time is as a percentage of U.S. gross domestic product.

Since World War II, we have spent an average of 5 percent of our GDP on defense during peacetime. Despite a world that has gotten more dangerous, the defense drawdown in recent years cut defense spending from 5 percent of GDP to 3 percent of GDP. And in a \$17 trillion economy, that is real money.

Meanwhile, since Vietnam, we have spent an average of 21 percent of the Federal budget on defense. Today, we spend well below that, about 15 percent of the overall budget.

Things are so bad today—and I don't have time in 2 minutes to go into all the details—that we are actually at risk of losing more American lives than we should in the event of another war.

The next step is to pass a robust defense supplemental and then to fund defense for fiscal year 2018 at a minimum level of \$640 billion. Anything less will not keep Americans safe and will not allow us to rebuild our military as we desperately must do.

Congress must deal with sequestration. Trying to fund defense at BCA levels is like trying to put a size 10 foot

into a size 7 shoe. It simply doesn't work and it is dangerous for our own security and it is dangerous for the world.

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

I want to say to my colleagues on the other side: I know you don't like me talking about health care. If I were you, I wouldn't want to talk about health care either. This is a serious matter, and it is a matter of security for millions and millions of Americans in our country.

Again, maybe somebody over there can tell me: How much is this new TrumpCare bill going to cost? How much is it going to add to the deficit? How much are the American taxpayers going to have to pay for it? Does anyone know how many people will lose their coverage? Hello?

I guess I would ask the questions: Why do we have over 200 employees at the Congressional Budget Office, who we pay \$50 million a year to be able to give us these estimates, if we are not going to utilize them? Why are we doing this?

It seems to me that before we do something that could harm millions of people in this country, before we could do something that could result in an increase in our deficit, why don't we ask the experts? And we all acknowledge that they are experts and we pay them lots of money. Why don't we get their advice?

This whole process seems backwards. You ought not to be marking up bills when you don't know what their impact is going to be.

Part of our job as Members of Congress, in addition to holding hearings and listening to experts and listening to citizens tell us their perspective—which, again, has been totally ignored in this process of the repeal of the healthcare bill—is also to make sure that when we are voting, we know what the impact is going to be, we know whether or not it is going to have a positive impact or whether it is going to have a negative impact.

Again, one of the reasons why I want to defeat the previous question is so that we can vote in a, hopefully, bipartisan way to get a CBO score so we know what is what.

I get it. I know my colleagues don't want to talk about health care. They would rather talk about something we should have done months ago. That is what we are doing now, we are doing old work now. This should have been done 4 or 5 months ago. I am just baffled why you don't want to do your job.

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

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

We on this side of the aisle are more than happy to talk about health care. We are more than happy to talk about the really crucial work that is under-way to rescue our healthcare system from the collapse and the train wreck of ObamaCare, which my colleague's

party put into place in the dark of night with no reading of the bill.

We are thrilled actually that our bill is 120 pages and that it is readable and that it is available online right now. So when he leaves the floor, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts can go read the bill.

It is also not surprising that our colleagues do not want to talk about our national defense because the record of the last 8 years, the record of the last President is unparalleled in American history. The mess that we are having to clean up with respect to our healthcare system is matched perhaps only—and maybe even exceeded—by the damage that was done to our military and to our national security under the last administration.

We think, on this side of the aisle, that it is crucially important that we do our job when the time is now to debate, discuss, and vote on this bill and address this topic.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TAYLOR).

□ 1315

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of the 2017 Defense Appropriations bill, a bill providing vital funding for the United States military and intelligence communities who continue to be engaged in responding, engaging, and destroying threats around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honor and the great responsibility of representing the largest concentration of Active-Duty military and veterans of any congressional district in the Nation. Who are they? Fathers, mothers, sisters, brothers, sons, daughters, soccer coaches, neighbors.

Our district has thousands of the less than 1 percent of the Nation that has gone forth over and over to fight for us; the best among us, fighting the worst in the world.

In our district, Mr. Speaker, we have the largest naval base in the world, NASA, SEAL teams, Marines, Army soldiers, Air Force Combat Command, coastguardsmen, Oceana Naval Master Jet Base, national guardsmen, and many, many more.

Mr. Speaker, we are moving toward the smallest Army since World War II, the smallest Air Force ever, Navy ships not being properly maintained due to budget, Marine planes not combat-ready. This is unacceptable. Our Nation requires a military, but our force is voluntary. We owe them more.

We must take up this 2017 Defense Appropriations bill to help maintain a technological advantage. If we must send our men and women into harm's way, let us always send these warfighters with an unfair advantage.

This bill provides essential equipment, platforms, and upgrades. We must give our force and our industrial base predictability and stability, the right equipment, the right training, and the right military superiority.

This bill not only supports the warfighters, but their families as well

who, Mr. Speaker, are the very backbone of our forces and an integral part of the tremendous sacrifice that has taken place for our Nation. This bill provides important investments in traumatic brain injury, suicide prevention, sexual assault prevention, and much more.

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this bill gives a well-deserved pay raise, enhances health care, and eases the burden our Nation demands on military families moving forward. I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in support of this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I surely want to make sure that we support our warfighters. My problem with the Defense bill is that we are spending so much money on things that I think are questionable. I would rather spend money on supporting our troops more than spending \$1 trillion over the next 3 decades building more nuclear weapons. We have more nuclear weapons than any other country in the world, and we ought to be talking about limiting nuclear weapons and eliminating them altogether.

I want to support our men and women who we put in harm's way, but I want this Congress, I want Members of this House, to do their job. It doesn't take any courage to sit back and have troops deployed all over the world, in harm's way, and we don't even take the time to actually debate an authorization for the use of military force. We are too afraid to talk about those issues.

So when we talk about supporting our men and women in uniform, people ought to do a little bit of reflection on how we have not been doing our job.

Again, I note my friends don't want to talk about health care. My colleague actually said she would like to talk about health care more. Well, we should, because the fact of the matter is, as I said, as we are speaking here, the Republicans have unveiled this bill that has been in secret, that nobody has really had a chance to digest. No hearings. They want to talk about health care so much—no hearings, no expert testimony, no nothing. Right to markup; trying to rush it to the floor before we find out the true cost to the American people about what this TrumpCare bill is going to be all about; when they find out how many of them are going to lose their care; how it is going to cut Medicare; how senior citizens are going to see an increase in their healthcare costs; how average Americans are going to pay more for health care and get less protections; how people who are struggling in poverty are going to be out of luck because they are going to do away with the Medicaid guarantee to States.

Health care ought to be a fundamental right in this country, and they are taking that right away, and they are doing it in a fashion so that CBO, again, 200 employees at the Congressional Budget Office that Congress appropriates \$50 million a year to support so they can do their expert work, they are doing this in a way so we are not even asking for their expert advice. What sense does that make?

This is the rule. This is where we set our priorities about what our legislative agenda ought to be; and all I am simply saying is vote "no" on the previous question so we can vote on an amendment so we can demand a CBO score in the healthcare bill.

By the way, that doesn't slow down the Defense Appropriations bill. It still goes forward. Nothing stops. So let's do what is right. Let there be a little sunshine on this House of Representatives.

There is a pattern that has developed under the Republican leadership where everything is closed. This bill that we are dealing with right now, closed rule. It is not a conference report, closed rule.

We have had more closed rules in the first few months in this Congress than any Congress, I think, in history, and that is the pattern. No hearings, no discussion, just go right to markup. We don't want to know how much it is going to cost. We don't want to know how many people are going to be thrown off of health care. Let's just rush something through. That is mindless legislating, and it has to stop.

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER).

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, over the last 8 years, the United States has experienced a sharp rise in the number of military threats from foreign aggressors. Last month, Russia secretly deployed two batteries of new nuclear-capable cruise missiles. North Korea test-launched four ballistic missiles just this week, and China continues to bolster its military presence in the South China Sea, while going toward a naval fleet that may surpass 351 ships by 2020.

Meanwhile, our own Navy is the smallest it has been in 99 years, satisfying only 40 percent of the demand from regional commanders. Fifty-four percent of the Air Force's major weapons systems now qualify for antique vehicle license plates in the State of Virginia.

The Army, to quote the Vice Chief of Staff, is "outraged, outgunned, and outdated."

These are the bitter fruits of defense sequester; defense sequester which must be pulled out, root and branch. To quote Secretary Mattis: "No foe in the field can wreak such havoc on our security that mindless sequestration is achieving."

I agree with General Mattis. I agree that defense sequester is mindless. It is

also dangerous. So today, while I speak in support of this rule and this bill, I applaud the Appropriations Committee for its critical work, and I urge my colleagues to support final passage.

This is just the first step. We will not have fulfilled our first and foremost constitutional duty to keep the country safe until we have completely eliminated defense sequester and truly begun the process of restoring peace through strength.

Einstein's words are as true today as they were in 1931, when he said of America: "The part of passive spectator is unworthy of this country and is bound in the end to lead to disaster all around."

If we do not act now to rebuild and modernize our military, if we continue to play the role of passive spectator, not only will it lead to disaster, at some point we will no longer be worthy of global leadership.

So to my colleague, I will say that this is our job. This is our most basic job. So let's do what the American people sent us here to do to keep the country safe, restore peace through strength. That is doing our job.

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY).

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Wyoming, and I appreciate the hard work of Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Chairman GRANGER on this very important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the FY17 Department of Defense Appropriations bill, and I urge voting and adoption of this bill.

I served 26 years in uniform, and I can say, firsthand, that continuing resolutions are bad for our troops. It is urgent that we pass this bill. One reason is that we are in a military readiness crisis like I have not seen in my lifetime.

This bill provides over \$215 billion for readiness, an increase of \$5.2 billion above the FY16 enacted budget. This increase includes funding for flight time for our pilots, maintenance for our aircraft, and base operations, among other things. It also provides more than \$6.8 billion for procurement of aircraft, ships, and helicopters for our troops.

The bill fully funds the mighty A-10 Warthog, and it has continued funding for upgrades for this critical plane, extending its service life by starting the re-winging of the remaining 110 aircraft in the fleet. It also increases funding to maintain our asymmetric electronic warfare advantage, developed and tested at Fort Huachuca, in my district.

Finally, it provides funding for important missile programs, from air-to-air missiles to missile defense.

Our troops are counting on us. Let's stop the bickering, and let's pass this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am going to again urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote to defeat the previous question so we can actually bring an amendment to the floor to demand CBO tell us how much the Republican healthcare bill is going to cost and what its impact is going to be on the American people.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you why I am worried. The AARP estimates that the Republican repeal bill could increase premium costs by \$8,400 for a 64-year-old earning \$15,000 a year, and it could put at risk the health care of millions of vulnerable Americans.

Now, we have over 200 employees at the Congressional Budget Office. That office costs nearly \$50 million a year. We pay them to advise us precisely at times like this. We ought to rely on their information. We ought to ask for their guidance. Before marking up bills, before rushing bills to the floor that could adversely impact millions and millions of Americans that could break the bank in this country, we ought to find out what we are talking about.

We can walk and chew gum at the same time. You can pass the Defense bill and you can also pass an amendment that tells us how much this Republican healthcare bill is going to cost. We ought to do both.

So defeat the previous question so that we can bring this amendment to the floor. Let a little sunshine in on this process. Let the American people know what is going on here. I think that is the appropriate way to proceed.

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

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

H.R. 1301 is the first step we must take in rebuilding our military. It is only a first step. We must also repeal the Budget Control Act and end sequestration if we are going to truly address our shortfalls. We must return to a rational budgeting process at the Pentagon, where spending is based upon defending the defeating threats to this Nation, not arbitrary and devastating across-the-board cuts.

Mr. Speaker, nearly 70 years ago, President Harry Truman addressed this body about the growing Soviet threat to Eastern Europe. He said: "There are times in world history when it is far wiser to act than to hesitate. There is some risk in action. There always is. But there is far more risk in failure to act."

President Truman continued: "We must be prepared to pay the price for peace or, assuredly, we shall pay the price for war."

Today, Mr. Speaker, I urge that we begin to pay the price for peace. I urge support for the rule and for the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 174 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC. 2. In rule XXI add the following new clause:

13. (a) It shall not be in order to consider a bill or joint resolution proposing to repeal or amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PL 111-148) and the Health Care and Education Affordability Reconciliation Act of 2010 (PL 111-152), or part thereof, in the House, in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, or in the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means, unless an easily searchable electronic estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office is made available on a publicly available website of the House.

(b) It shall not be in order to consider a rule or order that waives the application of paragraph (a).

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, sec-

tion 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.

Ms. CHENEY. 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 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1330

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 725, INNOCENT PARTY
PROTECTION ACT

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 175 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 175

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 725) to amend title 28, United States Code, to prevent fraudulent joinder. 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. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted.