United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 16, 2013 No. 69

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. HARTZLER).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 16, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable VICKY HARTZLER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

FREEDOM UNDER SIEGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, just a week after the President extolled the benign virtues of Big Government and told university students to ignore those who warn of its dangers, Americans woke up to headlines that this government has been targeting groups and individuals that it doesn't like for intimidation and harassment.

I appreciate the President's sudden interest in getting to the bottom of this. But I must remind the House that more than a year ago, I and other Members rose on this floor to warn of these tactics directed at Tea Party groups by the IRS. At the time, the administration responded by saying that this was just a natural backlog. Well, we now know that was a deliberate and premeditated lie.

It now appears that nearly 500 conservative groups were subjected to invasive review and intimidation. The IRS demanded the names of every participant at every meeting these groups held over a period of years, transcripts of every speech given at those meetings, what positions they had taken on issues, the names of their volunteers and donors and, in some cases, their family members and associates, and copies of privileged communications they had with elected officials. In some cases, the person filing the request was then subjected to a personal income tax audit.

There is no way to estimate the number of additional groups that were discouraged from organizing because of these tactics. Meanwhile, it appears that leftist groups had their applications routinely approved. The impact this had on the 2012 election is incalculable.

We are also learning that these tactics extended well beyond a few low-level rogue employees in Cincinnati. Lois Lerner, the official in charge of tax exempt organizations for the IRS, was awarded more than $42,000 in bonuses while she was directing what the President now calls outrageous behavior. Highly intrusive and unwarranted demands for information also originated from the Washington, D.C., office and at least two satellite IRS offices in California.

Dr. Anne Hendershott, a Catholic sociologist, professor, and writer, came under a personal income tax audit after she exposed a George Soros front group masquerading as a grassroots Catholic organization. She said the questions put to her during a grueling audit were largely political. And this occurred from the New Haven, Connecticut, office.

It appears that evangelical groups were also targeted, as were Jewish groups supporting Israel.

Nor was this misconduct limited to groups applying under section 501.

There is now reason to believe that IRS officials leaked confidential tax information to top officials in the Obama campaign and to liberal groups such as ProPublica and The Huffington Post, which may then have illegally published that information.

During the campaign, Austan Goolsbee and HARRY REID referenced confidential tax information involving Charles and David Koch and Mitt Romney, only to back off when they were pressed for their sources.

Nor does this conduct appear to be limited to the IRS.

Shortly after businessman Frank Vandersloot was attacked by the Obama campaign for his support of Mitt Romney, he came under audits by both the IRS and the Labor Department.

The Competitive Enterprise Institute has just released a damning survey of fee waivers granted by the Environmental Protection Agency under the Freedom of Information Act. Left-leaning groups had their fees waived 92 percent of the time. Conservative groups just the opposite—about 7 percent of the time.

And this week, it also became clear that the FBI is using general warrants, banned by the Fourth Amendment, to rifle through the phone records of AP reporters with a clear intention to intimidate whistleblowers and to obstruct the operation of a free press.

We are seeing a pattern of conduct throughout this administration that is absolutely toxic to a free society: government using its powers to intimidate

Printed on recycled paper.

private citizens who are simply trying to take part in the public policy debate.

Madam Speaker, this cries out for a full investigation by the Congress, and I utterly reject the notion that the ritual naming and firing of a few hapless scapegoats is sufficient. Every government employee who abused their power needs to be identified, exposed, disgraced, dismissed, and debarred from ever again holding a position of authority or trust within this government.

When the Constitution was read by the New York Convention, Alexander Hamilton said:

> Here, sir, the people govern; here they act by their immediate representatives.

Madam Speaker, the most cherished liberties of the American people are under attack, and we, their immediate representatives, have a solemn obligation to act in the defense of their freedom, their country, and their Constitution.

CLIMATE CHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, a few days ago, the world's atmosphere passed 400 million parts per million level of carbon, higher than anything we have seen in the atmosphere for over 3 million years. This puts in stark focus the climate crisis and the indifference we are seeing from congressional leadership on this problem.

In the last 24 hours, all you needed to know about the state of play for climate science and dealing with global warming was in two articles in the newspaper. Yesterday, the business section of The New York Times by Eduardo Porter discussed how the reinsurance industry is entirely comfortable with the climate science, predicting more rapid extreme weather events and dire consequences.

They in the insurance industry, after all, don't have the luxury of debating science when they must deal with facts on the ground. This is dollar and cents for a vast industry trying to help people cope with the consequences of natural disaster. As a result of the market discipline, they have had to embrace reality, accept it, and plan for it.

It was poignant that Porter observed and probed their lack of engagement in government policies, at least in the United States, that would help minimize future damage. Remember, this is even as the scientists told us we have had the highest concentration of carbon for 3 million years.

In today's Washington Post, there is a front-page story about fish populations that aren't waiting for their habitat to make it impossible for them to live. Species all over the globe are moving. They are migrating to cooler climates. In a process that has been taking place for decades now, fish are sorting themselves out and leaving areas that no longer sustain their quality of life, their ability to reproduce, and to thrive. They have steadily been moving to areas where the effects of climate change are not so pronounced.

Isn't it interesting that fish without fancy scientific instrumentation or computer analysis or, dare I say it, political focus groups have reacted to facts in the sea and move to where they can function, where they can live, where they can escape for the time being, at least, the impact of climate change?

They are also escaping from the people who depend on these fish for their living in the previous habitat. But that is another story about the devastation that local communities are facing because of the climate change consequences.

□ 1010

Isn't it time that the political process starts responding to a problem that even fish can figure out?

What is it going to take for people in this body to wake up to their responsibilities and act with the same insight as aquatic species that don't have graduate degrees in computers but, mercifully for them, don't have political blinders and ideological fervor, wasting huge amounts of time on pointless activities like debating whether to repeal ObamaCare for the 37th time?

Hopefully, insurance companies and the people who depend on these aquatic creatures will lend an air of reality to the discussion of climate change that is almost nonexistent here on Capitol Hill, maybe reaching the point where it is no longer a debate because it's really past time for a debate.

It is time for us to take action like our friends in the ocean. If Charlie the Tuna can figure it out, why can't the Republican leadership in Congress? Let's maybe spend a little time debating with the Safe Climate Caucus this existential crisis of climate change and global warming.

NATIONAL EXCHANGE CLUB BIRTHDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Today, I have the distinct honor of wishing a belated ''happy birthday'' to an organization that I am a proud member of back home in Texas 14.

I want to take a moment to say thank you to the Exchange Club of Pearland of which I have been a member for a number of years. They've done a lot of good work in the community, and I look forward to the expansion of their club and the work they will continue to do to better that community.

I would also like to welcome the newest chapter in Friendswood, Texas, where I currently reside. I look forward to working with them in promoting American exceptionalism and in helping to serve our community.

For those of you who might not know, the National Exchange Club is a service organization with over 700 clubs and 21,000 members throughout the United States and Puerto Rico. On March 27, 2013, they celebrated their 102nd birthday. From a handful of members in Detroit, Michigan, at the turn of the 20th century, Exchange has developed into an outstanding national service organization comprised of tens of thousands of men and women who serve their local communities and advance their motto of ''Unity for Service.''

Exchange-sponsored activities are designed to benefit, award, and develop our Nation's youth, promote crime prevention, serve senior citizens, and recognize military and public safety service providers. Exchange also promotes Americanism, and its national project is the Prevention of Child Abuse program. In addition to these programs, the National Exchange Club has been at the forefront of significant developments throughout American history, including the early days of aviation progress. The spirit of patriotism, along with a desire to heighten the awareness of our rich religious heritage, placed Exchange in a position of leadership with other organizations that led to the addition of the words ''under God'' to the Pledge of Allegiance in 1954.

As Reagan said, ''If we ever forget we are 'one Nation under God,' we will be a Nation gone under.''

The Exchange Club is America's service club, an organization that promotes American exceptionalism. I am a believer in our country's exceptionalism, and I will never apologize for it.

Think about this for a second, folks. Whether it's a hurricane, whether it's a tsunami, whether it's an earthquake, whatever it is, when the world has a catastrophe and dials 911, who is it that answers? It's America, isn't it? It's the red, white, and blue. It's the land of the free, the home of the brave.

For a safe world, we need a strong America. For a strong America, we need a safe America. The Exchange Club works ever so hard to keep America strong and safe.

So, to them, I wish a very happy birthday, especially to the Pearland club and the Friendswood club. I say thank you for all of your hard work.

I am RANDY WEBER, and that's the way I see it from where I sit here in America.

DEBT CEILING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office's latest forecast says this year's Federal deficit will shrink by 41 percent compared to last year's. That point bears repeating. The deficit is shrinking—and dramatically—thanks to the bipartisan actions taken by this

Congress earlier this year. The CBO now projects a deficit of $642 billion, which is $200 billion less than projected just 3 months ago, the lowest level since 2008. Just 4 years ago, the deficit was over 10 percent of our GDP. This year, it's projected to fall below 5 percent—half of what it was just 4 years ago.

Now, I understand that this news may not fit neatly within the narrative of our friends on the other side of the aisle, who, just as they did in the summer of 2011 unfortunately, tried just last week to manufacture yet another debt crisis where none exists.

I would note that it was only a few months ago that we worked together in a bipartisan fashion to suspend the debt limit. On the heels of our New Year's Day compromise on the tax portions of the fiscal cliff, my Republican colleagues recognized the dangers of yet another debt showdown on the markets and on the possibility of downgrading U.S. creditworthiness; but rather than build on that rare moment of bipartisan comity and work with Democrats on a balanced plan to put our Nation back on the path of fiscal responsibility, House Republicans doubled down. They pushed ahead with their ''cut spending at any cost'' agenda. They pushed through a continuing resolution that baked in the harmful cuts of sequestration, which is a self-inflicted wound on our economy.

Ironically, House Republicans just last week pushed through on a party-line vote a bill that claims to protect the full faith and credit of the United States when, in reality, it would only place it more at risk by suggesting we won't be good for our debt. Furthermore, many of my Republican colleagues have relied on this debt crisis research done by two economists, Messrs. Reinhart and Rogoff, who have suggested that high levels of public debt always lead to lower rates of economic growth. That research has been the foundation of Republican austerity proposals in America, including the last three versions of the Ryan budget, which decimate public investments in our communities and the economy in the name of deficit reduction. It turns out the researchers aggregated the data incorrectly. They couldn't even read the Excel sheets properly, and that dramatically shifted the findings to show growth for high debt countries was more than 2 percent higher than they said it was, and it turns out there is no magical threshold of 90 percent that always leads to, in fact, economic contraction. In fact, it's quite the opposite.

Raising the debt limit is not a license to spend more money. It simply ensures that America will be good for its current debts and obligations. We've been good for that since Alexander Hamilton established the U.S. Treasury in George Washington's first Cabinet. The bipartisan agreement to suspend the debt ceiling expires this weekend, but with this latest forecast, the CBO now says that that limit probably won't be reached until October or November of this year. Most news reports suggest this will reduce the political pressure to achieve a bipartisan deal on further reducing the deficit in a balanced way. I'd argue the urgency still remains and that this window of time presents us with a perfect opportunity for bipartisan negotiations to resume without the specter of that sort of debt ceiling limit over our heads immediately.

I am dismayed that my Republican friends continue to shun their own party's heritage for making strategic investments in infrastructure and innovation in favor of a blind adherence to slashing government spending with no acknowledgment for the consequences. I've consistently said that Federal spending must be reduced, but I've also said that it must be done in tandem with maintaining strategic Federal investments in things that create jobs, like R&D, infrastructure, innovation. I would suggest that my Republican friends look no further than the GDP growth from the last two quarters, showing it's not the Federal debt but their meat-ax approach to cutting those Federal investments that, in fact, has created what drag there is on the U.S. economy.

The last time Republicans played games with the debt ceiling we registered the lowest monthly job growth in 3 years; the stock market tumbled; and the S&P, for the first time ever, downgraded U.S. debt. The latest jobs numbers show we've been adding 208,000 jobs a month on average since November, prompting a surge in confidence reflected by the market's climb to record levels.

I implore my friends on the other side of the aisle to use this time to work with us on a balanced approach to deficit reduction and economic growth.

□ 1020

LIGHTS OUT AT OUR MILITARY BASES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TURNER. Madam Speaker, it is literally ''lights out'' at our military bases.

Next to me is a photo that ran the other weekend in my hometown newspaper, which shows darkened hallways at the largest Air Force base in the world, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. There wasn't a lack of power at the base that day, but a lack of leadership here in Washington. The lights were out because the Senate and the President have failed to take up the issue of sequestration.

Sequestration is having a devastating effect on the readiness and the morale of our servicemembers and civilian workforce. Imagine going to work and the President feels that you are so insignificant that you don't even deserve to have the lights on.

The President promised the American people during his reelection campaign that this would not happen, but it has. It's time for the President to come to the table with a solution to this issue before our military is irreparably impacted.

GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Madam Speaker, by now you've all heard of the terrible shooting that took place on Sunday during the Mother's Day parade in New Orleans. Like all Americans, I was saddened to once again see a joyous public event marred by gun violence.

Yet, as the Mother's Day shooting unfolded in New Orleans, I was struck by another lesser known story about the toll of gun violence that was playing out more than 100 miles away in Chicago. It is the story of love and loss told by the mothers of those killed by gun violence who were facing Mother's Day without their children, perhaps for the first time.

A group of these mothers gathered at a memorial outside a Chicago church to mourn and remember their children. As a mother who was blessed to spend the day with my children, their pain and anguish is unimaginable.

For every mass shooting that grabs the headlines, there are dozens more that take place on America's streets every day that are leaving a lost generation in their wake. And yet, in the national debate about gun violence, these everyday killings, this slow-motion massacre is often overlooked. And so are the mothers who are left behind.

Just as the mothers who wept for their children in Newtown, these Chicago mothers are also the faces of the aftermath of gun violence. Because whether your child is shot in the classroom or on a street corner or in a park, your hopes and dreams for them were the same, and so is the agony of your loss.

It is for these mothers—Clara Allen, Tanya Butler, Angela Blakely, and others like them—that I raise my voice and will continue to raise my voice in memory of their children to implore my colleagues in Congress to pass reasonable and responsible gun legislation. We must act now to end the senseless scourge of killings in our streets due to gun violence.

I know there are those who think that new gun laws are not the solution. I say they're looking at the wrong equation. Commonsense gun restrictions are part of a multipronged approach to stemming gun violence that should also include increased access to mental health services and better community and social supports. It will take a village to save these children, our children.

Passing commonsense gun legislation is a key step in the process by helping to keep guns out of the wrong hands. We must take a stand for these children and their mothers and send the message that we hear them, we care about them, and that their lives matter.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, later on this afternoon, the House will vote for the 37th time to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives has already been on record saying that the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land. So it's just not clear to me why we are wasting the time and the treasure of the American people on another futile legislative fantasy.

In fact, it's a legislative fantasy that has cost the American people more than $50 million. If, in fact, the Affordable Care Act were to be repealed, it would do even more damage, as independent economists have estimated that a repeal would add to the Federal deficit by more than $100 billion.

It's often been said that the classic definition of ''insanity'' is doing the same thing over and over and over again but somehow expecting a different result.

Barack Obama was elected President in 2008. The Affordable Care Act was signed into law in 2010. The Supreme Court, with the Chief Justice voting in the majority, held that the Affordable Care Act was constitutional in 2012. A few months later, President Barack Obama was reelected in an electoral college landslide. Yet, later on this afternoon, we're voting to repeal the Affordable Care Act for the 37th time—over and over and over again. It's a classic definition of legislative insanity, as if the 37th vote is going to be any different, will yield any different results than the previous 36 where we've wasted the taxpayer dollars of the American people.

The Affordable Care Act is the law of the land, and that's a good thing. It's a good thing because over the next decade more than 30 million Americans who otherwise would not have had health care insurance will be insured. It seems to me that that's a good thing.

The Affordable Care Act makes sure that insurance companies cannot deny medical coverage for preexisting conditions. It seems to me that that's a good thing.

The Affordable Care Act provides small businesses with a 35 percent tax credit, which will enable these small businesses to continue to grow and to flourish. It seems to me that that's a good thing.

The Affordable Care Act allows young Americans who are just starting out to remain on the insurance plan of their parents until the age of 26, giving them a real chance to get themselves started in their pursuit of the American Dream. I'm new, but it seems to me that that's a good thing.

Yet later on this afternoon, for the 37th time, we're engaging in another futile legislative fantasy.

There are a couple of other things that we could be doing. We could be dealing with the sequester, $85 billion in random cuts that are costing the economy more than 500,000 jobs, but we're not.

We could be debating the American Jobs Act, trying to put the people of this great country back to work and stimulate the economy, but we're not.

We could be trying to get a budget, go to conference, create some certainty for industry and the American people, but we're not.

Madam Speaker, I'm hopeful that after this vote is taken, we can finally come to the reality that the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land, it's good for the American people, and we should get back to doing things that will advance prosperity in this great country.

□ 1030

REPEAL PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise this morning to speak about an issue that is of great concern to my constituents back home in Pennsylvania, and it's the matter of the implementation of the President's Affordable Care Act, the implementation which some members of the President's party have described as a coming train wreck. Madam Speaker, that train wreck has arrived. This massive undertaking of enacting such a broad, confusing law has only highlighted the concerns that I and many of my constituents back home have had with this law and what it means for our small businesses and families in Pennsylvania.

However, a new concern—possibly greater than the idea of government-run health care—has presented itself over the last several days with the revelation that the Internal Revenue Service has been targeting law-abiding Americans simply because of their beliefs. The IRS now wants to know what we think and what books we read.

Madam Speaker, the President's health care law is largely a tax bill. It contains at least 20 new or higher taxes on American families and businesses. That makes it the biggest change to an already-confusing Tax Code in over two decades. And with the implementation of this massive tax bill comes the IRS' new role in running it.

By putting politics ahead of fairness, the IRS has violated the trust of the American people at a time when the administration is loading it up with more responsibility and more power. Under health care reform, the IRS will gather extensive information about the financial resources and health insurance status of all Americans. The expansion of the IRS' power will include hundreds of billions of dollars in new taxes, the hiring of thousands of enforcement agents, and a tower of new rules and regulations. I'm deeply concerned with the ability of the agency and the resolve of the agency to lawfully manage this significant undertaking with discretion and with accountability.

While the agency reported that new rules are in place to ensure that this type of situation never happens again, like many Americans, I question why this disturbing trend was ever allowed to happen in the first place. The President's health care law does too much to infringe on the rights of the American people and swells the size and scope of an already bloated Federal Government, which has once again proven incapable of acting responsibly.

Today, I urge Members of Congress to fully repeal the health care law and, in doing so, take the first step to replacing it with commonsense solutions for all Americans—like allowing people to purchase health coverage across State lines; stopping frivolous lawsuits against our doctors; clearing individuals to receive tax credits just like large businesses; and letting Americans keep control of the health care that works best for them.

RIGHT TO VOTE AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about the most fundamental right we as Americans have as citizens of this great country, the right to vote. The right to vote is not just fundamental; it is the right that preserves all of our other liberties that we as Americans hold dear. In fact, this right is so fundamental that most Americans, understandably, assume it is already enshrined in the Constitution. Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, most Americans would be wrong.

While the right to vote is inherent throughout our founding document, and there are amendments prohibiting discrimination, nothing in the Constitution explicitly guarantees our right to vote. We, as Americans, possess no affirmative right to vote.

Why is this important? Because without a constitutional provision, courts have upheld burdensome registration requirements, voter-identification laws, and reduced early voting opportunities in States across the country.

According to the Brennan Center for Justice, just this year alone, more than 80 restrictive laws have been introduced in more than 30 States. From New York to Washington, legislation

has been introduced that require voters to show a photo ID. States from Virginia to New Mexico have considered bills that would make voter registration more difficult. And from Arizona to Tennessee, States have taken steps to limit early voting.

Unfortunately, this plague of restrictive voting efforts has hit my State of Wisconsin as well. In 2011, our legislature passed a law that would limit the fundamental rights Wisconsinites have to vote. Not only would this law require a photo ID; it also took steps to disenfranchise senior citizens and college students, reduce registration opportunities, and restrict the ability of citizens to receive absentee ballots.

But Wisconsin has something that other States do not possess—a guaranteed right to vote. Article III, section 1, of the Wisconsin Constitution specifically states:

> Every United States citizen age 18 or older who is a resident of an election district in this State is a qualified elector of that district.

This one sentence makes a huge difference for Wisconsinites. In two separate cases challenging the Wisconsin voter ID law, the Wisconsin circuit courts have ruled that these restrictive, burdensome voting laws are unconstitutional because, from the decision in NAACP of Milwaukee v. Walker:

> The Wisconsin Constitution expressly guarantees the right to vote.

But this isn't enough. Not all States have this right. Our friends in Indiana, as we have seen, have little recourse if a restrictive voting law is signed into law.

Now more than ever, we need to be protecting our right to vote, not restricting it. We need to reaffirm our founding principle that our country is at its strongest when everyone participates. We need to guarantee a right to vote for everyone.

So this week, along with my friend and colleague, Congressman KEITH ELLISON from Minnesota, I introduced a right-to-vote amendment to the Constitution that will explicitly guarantee, without a doubt, the right of the American people to vote. The amendment is as simple as it is necessary: every American citizen possesses the fundamental right to vote in every public election where they reside, and Congress has the right and power to protect it.

No more will Americans have to prove their right to vote has been infringed. Instead, the burden of proof will be left to States to demonstrate that any efforts they take will not deny or abridge the fundamental right to vote.

Now, I know there are some out there who will say that an amendment to the Constitution is unrealistic; it's too hard to achieve. Those critics are shortsighted. This is about engaging my colleagues in Congress on both sides of the aisle and the American public in a movement to ensure our right to vote is not at the mercy of those acting with partisan motives. The right to vote is not a Democratic right, nor is it a Republican right. It is an American right, and it is fundamental to a government for the people, by the people.

Madam Speaker, I'm proud to support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to join on and protect our most fundamental right.

HONORING JACOBY DICKENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of America's most prominent African American businessmen and financiers. Mr. Jacoby Dickens was born and grew up in Panama City, Florida, one of six children in a low-income family.

The family moved to the south side of Chicago when Mr. Dickens was a teenager. He attended Wendell Phillips High School. After school he worked as a building engineer, saved his money, and began investing in real estate. He eventually purchased and managed a large number of apartment buildings before selling them in 1971.

After investing in several bowling alleys in the Chicago area, he was asked to join the board of Seaway Bank in 1979. In 1983, he became chairman of the board and remained until his death earlier this year. Under his guidance and leadership, Seaway Bank and Trust Company became the largest Black-owned bank in Chicago with assets of $547 million.

Mr. Dickens was a great civic activist and contributor to public causes. He served on the boards of Chicago State University, the School of Business at Florida A&M University, and the Chicago Urban League. He donated more than $1 million to Chicago State University's athletic center, which bears his name. He was a trustee at the Museum of Science and Industry and DePaul University, where a scholarship and loan program are named for him. In the 1980s, he was a key supporter and fundraiser for Harold Washington, who was elected the first African American mayor of Chicago.

Jacoby Dickens was a man of vision, courage, and determination. He used his wisdom, business acumen, and money wisely, not only for himself and his family, but also for the uplifting of humanity. My condolences and well wishes go out to his wife, Ms. Veranda Dickens, their family, and all of the trustees and employees of Seaway Bank and Trust Company.

□ 1040

Mr. Dickens was, indeed, a man for the times and the seasons in which he lived. His bank gave loans in depressed communities and neighborhoods where people were hard-pressed to find resources. He will be sorely missed and always remembered.

POVERTY IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, as the cofounder of the Congressional Out of Poverty Caucus and chair of the Democratic Whip Task Force on Poverty and Opportunity, I rise today to continue talking about the ongoing crisis of poverty and the impact of sequester.

We are well aware of the impact the sequester is having on many, many communities across the country in terms of devastating some of the basic social safety networks that we have all benefited from in many, many ways. They're really very, very harmful to our most vulnerable.

Nearly 50 million Americans, including 16 million children all across our country and in every congressional district, are living in poverty. Yet the sequester continues to have devastating impacts on access to childhood education, affordable housing, hot meals for low-income seniors, Head Start, and countless other programs that help low-income and vulnerable Americans.

But, Madam Speaker, these draconian cuts are not enough for some of my colleagues, given what took place last night at the Ag Committee. Last night, the Ag Committee passed a $20 billion cut to our Nation's first line of defense against hunger in the farm bill. The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, formerly known as the Food Stamp program, is really a vital lifeline for millions of Americans.

As a young, single mother, I relied on food stamps and public assistance during a very difficult period in my life. Let me tell you, no one—no one—wants to be on food stamps, but it is a bridge over troubled water. And so I am, quite frankly, appalled and very sad to see my colleagues attacking the integrity of such essential programs for families that need a helping hand during difficult times.

As we work to create, hopefully, a balanced reauthorization of the farm bill, we must keep in mind the people, the families, and businesses impacted by these proposed cuts.

Nearly half of all SNAP recipients are children. One in five children in America are at risk of hunger, and we know that nearly half of all children in America will be on SNAP benefits sometime during their childhood. That's half of all children in America.

Not only does SNAP help put food on the table for struggling families, every $1 increase in SNAP benefits generates $1.70 in economic activity. Yet, if the farm bill becomes law, more than 2 million families will be cut off from this economic lifeline.

With unemployment still at 7.5 percent—and in some communities it's over 13 percent—and the rate of poverty at 15 percent—again, some communities, it's 27 to 30 percent—ongoing

cuts to SNAP and other nutrition assistance programs will increase hunger in America, and we will see even greater consequences.

Hungry children cannot learn in school and suffer developmental delays. Hungry children have worse health outcomes. Hungry children have bleaker economic outlooks through the rest of their adult lives. But the impacts don't stop there.

Cuts to critical nutrition programs don't just hurt the hungry families who rely on them, they hurt the economies of local communities, as families have less money to spend in local stores. Allowing an increase in hunger across America will threaten our Nation's ability to develop the highly skilled and highly educated workforce that we will need to compete in the 21st century.

We must not make cuts on the backs of hungry children to balance our budgets. Doing so would be morally wrong and an economic disaster.

Madam Speaker, instead of scheduling a 37th vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act, we should come together to work to find an approach for all Americans to help get everyone back to work.

We need a comprehensive solution to replace the sequester and to address the ongoing crisis of poverty. That is why, with the support of our Democratic Caucus, we started a Task Force on Poverty and Opportunity in February, which I am proud to chair. We are working to build support for a comprehensive national strategy to help eliminate poverty, grow the economy, and create millions of new jobs, and I urge all of my colleagues to join us.

I also hope that our colleagues will join myself, Representative JIM MCGOVERN, our Congressional Black Caucus chair, MARCIA FUDGE, Congresswoman JAN SCHAKOWSKY, and our Democratic Caucus vice chair, JOE CROWLEY, in taking the food stamp challenge. We need to raise the level of awareness of what is taking place here in Washington, D.C., and so what we're going to do is commit ourselves to limiting our food budget to the average SNAP benefit for a week. That's $1.40 per person per meal. We will show how vital it is to strengthen and fully fund SNAP. And we're asking all of those who can do this to join with us.

We've got to protect the most vulnerable, grow the economy, and SNAP is one of the best programs to do just that. So it's time not to slash it, but to support it.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 46 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Dr. Mike Landry, Sarasota Baptist Church, Sarasota, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, I approach Your throne on behalf of a Nation that desperately needs You. We are faced with much division and disunity in our land, and we request Your healing and reconciling touch. We thank You that You are not a spectator God who sits in Heaven unconcerned and uncaring.

We acknowledge that the greatness of our Nation is due to Your blessing and provision. And we know that You have blessed us in order that we might be a blessing to other nations. We understand that to whomever much is given, much will be required.

Father, grant these legislative leaders wisdom and courage to make decisions today that honor You. May Your will be done on Earth, just as it is in Heaven.

Pour out Your grace and protect the marriages and families of these, our Nation's leaders.

I offer this prayer in the name of Jesus Christ.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. OLSON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

> I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING DR. MIKE LANDRY

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege this morning to welcome a very good friend to the Halls of Congress. Pastor Mike Landry, who delivered the opening prayer this morning, is a great spiritual leader in Sarasota, Florida. For the past 16 years, he has served as senior pastor to the Sarasota Baptist Church, located in the heart of my district.

My wife, Sandy, and I have had the pleasure of knowing the pastor for nearly 5 years. He is very devoted to his family, his church, his congregation, and serving the people of southwest Florida. He has made himself an incredible and beloved member of our community.

I commend Pastor Landry for his outstanding service to our community and to our Nation. It's my honor today to welcome him here to the House of Representatives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The Chair will entertain 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

THE TRUTH ABOUT BENGHAZI

(Mr. LONG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an important issue: the attack against America and its citizens by terrorists in Benghazi. Four Americans, including our Ambassador, Chris Stevens, have been killed. The American people deserve the truth about Benghazi and to know who was responsible, not convenient stories blaming the violence on some filmmaker's free speech rights. The people who died deserve justice.

As we investigate this attack, and the response of the civilian and military leaders in command, we must determine whether the paralysis that seemed to characterize the government's reaction was the result of individual bad decisions or a broader institutional problem.

Our military and our soldiers are the most capable in the world, but if their commanders refuse to send them into battle, they cannot safeguard American lives or interests.

The American people and our allies abroad need to know that the United States has the resolve to act in the face of uncertainty. Our enemies need to know that when they attack Americans, they do so at great danger because Americans do not leave our people behind.

HONORING HOLOCAUST EDUCATION AND RESOURCE CENTER

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Holocaust Education and Resource Center of Rhode Island, which is celebrating its 25th anniversary this weekend. I had the honor of serving on their board for a number of years.

This wonderful institution was first founded by Holocaust survivors living in Rhode Island during the 1980s. It formally opened its doors on May 5, 1988, and since that time it has helped to provide Rhode Islanders with educational resources on the Holocaust and commemorate the lives of the millions of victims of this horrific atrocity.

In addition, the Holocaust Education and Resource Center works with schools in Rhode Island, southeastern Massachusetts, and even the suburbs of Boston to teach young people about the importance of treating everyone with respect and dignity and to work to eradicate bigotry and intolerance.

Congratulations to the Holocaust Education and Resource Center on 25 successful years of promoting tolerance and respect to tens of thousands of Rhode Islanders, for helping us all remember those killed by the Nazis in the Holocaust, and for making Rhode Island and our world a better place. I wish this organization continued success in the years to come.

CONGRATULATING FORT BEND CHRISTIAN ACADEMY

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, Fort Bend Christian Academy rules. Yesterday, the Eagles won two State titles.

The day started with the Lady Eagles winning their fourth State championship in softball, the fourth title in 7 years. Behind Coach Ferguson Carroll and Elizabeth Fox's 12 strikeouts, the Lady Eagles crushed Fort Worth Christian 4–0.

Right after that game ended, the Fort Bend Christian men won their first State baseball title with a close 12–11 victory over Midland Christian. Coach Roman and the team never quit, scoring four runs in the top of the sixth inning to take the lead for good.

There's an old saying in naval aviation: don't mess with an eagle unless you know how to fly. The Fort Bend Christian men and women are Eagles who know how to fly. Those Eagles are Texas State champs.

PROVIDING FOOD STAMP SAFETY NET

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, our farms and ranches produce food products in amounts that greatly exceed our nutritional needs. There is no reason for anyone in this country to go hungry. And yet, that is a daily reality faced by many poor families.

The food stamp program provides a small but essential safety net to meet the nutritional needs of children, the elderly, the disabled, and those who fall on hard times when our economy sheds jobs.

The proposed cuts to the food stamp program included in the House farm bill are unacceptable and cruel. Poor nutrition leads to poor health outcomes and long-term developmental problems in children. It does not save money. It simply transfers costs to those who cannot pay those costs and needlessly increases suffering. We can afford to feed all of our citizens. A farm and food policy that cannot deliver nutritious meals to all Americans is indeed failed policy. We can and must do better.

□ 1210

AMERICANS NEED TO KNOW

(Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the President made a pledge to Americans: If you elect me and you like your current health care, you'll be able to keep it.

The reality today is that nearly 7 million people are set to lose their employer-sponsored health insurance when the President's health care law goes into full effect. On January 1, many Americans will be forced into an exchange program that has not even been set up.

NANCY PELOSI promised the American people Congress must pass the bill so you can find out what's in it. The Democratic-controlled House passed the bill almost 4 years ago. They didn't know what was in the bill then, and they don't know what to do now.

We're less than 7 months away from many Americans being forced into exchanges. Yet they don't know what options are available to them.

What we do know is that consumers are already looking at sharp premium increases. The very people who were promised the most, those young people under the age of 29, are expected to get increases somewhere in the range of 200 percent.

This is unacceptable, Mr. Speaker. Most Americans operate under a budget. Americans need to know what the increases in their health care costs will be and what plan options are available. Americans need to know the effects that this legislation will have on their lives, and they need to know now.

The administration has had 4 years to figure this out, and the only thing they've figured out is that they don't know what to do.

BLOCK THE BORDER FEE TAX

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Homeland Security Committee adopted my amendment to block a study of new fees for passengers and pedestrians crossing our borders. A similar amendment was successfully included in the Senate legislation last week.

The consensus for blocking this tax is welcome, but not surprising. Cross-border travel is central to the economic viability of border communities, including my own in western New York.

Last year, 3 million Canadians visited our region, spending nearly $1 billion. Canadians rely on seamless travel at one of my district's five border crossings to travel from the Buffalo Niagara International Airport, area businesses, and to attend sporting and cultural events.

Mr. Speaker, with the bipartisan support, bicameral support for this issue, I suggest that language blocking the border fees should be included in the upcoming immigration reform legislation. This is a senseless tax. It's counterproductive, and we should take every action to prevent it.

HONORING THE LIFE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF MOSES HARRISON

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and accomplishments of Moses Harrison. His judicial successes have been well chronicled, but he got elected to the Illinois Supreme Court in 1992 and served for 8 years before becoming the chief justice.

However, there's probably no more credible source than my mom, who says that Moses was a nice, gentle man; everyone who knew him liked him.

I also appreciated his support in a letter for me to go to the military academy at West Point.

Moses was very involved in local activities and also was involved in the Episcopal Church.

Mr. Harrison was preceded in death by his son, Luke. He leaves behind his wife, Sharon; his son, Judge Clarence Harrison and his wife and four grandchildren, who will greatly miss him.

SAFE CLIMATE AND RAIL

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are in dangerous and uncharted territory. At 400 parts per million, there is now more carbon dioxide in the atmosphere than at any time in the past 3 million years.

Now here in the United States, more than a quarter of our greenhouse gas

emissions come from the transportation sector, so it's urgent that we make our cars and trucks cleaner, but also that we invest in clean modes of transportation, such as rail.

Saturday was National Train Day, which celebrates the rail networks that efficiently move freight and passengers across our country and reduce the number of cars on our roads.

In California, we're building high-speed rail with renewable energy. When complete, it will move millions of people far more quickly, cleanly, and efficiently than we do today. And in the North Bay, we're connecting Sonoma and Marin Counties with 70 miles of rail, meaning 1.4 million fewer car trips along Highway 101.

Investments in rail at the national scale can increase efficiency, reduce traffic, and fight climate change. It's time for Congress to get ''all aboard'' with this climate solution.

ADMINISTRATION FAILURES

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, this administration's repeated disregard for transparency and the rule of law should trouble every American.

Mr. Speaker, the administration has accused congressional Republicans of playing politics as we conduct oversight into the administration's failures before, during, and after the terrorist attack in Benghazi. But this is hypocritical, coming from an administration that already altered talking points to cover their own political agenda.

And more recently, Mr. Speaker, we learned that the IRS deliberately targeted conservative groups. The IRS has the serious responsibility of collecting taxes and holding accountable those who cheat the system; and now it seems that they, themselves, are choosing when to follow the law.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve more from their elected officials. I hope as details of these events emerge the American people will find out the truth, not just the administration's spin.

THE FOSTER CHILDREN OPPORTUNITY ACT

(Mr. O'ROURKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be introducing the Foster Children Opportunity Act today. This legislation will ensure that abused and neglected immigrant children have an opportunity to succeed in our country. It is supported by over 175 child welfare organizations.

As we debate immigration reform, it is critical that we consider the needs of immigrant children involved in the child welfare system. This is a population that is especially vulnerable and frequently overlooked.

Despite being eligible for special forms of immigration relief, foster children are slipping through the cracks and leaving care without a resolution of their immigration issues. As a result, they cannot work legally in the U.S. and face the threat of deportation back to a country they don't know, one where their abuser may still live.

We owe these children better. My bill will make sure immigrant foster youth are assisted with resolving their immigration issues prior to leaving care and guarantees that they have access to programs, such as Medicaid that foster youth depend on to make a healthy transition into adulthood.

May is National Foster Care Month. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Foster Children Opportunity Act.

OBAMACARE IS FAILING

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

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, no single piece of legislation rests so squarely on a foundation of broken promises as the 2010 health care law known as ObamaCare. We were told that it would lower insurance rates to the tune of $2,500 per family, but we know not only is it not lowering rates; it's causing rates to spike 10 percent, 20 percent, even 30, 40 percent in some States.

We were told it was going to be cost effective, but now we know that the costs were purposely understated to mask the true cost of this nearly $2 trillion bill.

We were told if you like your plan, you can keep your plan. We now know the question is not whether millions of Americans will lose their current plans, but how many millions of Americans will lose their current plans. This is what you get when you pass a 2,000-page bill before reading it.

Oh, and do you want the IRS to be involved with your health care?

ObamaCare is failing, and the American people are paying the price for this failure. Let's turn the page on ObamaCare and enact true patient-centered reform that benefits people, not bureaucrats.

SEXUAL ASSAULT IN OUR NATION'S MILITARY

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, according to the Pentagon, about 26,000 servicemen and -women were subjected to sexual assault while serving in this Nation's military this past year. In fact, last year, Congress saw the Lackland Air Force scandal unravel as instructors were accused of engaging in sexual relationships with 32 recruits.

Earlier this month, an Air Force lieutenant colonel overseeing the sexual assault prevention programs was arrested for sexually assaulting a woman while he was under the influence of alcohol.

Two days ago, the Pentagon revealed yet another sexual assault allegation against an Army sergeant at Fort Hood who is currently under investigation for multiple charges, including prostitution solicitation charges.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about instructors, about lieutenant colonels, about sergeants, about people who have moved up in the ranks. I believe this highlights the underlying issue of leadership, or the lack of, in military leaders; and we must hold them accountable.

□ 1220

''TRUST'' THE GOVERNMENT

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

Ms. JENKINS. The President tells Americans to ''trust'' the government, but this week is loaded with reasons not to.

Take the new health care law. We were told it would lower costs and increase access. Now we find premiums could increase by 400 percent and 7 million who had insurance through their employers will lose it.

This law will turn the IRS, caught in a scandal of its own, into chief health care enforcers. And it's proven so unpopular, HHS Secretary Sebelius has resorted to soliciting contributions to promote ObamaCare from the same people this law authorizes her to regulate. If I got a call, I'd feel pressure to ante up; and in America, this shouldn't happen.

Today, I'm proud to support repealing this costly law to keep the IRS out of your health care and to work on replacing it with a patient-focused alternative that will actually help families.

SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

(Mr. BUTTERFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the deep cuts once again being proposed by Republicans to the SNAP program in the House farm bill. In July 2012, the House Agriculture Committee reported a bipartisan farm bill that included $16 billion in food stamp cuts. Guess what? The Speaker and the Republican majority refused to schedule that bill for a vote. And so the Agriculture Committee has now marked up another farm bill, this time with $20 billion in cuts to the SNAP program.

Why are you so determined to attempt deficit reduction on the backs of the poor and less fortunate in our society? The SNAP program helps families

that have fallen on hard times and helps them feed their families until they can get back on their feet.

I am very upset by these proposed cuts. I ask my Republican colleagues to take a fresh look at what they're proposing and reconsider these cuts, cuts that will affect 2 million poor people, many of whom are children and the elderly.

Mr. Speaker, we are a Nation that helps the less fortunate. This is not who we are as a country. We are compassionate people, and we should feed the hungry in times of need.

THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the House will again vote to address the imprecisely named Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. Critics say that we're tilting at windmills. Well, Mr. Speaker, let's review:

Within the last month or so, we've heard from the Senator who authored the law refer to it as a coming ''train wreck''—that's right, he called it a ''train wreck'';

We've heard the administration official responsible for helping set up the insurance exchanges worry that the public might be in for a ''Third World experience'' as they try and find health care;

Oh, and let us not forget some of the very same Members of Congress who voted to foist this massive overreach on Americans are now feverishly trying to find ways to exempt themselves and their staffs from its effects.

Let's look at the checklist, shall we?

Premiums shooting up, check;

Small businesses hiring fewer workers and jobs being lost, check;

Employees seeing their hours cut, check;

Faulty cost projections, check.

Everything that opponents of this law listed as a reason to vote against this example of government overreach is actually occurring and happening.

Tilting at windmills, Mr. Speaker, hardly. Working to protect the American people from a horribly disruptive and ineffective law, certainly.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1550

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1550.

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

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of struggling families and low-income women and children across this Nation and oppose the dangerously high cuts in the farm bill to SNAP programs. The current House version of the 2013 farm bill will have devastating effects on so many working families, especially in Alabama. It threatens over 900,000 participants in my home State of Alabama alone.

These proposed cuts are unacceptable. While I understand that our Nation faces a serious debt and deficit problem, we also face fragile economic recovery, and families and children depend upon these government assistance programs, especially the children in the State of Alabama. I think that we are encroaching upon a dangerous trend of cuts on the backs of the people who can least afford to have those cuts.

Now is not the time to turn our backs on these struggling American families. We must work together and take action to protect all Americans who depend upon these vital programs.

IMPROPER DISCRIMINATION BY THE IRS

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, it is unacceptable that our Nation's tax collectors have targeted organizations based solely on their political beliefs. Our Nation's strength depends on its citizens' freedom to organize and participate in the political process, and no branch of government should be used to harass and unfairly judge the American people.

The IRS' actions are not only troubling, but also further erode the American people's trust that public institutions will act impartially. It's unacceptable. This matter needs to be actively investigated, and those guilty of improper actions should be appropriately punished.

We cannot allow differences of political opinion to erode our Nation's best traditions and the rule of law. Americans cannot, and will not, accept judgment based upon their political beliefs. We must prevent this discrimination from ever happening again.

THE VETERANS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2012

(Mr. DELANEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, if there's one thing this entire Congress, this entire country, can agree on, it's the need to stand with our veterans. As a Nation, we're truly humbled by our servicemen and -women. They make incredible and, in some instances, unimaginable sacrifices to protect our country. And that feeling comes with an understanding that we have an obligation to provide our veterans with the benefits they've earned.

Among the most critical of these benefits are access to educational opportunities and workforce training. To make sure that the current programs are working, our veterans need a voice at the VA. For that reason, I am honored to introduce the Veterans Advisory Committee on Education Improvement Act. This bipartisan legislation extends the Veterans Advisory Committee on Education through 2015 and includes veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan. The committee advises the VA on how to improve educational and job training programs.

I thank my colleague and friend, Mr. RENACCI, for cosponsoring this bill, and I look forward to working towards its passage.

BENGHAZI

(Mr. COLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, the sad tale of Benghazi is a story of complacency, incompetence, and coverup: complacency in the face of repeated warnings by the CIA and diplomats on the ground that the post was in danger; incompetence in preparing for a potential attack in a region in turmoil in a place where we had multiple military assets and on a day where we had every reason to believe trouble would occur; and an attempted coverup of a successful terrorist attack with talk about videos and spontaneous riots when the State Department, the CIA, and top officials in the administration knew the truth.

Mr. Speaker, it's time for the administration to take responsibility, come clean, and dismiss those associated with this debacle that cost the lives of four brave Americans.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF DALIP SINGH SAUND

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during Asian Pacific Heritage Month to celebrate the life and achievements of Congressman Dalip Singh Saund.

Congressman Saund was the first Asian American Member of Congress, the very first Member of a non-Abrahamic faith, and the first Member born in Asia. He was also our first Sikh American to enter Congress. He also represented my hometown of Riverside, California, a community that I proudly represent today.

Having come to California from India to pursue his education, Saund graduated with a master's and Ph.D. in mathematics from the University of California, Berkeley. Following his

graduation, Saund worked as a farmer but was also a local activist. He spent years pushing to end naturalization restrictions for Indians living in the United States.

In 1950, Saund made a bold decision and entered local government. In 1955, Saund decided to run for an open seat in Congress—and won. Representing the Inland Empire from 1956 to 1963, Congressman Saund served on the Foreign Affairs and Interior Committees. Unfortunately, his promising career as a Member of this distinguished body came to an abrupt end when he suffered a severe stroke in May 1962.

Congressman Saund truly lived the American Dream: an immigrant who came to America with dreams and aspirations of making a difference for himself and for future generations. As the current Riverside Representative, I honor his impact and legacy on all Americans.

□ 1230

OBAMACARE AND IRS

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the IRS admitted to targeting conservative groups with extra scrutiny, demanding donor lists, meeting minutes, personal member information, and even Facebook activity. The Justice Department was caught essentially spying on the Associated Press. And the White House continues to twist itself in knots explaining why it misled the American public in the aftermath of Benghazi.

The administration's apologists are in a panic. They claim the President is not responsible for any of this wrongdoing. The President, who made a career touting government as the solution to most every problem, now solicits our understanding. It seems the leviathan is rather unwieldy and difficult to manage.

This is my shocked face.

These scandals are byproducts of government too big for its britches and proof that the IRS should not be given more power to manage our health care.

House Republicans are committed to a smarter, accountable government that works for the people and safeguards liberty against tyranny and bureaucratic incompetence. That starts with repealing ObamaCare.

IN OPPOSITION TO 2013 FARM BILL CUTS TO SNAP

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

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to voice my opposition to the proposed $20 billion in cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, also known as the SNAP program. This program currently provides food assistance to 47 million Americans who otherwise would not have access to one of the most basic human necessities—food.

Two million low-income Americans—most of whom are working families with children, senior citizens, and people with disabilities—will lose their food assistance as a result of these cuts. Of that number, 200,000 children would also lose access to their free school meals because their eligibility for these meals is tied to their receipt of SNAP.

Let me ask my Republican colleagues: How often do your children have to learn on empty stomachs or come home and study on empty stomachs? I dare say not often, if ever. But that is what the Republicans are proposing that we do to close to a quarter of a million children. They are asking them not only to learn on empty stomachs, but also to come home and study on empty stomachs. This cannot stand.

EFFECTS OF SEQUESTRATION

(Mr. VALADAO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, this month, the United States Bureau of Land Management indefinitely canceled all oil and natural gas leases in California. This includes 1,278 acres of prime oil and natural gas land in Kern and Fresno Counties located in my district—California 21. This land is part of the Monterey shale formation located in the Central Valley.

The Monterey shale contains two-thirds of our country's shale oil reserves, the equivalent of 15.4 billion barrels of oil. If tapped, it could generate half a million jobs and generate $4.5 billion in revenue. This would have a significant impact on my district, which has faced chronic unemployment for years. However, citing sequestration, BLM is suspending all future lease sales in California. This decision was made despite the fact that these leases provide significant revenue for the Federal Government.

This is just another example of the administration using sequestration to further their environmental policy agenda at the expense of American families. BLM's efforts to prevent energy development are depriving my constituents of quality jobs and increasing energy prices for hardworking families across the country. It is unacceptable that BLM is halting lease auctions in regions that have been used for oil and gas development for over a century.

SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

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

Ms. MENG. As I watch the farm bills move forward in the House and Senate, I am very saddened at the disregard for my most vulnerable constituents—our fellow Americans. Cutting another of our Nation's safety nets will only serve to further the suffering of disadvantaged children and senior citizens across the country.

Many of the recipients in my district who rely on SNAP to lift their families out of poverty and combat what would otherwise be certain malnutrition of their children, for many of these families this is the only form of income assistance they receive. Eighty percent of them fall below the poverty line.

Reducing benefits would have a terrible effect on millions of Americans. In addition to the Recovery Act's boost of funds ending, further cuts are not warranted.

Although the recipients of SNAP don't have an association to represent them here in Washington, I have come to the floor today to let them know that they are not being forgotten in this fight and that many Representatives will continue to battle on their behalf.

OBAMACARE: UNAFFORDABLE LACK OF CARE ACT

(Mr. GIBBS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming clearer by the day that ObamaCare is detrimental to all Americans. The Unaffordable Lack of Care Act will cost almost $2 trillion, raise taxes by $1.1 trillion, and cut Medicare by $716 billion.

Despite the President's statement that premiums would decrease by $2,500 under ObamaCare, the average family premium has grown over $3,000 and climbing. Over 30 studies have concluded that the law will make health care premiums more unaffordable for Americans. Furthermore, young adults could see their premiums increase on an average between 145 and 189 percent next year.

Even Democrats are beginning to jump off the ObamaCare bandwagon. The architect of the bill recently referred to the law as a ''train wreck,'' and HHS Secretary Kathleen Sebelius stated she did not anticipate how complicated it would be to implement the bill.

In light of the recent news that the IRS was deliberately targeting Americans, can we really trust them to be in charge of our health care?

The bottom line is the President's health care law is a bad one. Our job creators are citing the unknowns surrounding it as reasons for planned layoffs and why they cannot expand their businesses.

If the Senate really wants to pass a jobs bill, then they should listen to the American people and support repeal and replace.

MILITARY JUSTICE IMPROVEMENT ACT

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, we have a growing epidemic in our military that requires our immediate action.

I rise today to highlight a bipartisan, bicameral piece of legislation that will stem the growing cancer of sexual assault on men and women in the military.

This is absolutely unacceptable. In every branch of the military, from day one our servicemembers are instilled with the values of honor, respect, and integrity. It's what makes us proud to wear the uniform, and it's what makes our military strong. However, this epidemic completely undermines what these values and our servicemembers represent.

This morning I joined a strong, committed group of legislators to introduce the Military Justice Improvement Act, which provides a uniform and fair process, ensuring that sexual predators are exposed and punished accordingly.

We in Congress and leaders of the Department of Defense must keep the pressure on. Together, we must foster a respectful, productive environment for our military men and women. The success of our Armed Forces—and the security they provide our Nation—depends on it.

□ 1240

REPEAL OBAMACARE

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there's an article I missed that came out March 15, 2013, from Healthcare IT News—rather interesting. It talks about a lawsuit against the IRS because the IRS, it says, stole health records of some 10 million Americans, including the medical records of all California State judges. Knowing California, I bet most of them are Democrats. They took their medical records.

So, the allegation, the lawsuit, is over that. Ten million Americans' records. It doesn't matter what party they are. It doesn't matter what their political beliefs are. They have a right to have their own records kept private until ObamaCare fully kicks in.

I don't know why the IRS would take those medical records so prematurely, because when ObamaCare kicks in, the Federal Government has everybody's records already.

It's time to repeal it.

SNAP CUTS IN FARM BILL

(Mr. CROWLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today not to offer my own words about the Republicans' major cuts to food stamps.

Instead, I want to let my constituents speak directly to the House Republican leadership. In this stack of plates sent to me, one of my constituents asked:

''How would I live if food stamps were cut?''

Others have said:

''There are a lot of people who would go hungry without food stamps.''

''If the help I receive now for food stamps was cut, it will affect me and my kids while I'm trying to finish my college degree.''

''In these hard times, food pantries get me through the week.''

''To see your own kids starve and not be able to feed them is one of the worst pains a parent can experience.''

''If food stamps were cut off, my 4-year-old brother and I would have to go to sleep hungry. We would also have to miss meals. This will be unfair considering he's only 4—and I'm 15.''

These stories are heartbreaking and serve as evidence why cutting the food stamp program will really affect people's lives.

To my colleagues, I leave you with this last one: ''Please don't stop helping people.''

Please don't stop helping people.

COMMEMORATING THE FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE END OF THE CIVIL WAR IN SRI LANKA

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the fourth anniversary of the end of the civil war in Sri Lanka on May 18, 2009.

The last stages of the war were met with grave allegations of war crimes, including the Sri Lankan Government's treatment of Tamil civilians within no-fire zones—attacks that were a blatant violation of human rights.

As a result of the ensuing international outrage, Sri Lanka established a commission of inquiry to investigate the events of the 26-year civil war. However, this commission had no accountability and yielded little explanation for the families, the victims, or the international community.

We are left with the task of identifying what really happened during the last years of this terrible civil war and to hold accountable those who have committed war crimes. We also face the challenge of brokering peace in a country torn apart by civil war.

I urge the Government of Sri Lanka to demonstrate commitment towards reconciliation and promote human rights, particularly before hosting the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting in November.

DON'T REPEAL OBAMACARE

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, 3 years after the Affordable Care Act was signed into law, a law that is already helping millions of Americans, our friends on the other side of the aisle are wasting time again on a pointless symbolic vote that will never become law and takes us backwards.

For the 37th time, our colleagues are forcing us to vote on repealing the Affordable Care Act when they know—they know—it has no chance of succeeding.

For the 37th time, they are voting to allow insurance companies to deny coverage to children with preexisting conditions.

For the 37th time, they are voting to roll back our efforts to not allow insurance companies to charge women more just because they are women.

And for the 37th time, they are voting to strip small businesses of protections against the skyrocketing insurance premiums we faced long before the ACA.

Einstein used to say: Insanity is when one attempts to do the same thing over and over again—expecting a different result.

This is wrong for the 37th time and a waste of our time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise for a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I realize that H.R. 45 and its rule have not been brought up for consideration, but I wish to object to the consideration of H.R. 45 as well as consideration of the rule governing debate on the bill because it violates rule XII, clause 7, section (c), which states, ''A bill or joint resolution may not be introduced unless the sponsor submits for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement citing as specifically as practicable the power or powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the bill or joint resolution.''

The constitutional authority statement submitted with H.R. 45, argues that Congress is granted the authority to enact this legislation because of the Tenth Amendment.

The Tenth Amendment does not grant Congress the authority to act; it limits Congressional power. It states, ''The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.'' Citing the Tenth Amendment does not satisfy the rule.

Experts at the Congressional Research Service agree. In a recent report, they stated, ''The Tenth Amendment is not an affirmative grant of authority to Congress; rather, it is a limitation or disability on Congress's authority to legislate. Hence, because the House rule requires a statement citing the power or powers granted to Congress—not merely a statement of constitutional provisions—citations to the Tenth Amendment do not appear to satisfy the requirement of the House rule.''

Mr. Speaker, the constitutional authority statement for the bill before us today does not comply with the House rules, and I ask that the bill and the rule not be considered until this problem is fixed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's point of order is not timely. Neither House Resolution 215 nor H.R. 45 is pending at this time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill's constitutional authority statement cites the Tenth Amendment, and as such fails to live up to the rule of the House, and tries to perpetuate the false myth that the Affordable Care Act is unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has heard the case. They have made their decision. The Affordable Care Act is constitutional. And Speaker BOEHNER has said, it is the law of the land. The constitutional authority statement for this bill is completely inaccurate.

It is the 37th time we are voting to repeal or defund the Affordable Care Act, but apparently we still can't get the paperwork right. How does a Member correct the statement of constitutional authority?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not been recognized to engage in debate.

Does the gentleman have a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Has the House ever voted to repeal in whole or in part another piece of legislation 37 times, like we are doing here today—in this case, a piece of legislation that makes it illegal for insurance companies to discriminate against a woman if she becomes pregnant and makes sure that children under the age of 26 can stay on their parents' health care plan?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry, and the Chair does not place proceedings in a historical context.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Is it correct that the House Republican budget maintains $1.2 trillion of tax increases included in the Affordable Care Act and $716 billion in cuts of Medicare; and, in fact, this very budget that we operate under would not have balanced without including these savings in taxes from ObamaCare?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's parliamentary inquiry is not relevant to any business pending before the House.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Is the House here this week spending millions of dollars of taxpayer money to repeal the Affordable Care Act because it actually believes that that will occur while Barack Obama is in the White House or because freshman Republicans want to score political points back home?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not respond to political commentary under the guise of parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. I trust the American people will respond to these questions.

□ 1250

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 45, REPEAL OF PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 215 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 215

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 45) to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. House Resolution 215 provides for a rule to consider the full repeal of the flawed, ill-conceived and inappropriately named Affordable Care Act, a bill whose final language was written by staff on the Senate Finance Committee and the actual legislative text of which received not a single committee hearing or markup in this body. While many hearings and markups were held on other iterations of other health care bills, the legislation that was signed by the President received not a single moment of scrutiny in this House and contained none of the bipartisan amendments that were accepted during the markups of other health care bills, including H.R. 3200, which passed the House but was never considered by the Senate. As such, only a full repeal is acceptable, and that is what this rule provides for.

The rule provides for 2 hours of debate, controlled by the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce. Further, the rule self-executes the Bachmann amendment, which provides for a clean repeal of the entire ACA, consistent with the provisions of the opening day rules package of this Congress. The rule further provides the minority one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

This approach, a full repeal, will give the House, particularly Members who were not here in the past two Congresses, an opportunity to have an up-or-down vote, an affirmation or a denial, of the Affordable Care Act.

Americans should have the freedom to make their own health care decisions. In March of 2010, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act was signed into law. It was drafted quickly and behind closed doors at the end of 2009—behind closed doors in the other body, in fact. It included secret deals, loopholes, drafting errors, and allowed entirely new Federal agencies to be created without congressional knowledge or oversight.

The bottom line: it was not the way to achieve meaningful reform. In addition, the Supreme Court ruled last June that the law is, in fact, a tax. This is after President Obama continually told the American people that it was not a tax.

The health care system in America needs reform, and it needs improvement; but the law that was passed will cost American taxpayers and patients millions of dollars. It will not improve care, and it will not make care more affordable. We need to start fresh and address the issues with commonsense improvements that will focus on the real issues at hand—creating a health care system that is focused on patients instead of payment, quality instead of quantity, affordability instead of cheapness, and innovation instead of stagnation. The first step is eliminating bad legislation that simply does not work and that today stands in the way of any real improvement. That is why, today, I strongly support the repeal of the President's health care law.

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1300

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time

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

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

Mr. Speaker, NANCY PELOSI and her Democratic colleagues rushed this bill through Congress more than 3 years ago. Democrats and Republicans can agree on one thing, that this is very flawed and is not even what Americans asked for in the first place. Even President Obama has signed into law seven bills that dismantle provisions of his health care law.

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

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

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

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

How is this good for Americans and America?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1310

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Vote ''no'' on this repeal.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1320

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Over the past 5 years, I've had so many women come up to me and confess that they haven't had a mammogram in years because they can't afford the expensive co-pays or they fear the prohibitive cost of treatment. That is unacceptable in the United States of America.

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

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

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

Mr. HURT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1330

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

All this is is spoiled grapes. That's what this is. Drink the wine and leave us alone, and make sure that we keep the Patients' Bill of Rights and Affordable Care Act.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentlelady yield?

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

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

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

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

Ms. ESTY. I thank the gentlelady.

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

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

have serious work to do for our constituents.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1340

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

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

If you like your insurance and your insurance premium, you get to keep it. Your premiums aren't going to go up. We know that's not true. The costs have gone up. The premiums are going up. There was a discussion about a 73 percent—apparently an average number that the earlier gentleman spoke about—premium increase with ObamaCare. I can tell you that those numbers that say up to 400 percent, they are real.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I had the chance to ask the financial genius Charles Schwab recently what are two things we could do to really create jobs and grow the economy. He said: repeal Dodd-Frank and repeal ObamaCare—two of the most destructive pieces of legislation ever passed by the United States Congress, done by a Democrat majority that didn't even bother to read it and exempted themselves from it. The committee staff that wrote the bill exempted themselves from it. The Federal agencies that are implementing it are exempt from ObamaCare, but they stuck it on all the American people, including the Members of Congress. We're all under it, but President Obama and Vice President BIDEN are not. And that's all you need to know.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. No, they're not.

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

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman 30 seconds.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I thank the gentleman from Texas for the time.

□ 1350

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

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

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

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

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

Is the law perfect? No.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Vote ''no.''

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1400

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

discriminating against anyone with a pre-existing condition

charging higher rates based on gender or health status

enforcing lifetime dollar limits

enforcing annual dollar limits on health benefits

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

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

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

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

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

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 2 would have ensured full Medicare reimbursement to all hospitals including physician owned hospitals with at least 100 beds, provided they could produce reliable records to document their claims for reimbursement.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 215 OFFERED BY MRS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1424) to require the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor to establish the Make It In America Incentive Grant Program, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1424.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

The Republican majority may say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule .. . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he

then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 215, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

[Roll No. 150]

YEAS—228

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—193

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

NOT VOTING—12

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

□ 1430

Mr. LANGEVIN changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 192, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 151]

YEAS—226

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

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

NAYS—192

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

NOT VOTING—15

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

□ 1440

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

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

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

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

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

THE JOURNAL

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

There was no objection.

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

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

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

[Roll No. 152]

YEAS—277

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman
Collins (NY)
Conyers
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Gerlach
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Takano
Thornberry
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Vela
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—132

Amash
Andrews
Barber
Barr
Bass
Benishek
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Brady (PA)
Broun (GA)
Capuano
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan

Joyce
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Lance
Latham
Lee (CA)
Lewis
LoBiondo
Lowenthal
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
Meehan
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Nugent
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Ros-Lehtinen
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Sires
Slaughter
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Valadao
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Owens

NOT VOTING—23

Beatty
Burgess
Campbell
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Duckworth
Duffy
Farr
Gohmert
Grijalva
Johnson, Sam
Keating
Labrador
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Messer
Nunes
Quigley
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Wagner

□ 1450

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 36

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor to House Resolution 36.

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

There was no objection.

REPEAL OF PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 45.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 679, I call up the bill (H.R. 436) to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 215, the amendment printed in House Report 113–59 is considered adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 45

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

SECTION 1. REPEAL OF PPACA AND HEALTH CARE-RELATED PROVISIONS IN THE HEALTH CARE AND EDUCATION RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2010.

(a) PPACA.—Effective as of the enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148), such Act is repealed, and the provisions of law amended or repealed by such Act) are restored or revived as if such Act had not been enacted.

(b) HEALTH CARE-RELATED PROVISIONS IN THE HEALTH CARE AND EDUCATION RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2010.—Effective as of the enactment of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–152), title I and subtitle B of title II of such Act are repealed, and the provisions of law amended or repealed by such title or subtitle, respectively, are restored or revived as if such title and subtitle had not been enacted.

SEC. 2. BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF THIS ACT.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives, as long as such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Debate shall not exceed 2 hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the chair and ranking minority of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

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

You know, it is just absolutely amazing that we are once again here on the floor to repeal ObamaCare, but it is a necessary step that we find that we have to do.

It is so interesting being out in my district. Whether I am talking to State-elected officials or county-elected officials or talking to those who are employers in our district—those who are job creators—repeatedly we hear from them: this is a bill that turned into a law that is too expensive to afford.

One of the reasons—and I would point this out—this is a copy of the law as published. What it has turned into is 13,000 pages of regulation. Indeed, I wanted to bring that tower of red tape here to the floor today. It is seven feet tall and growing. It was too big to be allowed on the House floor.

It is amazing that much regulation that has come from this 2,700-page bill. Now we find out from The Washington Post and The New York Times that Secretary Sebelius had conversations with some companies and organizations asking them to help fund getting this started.

Why is this happening? Three years ago, we were told it would be an $800 billion bill. And guess what? When we went to the Budget Committee this year, $2.6 trillion is the estimated cost of this bill. So insurance—more expensive. It was to save households $2,500 a year, but instead they're already paying $3,000 more. And the survey that Chairman MURPHY ran for us in the Energy and Commerce Committee shows that the cost will go anywhere up to about 400 percent, depending on who you are, what group you're in. That's what you're going to see your insurance cost go up to.

We hear from physicians. Harder to get in to see a physician? Yes, it is.

Our goal should be about how do we preserve access to affordable health care for all Americans. Instead, what my friends across the aisle have done is to focus on how do you centralize health care, run up the cost, and decrease access. That is the reason that we are here on the floor today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act because what the Republicans will do is take away all the benefits the American people are already seeing under this law and they will stop the full implementation of it to provide millions of people with health insurance opportunities.

Our Republican colleagues say they want to provide access to health care. They want to do something about people with preexisting conditions. They say they care about stopping discriminatory practices. They want to lower the deficit. They want to stop rising health care costs. This bill, the Affordable Care Act, is the one piece of legislation that takes major steps on these issues.

Republicans offered nothing but opposition over and over again. This is the 37th time the House will vote to repeal the patients' rights bill. From the very beginning, the Republicans opposed it. They said it will kill jobs, and they were wrong. They said the law would drive up health care costs through the roof. They were wrong. We're seeing the slowest growth in health care spending in decades.

They've ignored the significant benefits that are helping tens of millions of people, such as 3 million young adults who have coverage through their parents' plans, 6 million seniors who have saved over $6 billion on their prescription drugs, 13 million Americans who have received over $1 billion in rebates from their insurers, over 100 million Americans who have access to free preventive care who no longer face lifetime limits on their coverage. And the Congressional Budget Office still confirms that the law cuts the deficit by $100 billion in the first decade and more than $1 trillion in the second.

The Republican Patients' Rights Repeal Act undoes all of these benefits. They add to the deficit, and they send us back to the days when insurance companies were in charge, costs were skyrocketing, and tens of millions either had no coverage—especially if they had preexisting conditions—or coverage that they could depend on.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Health Care Subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, in two separate forums, I met with members of the Lancaster County and the Chester County Chambers of Commerce, representing dozens of businesses and municipalities across my district, about the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. Every single one of them had grave concerns with the law. They're confused and deeply concerned about how it will affect their ability to provide care and jobs.

We're only a few months away from implementation of the employer mandate, and there are many unanswered questions. Each employer I talked to had pressing questions, but time and again I had to tell them that I didn't have an answer because HHS, the IRS, or the Department of Labor hadn't issued rules or guidance yet.

□ 1500

This uncertainty is leaving them paralyzed, holding off on hiring and wondering whether they will be able to provide coverage for their employees.

It is not just businesses that are hurting. I heard from school districts operating on tight budgets who said they have no choice but to outsource loyal hourly employees like cafeteria workers and special ed aides, going to part-time work.

Workers are losing their jobs, losing work hours, losing benefits to this bureaucratic nightmare. Let's stop the damage, and let's repeal the train wreck before it occurs.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that our time from the Energy and Commerce Committee be controlled by our subcommittee ranking member, Congressman FRANK PALLONE from the State of New Jersey.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act. I greatly respect my colleagues on the other side from Tennessee and from Pennsylvania, but I have to say they are simply obstructionists.

This is what we get from the GOP on a daily basis. Nothing happens here in the House of Representatives. We know there is a problem. Historically, there has been a problem with health care and a lot of people not having insurance or having discriminatory practices or not being able to get on their parents' insurance policy. So we as Democrats came up with a solution, and that solution is working.

We have kids now—almost 6 million or 7 million kids—that are now on their parents' policies. We have a situation where we are plugging up the doughnut hole in Medicare for part D prescription drugs for seniors. We have all kinds of preventive care that is out there relative to women's health. And the list goes on and on. These things are happening. Beginning next year, most Americans will have health insurance.

What do I hear from the other side? They don't want solutions. I'll be honest with my colleagues: if you really care, why don't you make some suggestions, and maybe we can work together. Anything can be improved. I don't say that anything can't be improved.

But, no, they come on the floor, and what do they want to do? Just repeal it, which is not a solution. It basically would eliminate all the progress that we have made in terms of health care.

Yes, costs are not going up as much. And, yes, people are getting rebates if their insurance companies charge them too much. All these things are happening because of the Affordable Care Act.

All I hear from you is: no, obstructionism. No, we have to repeal this because this is such a terrible thing. Bringing in all these distractions about what the Secretary of Health and Human Services is doing.

This is not what you are elected to do. You are not elected to come here and just repeal things and say how bad everything is. You are supposed to come up with solutions. I never hear it from the other side of the aisle. I simply do not hear it, which is why I get very upset the 37th time, the 38th time we are going to vote on the same thing, which is repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond.

We trust our constituents and the American people. We don't need government control of this. Certainly we don't need the IRS policing our private health care information. There is nothing affordable about the Affordable Care Act, and that is why we are concerned.

At this point, I want to yield 1 minute to the chairman of our conference, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, from Washington.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, when President Obama's health care proposal became law, he told us that it would lower costs, improve quality, cover everyone with preexisting conditions, and ensure that those under 26 would remain insured. But today, when we pull back the curtain, the American people see that this law has just made things worse.

The President promised that premiums would go down. In fact, he said families would see an average decrease in premiums by $2,500. Instead, the average family has seen premiums go up by over $3,000. And they are hitting young people hard, some facing increases up to 200 percent and many losing insurance.

The President promised those with preexisting health conditions would be covered. Unfortunately, just over 100,000 people enrolled in the program before he declared it ran out of money.

The President promised that his plan would lead to all Americans having health insurance. But CBO already estimates that 30 million people will still be uninsured even after the law is fully implemented.

We need to replace this policy with one that helps Americans.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to our chairman emeritus from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a prodigious waste of the time of the House working on a bad piece of legislation. I rise today in strong opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act.

My Republican colleagues are up for the 37th time with this nonsense, and they are fully determined to take away all of the rights that we have given under the Affordable Care Act to the people of the United States.

People are going to go back in the doughnut hole, courtesy of the Republicans. No longer will people be protected against being excluded from insurance because of preexisting conditions. And it is going to be possible now for insurance companies to kick people off insurance plans because they get sick while they have a policy. Kids are not going to go on their parents' policies after they are 26 if we pass this nonsensical legislation.

Einstein said that expecting a different result from things done over and over again is proof of insanity. Well, this is insanity. But worse than that, it is a waste of time of the people in the Congress and the money of the United States citizens who pay our wages.

This is a bad proposal. Vote it down.

Mr. Speaker, it has often been said by many, including everyone from Albert Einstein to Benjamin Franklin, that the very definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results.

We gather here in this Chamber today not to work on behalf of the American people, but instead to partake in our 37th round of insanity—repeal of a law that is already helping our struggling American families.

I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: just what part of helping the American people are you opposed to? Are you content in this preposterous display that is, by its very definition, insanity?

You are reinstating the lifetime cap on coverage for people—including children—telling

them there's nothing more that can be done for them, because their insurance provider said so.

You are ending the closing of the so-called ''donut hole'' and allowing millions of seniors to see increases in prescription drug costs, amounting to thousands and thousands of dollars in additional burdens on our seniors.

You are eliminating tax credits for more than 4 million American small businesses that stand to benefit from providing coverage for their workers, ensuring they can continue to work and provide for their business in good health and wellness.

You are telling the American people that it's fine for insurance companies to drop them from coverage just because they got sick.

You are returning our American children to the uncertain and vulnerable times when ''preexisting conditions'' meant their life and livelihood was less important than the bottom lines of insurance executives.

You are denying care for 6.6 million young people who qualify to stay on their parents' plan until age 26. Is that your preferred way of protecting and promoting the future leaders of our nation?

My friends, all that this 37th repeal vote offers is yet another piece of evidence in proving the newfound insanity of this body, further emulating the ''do-nothing'' Congress that was the 112th.

This is not what we should be wasting our time with—this is nothing more than political posturing so House Freshmen can make the same foolish mistakes of their most immediate predecessors.

This is not a vote for the American people, rather it is a callous disregard for the health and wellbeing of those who continue to work, each and every day, to make our nation great, provide for their families and ask for nothing more than a fair shot at the American Dream.

I will remind my colleagues that the very best way of protecting the American Dream is by protecting the American people—the very best asset our country holds.

We should be doing the nation's business in a cooperative manner, not working to further divide all of us who are so deeply in need of bipartisanship and unity.

Today's insane and useless vote will bring the total amount of taxpayer dollars wasted on hours upon hours of legislative attempts to repeal the Affordable Care Act to $52.4 million dollars in just three years since it became the law of the land, and just one year since the Supreme Court upheld it and ensured the care and cost-saving measures that all American families deserve.

I ask you, my colleagues, to oppose this insane legislation, end this further waste of taxpayer dollars, and bring this body back to the honest and necessary job we owe to the people we're blessed to represent.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the chairman of the Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee at Energy and Commerce, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the health care bill, indeed, has some good things in it: no lifetime cap, kids on their parents policy, people can't be denied, and some prevention. But good intentions do not guarantee good results.

Because of the guarantee of this bill, we were told it would lower costs; and we are now in a position where it may cost families more, and they won't be able to cover it.

On top of $835 billion in taxes, our Energy and Commerce Committee did a study. Getting responses from 17 insurance companies, they reported there will be a 96 percent increase in cost for those getting a new policy, 73 percent for those keeping, and some will be as high as 413 percent. Some will see lower costs, but most Americans will see some increase in the health care costs.

That is a reason why we need to repeal this and get back to really reforming health care, keeping the good parts. But Americans cannot afford this. And when it is not affordable, it is not accessible care.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, here we are again voting for the 37th time to repeal the Affordable Care Act, a law the Supreme Court has deemed constitutional. This is nothing more than a feel-good moment for new Members of the GOP who didn't get to vote on repeal in the last Congress.

If the new standard for scheduling votes is to provide wish fulfillment for Members of Congress, then I have a few requests:

If we are going to vote almost 40 times to repeal health care coverage for millions of Americans, I would like to have the chance to vote against the Defense of Marriage Act 40 more times. I had the pleasure to vote against it in 1996. I am sure there is a new generation of Members who would like to vote against it, and I would like to do it again.

Furthermore, I regret being a teenager when the Civil Rights Act was voted on. I would like a chance to lend my support to that landmark law.

To be able to cast a vote to go to war against Nazi Germany would be very satisfying to me.

I have contributed to Social Security my whole life; and since my father was not a Member of Congress in 1932, I would like to vote on his behalf to support the creation of Social Security.

I was a student of history in my youth, and I feel very strongly that the Compromise of 1850 was the point of no return leading to the Civil War. I would like a chance to vote against it.

I ask that the Republican leadership add all of these to the agenda in the weeks to come.

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

Mr. PALLONE. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ENGEL. Clearly, we have plenty of time available for wish fulfillment, rather than substantive measures such as the economy, immigration reform, and putting people back to work.

So I would like an opportunity to vote again on many different things as well.

□ 1510

Mrs. BLACKBURN. At this time, I yield 1 minute to a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today, we are once again voting to totally repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare.

Now, the most senior members of the Energy and Commerce Committee from the Democratic side stand up here and say this is the 37th time that we have voted for total repeal. No, it's the third time. We are voting for total repeal for a third time because Republicans and Democrats and 65 percent—young and old—of the people across this country demand total repeal. They know that they don't want the government taking over one-sixth of our economy and Washington bureaucrats imposing a massive tax increase on middle class Americans and small business owners.

As the government becomes more involved in health care, doctors and patients become further removed—more involved, further removed—from their own health care decisions, and this will result in a more expensive and a more dysfunctional system. Patients should have more control of their medical decisions, and reform should be driven at the State level rather than rushing through legislation that we have to read to find out what's in it. Now, Mr. Speaker, small businesswomen and men have to read a stack of rules and regulations 7-feet high to find out that, truly, the devil is in the details.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. As both a physician and a taxpayer, fully repealing ObamaCare is my top priority, and I am proud that we will soon take yet another step toward this critically important goal.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act.

Here we go again, and my colleague from Georgia knows it: 37 times, counting today, that the Republican majority has tried to repeal the Affordable Care Act, a law that was upheld by the Supreme Court, a law that will help not only millions of uninsured but everyone with health insurance because the Affordable Care Act improves coverage.

''Repeal'' means that insurance companies can once again deny coverage for preexisting conditions. It means college-aged dependent children will be kicked off their parents' insurance. Medicare beneficiaries will lose access to vital preventative screenings. Also, insurance company practices of the past, which frustrated the insured and drained their savings, will be allowed to return.

The Affordable Care Act means more than 80 percent of premium dollars are

spent on health care. That was in the Affordable Care Act. The law prevents insurance companies from providing their executives extraordinary perks while failing to provide health care to their customers.

But this will never happen again. The repeal of the Affordable Care Act will not be successful. It wasn't successful the first 36 times. It won't be today. That's because the American people need it. The law isn't perfect. The medical device excise tax and the Independent Payment Advisory Board should be addressed. This majority refuses to work with our side to fix the problems. The American people want to see Congress work together to fix problems. What they don't want is more political theater.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), a member of the committee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. I support repealing the misnamed Affordable Care Act because it is a law that Americans cannot afford.

A recent report from the Energy and Commerce Committee shows that health insurance premiums for small businesses could rise by an astonishing 400 percent. For my home State of Florida, the report notes that individuals enrolled in some current plans could see increases of over 100 percent. In the small group market, we expect to see increases as well. This law is not affordable for individuals or small businesses. The health law tries to hide these new costs through subsidies and tax credits paid for through new taxes and cuts to Medicare.

We need to repeal this job-crushing, premium-rising, government-expanding law. I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 45, and I support repealing this unaffordable act.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to set the record straight that there is no government takeover in the ACA, which is contrary to what my Republican colleagues are saying.

The ACA is built on expanding private sector coverage by improving options in the individual market and by encouraging employers to provide coverage. The claim that the ACA is a government takeover is totally unfounded. A system built on private insurance, private doctors and private hospitals is not a government takeover.

I yield now 1 minute to my colleague from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, yet again, in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act as 3 years and 37 repeal attempts later, the majority is still playing politics with the health care of real people.

Thanks to ObamaCare, 27 million American women now have access to preventative health screenings and health care without cost-sharing. They can receive cancer screenings, annual wellness physicals and contraceptives without extra costs. Seniors in my district saved an average of $600 last year on prescriptions, and as we close the doughnut hole, the savings will be even greater and families no longer have to worry that their children will be denied insurance due to a preexisting condition.

Repeal would take away these benefits and protections, raising costs for families. It would return us to a broken system, all the while increasing the deficit. It is time to move on. Let's spend our time working on new solutions instead of repeatedly placing partisanship over progress. I urge the defeat of this bill.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to our chairman emeritus of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

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

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee.

You've seen the TV commercial about oil filters where somebody brings their car in, and they haven't had their oil changed, and the guy says, Well, they could have paid me before by changing the oil filter or they can pay me later when they bring the car in.

That's why we're here today. We're going to repeal this Act. We can repeal it today or we can repeal it later, but it's going to be repealed.

My friends on the minority side talk about all the good things of it and act like there is no government intervention. There is just a government mandate that you have to have insurance. There is a government mandate that employers have to provide it. There is a government mandate on what has to be included in that coverage. There is a government price control on the price of the premiums. Of course, there is a mandate that everybody in the country has to have insurance, and the IRS can enforce that as a penalty if, in fact, you choose not to participate in that mandated program. Other than that, there is no government involvement in this law.

So, my good friends, I would say: vote with us to repeal it now so we don't have to come back later next year or the year after when health care is in a shambles, and we will repeal it then.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE).

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

Today is actually an embarrassment. Today, for the 37th time, we vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act—a messaging vote that is surely dead on arrival when it reaches the Senate.

I would say to my good friend from Texas, you can repeal it in this House 37 more times, and it's going to be just as dead when it gets over to the Senate.

This is a waste of our time. A CBS analysis last year said that Congress spent 80 hours—2 full weeks of work—on repeal votes that cost the taxpayers $48 million. Bryce Covert and Adam Peck of Think Progress estimated that, since then, we've spent an additional $6 million, bringing the total to $55 million on 37 symbolic votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act and waste our time here on the floor of the Congress. Just think what we could have done with $55 million. We could make sure college students have access to Federal work study grants. We could keep low-income kids in preschool.

Quit wasting the taxpayers' money and this Congress' time. You should be ashamed of yourselves.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. At this time, I yield 1 minute to one of our freshmen, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

□ 1520

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 45, and I thank our leadership for bringing this legislation to the floor because contrary to popular opinion, patients' rights were the ones in jeopardy a few years ago, and that's what we're restoring.

Architects of ObamaCare have said it is ''so complicated and if it isn't done right the first time, it will just simply get worse.''

By ''done right,'' they really mean that the administration simply has to write enough of the right regulations.

Nearly 20,000 pages of ObamaCare-related regulations are already on the books, including 828 pages that were issued in a single day earlier this year. This tidal wave of regulations should be no surprise to anyone who bothered to read the health care bill before they voted on it.

With the truth of our economic condition and the real contents of the health care bill beginning to sink in, I don't believe there's a better time to consider repealing ObamaCare than right now.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

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

Rather than more rhetoric, I challenge my Republican colleagues to explain to the American people why we should take away the benefits and protections that ObamaCare already provides and will provide; explain to the

125,000 young adults in Illinois that they have to get off their parents' policies, even if they're sick; explain to the 134,000 seniors in Illinois who have saved over $235 million on their prescription drugs why we need them to pay more for their drugs; and explain to the 1.4 million Illinoisans who will finally have the opportunity to obtain quality, dependable health insurance coverage—sorry, politics trumps expanding their access to health services.

I urge my colleagues to take a stand for the health of the American public. Vote ''no'' to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. At this time, I yield 1 minute to another of our freshmen, Mr. HOLDING of North Carolina.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is bad policy for patients, for doctors, for seniors, for young folks, for small businesses, for medical technology and pharmaceutical companies, and for families.

Mr. Speaker, folks in my district tell me time and time again that they are most concerned about the increase in the cost of health care, and ObamaCare does nothing to address those concerns. In fact, recent reports have suggested exactly the opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I think Senator BAUCUS was dead on when he said that he sees a huge ''train wreck'' coming down the line in regards to ObamaCare.

ObamaCare was shuffled through Congress with back-room deals and false promises. American families deserve better. They deserve to make their own choices about health care, not the government. That is why I'm proud to rise today and join my colleagues in repealing this misguided and misnamed law.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to our Democratic whip, Mr. HOYER from Maryland.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, apparently the Republicans are opposed to ObamaCare.

I know that comes as a shock to America, so we need to tell them one more time or 37 times or maybe a 38th or 39th or 40th or 100th time.

I don't know how many times we have to replay the election. There was an election in which this was one of the principal issues, and the proponent of health care for all Americans was elected by most Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this vote, as we all know, is a waste of our time; it is, however, a political exercise. This will be the 37th vote to repeal health care reform since the Republicans took control of the House. It's exactly the same as the bill that we considered in July. That partisan bill was dead on arrival in the Senate, just as this one will be; and everybody knows it.

In fact, The New York Times reported that since 2011:

> Republicans have spent no less than 15 percent of their time on the House floor on repeal in some way.

Since 2011, they've spent 15 percent of their time on this House floor trying to repeal health care for all Americans.

When President Obama was reelected after campaigning on the Affordable Care Act as a major first-term achievement with the unanimous opposition of Republican colleagues and after the Supreme Court said, yes, this is a constitutional exercise of the Congress' authority, Speaker BOEHNER said, ''ObamaCare is the law of the land.''

I had hoped that would be the end of wasted time and $52.4 million in taxpayer money on legislation to nowhere that would strip away benefits for millions and millions of Americans. Sadly, however, this vote is more of the same.

It would increase out-of-pocket costs on preventive services for 105 million Americans, including 34 million seniors on Medicare and 71 million Americans covered under private plans.

It would allow insurance companies to reimpose arbitrary lifetime limits on coverage for more than 100 million people.

It would allow insurance companies once again to discriminate against and deny care to as many as 17 million children with preexisting conditions. CantorCare tried to reverse that and had to be pulled from this floor because even a Republican-sponsored attempt at dealing with preexisting conditions was rejected by our Republican colleagues.

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

Mr. PALLONE. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the clock will not be turned back. ObamaCare is the law of the land. Those are not my words, but Speaker BOEHNER's.

You say this vote is necessary so that freshman Members have a chance to get on record on a major issue. If they haven't gotten on record now, they're not going to get on record.

If that is the standard for getting a vote on the floor, then let us have a vote on replacing the sequester which you have denied freshmen the chance to vote on all year. That is what we ought to be spending our time on, getting our country on a sound fiscal path, creating jobs and growing our economy. Instead, we tread water; we waste time as we continue to debate for the 37th time the repeal of health care for all Americans.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE).

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this may be the 37th time that the House has taken up the repeal of ObamaCare, but this is my first time; and I and the constituents that sent me here want my vote recorded to repeal this poorly crafted, job-killing law.

Last week, colleges in my district graduated more than 2,000 students eager to enter our workforce. These week-old college graduates in my district will be met with real-life challenges immediately thanks to the President's health care law. Over 50 percent of recent college graduates are unemployed. Five years after the recession, national unemployment remains unacceptably high.

Seventy percent of small businesses cite the Affordable Care Act as a reason not to hire. Businesses large and small are considering cutting their workforce and reducing hours to avoid the requirements of the Affordable Care Act in January.

Working families in America are hurting, and the Affordable Care Act is adding to their pain. The CBO estimates that 30 percent of employers will stop offering employer-sponsored health insurance next year.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 5¾ minutes, and the gentlewoman from Tennessee has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act is working for families and small businesses all across America.

Did you know that the Affordable Care Act provides tax credits to small businesses that offer health insurance to their employees and that over 360,000 small businesses have taken advantage of those tax credits so far and millions more remain eligible?

Speaking of young people, in the State of Florida alone, over 224,000 young people have been able to have health insurance because they've now been able to stay on their parents' policies.

□ 1530

Mr. Speaker, 1.3 million Floridians have received $124 million in rebates from insurance companies, an average of $168 per family, because of important consumer protection provisions in the law that say insurance companies can't charge families too much.

Medicare is stronger, the doughnut hole is closing, and the Affordable Care Act is a godsend to so many families who have preexisting conditions, whether it is cancer or diabetes or some other chronic condition.

To my Republican colleagues, let's come together to work on the economy and creating jobs rather than another deja vu of repealing health care and wasting time.

I urge everyone to vote ''no'' on the Patients' Rights Repeal Act.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield myself 15 seconds to respond to a couple of things.

We are working on jobs. One of the items that concerns us is that, according to the CBO, implementation of the ObamaCare bill with its 13,000 pages, 7-foot tall tower of red tape would cost this economy 800,000 jobs. We also know that it's grown to being a $2.6 trillion program.

At this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join a chorus of people who recognize the ineffectiveness of the Affordable Care Act which, frankly, Mr. Speaker, is not even affordable. The CBO also said that there's $1.8 trillion now added to the cost of ObamaCare.

We've seen the impact on physicians. Physicians, particularly those with specialties, don't want to continue in their practice. People in medical school, they don't want to continue. People in undergraduate, they don't want to go to med school. There's a dearth, Mr. Speaker, of availability in the future of physicians.

We've seen premiums skyrocket. In North Carolina alone, premiums have increased 284 percent.

We've seen the impact of 7 million people now who cannot take their own personal health insurance that they were promised.

We've seen a risk pool that no longer has funding available.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better, and we're going to work hard to ensure that we have a competitive health care program that will deliver true health provisions for the American people.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act. That's right, America, the repeal of patients' rights, brought to you by the Republican majority of the House. It is the 37th vote to repeal ObamaCare.

While far from perfect, the Affordable Care Act was a serious attempt to solve a serious problem. By contrast, the legislation we are considering today is not serious, and the only problem it portends to solve is offering new Members of this body an opportunity to vote on a bill that isn't going anywhere.

I assure you, there's no lack of real problems for this body to address. As of March, the unemployment rate for most of my congressional district was at 7 percent. Does anyone in this Chamber think we should sit on our laurels with 7.3 percent unemployment? Instead of holding 37 votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act, is it too much to ask that we just hold one vote on the American Jobs Act, legislation that included both Democratic and Republican ideas that would put more money in the pockets of small businesses and put countless Americans back to work? These political votes are a foolish waste of time, and the American people deserve better.

In closing, I would urge my colleagues to oppose this blatantly political legislation and return to a focus on legislation that creates jobs, grows the economy, lays the foundation for sustainable prosperity, and doesn't strip away health care benefits for millions of Americans.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN), who is the author of H.R. 45.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee who has been a champion for the repeal of ObamaCare for years and years.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the recent revelations that have just come out within this last week regarding the outrageous activities of the Internal Revenue Service pointed against the people of the United States, every American should be concerned about the negative consequences of this bill, ObamaCare.

The Supreme Court has ruled that ObamaCare is in fact a tax. Knowing that it's a tax, the logical conclusion is that the entity in the United States that will be tasked with enforcing tax policy is the IRS.

I'm a former Federal tax litigation attorney. I worked for the Treasury Department. We had only one client; it was the IRS. The IRS is the only entity that enforces tax policy in the United States, and ObamaCare is enforced by the IRS—probably the most feared Federal agency in the United States Government. It concerns me. It should concern every single American listening to our voices today that the IRS has admitted this week that they directly targeted Americans, including Christians, including those who support the State of Israel, including those who are for jobs and less debt, including conservatives, Tea Partiers. They were targeted; why? Because of what they believe—their religious beliefs, their political beliefs—and the IRS targeted them for punishment, or for reward, depending upon how their ideas lined up with the administration's ideas.

You see, this dysfunctional implementation of ObamaCare and the ongoing assault on nonnegotiable constitutional liberties is enough to convince every single one of us who are the people's representatives to seek full repeal of this law. It's our job, Mr. Speaker, to defend liberty. We're all sworn to protect and defend the Constitution, and that's why, today, we have to end this horrible piece of legislation and stand up for people.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I believe the other side has more time, and so at this time I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. At this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON).

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

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I'm driven today to rise because I agree wholeheartedly with Senator MAX BAUCUS, that ObamaCare is a train wreck to our economy. As a proud cosponsor of H.R. 45, I unequivocally support a full repeal of this onerous law.

Since the Supreme Court has delineated it as a tax, it's clear that obligations or commitments to not raise taxes on the middle class have gone by the wayside. In fact, this will be one of the largest tax increases on the middle class known to man. In fact, there's a hidden tax in this bill on medical devices, lifesaving medical devices.

My mother, 90 years old, has a pacemaker, and that keeps her alive. The next time she gets one, she's going to have to pay a tax on that, and so is every other senior citizen who has a pacemaker. I think this is just flat out wrong.

Also, the Maricopa Community College district just recently reclassified 700 professors from full-time status to part-time status so they don't have to pay this onerous tax.

Mr. Speaker, this is a terrible bill. It needs to be repealed.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arizona keeps talking about the terrible things in the health care reform bill. But let me just say, in his State, if the ACA was repealed, that would mean in Arizona, drug costs for over 65,000 seniors would have been $102 million higher; 69,000 young adults would not have had coverage through their parents' plans; 917,000 women and 434,000 seniors and people with disabilities would not have had access to free preventive care; 414,000 people would not have received $28 million in rebates from their insurance companies; and next year, 948,000 people will not have access to quality, dependable health insurance coverage.

And so these are the facts, the real problem that happens in the State of Arizona, if this bill were to pass and the health care reform were to be repealed.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. At this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Sanford).

Mr. SANFORD. I rise with a chorus of others in this whole notion of repealing ObamaCare primarily because of its financial impact. At the end of the day, if you look at the Government Accountability Office numbers, what they show is that there's $6.2 trillion of cumulative impact here over the next 10 years. If you look at the Congressional Budget Office numbers, what they show is increasing numbers in $800 billion increments. And, in fact, if you look at American tax reform studies, what they show are 20 new or raised levels of tax that go with this bill.

□ 1540

I think, more importantly, it turns on its head this whole notion of the Hippocratic Oath, which has been a 200-year tradition in this country of doctors working directly for a patient.

And finally, and I'd say most importantly, it turns upside down this American tradition of not having the government force on the consumers the notion of the purchase of a product. It's for that and many other reasons that I join again with a chorus of others in urging repeal of this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I'd like to yield 1½ minutes to the

gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member of our Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, voting to repeal the Affordable Care Act for the 37th time is a waste of resources and another example of the refusal to focus on the important issues of jobs and the economy right now. It's also an example of bad budgeting.

One of the things I don't think our Republican colleagues have focused on is that their claim to have a balanced budget rests on the savings and the tax revenue in the ObamaCare bill. So if you repeal all of ObamaCare, which this bill says it wants to do, the Republican budget will immediately be out of balance in 10 years. Here's how it works:

If you look at the Republican budget, in 10 years, they claim that there's a $7 billion surplus. But the reality is it also contains in it Medicare savings—we heard that issue demagogued during the last Presidential campaign—and it also includes ObamaCare revenue. And if you take out that over $400 billion in Medicare savings and the revenue in ObamaCare, poof, the Republican budget is way out of balance.

And, Mr. Speaker, it's not just me saying that. Here's what The Heritage Foundation said. They also point out that the Republican budget depends on ObamaCare.

So, long story short, you can't have it both ways. You can't repeal ObamaCare and go home and tell people you did that and, at the same time, say you have a balanced budget.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentlelady.

I rise in support today of ObamaCare repeal.

I can't begin to highlight all the problems of ObamaCare in 1 minute, so I will instead focus on this simple fact: ObamaCare is the biggest assault on the 40-hour workweek in this country in a generation.

Under ObamaCare, government mandates and penalties kick in for every employee that works more than 30 hours a week. Employers can't afford ObamaCare's mandates and penalties, so they're scaling back the hours of their employees to less than 30 hours as a result. And that's bad for workers. It means many working moms will be forced to look for a second job to find the hours they need to pay their bills and feed their family.

In my hometown of Shelbyville, for example, it has already meant that some part-time teacher's aides must work less so the local school system doesn't go bankrupt. That's bad for teachers and students. And the problems are just beginning.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to repeal ObamaCare and restore the 40-hour workweek. Forty may be the new 30 when it comes to aging, but 30 is the new 40 when it comes to the ObamaCare workweek.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Tennessee has 1¼ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just heard the gentleman from Indiana say, We can't do this; we can't do that. I mean, this is the problem with the other side of the aisle, with the Republican side of the aisle: they always believe that we can't do anything here in the House of Representatives.

The fact of the matter is that Democrats saw the problem. The problem was discriminatory health insurance practices. The problem was young people not being able to get on their parents' insurance policies. The problem was women not being able to access health care and so many Americans, 40, 50 million Americans, that did not have health insurance.

And what did we do as Democrats?

We found a solution to the problem, which was the Affordable Care Act, and it was working. The discriminatory practices are going away. More and more people are going to have health insurance. Most Americans will have health insurance by the beginning of 2014. And the doughnut hole for prescriptions drugs for seniors is being closed. All these things are answers that the Democrats have brought through the Affordable Care Act for the problems that existed with our health care system.

And all I hear from the other side of the aisle is, We can't do this; we can't do that.

Well, we've done something. Don't just come here and tell us we have to repeal it. As I said before, if you have a solution, you want to work with us to improve things, that's fine; but don't come here for the 37th and 38th time and say, We're just going to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

You never come up with a positive solution to the problem. In this Congress, all we hear from the Republican side of the aisle is, We want to repeal everything; we want to waste time.

Don't continue to do this. This bill is a complete waste of time. It passes here, it goes to the Senate, and nothing happens.

Let's keep this bill, the Affordable Care Act, in place. It's doing wonderful things for the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

This law has become 13,000 pages of regulation. It has gone from costing $800 billion to $2.6 trillion.

It's so interesting to hear people talk about solutions and wanting government to do things. Mr. Speaker, the American people can solve so many of these problems. They know the answers do not come out of Washington, D.C. They come from our communities. They come from our State legislatures. They come, solutions come from employers that are fighting every single day to keep people employed.

One of the biggest impediments to job growth, indeed, including the 800,000 jobs this bill will cost us, this law, ObamaCare, costing us 800,000 jobs over the next 10 years, is keeping people working full-time.

We know what the problems are. We're saying, Look, admit it was a mistake. The American people don't want it. It's too expensive to afford. Let's get it off the books.

And we do come forward with solutions. We come forward with keeping patient-centered, health care centermost for our constituents. That's what they want. They want options. They do not want regulation and mandates by the Federal Government, who can't seem to solve the problems that are in front of them right now, whether it's the IRS or anyone else.

Let's repeal this bill and pass H.R. 45.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 45, the legislation that will repeal the President's job-destroying health care law, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is mired in a jobs crisis, and the President's health care law is making it worse. Since ObamaCare was first enacted in 2010, Federal bureaucrats have written nearly 20,000 pages of new regulations—20,000 pages.

Colleagues on the other side of the aisle have talked about how many times we've tried to get rid of this menace and what's changed. Well, as we know, very famously, we had to pass the bill to find out what was in it, but even then we didn't know what was in it. We're now at 20,000 pages of regulations and still counting.

Meanwhile, America's job creators are struggling to manage the full effects of the law in their workplaces.

□ 1550

Ed Tubel has owned and operated Sonny's Real Pit Barbecue for more than 30 years. At a recent hearing in North Carolina, Mr. Tubel outlined the difficult choices he now faces, including higher prices for customers and fewer hours for workers. Brett Parker, vice chairman of Bowlmor Lanes of New York, testified in 2011 that his business may also have to shift workers to part-time hours in order to ''protect existing jobs.''

As chief human resources officer with Rowan-Cabarrus Community College, Tina Haynes stated the college must consider cutting the number of courses offered to students. She also described

the health care law as a ''massive administrative burden that comes with unanticipated costs.'' And Gail Johnson, president and CEO of an early childhood learning center, warned in 2011 that ObamaCare would ''force entrepreneurs to invest less into growing their business'' and slow the growth of small businesses.

These men and women live each day with the consequences of the health care law. No doubt, others across the country have similar stories to tell. There are a number of good reasons why Congress should repeal the government takeover of health care. It is driving up the cost of care, and millions will lose the health care coverage they have and like. Yes, Mr. Speaker, if you like your coverage, you may not be able to keep it. According to CBO, at least 7 million people fall into that trap.

But for many Americans, one reason stands above the rest: jobs. Our Nation's workers and employers cannot afford the Democrats' job-destroying health care law. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 45.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee, Dr. ROE, and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Tennessee will control the balance of the majority's time.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act. Mr. Speaker, we meet today for the 37th attempt to take away the basic health care rights from millions of Americans. Yet, despite all of these votes, the Affordable Care Act remains the law of the land. And it will remain the law of the land even after today's vote. That's a fact.

So why are we here for the 37th time? Are Republicans afraid that Americans are now able to get basic preventive health care screening with no copay? Are they afraid that Americans will now no longer be gouged or denied coverage because of preexisting conditions? Are Republicans fearful that the insurance companies can't cut off lifesaving care just because somebody got sick? Because they can't do that now with the Affordable Care Act.

Why on Earth would anyone fear American families being put back in charge of their health care? But we're here, yet again, to satisfy the majority's needs to have another meaningless vote. This obsession with repeal by the majority is bordering on the absurd. It's time to move on, for goodness' sake. Open season is set to begin in 5 months. Americans without affordable insurance will be able to shop for plans in an open and transparent marketplace with the help of tax credits for those who qualify. Employers of small businesses will be able to shop for appropriate health care for their employees and for their businesses with the help of tax credits.

It's our duty as public servants to help our constituents navigate this new law, not spend our time obstructing it. That's how California has approached the reform. We've worked in a collaborative way with all of the stakeholders. And that's how the government should work, because they know that it will help families struggling to afford health insurance.

Take, for instance, a family of four making $60,000 in California who buys their own insurance. Today, they pay some $12,500 on average for insurance. That's more than $1,000 a month. But starting in January, this family will save almost $5,000 a year because of the Affordable Care Act. Think about what this family can do with that extra $400 a month. It means paying your bills, it means saving money for your kids' education, it means repairing your car. This is what the Affordable Care Act can do. This is what ObamaCare does. This is what the Republicans are trying to hide from the American people.

Our country has been debating health care for more than a century. They keep saying there's other alternative solutions. It's funny that none of them came forward. None of them came forward during this debate with those alternative solutions, and health premiums were skyrocketing in double-digits year after year after year. For decades, we debated how to make sure all Americans have access to health care that won't bankrupt them if they get sick. For decades, we debated control of the national health spending by ensuring that everyone is covered. For decades, we debated how to control uncompensated care that cost families dearly. And it took the leadership of Speaker PELOSI and President Obama to bring positive change for families and businesses struggling under the weight of health care costs.

The fact of the matter is this plan currently today is working for millions of Americans, for millions of seniors, for millions of young Americans and for millions of young people born with preexisting conditions. That's what this legislation is about, lowering the cost of prescription drugs for senior citizens and making sure that people can get preventive care without copays. The Republicans want to yank that all away, and they don't have a plan to provide that health care security.

Interestingly enough, the other day in The Wall Street Journal was a full discussion about how this health care package is entrepreneurial because people who feel that they're job-locked will now be able to go out and start businesses because they know they'll have health care insurance for themselves or for their spouses or for the kids, and they'll be able to become the entrepreneurs they want to be. There's a discussion among large employers because people will leave and take their ideas and start their own businesses. That's what this health care enables Americans to do for the first time, not be locked into a job because of the fear of the insecurity of not having health care for your family and what that means.

This is an entrepreneurial act. This is liberating people. This is freeing people from the financial fear of the loss of health care. Never again, with the passage of this legislation, will an American lose health care because they lost their job, because somebody died in their family or because a child was born with a preexisting condition. Never again. The Republicans don't have an alternative. They only have obstruction and repeal as part of their program.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Today, I rise in strong support of H.R. 45, the repeal of a flawed health care reform bill.

I came to this body 4½ years ago understanding that the greatest problem with the American health care system was cost and access. I knew this because I practiced medicine in east Tennessee for 31 years. I also have been involved with health care reform in Tennessee beginning in 1993 with our attempt to reform our Medicaid program called TennCare. I knew here what not to do. ObamaCare is what not to do. We saw costs skyrocket, and we saw our then-Democratic Governor cut benefits and cut the rolls, therefore rationing care.

We need health care reform today in this country, but we need patient-centered health care reform where patients, their families, and their physicians make health care decisions, not government bureaucrats with 20,000 pages worth of rules or insurance companies.

Health care should not be a partisan issue. I, as a physician, have never seen a Republican or a Democrat heart attack. I have never operated on a Republican or Democrat cancer in my life.

We were made promises during the health care debate: your insurance premiums would go down, jobs would be created, and access would be expanded. What's really happened? Insurance premiums have skyrocketed by as much as 100 percent. We're looking at tax increases for individuals, taxes on productive companies, and taxes on lifesaving medical devices. Small business owners are being forced to cut hours, delay investment, and stop hiring just to stay afloat. This comes at a time when families need more income to make ends meet, not less hours to work and higher insurance premiums.

Are patients getting lower costs? It's an emphatic ''no.'' And maybe the biggest insult of all, the IRS will determine if your insurance coverage is adequate.

Mr. Speaker, I stand ready to repeal this flawed bill and work with my Democratic colleagues on health care

reform that will truly work for the American people, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS.)

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

It is right and good that people should passionately pursue their points of view in democratic debate. But it's also our obligation to work from the same set of facts. I have sat here and listened to my friends for the better part of an hour, and I do think it's important that we reflect a correct record on a lot of things, first of all, about the deficit. We have a neutral referee here on questions about spending and taxes called the Congressional Budget Office, and several Members on the other side have approvingly quoted what the CBO says on different things.

Here is what the CBO says about this law:

> Repealing this law will add at least $100 billion to the deficit.

Now, our friends disagree with that, but the referee that they hired, that we live by, says repeal of the law adds $100 billion to the deficit.

We hear that health insurance premiums have gone up by an average of $3,000 per year. I don't know the source of that claim. Someone should share that with us. But I do know this: the cost-control strategies in the new law which involve the establishment of a competitive insurance market so the insurance companies don't have huge market control hasn't taken effect yet and doesn't take effect until January 1 of 2014. This is characterized as government control of health care.

□ 1600

Here's what the law actually says: it says a person without health insurance can get a subsidy to choose among private insurance plans, like Blue Cross and Blue Shield, like Kaiser Permanente, and make their choice.

There is nothing in this law—and I would challenge any of my friends on the other side, Mr. Speaker, to show us one word that says that the doctor-patient relationship is in any way impeded or impaired by this law. They can't find those words because they're not there.

The bill is referred to as a job-killing health care law, right out of the polling and focus groups of the Republican Party. Here's the facts: in the months before the law was signed, the country was bleeding jobs; 750,000 jobs lost in the month of January of 2009 when the President was inaugurated. Since the law was signed, the private sector has added 3.5 million jobs. Now, you can argue, well, it would have been four and a half or five. Have that argument if you want. But since the law was signed, the number of jobs in the private sector has gone up by a lot, not down. That's what the private sector has done.

One of the gentlewomen referred to CBO saying 800,000 jobs are being lost. Apparently CBO is okay in that fact. Here's what that report really says: it says that a lot of people who are older—in their late fifties and early sixties—who are working because they feel they have to work for health insurance are likely to take early retirement. That's where the 800,000 job difference comes from. That's what the report says if you read it.

We've heard ObamaCare is a tax. That is true. ObamaCare is a tax on two kinds of people—people with investment income in excess of about a quarter-million dollars and people who can afford health insurance, choose not to buy it, and choose to have our neighbors and our constituents who do buy health insurance pay their bills when they go to the emergency room. That is true.

We've heard we have to protect the Constitution. Well, we are protecting the Constitution. With all due respect, your side litigated this and lost. The Supreme Court of the United States heard the claim this is unconstitutional and said you were wrong.

Finally, we hear about the assault on the 40-hour workweek. Massachusetts, under a Governor named Romney, did something very similar to this law—imposed an employer mandate. Here's what happened in Massachusetts: while the rest of the country was shedding 3.6 percent of its full-time jobs, Massachusetts lost 2.8 percent of its full-time jobs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield the gentleman 30 seconds.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend.

Massachusetts added nine-tenths of 1 percent of part-time jobs to the workforce. The country was 0.8. So if this bill is going to force all of these employers to drop their hours from full time to part time, why didn't it happen in Massachusetts?

This has been a fact-free debate up until this time. The country deserves better. The House deserves better. We should oppose this absent-minded repeal.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I just left in my office the Tennessee insurance commissioner who said the first of January, the individual market, 40 to 75 percent higher premiums; the smaller-group market, 50 to 55 percent higher. Plans would be less rich, with higher copays, higher deductibles, young healthy males get a huge increase. Instead of having eight statewide plans, we're now down to two and maybe one.

I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

Mr. DAINES. Earlier this week, I sent an online survey out to my constituents with one simple question: Do you support efforts to repeal ObamaCare? Thousands of Montanans responded, and by a 3–1 margin they made it clear that ObamaCare needs to be repealed.

And as we speak, the American people are lighting up Twitter. Check it out yourself. They're tweeting about the harms of ObamaCare in three words. Actually, the hashtag is: ObamaCare in Three Words.

But while Americans are saying things like ''job-crushing mandates'' and ''premiums are skyrocketing,'' 1 hour ago the White House tweeted back and said this: ''Because. It's. Law.'' Well, I have three words for the White House: arrogance of power.

Madam Speaker, if the President is unwilling to listen to the voice of the people, then the House will, because this is the people's House. ObamaCare is a bad law, plain and simple.

I was elected to serve the people of Montana and represent their voice in this Congress, and that's what I'm doing today. Montanans have spoken loud and clear: they want this law repealed. That's why I will vote to repeal it.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act.

Today, if people want to talk about repealing health care reform, it's important that they talk about exactly what repeal means.

Repeal means that young people under 26 will have to get off their parents' policies.

Repeal means that seniors will have to suffer through the doughnut hole that we're in the process of closing.

Repeal means an end to tax cuts to small businesses who are providing health coverage for their employees.

Repeal means that next year all Americans who expect to be able to afford health insurance will not be able to afford it, and all Americans with preexisting conditions who expected to be able to buy health insurance at the standard rate will not be able to buy it.

Repeal means that those who think they will need health security if they switch jobs, they will lose that security when they switch jobs.

Repeal means an end to the laws against insurance abuses, like unreasonable rate increases and cancellation of policies when you most need them. There will be an end to that if we repeal.

If people want to talk about repealing the Affordable Care Act, they should talk about what's going to happen to young people, to those with preexisting conditions, to seniors in the doughnut hole, and the future affordability of health care.

Madam Speaker, we should not repeal the Affordable Care Act, we should oppose the legislation.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to my

good friend from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to ObamaCare for the reasons we've heard already here today. However, I would like to explain how this ''train wreck'' is affecting Indiana and costing good-paying Hoosier jobs.

Indiana is home to over 300 medical device companies, creating over 54,800 jobs that pay an average salary of $59,706 per year, and the medical device industry provides $50 billion to Indiana's economy.

Companies have already decided not to expand and many across the country have announced layoffs. The device tax is so dangerous that our friends in the U.S. Senate voted recently 79–20 to repeal the medical device tax, and last Congress the House voted in a bipartisan manner to repeal the tax.

Yet we've heard from the White House that the President doesn't support repeal because they need the money to support ObamaCare. This tax is a job killer and stifles innovation. It must be repealed.

ObamaCare is full of these types of examples. This near government takeover of our Nation's health care system is riddled with more taxes, burdensome regulations, and unintended consequences that are costing jobs and compromising the quality of health care available to Americans. Not to mention many full-time employees are being cut back to part time so that employers can comply with all the requirements of the law. My constituents are telling me that this is happening as we speak back in Indiana.

Before coming to the House, I practiced medicine for 15 years. That experience tells me that this law fails to help patients get access to quality, affordable health care, prevents businesses from expanding, and is not helping us create much needed jobs.

It also puts government bureaucrats between the patient and their doctor—government bureaucrats in an agency that is intrusive, untrustworthy and targeting American citizens based on politics. Yes, Madam Speaker, ObamaCare vastly expands the IRS and is dependent on the agency for its implementation. That's why I'm proud to stand here today with my colleagues to support our Nation's patients by voting to repeal this disastrous law so we can replace it with commonsense, patient-centered reforms.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act.

The U.S. Supreme Court's ruling upholding the health care bill was a historic win for this Nation's small businesses and their employees. In fact, 62 percent of all small businesses didn't have access to health insurance for themselves, their employees, and their families. That ruling proved that the Affordable Care Act was a good law.

□ 1610

The benefits small businesses are already seeing reiterate this fact, and yet we find ourselves voting again on repealing this landmark law. Once more we must vote on a bill that will not help a single small business invest, hire, or secure a loan. If you want to help small businesses, put people back to work.

In addition to the small business health care tax credit, which has already helped 360,000 small businesses providing health insurance to up to 2 million workers in this country, the medical loss ratio has ensured that businesses of all sizes were getting the most out of their premium dollars, saving them nearly $321 million—money that they could put back into their companies.

The future of health reform holds more promise. Banning denials for preexisting conditions reduces ''job lock'' and encourages more than 1.6 million prospective entrepreneurs to launch new companies.

At a small business hearing last month, Ms. Louisa McQueeney credited the ACA with providing her company ''better coverage and greater peace of mind.'' The ACA will soon prohibit insurers from hiking rates on small firms without justification and end discrimination based on gender. So, I agree with Ms. McQueeney when she says, ''Frankly, it can't come soon enough.''

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Contrary to beliefs, the ACA gives small businesses better access to quality coverage. Passage of today's bill would strip new protections that provide bargaining power to small companies. That is why I will continue to oppose any efforts repealing a law that is beneficial to millions of small firms, and I urge our colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. COTTON. Madam Speaker, every time Cato the Elder spoke in the Roman Senate, he said, whatever the topic, ''Carthage must be destroyed.'' As long as Carthage survived, the freedom and prosperity of the Roman people would never be secured.

As then with Carthage, so now with ObamaCare: as long as it remains on the books, the health, prosperity, and freedom of the American people will never be secure.

ObamaCare raids $700 billion from Medicare, meaning seniors across Arkansas will have their health care rationed as doctors refuse to see new Medicare patients.

ObamaCare creates an unelected and unaccountable panel of bureaucrats to ration and deny needed medical care for Arizona seniors.

ObamaCare will cause insurance premiums to skyrocket by as much as 60 to 100 percent for Arkansas families.

ObamaCare raises 21 taxes by more than $1 trillion and will cost at least $1.7 trillion in the first decade alone.

ObamaCare violates our freedom of conscience by using taxpayer dollars to fund abortion.

ObamaCare is corrupt to its rotten core. The government has exempted hundreds of the President's cronies from the law. The Secretary of Health and Human Services is right now shaking down private companies for millions of dollars to promote ObamaCare.

And, of course, the IRS, expanded by 2,000 agents, will be the main enforcement agency for ObamaCare, the very IRS who we now know targets the President's political opponents for harassment and intimidation.

Madam Speaker, ObamaCare must be repealed. I urge the Congress to repeal this abominable law, and I urge the American people to vote out of office every politician who voted for it 3 years ago.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act. This is now number 37, the 37th time that we have debated this issue. We have now built up quite an archive of hysterical predictions by the Republicans during all these debates and 3 years of experience to see how those predictions have actually panned out.

Prediction number one, ObamaCare was going to kill Medicare Advantage plans. Has that happened? No. In 2013, this year, 14.5 million Americans have enrolled in Medicare Advantage plans, up from last year, which was 12.8 million. And while the enrollment is up, the cost has stayed flat, even. The monthly premium, average monthly premium for Medicare Advantage this year versus last year, went up $1 a month.

Health savings accounts, the GOP said that ObamaCare would kill health savings accounts. This year, in 2013, health savings accounts have never been higher. 13.5 million Americans are in a health savings account, up from 11.4 million in January 2011. The President of the Health Savings Administrators was quoted recently as saying, ''You're going to see an explosion of health savings accounts assets.''

We have heard that it is going to kill jobs. We have already heard from Mr. ANDREWS 6.7 million new private sector jobs have been created since March of 2010, many of them, by the way, in health care—over 800,000.

But, lastly, all the predictions about busting the budget and creating higher new costs. We heard yesterday from the Congressional Budget Office that Medicare cost growth has been at the most moderate level since Medicare

was created in 1965. The index of per capita Medicare expenditure last month rose less than 1 percent, again, shattering records over the history of the Medicare program. And it is doing it the smart way, by greater oversight of fraud, by better coordination of care, by more preventive care such as giving seniors the prescription drugs that the Republican prescription drug program denied them back in 2003.

This program, like any program, can always be improved, and I have worked with Dr. ROE in terms of the IPAB repeal. Let's do that.

Let's stop wasting our time on a mindless repeal of measures that are working.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, KEITH ROTHFUS.

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding.

I rise in support of H.R. 45.

President Obama made a lot of promises when pushing his health care law through Congress. He promised that it would make health care more affordable and accessible. He promised that if you liked your health care plan, you would be able to keep it. Western Pennsylvanians will tell you that President Obama has failed to keep these promises.

We recently saw one of these failures when the Community College of Allegheny County reduced the hours of many part-time employees because it could not afford the increased cost of health insurance. This is just one of the many sad side effects of a law that puts the government in the driver's seat of our health care system while taking patients and doctors along for the ride.

Western Pennsylvanians do not want a law that will turn a doctor's waiting room into the waiting room for the Department of Motor Vehicles. They want commonsense and patient-centered reform that makes health care more affordable and accessible for workers, seniors, and families.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

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

This is the 37th time Congress is wasting time attempting to repeal this law. My friends across the aisle could focus on putting this helpful and urgently needed law into effect.

Forty-one million more Americans will have the opportunity to get health care under this law. One in four of them are hardworking Latino Americans who want to protect their families and provide for them. They will finally be able to live without fear that they are not one illness away from going into bankruptcy. Now you want to take that promise away from them.

Earlier this year, my friends across the aisle committed themselves to engaging Hispanic Americans. How can they say they genuinely want to address our needs when they vote to destroy a law that is vastly going to represent 41 million Americans having access to health care and, of those, 10 million Latinos having access to health care?

A point of personal privilege, Madam Speaker. I would like to take the opportunity to thank my wife for being married to me for 21 years. Today is our anniversary, and here I am on the floor working. Hopefully, we will have some good work done today.

□ 1620

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, very briefly, Republicans and Democrats did vote to repeal the 1099 and the IPAB and to repeal the device tax and the CLASS Act. Then we hear we didn't have any solutions. There were 80 amendments to this bill. None of them were ruled germane to the bill. I had 10 amendments on which I wanted to work with the other side. The Republican substitute was voted on, which is an across-State-lines association of health plans actually funding high-risk pools for preexisting conditions, HSAs and consumer-driven, putting the patient in charge of health care decisions.

I now yield 1 minute to my good friend from South Carolina, JOE WILSON.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Thank you, Dr. ROE, for yielding.

Today, House Republicans will vote for the 37th time to repeal or defund ObamaCare.

Prior to its deal-making passage in 2010, the National Federation of Independent Business, America's largest organization of small businesses, warned that the implementation of the government health care takeover would destroy 1.6 million jobs due to mandates and tax increases, crippling small businesses.

To make matters worse, at a time when our Nation is experiencing record unemployment, President Obama has called on the IRS, an agency currently in the midst of scandal, to hire thousands of new agents to enforce ObamaCare. Based on the recent reports, it is clear that the IRS should not be expanded to include the authorization of controlling health care for the American people.

Today's vote will give us an opportunity to repeal a crucial job-destroying bill that, in turn, will provide small businesses the certainty they need to begin hiring again and to put American families back to work. As a proud cosponsor, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. May I inquire of the Chair how much time is available on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 4½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Tennessee has 7¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the Republican Majority Leader, the gentleman from Virginia, ERIC CANTOR.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Madam Speaker, today, I rise in support of the full repeal of ObamaCare.

Moms and dads across America are worried. They are worried about their health, the health of their kids, the health of their aging parents. They are struggling to understand how the new health care laws will affect their prescription prices, their emergency room visits, whether they can keep their doctors or, worse, whether they can keep their jobs.

These families want the best for themselves and their children, and so do we. House Republicans want patient-centered health care reform that lowers costs, increases access, makes the health care system easier to enter and easier to navigate. ObamaCare is not the answer.

While both parties agree that we must make health care more accessible, we in the majority fundamentally disagree that more government is the answer. Sweeping mandates on individuals and businesses will not improve our health care. We do not wish to see unelected, Federal bureaucrats come between patients and their doctors—limiting choices, lowering quality and raising costs.

Madam Speaker, this act, which is the ObamaCare law and which is set to be implemented 8 months from now, is a threat to American patients and their families. When this law was first debated in 2009 and signed in 2010, the White House promised the American people that ObamaCare would lower costs for families and businesses. That promise has been broken. Nothing could be further from the truth.

If you like the health care coverage you currently have, you really don't know if you will be able to keep it under ObamaCare. Many employers are delaying hiring decisions because of provisions outlined in the law, and people with preexisting conditions are now being denied the coverage the President promised. There are more complaints about the law than praise—and for good reason.

It is now projected that ObamaCare will send health care premiums skyrocketing in the individual and small group insurance markets. When fully enacted, this law is expected to pose new financial burdens on America's youngest adults and many working families. Moreover, due to the projected cuts to Medicare Advantage, many of our seniors will face a type of health care that they didn't bargain for. This act should not be considered a reform but a bureaucratic overreach that makes a mess out of our health

care system and gives incredible power to the Internal Revenue Service.

President Obama has already signed seven bills originating in the House that repeal or defund parts of this health care law, but if we are serious in wanting to deliver real results for the people who sent us here, we should repeal ObamaCare and replace it with the health care that the American people desire.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to my friend from North Carolina, RICHARD HUDSON.

Mr. HUDSON. Now, I don't have much in common with the leadership in the Senate, but today I stand in agreement with Senator MAX BAUCUS, who characterized the implementation of ObamaCare as a ''train wreck.''

Disasters occur when the government oversteps its bounds. We've seen it with ObamaCare, as it is the most egregious example. We've also seen this week what happens when Federal agencies target people for their political beliefs, and we've seen the same kind of overreach with violations of the First Amendment rights of reporters and journalists and in the failure to answer questions about the origins of the terrorist attack in Benghazi.

Legislatively, ObamaCare is the most egregious example of government overreach we have ever seen, and a disaster, ladies and gentlemen, is ensuing. Hardworking Americans are losing their jobs, families are paying more in taxes, and seniors are losing much-needed Medicare coverage—and this bill hasn't even been fully implemented yet.

Health care has always been and should always be a relationship between a patient and a doctor of one's choice, not a government mandate to be managed by faceless bureaucrats in Washington, D.C. The Federal Government has no authority to be the manager of the physical well-being of every American. I support its full repeal.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. May I inquire about the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee has 5¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas, RANDY WEBER.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I rise to implore Congress to listen to the American public and to pass H.R. 45.

If you think the Unaffordable Care Act is a good deal, then as an American you have to ask yourself:

Do you believe the IRS acts in your best interests? My conservative guess is: not on the best days.

Ask yourself: Were all of the events swirling around Benghazi shrouded in mystery or bathed in sunlight and transparency? Not on your life.

Ask yourself: Were the phone records of the AP reporters and the privacy that should have been afforded to them protected? Not on the best days.

Ask yourself: Is the government here to help? No.

The government that is in the process of bankrupting Social Security, of bankrupting the post office and that is on the verge of killing Medicare and Medicaid now wants to come tell us, Trust us. We're from the government. We're here to help.

Madam Speaker, I don't think the American public can afford that kind of trust or help. The answers are not here in Washington, D.C. They're back with Americans. Listen to the American public.

I am RANDY WEBER. Let's pass H.R. 45. That's the way I see it from where I sit.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield myself 2 minutes.

The previous speaker just said that we should listen to the American people. When the American people listen to the Congress of the United States, they assume that all of the Republicans in the country are against this health care bill and that all of the Democrats are for this health care bill.

Yet, if you look at the Kaiser Family Foundation's most recent poll on this, you'll find out that 96 percent of the Democrats and 83 percent of the Republicans support the tax credits for small business, which are now the law of the land, and 360,000 small businesses are getting those tax credits.

□ 1630

Ninety percent of the Democrats and 74 percent of the Republicans support closing the doughnut hole, and the doughnut hole is in the process of being closed. Democrats and Republicans agree in the country that this is a good deal.

Eighty-seven percent of the Democrats and 72 percent of the Republicans are excited about the creation of health care exchanges where they can go and shop for health care just as the Members of this Congress do in open season when they can pick and choose from different plans. In California, there will be 33 plans offered by private health insurance companies that they can pick and choose from. They think that's a good idea. They think it's a great idea.

Eighty-four percent of the Democrats and 68 percent of the Republicans think it's a great idea that children will not be thrown off their parents' policy, as is the law today.

That's why you've only voted to repeal. On the first day you took the majority in this Congress, you voted to repeal and you instructed the committees to come up with an alternative. You've had 37 votes on repeal, and you've had no action by the committees on the alternative.

So you have a plan that is meeting the needs of American families, millions of Americans of all walks of life, small businesses, big businesses, employees at both, children, seniors, people with preexisting conditions, and your answer is to repeal, like that's progress.

No, that's not progress. That's the failure to have an alternative and creative thinking about how to deal with the health care problems of the American people. ObamaCare does that, the Affordable Care Act does that, and that's what this Congress did.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I would now like to yield 1 minute to SCOTT PERRY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, in 2010, this body was told by Speaker PELOSI that it needed to pass the bill so the American people could know what's in it. Well, Madam Speaker, if the American people would have known of the toxic consequences that ObamaCare would have, I'm certain they would not have allowed this legislation to be passed. I rise today to expose some of the ramifications that ObamaCare will have on Americans when it is fully implemented in 2014.

In my home State of Pennsylvania, premium rates in the individual market will increase by approximately 30 percent, and on a national level there will be a 73 percent rise in premium costs for those keeping insurance. For those interested in getting a new plan, you're going to see an average increase of 100 percent in cost compared to today.

Due to the employer mandate, as many as 20 million to 65 million Americans will likely lose their employer-sponsored health care.

Well, Madam Speaker, it's 3 years later, and we still don't know everything in this legislation, but we do know who's picking up the tab: hardworking families and job-creating small business owners.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 1 minute to the minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership and that of Mr. LEVIN and Mr. WAXMAN as the chairs of the three committees when this legislation, so transformative in the lives of the American people, was passed by the House of Representatives and now for coming to the floor today—I don't know what the word is—to even counter some of the ridiculousness that is being said on the other side of the aisle in relationship to the Affordable Care Act. The fact is that what's happening today is the Patients' Rights Repeal Act. That's what they want to do is repeal patients' rights.

Why are they doing this? Do you think it's a good idea to do this on Women's Health Week, to repeal legislation that gives a wide range of free

preventive services to women, protection being dropped for women when they are pregnant or when they are sick and they no longer will be charged higher premiums than men? Of course the Republicans want to repeal that today on Women's Health Week. But knowing soon that a woman will no longer be a preexisting medical condition is just one piece of it.

The fact is this is not a serious effort to repeal the act. That's not going to happen. What this is is another example of jobs evasion in several ways.

First of all, it is our job to come here and act for the good of the American people. Right now, the American people see that good as the creation of jobs. What is it, 134 days into this Congress and the Republican majority has yet to vote one bill out to create jobs? That's job evasion.

Here we are today with yet another one of their subterfuges. Let's not talk about jobs; let's use up time. What does it add up to? Up until now, it has been $54 million and 43-some days spent on this, the 37th effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

What we should be doing is what the Republicans have asked for, regular order, to go to the budget table, to reconcile the differences between the House and the Senate so that we can put forth a budget that creates jobs, that reduces the deficit, that strengthens the middle class. Instead, we're wasting the taxpayers' dollars and time on legislation that is going to undermine protections for the American people when it comes to their health and well-being.

This bill today just gives us another opportunity for our side to talk about the transformative nature of the Affordable Care Act.

If there were no reason to pass such a bill, if everyone loved his or her own health care and health insurance premiums, if that were the case, we would still have had to pass the legislation because the status quo in health care in our country was unsustainable from a financial standpoint. It was unsustainable for families, for individuals, for small businesses, and for corporate America.

The cost of health care was a competitiveness issue. As we try to retain our position as number one in the world—a competitive issue—the cost of health care was rising. It certainly was unsustainable for cities, States, and the Federal Government. Our budget could not sustain the rapid increase of health care to our budget.

That is why, when the Speaker asked, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office responded by informing House Republicans in a letter sent yesterday reiterating that repealing the Affordable Care Act would increase the deficit by $109 billion over the next 10 years. They said that this is a figure that they had given the Speaker last July. There may be some little changes in it between now and then, but that was approximately where the figures were.

So if you want to reduce the deficit, you don't repeal the Affordable Care Act because you will increase the deficit by $109 billion over the next 10 years. The purpose of the bill was not only to improve the quality of health care, increase accessibility to many more people and to lower the cost, but that in lowering the cost, it would reduce the deficit.

So it's a bill, and pretty soon many more Americans will be taking advantage of it. So far, over 100 million Americans have taken advantage of the preventive services and over 100 million Americans are no longer subjected to lifetime limits on their insurance coverage. That's a remarkable thing. Seniors who are in the doughnut hole have seen their prescription drug costs reduced by around $6 billion. Right now young people can stay on their parents' insurance policy until they're 26 years old.

The list goes on and on about the preventive exams that are free to seniors. The list goes on and on about what benefits the action that the Republicans are taking today would repeal that are good for the health and well-being of the American people. This bill is not just about health care; it's about the good health of the American people.

□ 1640

It's about prevention. It's about wellness. It's about electronic medical records that will change everything in terms of access to care and the quality of your care because your records are wherever you are. It's entrepreneurial.

Our Founders, in their dedication, in their sacrifice, in their courage called for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as goals of our new Republic, of our democracy; and this bill honors the vows of our Founders in just that way—a healthier life, the liberty to pursue your happiness. If you're an artist or if you're a photographer or a writer, if you want to be self-employed, if you want to start a business, if you want to change jobs, whatever it is, you are no longer job-locked because you can only go as fast in reaching your passion and your aspirations as your health insurance program will take you.

If you have a child with a preexisting medical condition, or if you're concerned with being sick yourself, you no longer are confined in your pursuit of happiness by the cost of a health care premium or the ability to even get one. It is entrepreneurial.

We even see articles now, and, Mr. Chairman, you have pointed them out in the public media about young people, or not even young people, but people who want to leave companies and start their own businesses. They're waiting for this bill to be fully implemented so they have that freedom to go forth.

So while I think it is a waste of the public's time to take this bill up on the floor of the House, to hear my colleagues talk on the floor, you think either they don't know what they're talking about, or they do. But in either case, they're not presenting the facts about what this legislation does.

It is going to be right up there with Social Security and Medicare as pillars of economic and health security for the American people. It is going to make us more competitive internationally because our businesses will not have an anvil of the rising cost of health care. It reduces the deficit, improves the health and well-being of the American people. It's about the entrepreneurial spirit of America. It honors the vows of our Founders of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

This legislation should be rejected; and pretty soon more people, as they take advantage of the legislation, will see just how important it is to them individually and how important it is to the health and well-being of our country.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to Mr. DOUG LAMALFA from California.

Mr. LAMALFA Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to be able to join my colleague, Mrs. BACHMANN, on this legislation.

We do have a history in the past of repealing bills, such as Prohibition. It has been done, so this one would have near the same status in size by the time it's all done.

I'm from California. We know a lot about boondoggles in California, going back to high-speed rail and other issues like that. They call this the Affordable Care Act, and it's still being done with a straight face. Really? Price tag: it was advertised as $900 billion. Now it's approaching $2 trillion.

Jobs—48 percent of business owners are saying that they're holding off on new hires because of the ObamaCare health care takeover.

Taxes—again, affordable? There's over a trillion dollars in new taxes with more in sight. How are we calling this affordable?

We've had seven different measures to repeal portions of the Obama health care takeover, with more on the way.

And this part is really great: thousands of new IRS enforcers will be hired to help implement ObamaCare. Isn't that great. I ask you to support H.R. 45.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield the balance of my time, 1½ minutes, to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) to close.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, on the east coast it's almost the end of the workday. And we know that somewhere a mom who stood on her feet all day in a retail store, or broken her back all day in a nursing home, will come home, and she will see that her son or her daughter isn't feeling very well, is too sick to eat dinner, can't seem to sleep through the night.

Most of us in this country have the privilege of taking that child to the pediatrician or to the emergency room

right away. Right away. But for over 40 million people in this country, they don't have that privilege. She'll hesitate because she'll think, maybe my daughter will get better by the morning, because a trip to the emergency room for that family might also mean a trip to the bankruptcy court.

We are here today to honor her work, not disrespect it. Almost every day here the Wall Street bankers, the oil barons, the big shots get their way. Her day is coming on January 1, 2014, because for the first time in this country's history, we'll do more than talk about the fact that we honor her. We will honor her work and honor her family with affordable health insurance. That day is coming.

This charade won't stop it. No amount of misrepresentation will cease it. That day is coming. Her work will be honored. The Affordable Care Act will be implemented.

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I came here 4½ years ago in a bipartisan way to work on health care reform which this country desperately needed. We've now had 3 years to look at the Affordable Care Act, and I wish the bill had done as everyone had described here today. I wish that it had done that. I wish that costs had gone down. I wish that businesses were hiring everybody because of this bill. I wish that taxes were not going up. But none of these are true. They are. And I wish that we had debated this bill in an open manner here by regular order, the Senate version of the bill on this very floor of the House, which we did not.

So I asked our insurance commissioner today in Tennessee, if we did not pass this bill—and you just heard me say earlier in the debate about premiums going up 50-plus percent—I said if we did absolutely nothing, what would happen to rates in Tennessee? They would go up about 8 to 10 percent. We would be much better off in my State and around this country; and, again, I came here in a bipartisan way not to work on a partisan bill, which is what this is.

Madam Speaker, we need to repeal this bill and to replace it with patient-centered reforms that put patients and doctors back in charge of health care decisions.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 45, legislation to repeal ObamaCare. In March of 2010, then-Speaker PELOSI famously said, with respect to the President's health care law:

> We have to pass the bill so that you can find out what's in it.

□ 1650

Well, Washington Democrats passed that bill, and virtually every week since has been an expensive, eye-opening experience.

Over the past 3 years, it's become clear that ObamaCare is irreparably flawed, fails to deliver on its promises and causes serious harm to our economy. The legislation before the House is the first step toward fixing all of these problems. We must first repeal this onerous law and then move forward and work with stakeholders to develop step-by-step, commonsense reforms that actually lower the cost of health care and respect the patient-doctor relationship.

The President's health care law is, at its core, a flawed policy. It puts the Federal Government precisely where it doesn't belong, between Americans and their doctors. Instead of families deciding what coverage is best for them, or families and employers deciding how much they can afford, this law has the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the IRS making those decisions.

ObamaCare also falls short of almost every one of the President's and congressional Democrats' promises for the law. It doesn't control costs, doesn't let Americans keep the insurance they have and like, doesn't protect jobs, doesn't ensure seniors have access to their doctors and hospitals, and doesn't prevent 21 new tax increases, including more than a dozen that will hit middle class families. Simply put, it's a resounding failure.

If that wasn't enough, the health care law is causing serious harm to our economy at a time when it's struggling to climb out of the hole dug by the administration's failed economic policies.

We've received countless reports of businesses reluctant to hire, or shifting employees from full-time to part-time employment because of the steep costs associated with complying with the law. This is simply unacceptable. Well over 11 million Americans remain unemployed.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to repeal this burdensome law and continue working toward real reform that lowers costs and improves the quality of health care in this country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself such time as I shall consume.

I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act.

Here we go again. This vote is more than just a sideshow. It's an embarrassing spectacle that has consumed House Republicans for more than 2 years, to the detriment of our economy and millions of Americans looking for work.

Republicans, on this, have their legislative heads in the sand and their feet in cement.

The Republicans are blind to the benefits that so many are already experiencing through ACA. It's already helping millions of Americans, with many millions more set to gain insurance coverage through the marketplaces next year.

With their feet in cement, 37 times House Republicans will have voted to repeal all or part of ObamaCare.

More than 50 million—50 million—taxpayer dollars have been spent by House Republicans through the dozens of hours Republicans have devoted to floor votes to try to repeal ObamaCare, which even Speaker BOEHNER acknowledged last year is the law of the land.

Since the beginning of 2011, Republicans have spent no less than 15 percent of their time on the House floor trying to repeal ObamaCare, when they know it would not happen.

Yet, not once this year, not once, have Republicans turned their focus toward job creation. What we have here, repeal, is a Republican obsession.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. At this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, as a physician with 30 years' experience, clinical experience, I rise to vigorously oppose ObamaCare once again. We need to repeal this abomination. Why?

Just take a look at this chart. Where's the doctor, and where's the patient?

Well, look at the corner. Physician's way here in the corner. Patient's way over there.

And what's at the center of this?

The Department of Health and Human Services with the Secretary. And at the top, the IRS. And we all know what's going on with the IRS today. How can we trust an entity like that to enforce this abomination of a health law?

Doctors and patients deal with very personal information, very personal. That's why you have to preserve the sanctity of the doctor-patient relationship. And having all this between the doctor and the patient is basically a recipe for massive failure. That's why we must repeal it. That's why I stand with my colleagues to repeal it.

Let's do the right thing. Let's go step by step and get sensible, real reforms that will make Americans proud of their health care system.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I think all of us came to this august body with the mandate that we should try to improve the quality of life for our constituents and, therefore, the United States, the people that made our country so great. Education, health care, jobs, these are the things we want to do.

But it's reached a point that this is no longer just putting Democrats in a political advantage. What it is doing is embarrassing the entire Congress, and I dare say, people in the country recognize that there's something wrong going on in Congress.

Now, those of you that have taken Civics 101 know that there is no intention to repeal this act.

People are waiting to get jobs. They're waiting, really, to get health care. And we're on the move for that.

I've been here over 4 decades, and darn it the devil, we've been trying to get universal care. We're almost there.

Now, if you're talking about repeal, it takes a majority of both Houses to pass this bill. The President's going to veto it. And you have to have two-thirds of both Houses in order to repeal. That is not going to happen, and you know it.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the Chair's leadership on this.

This law has been in place now for a little over 3 years. So, as a physician, let's look at the symptoms of this law. Cost of premiums: increasing. Access to your doctor or your plan: already more difficult. Quality of health care going down because of Washington interference. Innovation: terribly affected, harming quality in this country. Choices for patients: decreased.

So let me get this straight. Increasing costs, less access, lower quality, less innovation, limiting your choices.

Madam Speaker, that's a life-threatening and terminal diagnosis.

It's time to repeal the ACA and adopt patient-centered health care, where patients and families and doctors make medical decisions, not Washington and the IRS.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), who's the ranking member on the Health Subcommittee.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Well, Madam Speaker, it's Thursday. Everybody's going home. Got to have your press release ready.

So here we come. The thirty-seventh time they're going to try and repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Now, you've heard a lot of nonsense already in two speakers, absolute untruths told right here about killing jobs and about rising premiums.

Washington State put out their premiums yesterday, and their premiums for young people are down by 15 percent. All that hyperbole about going up 450 percent, or whatever we hear, is nonsense. It is simply fearmongering and, you know, the deficit comes down, insurance is more affordable and accessible and, at the most, 33 percent have been convinced by this stuff over here.

In my home State, people are ready and willing to do it. Our Governor went out and set it up, and we're going to go and do it.

Now, the only thing the Republicans are angry about is that ObamaCare's going to become the law. It's being implemented. It's going to be in place in October. It drives them nuts that they can't figure a way to stop it.

□ 1700

They've come out here once a month to try and repeal it over and over and over again, and they keep failing. That's pretty close to the definition of mental illness: doing the same thing over and over again and thinking you're going to get a different result. You are not going to get a different result. The fact is that this is about votes. We have a new crop of freshmen who are getting their campaigns ready, and they've got to have that check in the box that says, I voted against ObamaCare. Vote ''no.''

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I stand here today outraged by the fact that the Internal Revenue Service has been targeting conservative groups since as early as 2010. This is not a Republican or Democrat issue. This is a First Amendment issue, one that should be a wake-up call about the dangers of the new, expansive powers afforded to the IRS under ObamaCare. No government agency, particularly one with such corruption and apparent disregard for the Constitution as the IRS, has any business accessing or monitoring Americans' personal health information.

As I speak here today, government bureaucrats are building the Federal data services hub, the largest personal information database ever created by the U.S. Government. And because of ObamaCare, five major government agencies are compiling information for the data hub, including the IRS, HHS, Department of Justice, Department of Homeland Security, and Social Security Administration.

What this hub means is that government bureaucrats are gaining unprecedented access and power over the American people's financial, health, and personal information through the implementation of ObamaCare.

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

Mr. CAMP. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. BLACK. The IRS scandal begs the question: How can President Obama and the congressional Democrats continue to support ObamaCare, a law that gives more power to the IRS? Ultimately, the IRS scandal is yet another example of why ObamaCare must be repealed—for the sake of our health care, our economy, and our constitutional freedoms.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts, a distinguished member of our committee, Mr. NEAL.

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

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, today I rise in opposition to the repeal of the Patients' Rights Act. Seventy-one million Americans have already taken advantage of this opportunity for preventive health care services, 100 million Americans no longer will have a lifetime limit on their health insurance program, and young adults can stay on their parents' health insurance until they're 26. Ninety-eight percent of the people of Massachusetts are insured. The number regularly polls in the high 70s for customer satisfaction.

Let me just state this with some degree of certainty: the best hospitals in the world are in Massachusetts. Arguably, the best doctors in the world are in Massachusetts. Certainly the best teaching hospitals in the world are in Massachusetts. They've made it work. People are happy with the plan. If you're going to get sick, I say this to my Republican friends, as well, I'm going to get you a spot in Massachusetts.

Here's the point that we ought to be discussing today: the implementation of this successful plan. And I want to say this today tongue-in-cheek, but also with some satisfaction, we should thank Governor Romney for working with a Democratic legislature to make sure that the model for the Affordable Care Act was in place.

Let me say that again: thank Governor Romney for helping to make sure this plan was successful.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Madam Speaker, when ObamaCare was being debated, its champions and cheerleaders indicated it would create 4 million jobs, including 400,000 jobs almost immediately. I find it deeply disturbing, then, that when I travel back to my district in Indiana, I hear from constituents that jobs are already being lost and hours are being cut in anticipation of this law's implementation.

I've heard from numerous constituents who work low-wage, hourly jobs like school support employees: cafeteria workers, janitors, bus drivers and so on. They're being told that, due to ObamaCare's employer mandate, they will no longer be allowed to work more than 29 hours a week. ObamaCare's proponents have created an incredibly perverse incentive here. Who in their right mind endorses a law where the best business decision is to lay people off, and during a very down economy to boot?

If we're serious about addressing rising health care costs and putting

Americans back to work, we should repeal this law, and repeal it now, and replace it with sustainable, bipartisan health care solutions.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1 minute to another member of our committee, the distinguished gentleman from the State of Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

(Mr. LARSON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I have an idea: What if The Heritage Foundation had an idea to reform our entire health care system? Even better, as Mr. NEAL says, what if that idea was piloted successfully by a Republican Governor in a Democratic State who would go on to become their nominee for President? What if that idea were brought to fruition nationally through the Affordable Care Act so it could provide American citizens, especially the uninsured and those with preexisting conditions, to become the focus of our energy and concern in Washington? An emphasis on wellness by seeking to enhance the best in the private sector, the best in the academic sector and the public health initiatives that have guided this great country of ours?

What if we do what the American people expect us to do, instead of quibbling over partisan issues—rolling up our sleeves and coming together for a solution to the American people?

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. What if we come together, and instead of quibbling over the Affordable Care Act, we rolled up our sleeves and put the Nation to work? Every day we waste in ideological turmoil is another day lost in the opportunity to help the American people and the key, as Mr. RYAN states, to driving down our national debt. Come together with us, Republicans, solve this issue for America.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to say it is time to pull ObamaCare out root by root. We all know that it increases premiums and squeezes the family budget. We know that it does not let you keep the plan that you have today. We all know that ObamaCare is crushing jobs and forcing many parents who have full-time jobs today into tomorrow's part-time jobs.

And now we have some new information as we prepare to vote. The chief enforcers of this law, the IRS, have been outed as partisan political operatives. They've harassed, bullied, and suppressed the political opponents of the Obama administration. And now they want to be in charge of our health care? Give me a break. I don't think so.

Members, this is your chance. This is your chance to weigh in on the IRS scandal. A vote to repeal is a vote to stop the IRS, but voting to keep ObamaCare is a vote to empower the IRS as the health care police of the United States. The choice is easy. Vote to take power away from the IRS, not to give them more.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act. Like a broken record repeating the same old, scratchy, sad verse, these Republicans cannot stop repeating their record of indifference to the health care crisis. They've given up on ''repeal and replace'' because all they ever cared about was the repeal part. As the Party of No, this year they have not advanced a single health care proposal as an alternative.

I only wish that the Affordable Care Act were as good as they think it is bad. But to the millions who have received refunds from insurance company monopolies for overcharging, to the millions who are no longer denied coverage by the fine print in an insurance policy they didn't write, to the seniors who are getting some help on their prescription drugs and preventive care, to the millions more who will be able to finally apply in October for coverage they do not have now, and for the small businesses who will receive assistance in supplying their employees with the coverage they have been unable to afford in the past, you know, this ObamaCare works pretty well.

□ 1710

Together, we could make it better. We could make it more accessible for more individuals—like the many people in Texas who will be denied by Governor Perry's decision to refuse 100 percent of the cost of Medicaid protection. Together, we could provide more cost-effective care and do something more about spiraling health care costs. But really, the only true Republican alternative to ObamaCare is ''nothing care.''

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

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

Mr. BENISHEK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge support of H.R. 45, legislation that will repeal the President's massive and unaffordable health care law. As a doctor, I am extremely concerned with many different aspects of the bill, which is broad and overreaching.

When this law was passed, I was in northern Michigan treating patients and wondering how this bill would change the relationship between a doctor and his patients. I can tell you that after my 30 years of experience and after continuing to speak with doctors, nurses, hospital administrators, and patients across northern Michigan, there are innumerable problems with this law, and it needs to be repealed.

Thanks to ObamaCare, we will face severe problems with access to quality health care. We are looking at massive cuts to reimbursements to hospitals and other care providers, cuts that will end up limiting access to care.

ObamaCare does not fulfill the most basic promises that were used to pass this law. Health care costs have not gone down. My constituents are not able to ''keep their plans.''

These are just some of the reasons why I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill so we can work together to provide patient-centered reform that will reduce costs and expand access.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to another member of our committee, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition and in support—in support—of the Patients' Rights Repeal Act.

Madam Speaker, you know we've gone through this many times. You've attempted in committee and subcommittee to try to undercut the patients' rights to health care, and it wasn't successful.

By the way, the IRS is not the individual agency that is the operative of health care. Where in God's name did you get that from? There hasn't been much truth spoken today on the floor over there.

Whether in town halls or small group meetings, I ask this question when we talk about health care. I ask individuals to raise their hands if they're against, number one—you ought to raise your hands, too—closing the Medicare doughnut hole for seniors; are you for that or are you against it? Allowing children to stay on a family's health plan until they're 26 years of age; are you for that or are you against it? Ensuring Americans are not denied insurance for preexisting conditions; are you for that or are you against that? Or helping American families avoid medical bankruptcy.

Every meeting not one hand goes up. How many over there? Raise your hand. Free country. I'll wait 2 seconds. Maybe you didn't hear me.

In New Jersey, a report by the New Jersey Public Interest Research Group explained that by repealing health reform, employers would see health costs grow by more than $3,000 a year and, most shocking, New Jersey would have 10,000 fewer jobs.

Let's get it straight. In conclusion, let me ask my colleagues, in voting, those who will vote for repeal, is the opposition willing to increase the deficit? Because you already used the money from the Health Care Act to pay your budget, or else it doesn't even balance in 50 years. Are they willing to give the power back to the insurance companies? You've got to ask that question.

We've come down to the skinny right now. This is down to the bare bones. Are you willing to allow premiums to escalate? Better ask yourself those questions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds the Members to address

their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. RADEL).

Mr. RADEL. Heavy-handed government has been chipping away at our freedom and your freedom and your opportunity for generations, whether it's Big Government Democrat programs or, to be bipartisan, Big Government Republican programs. And that brings us to this debate today on the Affordable Care Act, which is not affordable and it is not about health care. It is about control.

Your freedom, your choices between you and your doctor no longer between you and your doctor. Someone from here in D.C., in some way, shape, or form will be involved in your most personal decisions. Freedom and opportunity, the freedom to choose insurers, insurance, and your doctor in a truly free market now gone.

This repeal is about your opportunity, which ObamaCare is already taking away from you. I want you to have a job. I want you to work more than 39 hours a week.

This repeal is about your freedom. I want you to keep more money in your pocket. I want you to have low premiums. I want you to have a choice—your choice, not Washington, D.C.'s.

This Affordable Health Care Act is not affordable and it is not about health care. It's about control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds the Members to address their remarks to the Chair and not a perceived viewing audience.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

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

We've heard a lot about the fact that this is the 37th vote to take away health care from hardworking Americans, but let me put that in context.

Under the Republican majority, we have spent over 56 hours on the floor debating repeal of the law of the land—and that doesn't even come close to capturing how much committee time, amendment debate, and general grandstanding has been spent on this bill.

Now, it is tempting, but I'm going to avoid illustrating this point with comparisons like telling you how many times you could have watched ''Gone With the Wind'' in that same amount of time—although, as a matter of fact, you could have watched it 15 times. What I want to talk about is what else we could have done with that 56 hours of Congress' time and energy:

We could have acted on a real jobs plan to get our economy moving;

We could have come together on a plan to avert the devastating sequester cuts that are hitting our Head Start programs, our cancer patients, and our military, just to name a few;

We could have moved forward on immigration reform, gun violence prevention, or infrastructure development, but we haven't.

Now, my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle have been using a chart—an incomprehensible chart, something that no American can understand—to try to demonstrate how the Affordable Care Act works. Well, it just so happens I have a chart right here. This is the Republican plan to deal with the absence of the Affordable Care Act. It's right here. This is the chart. This is the chart right here. I will try to explain it to you. In fact, it's self-explanatory. They have no plan. They have no plan to substitute the repeal of the Affordable Care Act. In fact, they haven't a plan for health care at all.

So, my colleagues, my colleagues, I just wish my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would spend as much time building America up as they've tried to tear it down because, frankly, my colleagues, I do give a darn.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 45 to repeal ObamaCare.

Madam Speaker, as a physician, I know our health care system is broken, but this form of Washington meddling only makes it worse. The President's law puts too much control in the hands of the Federal Government, creating a complex system that emphasizes government intrusion over actual patient care.

There is no reason for the IRS to play a role in our health care system, favoring one and punishing another. Medical decisions already cause deep anxiety in the lives of too many Americans. Why compound that with the weight of an audit?

Our goal should be simple: respect you as a patient and connect you to the doctor that you deserve. Patient-centered solutions place you, the patient, at the center of our health care system, simplifying your life, not pushing you to the corner of Big Government sprawl.

Madam Speaker, the American people deserve full repeal.

□ 1720

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to another member of our committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act.

As some of my colleagues on the other side prepare to vote in favor of this legislation, I want to make sure that the American people know that they are taking 13 million Americans' rebates that they got from insurance companies last summer, totaling at least $1.1 million.

They will be voting to repudiate the fact that beginning last summer, millions of women began receiving free coverage for preventive services.

They will be voting to take away the fact that 17 million children with preexisting conditions can no longer be denied coverage by insurers.

And they will be voting to take away the coverage of 6.6 million young adults, who, up to age 26, are able to be on their parents' insurance coverage, half of whom without it would have no coverage at all.

They will actually be voting, Madam Speaker, to take America's health care backwards. We can't afford to go there.

I urge that we vote ''no.''

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Health Subcommittee for the purposes of controlling the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to a new leader in health care, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, I stand today to show my support for H.R. 45, the repeal of the largest legislative piece of malpractice ever passed through the Halls of Congress.

This one bill, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, has done more to disrupt our economy and bring uncertainty to the marketplace than anything I have witnessed.

My colleagues on the other side talk about jobs and no job creation on this side. We are working to create jobs here by repealing this bill. This is the number one job-killing bill in America, and it has rocked the engine that drives our economy—the business owner and the entrepreneur that create the jobs. Without jobs being created, the hardworking Americans will lose their jobs and they are going to lose their health care.

Instead of health care reform, Congress created a health care tax. It is a tax that will be paid by all Americans young, old, rich, or poor.

Today, in response to the people who have had enough, the White House declared this: ''It's the law.'' My response on behalf of the people I represent is this: Not for long.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to another distinguished member of our committee, Mr. BLUMENAUER, from the State of Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, this is, as has been pointed out, the 37th attempt to repeal the health care reform. It has been my privilege to run 37 marathons in my career, but at least when you run a marathon you get someplace.

Millions of people are benefiting from the health care reform. Over a third of a million small businesses are getting tax credits to be able to help insure their employees. We are seeing aggressive efforts at better care, lower cost, eliminating lifetime limits, keeping young people on their parents' insurance policies.

Madam Speaker, we are finding across America there are literally hundreds of thousands of people working on the implementation of this legislation. Is it perfect? I haven't seen a perfect bill, especially one that is dealing with 17 percent of our economy. It is a dramatic improvement over what we have got. But instead of working with us to refine and improve over the course of the last 4 years, we go through these pointless exercises without offering an alternative.

My friend, my colleague from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), had their plan: a blank piece of poster board. No specifics; no effort to come forward with something that would do a better job of meeting the needs of seniors' prescription drug problems, young people, patient protection, lifetime limits, payment reform.

I will tell you, in Oregon I have met with thousands of professionals in the health care arena who are working cooperatively on making sure that Oregon is a model of how to do it right.

The health care reform train has left the station. We are not going to be repealing it today. We ought to be working to refine it in the future.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield 1½ minutes to a new member of the Ways and Means Committee, a job creator, a businessman himself, who has had to deal with rising health care costs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, it is interesting to hear as we go through this tonight about just how important and how great a piece of legislation this is. I've got to tell you, there is an old saying out there: ''Of all the words of mouth and pen, the saddest are what could have been.'' This could have been a miraculous piece of legislation.

Wouldn't it have been wonderful if both sides of the aisle had been able to work on it? Wouldn't it have been wonderful to have some debate and some amendment on it? Wouldn't it have been wonderful not to have to wait until midnight and shove it down the American people's throat? And wouldn't it have been wonderful for guys like me who have small businesses to be actually able to look at this and think to the future that, you know, I can actually plan?

ObamaCare is making this Nation sick. It is having a terrible effect on our economy. They keep people from hiring.

But do you know what it does, and it is the worst thing of all? It drives a wedge between business owners and business operators and their employees and their associates. That is the biggest problem. We are trying to make those people—the owners, the managers of the businesses—the bad guys.

Listen, the bad guy in this case is the United States Government. We have done something that is absolutely reprehensible. You cannot do that to people who make a living working with each other and then put them on opposite sides of a case. Better health care? Absolutely. Affordable, accessible? Absolutely. This piece of legislation did not do that.

I am intrigued by the amount of passion that we see now from the other side when there was so little concern at the time it was crafted to even bring the providers to the table and ask their opinion. You talk about having a piece of legislation ready. It is law. We know it is law. But do you know what? We are not going to quit trying until we go to the will of the American people.

I will tell you all, please go out to your constituents, go out to the people who actually create the jobs and find out how difficult we have made it for them with this piece of legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining on each side, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas has 6¾ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama, a former district attorney, State legislator, and county commissioner, who understands how communities struggle with health care, Mr. BROOKS.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise to proudly vote to repeal ObamaCare, the most dysfunctional law to ever pass United States Congress.

Why is ObamaCare dysfunctional? For the vast majority of Americans, ObamaCare guarantees worse health care at higher costs.

Why is ObamaCare dysfunctional? ObamaCare imposes 21 new taxes on America; thereby, according to the Congressional Budget Office, costing 800,000 Americans to lose their jobs.

In my home State of Alabama, just one of those tax increases imposes roughly $200 million a year in higher tax burdens on Blue Cross/Blue Shield, costs that will translate into higher premiums for Alabama citizens.

Why is ObamaCare dysfunctional? Those 21 tax increases come nowhere close to paying for the increases in ObamaCare costs, thereby either denying health care to American citizens or forcing even higher taxes on already stressed family incomes.

□ 1730

Why is ObamaCare dysfunctional?

It gives Americans worse health care.

Doctors and patients will largely be shut out of costly lifesaving health care decisions. Instead, Independent Payment Advisory Board bureaucrats will decide whether ObamaCare will pay for the treatments that save your life or risk ending it.

Why is ObamaCare dysfunctional?

It suppresses the research and development necessary for the discovery of the next generation of lifesaving diagnostic tools and medical cures.

Why is ObamaCare dysfunctional?

It drastically drives up health insurance premiums for Americans who work for a living.

Madam Speaker, while my friends across the aisle bemoan today's vote to protect Americans from a dysfunctional ObamaCare, I rejoice that Republicans in the House of Representatives say that when American lives are at stake, we will never give up, and we will never, never surrender.

Mr. LEVIN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. At this time, Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to a long distinguished Member of this House and one who is very knowledgeable of health care and the costs to families and businesses, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In my role as chairman of the Health and Human Services Subcommittee of Appropriations, we oversee the budget for ObamaCare. I can tell you that the money is not there even for implementation. The request was for $1.2 billion. Now it has accelerated up to $1.7 billion, and there is no funding for it available. So here we are on the eve of the largest takeover of a private sector function in United States history, and the money is not there to implement it.

So what does the Secretary of HHS do? She goes to the private sector and says, We need to get money from you to implement ObamaCare.

Now, that is like the Mafia's shaking down businesses for protection money. I'm not saying at all that the Secretary would be trying to do that purposely, but it is similar to it. How can you ask people for money, whom you regulate, in order to implement a program that they're going to fall under? That is just repugnant to any American, and we can't let that happen.

The money is not there. We need to vote ''no'' and send this thing back to committee and look at it another day and in another way.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman for his time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act.

I simply want to say thanks. My good friend Mr. CROWLEY indicated that there is no plan on the other side, but look at the list that I can give, and let me just emphasize Texas:

For the gentleman from the business community, 360,000 small businesses

are using the health care tax credit for their workers that is provided by the health insurance under the Affordable Care Act;

There are 17 million children with preexisting conditions in the country who no longer can be denied coverage by insurers;

Then, of course, what we are finding out is those who treat those with cancer are suffering because there are cuts in Medicare and those cuts in Medicare are coming because of my friends on the other side. The Affordable Care Act will provide an umbrella for those who are in need;

Then we find out that Texas, itself, has 3.4 million women and over 1.8 million seniors and people with disabilities who are benefiting from the Affordable Care Act.

More importantly, we have articles that suggest that the poverty in Texas is going up and that Texas has the highest uninsured people in the Nation. How can people from Texas vote against this? How can they vote against this?

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 45, the 37th attempt by House Republicans to repeal the Affordable Care Act. This bill is as bad as the previous 36 and has no chance of becoming law. And that is a good thing because the Affordable Care Act has and continues to be a life saver for millions of Americans.

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

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

Many of those most in need of the healthcare coverage provided by the Affordable Care Act live in the Districts of many of the new members of Congress. Texas, my own state, leads the list of states with the highest percentages of uninsured residents.

Those states with the highest percentage of uninsured are:

Texas with 28.8 percent; Louisiana with 24 percent; Nevada with 23.3 percent; California with 23.2 percent; Florida with 22.8 percent; Georgia with 22.5 percent; Arkansas with 21.9 percent; Mississippi with 21.7 percent, and Oklahoma with 21.4 percent.

The highest concentration of the uninsured is the poor. The Affordable Care Act provides at no or nearly no cost to states an option to enroll those living in or near poverty into their Medicaid program.

This option would help states in three ways—reduce the cost to states for those insured through Medicaid, reduce the numbers of poor persons without healthcare insurance and address the problem associated with the high cost of persons who arrive at local emergency rooms in need of very expensive critical care. Health care costs that result from emergency room ad hoc primary healthcare are unpaid medical expenses passed on to everyone.

The idea of everyone paying something towards their healthcare was a Republican idea that was put into practice in the State of Massachusetts by then Governor Mitt Romney six years ago. Today, Massachusetts has the lowest percentage of uninsured residents' and a model for where every state could be in six years or less.

Just taking advantage of the Affordable Care Act's Medicaid option would help reduce the numbers of uninsured persons living in the United States.

Medicaid would provide the much needed support to our nation's most vulnerable by providing early diagnosis and treatment for chronic conditions. In many cases conditions could be caught prior to the onset of disease and allow medical professionals the opportunity to work with patients to avoid the major drivers of health care cost: diabetes, high blood pressure and obesity, which can lead to heart and arterial disease as well as kidney disease.

Many watching today's debate may wonder why this is an issue—money from the federal government that would reduce their state tax burden associated with Medicaid. The issue is governors who reject extending Medicaid coverage to their state's poor. The Governors in the States of Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Maine, Wisconsin, Iowa, Idaho, and South Dakota need to hear from residents who want healthcare cost to be lower and more people covered.

As a resident of Texas and a Member of Congress representing a Congressional District in the state, I sent a letter to Governor Rick Perry in response to his letter of March 14, 2013, in which he re-affirmed his opposition to expanding the Medicaid program in Texas.

For all of the pro-business talk by the Governor over the last few months—his position on this issue will lead to higher local and state sales taxes; unduly burden local governments, and needlessly place the health and safety of millions of Texas children and adults at risk.

The infusion of federal funds associated with the state accessing the Affordable Care Act Medicaid option would increase economic out of Texas by $67.9 billion.

A May 13, 2013, editorial in the Houston Chronicle titled ''Medicaid costs driven by poverty,'' outlined why the Congress should be focused on ending the sequester and creating jobs if we are serious about reducing taxpayer dollars going to Medicaid.

Poverty is the reason for higher Medicaid costs—if we work to reduce poverty then Medicaid costs would decline.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Discriminating against anyone with a pre-existing condition;

Charging higher rates based on gender or health status;

Enforcing lifetime dollar limits; and

Enforcing annual dollar limits on health benefits.

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

Another reason why I oppose this bill—I offered six amendments, but none of them were accepted by the Rules Committee. I will explain what my amendments would have done to improve this bill.

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

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 2 would have ensured full Medicare reimbursement to all hospitals including physician-owned hospitals with at least 100 beds, provided they could produce reliable records to document their claims for reimbursement.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 3 would have authorized additional funding to establish

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

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

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

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

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

I urge my Colleagues to join me in voting no on the passage of this bill.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I am honored to yield 1 minute to the author of the legislation that we are debating today, the gentlelady from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

This is a bill that is changing the course of American history, and it is why we need to repeal this bill today. I believe, Madam Speaker, that we will see this bill ultimately repealed.

Why? Because it is women who will be hurt under this bill; it is senior citizens who will be hurt under this bill; and it is little vulnerable children who will be hurt under this bill—as well as families, as well as employers. All of America is at the cusp of being negatively impacted.

Here is just one example: this bill was sold out of compassion. We wanted people with preexisting conditions to find care, but the reality is less than 1 percent of those with preexisting conditions were able to receive the assistance when the door was slammed shut.

Why? We ran out of money.

That's what ObamaCare has delivered—a lot of promises that can't be fulfilled. Before we go forward with this train wreck, let's make sure it ends so we can bring about cures, so we can bring about better developments in health care. That's what we want—health care for American citizens.

Mr. LEVIN. How much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas has 2¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I am from Michigan, and 75 years ago, a predecessor brought forth ideas that at long last we would lift the shame of millions of Americans who go to bed without health care. Since that time, the numbers have grown. Today, there are over 50 million.

There was a reference to children. How many children today go to bed without a stitch of health care? Millions. How many women today go to bed without any health care coverage? We provided for seniors, and we have, so far, left most everybody out who needs some health care.

Then someone has the nerve to come forth and say there isn't enough money to implement—when Republicans won't provide that money. Someone comes forth here and says there isn't the money to cover those with preexisting conditions, and Republicans won't provide the money to provide further help for those people.

You talk about repeal and replace. The disgrace here is you're fixed on repeal, and you never have come forth to satisfy the needs and the conscience of the people of this country. That's a disgrace. This bill is a disgrace. The Republican conduct on this has been disgraceful.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

What is disgraceful are these thousands of pages of a bill that was rushed through this Congress with little chance to read it, laden with special interest provisions to buy off votes, while promises were made to the American people that their costs would go down, that they could keep their plans if they would like, and that the economy would boom. None of it happened, and Republicans were denied even one vote on the House floor to provide a real alternative. That's the disgrace.

Today, health care costs are going up. Independent experts say it could double in some States. Workers are finding out they can't keep their plans at work and that they'll be forced into the exchange. Who can afford more expensive health care? Almost two out of three small businesses aren't hiring because of this legislation.

I toured a power plant in Conroe where the cost of ObamaCare is so high that it's the equivalent of building two new plants and of hiring 100 new workers. That won't happen. Local businesses are cutting jobs and cutting hours. One restaurant owner in Houston told his managers he will not hire another full-time worker—period. ObamaCare simply makes it too expensive.

When these concerns are voiced, what Democrats in Congress and the President say is, It's the law. Get over it. Just get over it.

The bottom line is that we are fighting to repeal ObamaCare because it will hurt too many patients, too many people, too many families. Bad laws should be stopped early before people get hurt.

Year in and year out we've wrestled with this Medicare formula to reimburse doctors. We got it wrong, and doctors and seniors are being hurt.

□ 1740

The alternative minimum tax has been a mess for years. The death tax, as well. Can you imagine how much pain we would have avoided if these bad laws had been stopped early before they hurt so many Americans?

Make no doubt about it, we needed health reform. But the President and Washington Democrats got it wrong. So let's repeal it now and replace it with real reforms that help patients, that help families, that help small businesses. Let's get government out of the office room, let's give patients real choices, and let's lower health care because ObamaCare, this Affordable Care Act, has failed on all of its promises.

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

Mr. LEWIS, Madam Speaker, it is unbelievable. With so much to be done—so much good that we could do—this Congress stops work to vote a 37th time to destroy health care reform. Thirty seven times! The voters have spoken. The Supreme Court has ruled. The Affordable Care Act is the law of the land and we will not go backwards.

The American people are counting on us to do what is right; what is just. We made a promise of health care to the American people. We must keep that promise. Vote no. Keep the promise of health care.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 45, the "Patients' Rights Repeal Act."

Today's vote will mark the 37th time that this House will vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act. It was only ten months ago when I spoke in opposition to the same bill being considered today. I would like to remind my colleagues of what repealing health care reform would mean for the Central New Jerseyans whom I represent.

Take, for example, Matt from West Windsor. Matt wrote me, "I graduated from college this past May and am currently working at a job with new health insurance. I have a preexisting condition, and, shockingly, I truly would be without insurance and in big trouble if this legislation is reversed."

Carolyn from East Brunswick contacted me to say she had been laid off and her COBRA benefits were about to expire. Because of the

Affordable Care Act, she could enroll at age 25 as a dependent on her father's Federal employee benefits plan.

Mary from Princeton wrote to me that her son ''has cystic fibrosis and he would be subject to both the lifetime cap on benefits and the denial because of preexisting conditions were it not for the provisions of the health reform.''

Matt, Carolyn, and Mary's examples are not just anecdotal: they are representative of the numerous affordable and comprehensive health coverage benefits that New Jerseyans have gained under health care reform—as well as what they stand to lose if the Affordable Care Act were repealed.

For example, in addition to Matt, who was able to gain coverage as result of health care reform despite his pre-existing conditions, 1,343 previously uninsured residents of New Jersey who were locked out of the coverage system because of a pre-existing condition are now insured through a new Pre-Existing Condition Insurance Plan, which receives finding from the Affordable Care Act.

Carolyn is one of more than 73,000 young adults in New Jersey who gained insurance coverage as a result of the health care law.

Mary and her son, along with 3 million other people in New Jersey, including 1.2 million women and 877,000 children, are free from worrying about lifetime limits on coverage thanks to health care reform.

Republicans here in the House may be able to point to a business owner who has concerns over a provision of the law, or an adult who resists purchasing health insurance, but the truth is, the law has something to offer for every American. The Affordable Care Act requires that insurance companies spend the majority of your premium on health care—not on CEO bonuses or administrative costs. The law requires that Medicare coverage includes preventive services—such as flu shots and mammograms—without any cost sharing for our seniors. Furthermore, the law prohibits insurance companies from dropping someone when they get sick, or charging women more than men for the same health coverage. If you repeal the law, you take away these important provisions that make our health care more accessible, affordable, comprehensive, and reliable.

One does not bring a proposal to a vote 37 times out of a rational, considered desire to improve the lives of the American people. You do it out of an irrational, ideological vendetta. But the problem with irrational vendettas is that they are so focused on ideology that they ignore human consequences.

Stop ignoring Matt. Don't punish Carolyn. Don't overlook Mary and her son. Let's stop this foolish vendetta and do the real work we were sent here to do.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Speaker, we have millions of people out of work and a Republican majority that refuses to bring a real jobs bill to the floor. We have record drought across the United States and in my home state of Texas, and a Republican majority that has refused to bring a 5 year farm bill to the floor. In fact the only thing this Republican majority knows how to do is waste the Americans people's time. Ever since Republicans took the majority, they have created the most unproductive congresses in our history. We recently spent two days to vote on a helium bill that could have been voice voted in 5 minutes. We are working in Washington this year for only 126 days. 126 days out of 365.

Instead of spending some of those precious work days on bills that can help Americans get back to work, we are here to vote for the 37th time to repeal Obamacare. This vote is a waste of time. This bill will never become law and they know that. They knew it the first 36 times we voted to repeal it, and they know it today, but Republican leadership needs to do it so the freshman tea party members can send out a press release and a fundraising email this weekend saying they voted to repeal it. Meanwhile in my district, farmers are struggling to grow crops, families are struggling to eat, and this Congress refuses to lift a finger to help them. They should be ashamed. Vote no on this bill.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to H.R. 45, which would repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. The Affordable Care Act has significantly improved access to health care for Americans, and I strongly support it.

Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, millions of Texans are already seeing lower health care costs and receiving better insurance coverage. Over 7.5 million Texans now have no lifetime limit on most health insurance benefits, which will protect them from having their insurance cut off if they require significant medical care.

The Affordable Care Act has lowered prescription drug costs for over 200,000 seniors in Texas by closing the gap in drug coverage known as the ''donut hole.'' It has also allowed 357,000 young adults in Texas, who might otherwise be uninsured, to gain coverage through their parents' plan. Over 1.5 million consumers in Texas have received rebates from insurance companies because under the Affordable Care Act, insurers must spend at least 80 percent of premiums on medical care and quality improvement rather than CEO pay, profits, and administrative costs.

The Affordable Care Act also promotes equal treatment for women. Starting in 2014, insurers will not be allowed to charge women higher premiums than men simply because of their gender. Because of the Affordable Care Act, insured women are already able to receive critical preventive services such as mammograms, birth control, and well-woman visits without paying any out-of-pocket fees.

Today marks the 37th time that Republicans have voted to repeal or defund the Affordable Care Act. Unfortunately, Republicans seem to be treating the legislative calendar of the U.S. House of Representatives as a playing field for their political games. Instead, we should be working hard for the American people by passing legislation to create jobs, spur economic growth, and reform our broken immigration system.

The Affordable Care Act is the law of the land and it is working. Up to 17 million children with pre-existing conditions can no longer be denied health insurance, and nearly 13 million Americans have received $1.1 billion in rebates from their insurance companies. Texans cannot afford to lose the crucial health benefits that the Affordable Care Act provides. That is why I plan to vote against H.R. 45 and all future efforts to repeal the Affordable Care Act. I am proud to stand with my colleagues and the President to support a health system that provides security, accountability, and peace of mind to Americans.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, since the law's passage over three years ago, the Energy and Commerce Committee has conducted rigorous oversight to educate the country on how the law impacts patients, providers, the economy, taxpayers, and states. At every turn, we have encountered an ugly reality filled with broken promises, rampant uncertainty, rising premiums, and harsh consequences on jobs and our economy.

The alarm bells over how Obamacare will unfold are getting louder by the day: costs are going up, insurers are warning about premium increases, and small businesses are struggling with the choice about whether they can provide employees with coverage. One of the law's chief architects and ally of the president even scolded the administration over the looming ''train wreck.''

But as we fast approach the law's full implementation, the Obama administration is in full propaganda mode, and the facts don't seem to matter. Last week the president publicly declared, ''And whenever insurance premiums go up, you're being told it's because of Obamacare. Even though there is no evidence that that's the case.''

Mr. President, we have plenty of evidence, and sadly millions of Americans nationwide, from recent college graduates to older adults, will not be able to afford the law's rate shock. We have the plans of some of the nation's leading insurers for 2014, and the looming rate shock will be devastating. One of the nation's leading insurance companies that insures millions of folks predicts premiums will nearly double for individuals getting a new plan, those keeping their insurance will see an average increase of 73 percent, and some individuals could see increases of as much as 413 percent. The last three years have been littered with the Obama administration's broken promises. Today we keep our promise to the American people as we continue working to repeal this disastrous experiment, and work towards real solutions.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, ever since President Obama was first elected and chose to push through a federal takeover of America's health care system, House conservatives have led the charge to repeal the law commonly known as Obamacare and replace it with true reforms that will increase access and lower costs for consumers. With a string of broken promises from its authors and prominent backers, this law has already forced people off of the insurance they previously had, has increased premiums by thousands of dollars, and has reduced work hours for millions.

The fundamental question facing uninsured Americans was never, ''how do we give the federal government more power over our lives?'' Yet government control over health care was what the Democrat majority provided. House Republicans offered alternatives that gave our constituents the peace of mind to know that a safety net would be in place for the least fortunate amongst us, and provided commonsense reforms to allow those uninsured or underinsured to get the insurance they needed at an affordable price. Unfortunately, what we got was a law that, as former Speaker PELOSI famously stated, ''we have to pass the bill so that you can find out what is in it.'' Well, we've read the bill, and the tens of thousands of pages of regulations to enforce it, and I can tell you the backlash and opposition to the law continues to mount.

One small example of the absurdity of this law is provided by a constituent of mine who lives in Virginia. This small business owner has chosen to insure his employees for the last forty years, helping his employees afford the insurance they need to keep their families healthy. Because of Obamacare, this company is required to spend more than $30,000 to re-enroll their current employees. Let me repeat that. Even though these employees already have health insurance, the company is required to pay a fee for each and every one of them, to enroll the employee back into the exact same plan. That $30,000, which could have been used to hire new workers or grow the local economy, will now be sent to bureaucrats in Washington. Instead of health insurance for Main Street, this appears to be health insurance for K Street.

Today the House has a chance to stop growing the size of government, and to give power and freedom back to the American people. Instead of propping up health care exchanges, bureaucratic IPAB rationing panels, and mandates which cost Americans thousands of dollars each year, let's start over and focus on the real needs of access to care and reduced costs of insurance. We can all admit that our health insurance system can use strengthening, but this is not the way to do it. If you are serious about reforming the health insurance system in this country, then join me in voting to repeal Obamacare and send a message to the American people that we have heard their anger and outrage over this law and we will do what it takes to see it repealed.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 215, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mrs. CAPPS. I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Capps moves to recommit the bill H.R. 45 to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end of the bill the following new section:

SEC. 3. PRESERVING CERTAIN PATIENT BENEFIT PROTECTIONS FOR WOMEN AND THEIR FAMILIES, AS GUARANTEED UNDER CURRENT LAW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1 shall not apply with respect to the ACA women and families' patient benefit protection provisions described in subsection (b) until such date that all group health plans and health insurance issuers provide equivalent protections for women and their families as provided under all such provisions.

(b) ACA WOMEN AND FAMILIES' PATIENT BENEFIT PROTECTION PROVISIONS.—For purposes of subsection (a), ACA women and families' patient benefit protection provisions described in this subsection are the following, as such provisions would be in effect before application of section 1:

(1) PREVENTIVE HEALTH SERVICES COVERAGE WITHOUT COST SHARING.—Section 2713 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–13), relating to the coverage of preventive health services without cost sharing, including well-woman preventive care visits, breast cancer screening, mammography, screening for gestational diabetes, and screening for interpersonal and domestic violence.

(2) COVERAGE FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH PREEXISTING CONDITIONS.—Section 1101 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18001), relating to immediate access to insurance for uninsured individuals with a preexisting condition.

(3) ENSURING THAT CONSUMERS RECEIVE VALUE FOR THEIR PREMIUM PAYMENTS.—Section 2718 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–18), relating to the use of health insurance premiums primarily for health benefits rather than the administrative costs of insurance companies, including executive salaries and compensation.

(4) NO LIFETIME OR ANNUAL LIMITS.—Section 2711 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–11), relating to no lifetime or annual limits.

(5) PROHIBITION OF PREEXISTING CONDITION EXCLUSIONS FOR CHILDREN.—Section 2704 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–3), relating to the prohibition of preexisting condition exclusions or other discrimination based on health status, insofar as such section applies to enrollees who are under 19 years of age.

(6) COVERAGE OF ADULT CHILDREN UNTIL AGE 26.—Section 2714 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–14), relating to the extension of dependent coverage for adult children until age 26.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer the final and only amendment to this bill. And I want to be clear: passage of this amendment will not prevent the passage of the underlying bill. If it's adopted, my amendment will be incorporated into the bill, and the bill will be immediately voted upon.

My amendment would simply ensure that women and families do not lose the benefits they have already gained from ObamaCare in the event that the law is repealed.

These benefits are critical to keeping families healthy and identifying problems when they are easier and less costly to treat—benefits like the ability to get preventive health services without any copays.

Thanks to ObamaCare, no longer must women put off critical screenings like mammograms or colonoscopies because of the cost. And women are now able to be screened for domestic violence, gestational diabetes and receive other preventive care without worrying about whether they can pay for it. Millions of us have taken advantage of these potentially lifesaving screenings.

Similarly, young adults—the most uninsured age group in our country—now have the option of staying on their parents' insurance plan until they're 26. This is a real benefit, one that has already enabled 6.6 million young adults to keep their health insurance coverage as they begin to make their way in life.

On top of these benefits, we now have protections from some of the most abusive insurance company practices. For example, no longer can insurance companies cut off your care just because you're too expensive to treat. For too long, individuals who paid their premiums and followed the rules would still be cut off after hitting arbitrary lifetime or annual caps on coverage.

These are our friends, they're our neighbors who did nothing wrong. They just got sick or had a tragic accident. Now they are protected, knowing their insurance coverage will be there when they need it.

In addition, mothers no longer have to worry that their children with a preexisting condition, like autism or asthma, will be denied health care. And starting this January, no American will be told that they cannot get coverage due to a preexisting condition.

All of these benefits have been secured while holding insurance companies accountable to use your premium dollars on actual health care, not on bonuses or advertising.

And all of these protections have been and would continue to be there for American families if my amendment passes.

You truly do not realize the importance of these protections until you or someone you love needs them. And that is exactly the case of Victoria Strong. She's a young mother living in my hometown of Santa Barbara, California.

Victoria's daughter, Gwendolyn, was diagnosed with a rare and extremely expensive disease when she was 6 months old. Despite the fact that she and her husband, Bill, had a good health insurance policy, one they paid thousands of dollars for each month, Victoria lived in constant fear that Gwendolyn would reach her lifetime policy limit before she even reached second grade, and because of her preexisting condition, Gwendolyn would then be uninsurable for the rest of her life.

I cannot imagine how difficult it was for young Victoria to not even know whether her child's basic health care needs would be covered or not in the future, and that's exactly what so many mothers faced before ObamaCare. But the elimination of lifetime caps on care has given Victoria peace of mind, and it's done the same for millions of mothers across this Nation.

That's exactly what ObamaCare is all about: fixing our broken health care system, fixing it for families like the Strong family, for women across this country, for their families. This law gets it right. And now we have one last vote to at least preserve the rights they already have.

I believe that all Americans would be better off if we in Congress worked to ensure swift implementation of the law

instead of wasting time and taxpayer dollars debating repeal for yet the 37th time. But I think we can all agree that taking away existing insurance protections from everyday Americans is the wrong thing to do just because we are setting out to repeal.

I remember the numerous hearings and markups about this law, and there was great agreement on both sides of the aisle that these consumer protections were critical to improving our broken health care system. So no matter what you think of this bill, my amendment would guarantee that no American family loses the care they have paid for now just when they need it the most.

□ 1750

The law provides legal protection and peace of mind to the Strong family in Santa Barbara and to all families like them across our Nation. Our families need this law; and if the majority is willing to vote for the 37th time to repeal it, they at least need to vote on this amendment. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on my motion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALORSKI. I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can try as much as they would like today to distract the people from the real issue at hand. But the fact remains today that ObamaCare was bad policy when it was enacted, and it's getting worse the closer we get to its implementation.

When I hear from Hoosiers in the State of Indiana, from business owners trying to run companies to seniors seeking quality care options, I hear overwhelming uncertainty and concern, and ObamaCare is the driving force.

To protect Americans from this impending train wreck, I support full repeal of this law, which has been nothing more than a string of broken promises. Let's just quickly look at a few.

Broken promise number one: the President claimed that he would not sign a plan that adds one dime to our deficit. However, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimated that this bill adds almost $2 trillion. After consecutive trillion-dollar deficits, our national debt is soaring towards $17 trillion. It's time to stop spending money we simply don't have.

Broken promise number two: the President claimed that no family making less than $250,000 a year will see their taxes increase. However, the Joint Committee on Taxation reports that ObamaCare includes 21 new or higher taxes that will cost taxpayers roughly $1.1 trillion.

I recently had the chance to tour an orthopedic manufacturing company in my district in Mishawaka, Indiana. During this visit, I heard real-life stories from real-life employees about the taxes in ObamaCare. I was warned that the new medical device tax will prevent the company from creating good-paying jobs in Indiana for Hoosiers who are out of work. The reality is this tax will increase the cost of medical devices used by our senior citizens and our wounded warriors.

Broken promise number three: the President repeatedly claimed that his proposal could save families $2,500 a year in health care premiums when, in fact, researchers from the Kaiser Family Foundation found that average family premiums have instead increased by over $3,000 since 2008. If not repealed, this law will continue to increase premiums and eat away at the paychecks of single moms and young families all across the country. The reality, Madam Speaker, this Affordable Care Act is not so affordable.

Broken promise number four: the President claimed he would protect Medicare. But instead of protecting Medicare and making it stronger, he raided $716 billion from the program to fund his government takeover of our health. The millions of seniors who depend on Medicare deserve better. My mom, a Medicare beneficiary, deserves better.

Madam Speaker, we don't need this law, period. We don't need a law that tramples over our freedoms by allowing the government to make our personal health care choices. We don't need a law that restricts our access to quality and affordable health care. And we definitely don't need a law enforced by an agency actively targeting citizens with opposing political views.

I urge all of my colleagues to defeat the motion to recommit and stand today and repeal ObamaCare.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 190, nays 230, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 153]

YEAS—190

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

NAYS—230

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

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

NOT VOTING—13

Campbell
Clyburn
Cole
Conyers
Duffy
Engel
Johnson, Sam
Labrador
Lewis
Markey
McIntyre
Quigley
Wagner

□ 1818

Messrs. BILIRAKIS, TERRY, CRAMER, DESJARLAIS, POSEY, HARPER, LUETKEMEYER, PETERSON, KINGSTON, HARRIS and ROSKAM changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. OWENS, JEFFRIES, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Messrs. COOPER and THOMPSON of Mississippi changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 195, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 154]

YEAS—229

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—195

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

NOT VOTING—9

Campbell
Clyburn
Duffy
Johnson, Sam
Labrador
Lewis
Markey
Quigley
Wagner

□ 1826

Mr. GUTIERREZ changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday May 16, 2013, I was in St. Louis, Missouri celebrating children's graduations. My son, Stephen Wagner today graduated from Washington University in St. Louis, and my daughter, Mary Ruth Wagner, has a Baccalaureate Mass for Ursuline Academy.

Due to these lifetime events, I was unable to be in Washington, DC and vote on the legislative business of the day.

On Ordering the Previous Question for H. Res. 215, a resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 45 to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health-care related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, rollcall Vote No. 150, had I been present I would have voted "yes."

On Adoption of H. Res. 215, a resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 45 to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, rollcall Vote No. 151, had I been present I would have voted "yes."

On Approval of the Journal, rollcall Vote No. 152, had I been present I would have voted "yes."

On Motion to Recommit with Instructions H.R. 45, rollcall Vote No. 153, had I been present I would have voted "no."

On Passage of H.R. 45 to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, rollcall Vote No. 154, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 107

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I might remove my name from H.R. 107 as a cosponsor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BACHMANN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BRITISH-AMERICAN INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Member on the part of the House to the British-American Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. CICILLINE, Rhode Island

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913 and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China:

Mr. WOLF, Virginia
Mr. PITTENGER, North Carolina
Mr. MEADOWS, North Carolina

HONORING CIPRIANO GARZA

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Cipriano Garza, who this Saturday will be joining the ranks of the select few members in the South Dade High School's Alumni Hall of Fame.

Throughout his life, Cip—as he is known—has achieved high levels of personal success and excelled in his profession, making him a great example of the diversity and ingenuity of the south Florida community.

During his senior year at South Dade High, Cip set new State and school records for the 100-yard dash at the State Championships while crossing the finish line barefoot.

As a son of migrant farm workers, Cip has used his unique perspective in working with Dade County Public Schools to create innovative educational programs and eradicate the school dropout rate among children of migrant farm workers.

In 1993, after being appointed a special assistant to the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Cip became the first Mexican-American to receive a Presidential appointment in the State of Florida.

Cip's many accomplishments and dedication to the betterment of the community make him deserving of this great honor.

Congratulations to Cip Garza.

ACA REPEAL

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, today, for the 37th time, the Republicans set a vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Yet again, this is a waste of time and taxpayer resources on pure political posturing, rather than working hard on behalf of hardworking American taxpayers.

As a freshman Member, I can tell you where I stand, and that is in 100 percent pure full support of the Affordable Care Act.

Republicans have ignored real problems affecting our country and instead have chosen to attack the poor and most vulnerable. Millions of Americans are already enjoying protections and benefits under the law. In my State of Texas, over 300,000 young adults are able to stay under their parents' plan. Over 3 million women and 1.8 million senior citizens have access to preventive care. Many more will have insurance coverage once the insurance exchanges are in place for 2014.

Republicans constantly talk about requiring more efficiency and reducing redundancy in Federal Government. How about we start reducing redundancy right here in Congress? Let's move beyond messaging bills and into actual substantive legislation. Let's focus on jobs and grow the economy rather than wasting money on repealing the Affordable Care Act.

SO-CALLED AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Americans want and need greater access to health care, and they deserve reforms that will lower costs and expand access, but without undermining quality and innovation.

These were the promises of the President's health care reform law. They were worthy goals. Unfortunately, they are not reality.

To the contrary, over the past 3 years, families and businesses have seen a 400 percent premium increase for health care. Patients are being denied coverage that physicians will not accept. Employers have slowed hiring under new costs and the fear of what is ahead.

This Congress has rescinded funding for or completely repealed eight separate provisions of ObamaCare. Key provisions of the act are beginning to collapse under the weight of their own irreparable flaws. And even my Democratic colleagues have warned of the law's looming ''train wreck.''

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better. Full repeal of this flawed policy is the first step to enacting commonsense reforms to actually lower costs and expand access. Only then can we enact a law that can be truly called the ''Affordable Care Act.''

AUTOMATIC IRA ACT OF 2013

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about legislation that I have reintroduced—the Automatic IRA Act of 2013.

According to Boston College's Center for Retirement Research, the United States has a retirement income deficit of $6.6 trillion.

One area I think we need to focus on is getting more low and middle-income workers into retirement savings.

It is estimated that 75 million workers—or half of American workers—have no employer-provided retirement plan or other opportunity to save for workplace contributions. The auto IRA is a commonsense solution to dramatically expand retirement savings in the United States.

Listen to this: this auto IRA proposal was jointly developed by myself, along with the Brookings Institution and the Heritage Foundation. It has garnered widespread support, including from AARP, the U.S. Black Chamber of Commerce, the Women's Institute for a Secure Retirement, and the Aspen Institute Initiative on Financial Security.

This is a commonsense piece of legislation that should be joined by both parties in advancing retirement opportunities for the American people.

PROMOTING OUR RELATIONSHIP WITH THE STATE OF ISRAEL

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to encourage my colleagues to cosponsor legislation I have introduced to ensure that the State of Israel maintains its qualitative military edge.

Israel recently celebrated its 65th anniversary of independence.

Unfortunately, many of Israel's neighbors continue their relentless attacks against this Nation. While Iran pursues its nuclear program, it has launched cyber attacks against Israel.

Israel is under constant danger from both conventional and unconventional weapons. However, the current statutory definition of ''qualitative military edge'' does not include the threats posed by militia activity or cyber attacks.

These are very real threats against Israel and must be taken into account.

H.R. 1992 updates the definition of ''qualitative military edge'' so that the asymmetric and cyber warfare are considered and would require a 2-year reporting process.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee to advance this legislation and to increase our special relationship with Israel. I appreciate the chairman of Foreign Affairs, Mr. ROYCE, for his support and cosponsorship.

And I also would like to thank my friend from across the aisle, Mr. SCHNEIDER, for his support. Good policy knows no party line, and I look forward to working together to move forward this legislation.

REGARDING THE PATIENTS' RIGHTS REPEAL ACT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted a moment to reflect. This was a very sad day for me. Having been here during the emotional time during the debate on the Affordable Care Act, remembering the long hours and the deliberation in the committees in regular order, the opportunity for Republicans to offer amendments, and then today for the 37th time this particular act has now hurt millions of Americans.

My State is number one. Today, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to call the roll and ask those citizens of those States to call their Senators. For how can you vote for such a repeal of the Patients' Rights Act when Texas, Louisiana, Nevada, California, Florida, Georgia, Arkansas, Alaska, Mississippi, and Oklahoma all have uninsured over 20 percent, with Texas being 28.4 percent?

It is poverty that drives the need to expand Medicaid to my State, to my Governor. It is poverty that drives this. Whether you are poor, whether you are low-income, whether you are working middle class, the Affordable Care Act is to lift your boat to give you the opportunity to have preventive health care to be able to have access to doctors. Why would anybody vote to repeal the Patients' Rights Act?

□ 1840

RESCUING AMERICANS FROM THE TRACKS OF HEALTH CARE DESTRUCTION

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

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Ladies and gentlemen, let me tell you why people would vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act. It has become very, very clear that no matter how well-intentioned it may have been, it will not work. Time after time, we are finding that the things that they told us just aren't panning out to be true; and Senator MAX BAUCUS, one of the law's main architects, recently described ObamaCare as a huge train wreck coming down.

We have a chance to save Americans from being casualties of the train wreck. We can yank them off the tracks. Today, I voted to show that I am trying to do just that.

I call on the United States Senate and the Senators to join us in rescuing the American people from the tracks of health care destruction.

SCANDALS IN WASHINGTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In the past few weeks, it seems as if you can't turn on the news without hearing of another drama, of another crisis in Washington undermining confidence in our government, whether it's Benghazi, the IRS, the Department of Justice, or the Department of Health and Human Services. It's hard to know what may be next.

Mr. Speaker, there is an age-old expression that goes like this: be careful to whom you give a gun and a badge.

Authority is a very delicate matter. A well-functioning government must ensure that those who are in positions of influence are committed to serving the public with impartiality and fairness. Recent revelations have done much to undermine the public trust.

Mr. Speaker, 8 months ago, our Ambassador to Libya was killed along with three other Americans. Not only is this an affront to America because we lost our Ambassador; it is also an attack on our Nation, and it undermines the international rule of law. The process by which we have tried to unpack the details of this attack has been careening all over the place. Even after several committee hearings on Benghazi, including a Foreign Affairs Committee hearing in which I participated last December, a core question remains unanswered:

Who said ''stand down'' when reinforcements were called for?

Now, there may be legitimate military and diplomatic reasoning here, but we simply need to know the answer to that question; or this could have been a very serious mistake with the gravest of consequences.

In the past week, we've learned of discrimination against specific groups by the Internal Revenue Service. These reports are causing a firestorm across our country. Our sensitivities are rightly heightened when it comes to the collection of taxes. No one wants to pay taxes, but we must have a revenue-collecting agency in order to have a functioning Federal Government. It is unconscionable, though, that this agency targeted citizens because of their political or religious beliefs.

The IRS, of all agencies, must be held to the highest of high standards of fairness and impartiality. The reported actions seriously undermine the foundation of trust necessary between citizens and their government. That's why, this week, the Taxpayer Nondiscrimination and Protection Act was introduced with my support. The legislation puts meaningful penalties in place when this foundation of trust is violated, penalties that could include prison time.

Perhaps it's also time for the IRS to implement a new policy. Everyone they are auditing, or perhaps have audited in the past 3 years, must be provided with a fuller explanation as to why they're going through this process so as to ensure that there is no improper targeting of American citizens based upon their religious or political beliefs. Just this morning, a friend of mine texted me, and another one called me just yesterday, worried that the audits that were undertaken against them were due to their own political leanings and engagements.

Mr. Speaker, the real issue is this: Just how deep and wide is the mind-set that pervaded the IRS that did target Americans based upon their religious or political leanings?

On another issue, we are learning that the Department of Justice seized phone records of Associated Press reporters, including records of their personal phone lines. Now, the ability to wiretap and probe needs to be in place in narrow circumstances, but the wide-ranging nature of what happened raises a number of questions, questions that beg us to ask: How do we protect the freedom of the press?

Another problem that hasn't been widely discussed is that the Department of Health and Human Services, in effect, is also targeting people based upon their beliefs. The Department is forcing Americans to pay for drugs and procedures that many find to be inconsistent with their deeply held, reasonable beliefs or their religious traditions. When the President introduced his health care plan, he told Americans that if they liked their health insurance, they could keep it. Now we are finding in some cases that you cannot keep your doctor, that you cannot keep your own health care plan, and now you may not even be able to keep your own faith tradition. This is a form of coercion that sets up a false choice and is un-American.

All of these events are converging to erode confidence in Washington. Now, thankfully, many of these concerns actually cross the political aisle. There is bipartisan concern. These are American issues, and these events underscore why we actually do have a balance of power in Washington. There is an executive branch that enforces the law, and there is a legislative branch that writes the law. The legislative branch also has the duty to provide oversight over the executive branch, which is a duty that Congress now is rightly embracing.

It is important that in each instance here the truth is uncovered and that swift and appropriate actions are taken to help restore confidence in the impartiality, fairness, and competence of the Federal Government.

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

THE INNOCENT AND THE INCONVENIENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 55 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Speaker.

With the recent murder conviction of abortion doctor Kermit Gosnell, we've got to encourage Americans to ask: How different, really, is Gosnell's house of horrors from abortions that occur in clinics throughout the United States? The tragic answer: not much. Not much at all.

Mr. Speaker, there are Kermit Gosnells all over America—predators, child abusers, exploiters of women. Some abortionists may have cleaner sheets than Gosnell did and better sterilized equipment and better trained accomplices, but what they do and what Gosnell did for four decades—kill babies and hurt women—is the same.

Will Americans ever be told the horrifying details as to how and how often abortionists dismember, decapitate, and chemically poison innocent babies?

Where is the outrage, Mr. Speaker, over the 55 million child victims who have been brutally killed by abortion over the last 40 years and over the millions of women who have been hurt physically, emotionally, and psychologically?

Why the appalling lack of compassion? Why the empathy deficit for the victims—women and children—by so many, including and especially by President Obama and Vice President BIDEN? Women and children deserve better.

Of course, Gosnell's trial isn't the first to rip the benign facade of legitimacy from the abortion industry. As far back as 1975, Dr. Kenneth Edelin was convicted by a jury in Boston of murdering an African American baby boy who was found dead and abandoned in the Boston City Hospital morgue.

□ 1850

An investigation that led to trial revealed that the child was yet another Kenneth Edelin victim. When the jury saw the picture of the dead baby, they were appalled and persuaded that indeed a homicide had occurred. Astonishingly, that conviction was subsequently overturned by the Massachusetts Supreme Court, which simply dismissed the murder as yet another legal abortion.

Mr. Speaker, how did Planned Parenthood react to the reversal of verdict? With euphoric celebration. Dr. Edelin, after all, was their guy. Years later, Dr. Edelin became the chairman of the board of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, and was even given the Margaret Sanger Award in 2008. And I would note parenthetically that in 2009, Planned Parenthood gave the Sanger Award to Hillary Clinton. And like Gosnell, not a single tear was shed by Dr. Kenneth Edelin or Planned Parenthood for the murdered child victim.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, an undercover investigative organization, Live Action, released more undercover videos that exposed the abortion industry's absolutely appalling and callous disregard for human life, human rights, and Federal law. Previously, Live Action aired several videos showing Planned Parenthood abortion clinic personnel advising women at several clinics throughout the country, including in my own home State of New Jersey, as to how to procure sex-selection abortions simply because the unborn child happened to be a little girl and other equally disturbing videos showing Planned Parenthood staffers who counsel and offer to arrange secret abortions for teenager sex trafficking victims.

One of those was in a Planned Parenthood where I went to high school in Perth Amboy. A very young Latina, 14, 15, posing as a woman who had been trafficked with a man that was posing as a pimp, talks—and I advise and ask people to watch those videos. Just go to Live Action. Google it, and you can find it. Watch how they say, We cannot only abort this young girl who has been trafficked—and I wrote, Mr. Speaker, the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 to combat this hideous modern-day exploitation mostly of women and children. And there's Planned Parenthood personnel saying how this young girl could get a secret abortion, be back out on the streets and, of course, further exploited by this person who purported to be a pimp.

The first call should have been to the police to have them arrested; instead, they talked about how to get the secret abortion.

Live Action has released undercover videos showing a Bronx, New York, abortion counselor describing how, in violation of U.S. Federal law, a born-alive baby would be placed in a jar of toxic solution to ensure his or her death.

A D.C. abortionist is also captured on film who talks about leaving a baby born alive after a botched abortion simply to die due to the elements.

An Arizonan worker said that they would not resuscitate should a baby survive an abortion attempt.

This is not just violence against children; this is a violation of Federal law.

Live Action President Lila Rose has released yet another must-see video of a Maryland abortionist by the name of Dr. LeRoy Carhart, who compares a baby in the womb—you've got to watch this—to meat in a slow cooker and jokes about his abortion toolkit, complete with pickax and drill bit. I watched that, and I was sick. This man does so-called ''legal abortions'' right within range of this Nation's capital.

Mr. Speaker, some day—and I believe the day is fast approaching—Americans will look back and wonder how and why such a seemingly enlightened society, so blessed and endowed with education, advanced science, information, and wealth, opportunity could have so utterly failed to protect the innocent and the inconvenient. They will wonder how and why a Nobel Peace Prize winning President could also have simultaneously been the abortion President and Planned Parenthood's best friend, despite the tragic fact that Planned Parenthood is directly responsible for aborting over 6 million babies in their clinics.

History will not look favorably on today's abortion culture. We must instead work tirelessly to replace it with a culture of life. Women and children deserve no less.

I yield back the balance of my time.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I'm proud to rise in strong support of comprehensive immigration reform. There are many of my colleagues that have fought these battles long before I arrived in Congress, but today I join my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, in strong support of comprehensive immigration reform.

Comprehensive immigration reform is the single most important thing we can do to grow our economy. It will also help make sure that our laws reflect our values as Americans. We are, after all, a Nation of laws and a Nation of immigrants, and the two can and must be made consistent through comprehensive immigration reform.

I want to acknowledge the work of many of my colleagues both in the Senate and House in working towards this worthy goal. I've said in my district and here on the floor of Congress that never in my limited time here have I ever been more optimistic about getting immigration reform done than I am now.

Immigration reform is long overdue, and should this Congress fail to rise to the challenge, Mr. Speaker, the issue will not go away. There may be 10 million or 11 million people here without papers to be able to work, and that doesn't solve itself, so let's take this on. Let's take this on on behalf of the American people, on behalf of Americans of all ideologies, arm in arm with faith-based groups, with civil rights groups, with law enforcement, with the business community, all of whom have

come to Washington and met with Members back home imploring on us the urgent need for action.

There is a strong economic argument about how immigration reform spurs innovation, helps create jobs. We need to also make sure employers play by the same set of rules and some employers don't benefit by dealing under the table in an illegal way. This happens today.

I've spoken out about some of the steps that States and Congress have taken in the absence of comprehensive immigration reform because those measures simply don't work. Let's take, for example, programs like 287(g) and Secure Communities. These draconian laws have actually made our communities less safe by making our immigrant communities less likely to report crimes. Failure to access health care makes our communities less safe by deteriorating public health.

A recent poll showed that almost 30 percent of U.S.-born Latinos, Americans, are scared to report a crime, even if they're a victim, out of fear that they'll be asked about their immigration status or the status of their family and friends. In order to begin to address this important public safety issue, we have to pass comprehensive immigration reform and restore trust to community policing across the country.

There is a political imperative facing the United States Congress because a vast majority of Americans want to see us pass comprehensive immigration reform. Over 70 percent—a majority of self-described conservatives, of liberals, of moderates, majorities of Democrats, of Republicans, Independents—83 percent of Americans support a pathway to citizenship for immigrants who pass a background test and want to learn English and play by the rules.

I've heard some of my colleagues say, Oh, why don't they get in line? Well, the truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, there is no line. Immigration reform is about creating a line. Of course, those who are here illegally will be in line behind those who are in the process legally. There's never been a question about that. But we need to create a line to have an orderly way of doing what is under the table and done extralegally today.

□ 1900

The American public wants us to act now and continues to demand that of this Congress, because the American people are wise. They know that nothing will help us grow our economy more, will shore up the budget deficit and the entitlement programs that we worry about, will reestablish the rule of law, will help us secure our borders and facilitate trade. Nothing will do that better than bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform.

I'm proud to say that the Senate markup of immigration reform is now underway. As we move forward, we'll be talking out for and against various amendments that support or undermine our principles. I think what's critical is to protect a pathway to citizenship for 11 million aspiring Americans living in the shadows, and we need to make sure that there's a realistic way for that to happen.

Let me be clear: no version of comprehensive immigration reform confers citizenship on anybody. Citizenship is earned over time. This is about creating a line and a process by which people have provisional status, maybe some day a green card, and then maybe some day if they want to learn English and take the citizenship test and forgo their foreign allegiances, we'd be happy to have them as our American brothers and sisters. If other immigrants choose not to and choose to work here for a period of time legally and return to another country, that is fine, too. This country has been built by immigrants from across the world. My own great-grandparents came to these shores, and today, I have the deep honor of serving in the United States Congress.

We need to make sure that immigration reform keeps families together, strengthens our family-based visa program for future immigrants, has realistic wait times that are consistent with people's lives so that parents can be with their kids as they grow up. Nothing can be more inhumane than the way immigration laws play out today in our country where an American child, an American citizen, returning home from school might find that their mother or father is in an indefinite detention process, and not because of anything their kid did. Why? Maybe they had a taillight out. Maybe they were going 10 miles over the speed limit. Is that really a moral justification for tearing up a strong family unit, Mr. Speaker?

I've met with many of these kids and I've met with their parents. We need to be a Congress that supports families. We need to be a Congress that helps parents have time to spend with their kids, make sure no kid has to worry about their parent, who has no criminal violation—we're only talking about civil violations, no criminal violation—and suddenly being missing for months or being sent to a country that the child might never even have been to.

There's a number of reasons in addition to the moral ones for immigration reform. Many of our fast-growing companies cry out for a skilled workforce. For America to be competitive, for innovative companies in the technology industry to be successful, for innovative companies in advanced manufacturing to be successful, we need to compete in the global talent pool. We are precluded. American companies are precluded from doing that today. And we wonder why jobs are being outsourced. Why are companies growing in India? Why are companies growing in England? Why are they growing overseas in Chile? Well, you know what? Many of those companies would rather grow here and hire people here, and our current laws prohibit them from doing so because they can't get the people they want.

I represent a district with two fine universities, great institutions: Colorado State University in Fort Collins, the University of Colorado at Boulder. Right down the road is the School of Mines in Colorado, DU. All these schools are educating the next generation of engineers, of mathematicians, of computer programmers, of scientists, some of whom are foreign nationals legally here on student visas. But once they're trained, once that young man from India, that young woman from France gets that advanced degree in computer science and a master's degree and is ready to go into a good job, guess what our government says? Our government says, Guess what, you've got to leave. You've got to take that job to France. You've got to take that job to India. You've got to take that job to Canada. Our government is saying we don't want that job in our country.

Well, Mr. Speaker, through comprehensive immigration reform, this Congress can make a statement that we do want that job here in America. We want to grow our economy stronger. We want to make sure that the people who have had the great benefit of learning at one of our premier institutions of higher education can employ their talents here to make our country stronger and grow our economy. That's what comprehensive immigration reform is all about.

I'm also optimistic that comprehensive immigration reform will provide a new mechanism for entrepreneurs from across the world to start their companies here. Currently, there is no visa classification for somebody who has an idea, has some backing, venture capital investment, and wants to hire 10 or 20 people. And guess what. It's not just about the 10 or 20 people that they hire. It's about the potential for that company to employ thousands of people years down the road. And again, what does our government say? No, go start that company in Chile; go start that company in China or India.

Well, I'm sure all those countries need companies, too, Mr. Speaker; but I, as a Congressman, represent America, and I want that company here. I want it in my congressional district and in my State, but I'll be happy as long as it is in America. So let's provide a way, through a start-up visa, that an entrepreneur from anywhere in the world who has a great idea and that idea is validated by receiving a real investment can come start their company here in our country. Hire Americans; grow that company; bring value to consumers; create jobs; live the American Dream. That's what this country is all about. That's what this country is all about.

And let's talk about the dreamers, Mr. Speaker. These are young de facto Americans. Why de facto Americans?

They know no other country. Maybe they were brought here when they were 2 or 5 or 1. They didn't violate any law in coming here. What does a 1-year-old know from the law. They grew up here. They played sports with your kids in school. They were cheerleaders with your kids in school. They got good grades. They're going to college. Guess what. They don't have any type of identification that allows them to work in this country. And technically, under the law, they would have to return to another country where they may not even speak the language or know anybody.

So while President Obama's deferred action program is a strong step in the right direction, and at least many of these dreamers no longer live in fear of indefinite detention and can go to work, that's only a 2-year timeout. Only Congress can provide a permanent status for these millions of de facto Americans who know no other country, are as American as you or me. American in fact; let's make them American in law. And that, too, should and must be a part of the comprehensive immigration reform package.

Our country is about family values and letting parents raise their kids without fear of government intervention, being able to live the American Dream. These are values that transcend our ideologies. These are values that conservative Americans and liberal Americans and moderate Americans can all agree on.

When I have town hall meetings in my district—and we always, as you can imagine, Mr. Speaker, attract a broad ideological diversity, as many of us do across this country, everybody from the far right to far left to people in the middle—I always like to ask, Is anybody happy with immigration today? Does anybody here think we're doing a great job; everything's right? Not a single constituent anywhere along the ideological spectrum has raised their hand and said, Yes, we just need to keep doing what we're doing.

It ain't working. There are 11 million people here illegally. Countries are violating the law every day. Families are being torn apart. Taxpayers are on the hook. Let's change it. It ain't going to change unless we change it. It doesn't change itself.

States have tried to move forward with what they can. They can't solve it. Some States have looked into issuing State work permits or in-State tuition or how they can make sure that people have driver's insurance who don't have Federal paperwork. But look, they're just cleaning up after our mess. That's all the States can do. We need to fix this mess here in Washington. Only the United States Congress has the authority to restore credibility and integrity to our immigration law.

□ 1910

Americans of all stripes are joining the call for comprehensive immigration reform now, strengthening our border security, and facilitating legitimate trade and commerce across the border, employer enforcement, making sure that employers aren't let off the hook for hiring people who don't have the right to be here, making sure we have the workers we need to fuel our economy, all kinds of jobs that we need.

We talked about technology and programmers. Well, guess what? We also need people in the fields picking tomatoes, in the fields harvesting oranges. We need people who clean buildings at night. We're happy, we're always happy to have Americans do that.

I was meeting with a farmer in Larimer County a couple of months ago. He said he'd love to hire Americans. He's never been able to have an American who agreed to keep that job and do that backbreaking labor for more than a couple of weeks. He relies on immigrant labor. He wants us to pass comprehensive immigration reform that includes a way that they can have seasonal workers to meet the needs that they have in the field.

I'm joined by one of my colleagues from the great State of California. Congressman TAKANO, despite being a freshman, has quickly become a vocal advocate for immigrant families. He's shown a strong commitment and true leadership in seeing that comprehensive immigration reform passes in the 113th Congress.

I'm proud to welcome and yield time to my colleague from the State of California.

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding time.

Even though the economy is improving and job creation levels are the highest they've been in 4 years, the top priority for all Members of Congress must be putting people back to work and strengthening the economy.

Despite what opponents of immigration reform say, the bill proposed in the Senate does just that; and, moreover, it strengthens Social Security.

One of the Republican architects of the Senate bill, Senator MARCO RUBIO, sent a letter to the Social Security Administration's chief actuary, asking for the net effect of comprehensive immigration reform on the Social Security trust fund.

In his reply, Chief Actuary Goss stated that they are developing 75-year estimates, but, quote, and this is Actuary Goss speaking, ''overall, we anticipate that the net effect of this bill,'' meaning comprehensive immigration reform, ''on the long-range Social Security actuarial balance, will be positive.''

The actuary's office also states that over the next 10 years, comprehensive immigration reform will prevent 2 million illegal border crossings, create 3.2 million jobs, and increase the rate of growth on our gross domestic product by a third.

Opponents of immigration reform don't seem to understand that many of the undocumented immigrants in this Nation are already working. Yet because of their illegal status, they are forced into the underground economy, with no labor protections and no way to pay into the system.

Put plainly, undocumented immigrants are often paid cash under the table, and often drastically less than the minimum wage. Allowing these individuals to come out of the shadows and putting them on the pathway to citizenship brings them into the system, where they will pay taxes and receive basic protections against abuse.

For example, an undocumented worker in my district may only be making $4 or $5 an hour, instead of the California minimum wage of $8 an hour. If comprehensive immigration reform is passed, he or she will be eligible for the minimum wage, which will, in turn, increase his buying power, raise revenues for businesses, and drive up wages for everyone else, thus increasing our annual GDP growth rate, as shown here on this chart.

Now, just to be clear, without comprehensive immigration reform, our annual growth rate will only be 4.5 percent. But with comprehensive immigration reform, our annual growth rate shoots up to 6.1 percent.

If the priority of this body is putting Americans back to work and strengthening our economy, then it must pass comprehensive immigration reform that creates a pathway to citizenship and allows undocumented workers the ability to work under the same labor protections and pay into the same system as everyone else.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from California for sharing that information.

What better way can we grow our economy, create jobs for Americans, reduce our national debt, reduce the deficit than if we simply accomplish comprehensive immigration reform.

Many colleagues on both sides of the aisle have expressed concerns about how we can make sure that Social Security is viable and there for young people when they retire. Well, guess what? Making sure that we have our younger new immigrants paying in will help make sure that occurs and that today's seniors and tomorrow's seniors will be taken care of in their old age.

I think that comprehensive immigration reform is absolutely critical towards job growth and creation. And the gentleman from California talked about the difference between a 6.1 and 4.5 percent growth. That represents millions of jobs, millions of jobs for Americans. That's what's at stake with this discussion.

I want to ask the gentleman from California to talk about how important jobs are in his district and how you'd benefit from that additional 2 percent growth. What would that mean to folks in Riverside and folks in California?

Mr. TAKANO. Well, a 2 percent growth rate could translate into a reduction of our current 11 percent unemployment rate in my district, which

is located in Riverside County. We often, in the Inland Empire, as we call the region of California where I represent, we often lag behind the rest of the State when we are coming out of economic downturns.

What I find most interesting about Chief Actuary Goss's statement, his reply to Senator RUBIO's question was how comprehensive immigration reform will have a positive net effect on Social Security.

And if you think about that carefully, and you compare our Nation to, say, a nation such as Japan, where there is no inflow of immigration, and where the population is aging, or other advanced nations where there is no significant amount of immigration, and their populations are aging, they are facing tremendous stresses on the ways in which they are going to provide for their senior citizens.

It only makes sense that, to keep Social Security solvent, we want young, vibrant inflows of capable workers to pay the taxes that will support Social Security into the future.

Mr. POLIS. The gentleman from California has also been a leader in opposing the chained CPI adjustment to Social Security. Don't you think that this immigration reform concept is a better way to shore up Social Security than trying to change the formula to a chained CPI?

Mr. TAKANO. I agree. That's a very good question. Chained CPI, as you know, was—many Americans may not know what chained CPI means. CPI is the consumer price index, and that's the way in which the increase in Social Security benefits are calculated.

There are some economists who've proposed something called chained CPI, which assumes that seniors could withstand a slight reduction in their benefits because they could substitute other goods and services that are cheaper.

But the main goods and services that senior citizens consume are health care and medicines and prescription drugs. Those goods and services they can count on increasing faster than the rate of inflation.

Let's look at how this immigration bill is going to work.

□ 1920

For the first 10 years, registered provisional status for the immigrants who have been previously undocumented would mean that people would be legal in this country, on legal status. They would be paying taxes, but they could not be drawing any Social Security benefits out. I personally have some problems with this. But under this current law, for 10 years, we would see millions of workers who are under the Social Security cap who would be paying into the Social Security Trust Fund, but none of them would be able to draw anything out for at least 10 years. You just do the simple back-of-the-envelope math, and you have to understand what an inflow of revenue that would be to the system.

Mr. POLIS. This comprehensive immigration reform helps two ways. One, there's more people paying in, young people. The second way is more economic growth, which means Social Security is funded through a payroll tax. So when you have more people working, lower unemployment, we talked about getting that rate in Riverside down from 11 percent to 9 percent to 8 percent to 6 percent. Everybody working is then paying in, and that also makes Social Security stronger.

So this argument about the critical economic growth engine that we need not only creates jobs today but helps ensure that tomorrow's seniors are taken care of in their old age.

Mr. TAKANO. Yes, it's a double benefit that many people may not have been aware of, a double positive effect on our economy. For many people it's counterintuitive to think that by reforming immigration and by giving legal status to undocumented immigrants to allow them to come out of the shadows and to be protected by our labor laws that that would have a net positive effect on all wages, but it would. These people are already working, and they're working currently, many of them, at sub-minimum wage levels. If we bring them up to minimum wage, it will mean an even playing field for all workers. There's a kind of rising tide effect that lifts all boats.

Mr. POLIS. That's a good point because I, like yourself, I'm sure many of us sometimes hear from American workers. American workers say, hey, I'm frustrated because there are people that are here illegally working for less than minimum wage or working for cash. What I say to those American workers is, I say, that's exactly why we need comprehensive immigration reform. We need to make sure that people aren't allowed to compete under the table for cash. We're actually creating, by the failure of our own laws, an entire underground labor economy. And by the way, those workers aren't protected from abuse by their employers. Sometimes they do the work and they're not paid, and they can't sue.

I have some very exciting news to announce, to break some news. This just broke on CNN that the bipartisan House group has reached an agreement on immigration reform, announced by Republican Representative MARIO DIAZ-BALART. So I know that the group has been working for some time. Many of us have encouraged them and supported their work. We certainly hope to be able to see the bill soon.

So as the Senate continues the markup, hopefully there is a great additional dose of enthusiasm for us that it looks like here in the House our efforts will hopefully be moving forward as well on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. TAKANO. I associate myself with the gentleman's comments. I am very heartened by this announcement. I will, of course, temper my enthusiasm until I actually see the elements of this compromise. But what many folks here are saying on the Hill—which I'll reveal here on the floor of the House—is I think there is great hope on both sides of the aisle that if we can pass comprehensive immigration reform it will be evidence, the first evidence in a long time, that this body is functional and can work and that our government can do great things. So I am cautiously optimistic, and thank you for sharing that information.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from California for his leadership on this issue. I agree that for Congress to ever be a trusted institution, it needs to solve problems. It needs to come up with practical, commonsense solutions. It's clear what that route is for immigration. It's not too different from what President Bush talked about that President Obama supports. It has long had bipartisan support. It's a comprehensive approach, not this piecemeal approach some talk about, oh, let's build a wall and then talk about something else, or let's do something in high tech and then talk about something else. Look, those are band-aids and the patient is bleeding. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TAKANO. I agree. We need a holistic approach. I was very impressed that the AFL–CIO and the Chamber of Commerce were able to come together and sign off on what Senators, the Group of Eight in the Senate, had devised.

My goodness, if the Chamber of Commerce and AFL–CIO can come together, certainly Republicans and Democrats in this institution can come together, as well.

Mr. POLIS. Like yourself, obviously, I refrain from any particular comments about the House package until I see it, but I'm confident that with bipartisan support, like the Senate bill has, hopefully this House package will address a lot of these issues that you and I have discussed today, making families stronger, restoring the rule of law, reducing crime, creating economic growth and improving Social Security. Hopefully those benefits are included in this package, which I am very excited to examine and look at in the days and weeks ahead. Hopefully, we can join our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol in dealing with this critical issue.

Again, over 84 percent of the American people support a pathway to citizenship. You can't get 84 percent of the American people to agree on anything. And yet on this pathway for citizenship and immigration reform, you have 84 percent support.

I hope that Congress heeds that call. I know the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) is a leader in getting our colleagues to hear that call. He is joined by many of our friends, and it will take all of us working hard to ensure that Congress lives up to the expectations that the American people are setting and takes the right course on this for our country and for economic growth. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TAKANO. Thank you for this time to share our vision for moving forward with the American people. I wake up each day excited to come to work, to work on their behalf. Despite our divisions, despite the rancor we see sometimes on the various cable shows, it's an enormous honor to serve in this institution, and it's a great honor to serve in this institution with the gentleman. I must bid adieu. I have to get going, but thank you so much.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from California for highlighting the argument of economic growth and the critical nature of economic reform. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire as who how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 27 minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. We have the unique opportunity here in the United States Congress to reflect the will of the American people. The will of the American people is clear in this regard. In my time here, seldom, if ever, have I seen an issue where 80 percent, 75 percent, 84 percent of the American people agree. And here we are, the faith community, the civil liberties community, the human rights community, the education community, the business community and the labor community all coming together to say, Congress, do something. And by the way, Congress, not do something like create some new program or do some new policy. It's, Congress, fix this. Only you can do it, Congress. The States can't do it. The States don't have control over this. Some nonprofit or private organization can't do it. Only the Federal Government and only the United States Congress can replace our broken immigration system with one that works for our country, one that reflects our country's need for human capital, for talent, for ideas and for innovation, one that helps make sure that we attract the best and brightest and hardest-working people from across the world to deploy their talents here to make our country stronger in a legal way, one that restores the trust with law enforcement, improves public safety in our communities, allows community policing and police officers to win the trust that's so critical for them to fight crime that affects all of our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to talk about a commonsense issue that's received a lot of discussion in the press and continues to be on many of our minds, and that's how we can reduce violent crime in this country, gun violence and senseless murder and deaths that occur.

Now, this is no easy question. My focus here has always been improving education. I truly believe that improving our schools and making sure that our kids have access to the great opportunity that this country offers is the best way that we can reduce crime.

□ 1930

But we can do more, Mr. Speaker. We can do more in a commonsense way to make it harder for criminals to acquire weapons.

Now, how can we do this? Many States have already led the way. My home State of Colorado has long had a rule that has closed the gun show loophole and made sure that people that buy guns at gun shows have the same type of background check they would at a gun dealer. I think that's a commonsense rule that we should do nationally.

I also think we need a national way to make sure that when somebody buys a gun, that there's a background check. In doing so, we need to make sure that there's no national registry of gun owners. We need to protect gun owners' privacy. We want to make sure it doesn't inconvenience law-abiding Americans who want to be able to buy guns at dealers—and have done so and will continue to do so. But this is easy to accomplish. The Senate discussed such a bill. I understand there are several proposals, as well, in this body. And I have seen data. This has broad support from the American people, and it should be a commonsense idea for many of us.

There are people in this country who have lost the right to bear arms because they've committed a crime—armed robbery or rape—and as part of a judicial sentence they have lost that right. They may have lost the right to vote as well. Now, you're not going to stop them from getting a knife or a gun—no law will stop them from doing that—but we should make it harder. We should make it so they can't just go to a gun show and buy a gun for cash. There should be a background check to make sure that the person buying the gun is a law-abiding American and has the right to do that. I think law-abiding Americans want to protect their Second Amendment rights and want to make sure that it's not abused by criminals. I think that's a common step measure that I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to take up and pass to help reduce violence in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to talk about the urgent need to improve our schools. Across our country we have schools that many parents would be proud to send their kids to. We also have schools that continue to fail year after year, that anybody who has the means to have choice—meaning, they're able to afford to be able to drive their kids somewhere else or pay a private school tuition—would never send their kids to that school. Thus, families that are essentially forced to have their kids go to that school have no choice, have no alternative. It's incumbent upon our school districts, our States, and, yes, our Federal Government because we, too, fund part of public education through IDEA, special education, to ensure that those schools don't continue to operate the way that they have been.

That's why I introduced last session and will introduce again a school turnaround bill. This bill will help address the lowest 5 percent of schools, the bottom performing 5 percent. We're talking about high schools that are dropout factories, where half the kids that go in the front door in 9th grade don't graduate in 12th grade. We're losing half of them. And what options do you have in life to support yourself and your family if you don't have a high school degree? It's hard, and it's getting harder in the 21st century information economy, Mr. Speaker.

We need to turn around these schools, make the tough choices, empower the superintendents of those school districts to use the creativity that they have to turn those schools around. And we need to make sure that they take action. As I told one of our local superintendents in Colorado, our goal, through public policy at the Federal level, should be to give you, the superintendent, the flexibility for you to be able to do what works but not the flexibility to do nothing, because we know that in doing nothing we will fail to change models that fail.

And whether the model that works is turning it into a charter school or extending the learning day or closing it down and opening three new schools in the same building, there's a lot of options, and many more, that a superintendent can choose from and apply, depending on the community needs and the buy-in from parents and families, which are important to make any education reform work. But it's critical that they take action, because without taking action, they're guaranteed more of the same.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support comprehensive immigration reform today. In my time on the floor in the last hour—and I could continue for even longer to articulate all of the reasons why comprehensive immigration reform benefits our country. Whether one cares about the safety of our communities from crime, whether one cares about the public health and infectious disease, restoring the rule of law, securing our borders, preventing terrorism, growing our economy, high-skills jobs, making sure that our farmers can thrive and grow, making sure that families stay together so that their American kids can grow up in wholesome family homes, for all these reasons and more, I call upon my colleagues to support comprehensive immigration reform.

I thank the Speaker for the time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

CORE AMERICAN BELIEFS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MULLIN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROKITA. I want to start out this evening by saying it's been a busy day here in the Capitol and it's been a busy week—some of it good, a lot of it not so

good. But it caused me to come to the floor tonight to talk with my colleagues, talk with the Speaker about some of the things that really are our core values, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans.

First of all, let me say that all of us—Republicans, Democrats, all Americans—believe in diversity, and we are here as a Congress in so many respects to celebrate that diversity. A great, free Republic like this is going to have divergent views, divergent opinions. We're going to have diversity in just about everything we do, everything we say, everything we are, and that's okay. We are open to all races, genders, and other classifications.

We're a family. We're one big national family. And like any other family, we're going to have our struggles, we're going to have our disagreements. But, Mr. Speaker, I'm here to remind us all tonight that that's okay. That's what it means to be in a free Republic. Because the alternative is much, much worse. You see, the alternative is not being able to have diversity at all, not being able to have an opinion different than the commanders at all, not being able to have free speech or free association.

Mr. Speaker, like any family, we face issues that make it difficult—especially seemingly these days—to find consensus. And like any family, we need to have open and honest dialogue, preferably without yelling or judging each other.

Just like any other family, the neighbors down the street, so to speak, are going to be judging us, be watching us. We don't have to worry so much about them, just to make sure that we continue having our discussion in a respectful way.

Like I said, although we have severe disagreements over some issues, there are core things that we all should be about, regardless of our diversity otherwise. I want to go through some of those tonight.

For example, we believe in the power of the individual, not the power of government over the individual. This isn't a Republican theme, although I am a Republican. This is a constitutional theme. This is what our Founders fought for and wrote for in those two great documents we call the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution.

We believe, as Americans, that people are capable of making their own decisions—for example, about health care—much better than government can. And, Mr. Speaker, we saw a great debate on that very point just a few hours ago on the very floor of this very House. It is because individuals, families, and people can make decisions for themselves, regardless of whatever it is, better than the government can that I oppose this Affordable Care Act, that we oppose ObamaCare.

We believe that freedom is more when government is less—this is called the power of individualism over collectivism—and it's key, it's key to what this country has been successful about for over 200 years. But perhaps it's better to illustrate what I'm talking about when you realize what happens when freedom is absent.

I want you to take a look at this view from space. This is the Korean Peninsula, and here is the dividing line between North and South Korea.

□ 1940

It is obviously taken at night. And what you are seeing is an actual representation of the lights in both countries, lights generated from electricity by power plants, lights that in South Korea show bustling commerce, show vitality, show economic freedom, show individual freedom.

But look to North Korea. Almost complete darkness. Only one group of lights right around here. The capital city of North Korea where all the elites live, more specifically where all the government officials live, and more specifically than that where all the government officials in a closed tyrannical society live.

Freedom is more when government is less, when government is limited. We believe that the best way to ensure that government remains limited is to stop feeding it so much. Around here, the government's food, what it lives on, what it grows on day by day is money; what it grows on is our tax dollars. More and more these days it is also growing on the taxes of individuals who don't even exist yet, Mr. Speaker—the children of tomorrow. Yes, they are being taxed here today. It is called our nearly $17 trillion worth of debt. And it is also represented by the $100 trillion of debt that is on its way. I would like to get to that in a minute.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that money is the fruit of our labor. We believe that money is our property, the same way this suit is my property, the same way that the land and the homes that some of us may own are our property, the same way that a bicycle that we ride might be our property, so is our money. We believe that when government taxes us, they confiscate our property, and that that property is the fruit of our labor.

We can't forget that. I remember recently being in my district, and specifically in the city of Lafayette, a great place, and West Lafayette, home of Purdue University. And I was struck at a Rotary Club meeting when I used the term ''confiscation'' to describe what government does with our property in the form of taxation and got a good degree of pushback—very annoyed with me that I would use such a word to describe what government does—confiscation of our property—when clearly the government needs our money in order to function.

And that's true. Government absolutely has a valid role in a free society, as long as it remains in a limited form. And more and more, Mr. Speaker, what I see being debated here on this House floor, and when I see us enact in terms of laws some new laws, some laws that have been on the books for years, is government being involved in things that the Constitution and the people and the free society do not require, in fact, should not have the government be doing.

We believe that individuals, families, communities are always better at making decisions for ourselves than government is. Today, some believe that just having more power over your life, if they could have that kind of control, it would be that much better.

For example, they believe they have the right to tell you what kind of light bulbs to buy, they believe that you should only be able to buy cars with certain gas mileage standards, they believe that they have a right to dictate what goes inside your child's lunchbox before they go to school, and at school they believe they have the right to make sure your child learns certain things, but also to make certain that they don't learn other things. They believe that they can make better health care decisions for you than you can. They believe through the EPA that they can tell you how much electricity to use. And under the guise of making things cleaner, they are simply controlling your life.

That is not America; that is not Americans. We believe the opposite. The Founders knew exactly that the opposite was true—that decisions are best made by individuals and communities at the local level.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, we believe that government is the servant of the people and that people aren't the servants of government.

Right now, we in the House are fighting to hold the executive branch accountable for a possible cover-up in Benghazi. This is not only about lives being lost, but about trust being breached. The Obama administration lied about the cause—Islamic terrorism—then they tried to cover their tracks. And now they claim that those of us who are demanding the truth are the ones who are politicizing the situation.

The executive branch owes the people the truth. It is basic accountability. They are our servants; we are not theirs.

We also believe in the right of a free press. Unfortunately, right now we have a Department of Justice that tries to spy on and intimidate members of the press. We found out in recent days that through subpoenas, which is a government action, individual reporters' names, their cell phones, and their phone records have been compromised, have been taken by the Federal Government.

It is my opinion that this administration is simply afraid of being held accountable, whether it is by a free press or by this Congress. Now, the Founders knew that both the free press and Congress with oversight are necessary to prevent tyranny. That is why

our job is so important today. That is why Americans are expecting and counting on us to take the Benghazi investigation, to take the AP, as it is called, the Associated Press, investigation as far as it goes until we find out what the truth is.

Perhaps a fundamental right is the one of free speech. It is the one that is absolutely necessary in a free society. It is the one that is core and fundamental in our Bill of Rights.

But, today, Mr. Speaker, we have an IRS that is targeting groups of private citizens simply because of their political beliefs, violating their right of free speech and violating their right of free association. This is nothing more than an abuse of power. It violates the Constitution's guarantee of equal protection under the law and should frighten each one of us, regardless of political party.

I guarantee you this, Mr. Speaker, this American, along with many others in this Congress, is going to go as far as we need to go with this investigation in order to find the full truth. The government must remain a servant of the people and not the other way around.

Mr. Speaker, we believe in giving a hand up, not necessarily a handout, because we believe that hand up is what made America strong, while a handout is what basically caused other nations in history to fail, resulting ultimately in tyranny.

A government can't be all things to all people; it can't do everything for everybody. It has been tried before. This is not a new idea, Mr. Speaker. But every time it has been tried in our history, it has resulted in terrible tyranny or ultimate failure altogether.

Let me give you an example, Mr. Speaker. Approximately 48 million Americans are on food stamps, more than at any other point in our history. Now, I know we have been going through some tough times, but that is not because too few people are getting food stamps.

The government is handing out free cell phones; but welfare programs are supposed to be for the poorest of the poor, for those who need that hand up. We shouldn't be giving handouts.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we are. Just look at the facts. Under the Census Bureau's definition of ''poor,'' 80 percent of poor households have air-conditioning. In 1970, only 36 percent of the entire U.S. population enjoyed air-conditioning. Ninety-two percent of poor households have a microwave. Nearly three-fourths have a car or truck, and 31 percent have two or more cars or trucks.

□ 1950

Nearly two-thirds have cable or satellite TV. Two-thirds have at least one DVD player, and 70 percent have a VCR. These are all poor households. These are mostly households that would qualify also for food stamps and for other welfare programs. Half of them have a personal computer, and one in seven have two or more computers. Forty-three percent have Internet access. One-third has a wide-screen plasma or LCD TV.

Now, we are a giving Nation. We want to help out. Our volunteerism and our charity work are second to none in this entire world. It is actually part of our American exceptionalism. It is what makes us unique and different from any other place on this Earth. I'd like to know the American who thinks that given everything I've just listed that that fits his definition of ''poor'' and that that's whom we should be helping and not others who really, really need, again, that temporary hand up and not the permanent handout.

We believe in the freedom of individuals to make their own choices and also in the responsibility to live with the choices that they make. Perhaps more than anything else I've said here tonight, we are losing sight of that in this Congress, in this Federal Government.

The free enterprise system is a beautiful system. It's a wonderful system that rewards risks and rewards those who do useful work. Is it a perfect system? Absolutely not. Is it the best system ever devised by man to raise the condition of all men? Absolutely. Nothing in history has ever compared to it, and no experimentation that we are going to do now—mind you, they're not new experiments; these experiments have been tried—is going to make it any better. The free enterprise system absolutely works.

We believe that each generation should leave the next generation better off to enjoy life, to enjoy liberty, to enjoy the pursuit of happiness. Unfortunately, everyone knows on the floor of this House and elsewhere, day by day, that we are not leaving the next generation better off, that we are going to be the first generation in the history of this great Nation—based on the facts, based on our budget, based on our debt, based on our standard of living—that will not leave the next generation better off if we don't start living within our means again and if we don't stop printing and borrowing the money that we are to fund this beast called the Federal Government.

The Book of Proverbs commends hard work and enjoying the fruits of one's labor. With the money we earn, we provide for our families, and we can bless other people who are in need. Proverbs says: ''A good man leaves an inheritance to his children's children.'' I can't think of a higher source to make the point. We are breaking the promise to the next generation.

The good news is that, again, these are our core values. They're not Republican core values necessarily, and they're not Democrat ones. They are American ones. You might find things that sound like them in the Democratic Party platform. I know we practice them in the Republican Party platform, but, again, they're not ours—they're America's.

Everything I've said here tonight is defined explicitly in the Constitution—that great founding document that is, in my opinion, the core of our American exceptionalism. Now, when I say ''American exceptionalism,'' it's not that I'm thinking about it as our President has thought about it. I don't mean to say that we are a country that judges others. I don't even mean to say that we are a country that thinks categorically we're better than everyone else. Like I said at the outset, we have our own struggles in this family, this national family, but the fact of the matter is we are different, and it's this document—this Constitution—that, in large part, sets off that difference. Here is why:

The Constitution and the core values it contains—the things that I've just recited—all represent the best ideas for self-governance that the world has ever known. Never before in world history have those ideas ever come together at the same time and in the same place except for in the United States Constitution. That's unique. That makes us exceptional.

Now, the President when asked about this said, Oh, yes, America is exceptional. We believe we are exceptional just like the Brits think they're exceptional and just like the Germans might think they're exceptional—entirely missing the point and lacking the understanding of the founding of this country.

I bring that up today, Mr. Speaker, to get the word out, to make a record in this House of Representatives, that that's not at all what this country was about. Again, it doesn't mean we're judging. It doesn't mean we think we are better. We are different, we are unique, and we are the best experiment in self-governance the world has ever known. The only thing that can mess that up, that can destroy that exceptionalism, is us. That's what brings me to the floor at 8 o'clock on a Thursday night. It's important stuff.

In my time remaining, I'd like to focus on this debt that I've mentioned a few times now. Of all the issues that we face, of all the issues that we can properly and rightfully alleviate as a Federal Government, as a Congress, it's this spending. That is one of our chartered things, one of our enumerated powers, to set a budget of this Federal Government's size and its spending levels—and we have failed.

As I talk with you tonight, we are nearly $17 trillion in debt, but that's not even the half of it. The worst part, Mr. Speaker, is this red section—this $100 trillion that's on the way in the next 25 or so years. Do you see how vertical that line goes? The real fear is that, if we don't get our spending under control now, we might never be able to catch it. The fact of the matter is that the drivers of our debt—the social entitlement program of Medicaid, the health care program of Medicare, Social Security, the net interest we owe ourselves and other countries—mean

that it's growing so fast we may never be able to catch it. That's a huge problem.

Now, the slides I'm showing the House tonight are not TODD ROKITA slides. They are the House Budget Committee slides. The Democrats on the House Budget Committee don't disagree with the data. There certainly is disagreement about how to fix the problem, but more and more every day, more astonishingly, I find out that many believe there is not a problem with that graph I just showed you. Here is what the Federal Government is spending its money on. I pulled out two pieces of the pie to show that that's what we vote on in terms of our budget: non-defense discretionary and defense discretionary.

We call this funding ''discretionary'' because we can dial it up or we can dial it down depending on our wishes and our votes here in this Congress and if the Senate agrees or doesn't. Then the President chimes in, albeit late—certainly not on time—with his budget, but it all focuses on not more than about 40 percent of our total Federal spending. The rest of it is all on autopilot. We don't get to dial it up or dial it down. I don't get to decide what the retirees in this country will get in terms of a Social Security check. I don't get to decide what services they're going to get or what fees their health care providers are going to pay for those services through Medicare. That's all decided in the underlying, substantive bills we've passed regarding those programs.

Unless we amend those programs, unless we amend that law, we will never get to what's driving most of our debt, representing about two-thirds of our Federal spending. Again, Social Security: $768 billion per year; Medicare: $466 billion per year; Medicaid: $251 billion per year; the interest we owe ourselves and other countries for this debt: $223 billion per year; other mandatory spending that I can't dial up or dial down nor can you, Mr. Speaker: $547 billion per year—all on autopilot. Until we get to this, we will never get to reducing or to even stabilizing our debt. That's the problem.

□ 2000

Some people have asked about military spending. Some people have asked about cutting it more, even though we've had drastic cuts already. Some people have asked about foreign aid spending. Some people have asked about earmark spending and wouldn't that solve the problem.

I believe that all that should be looked at, including the military. This is a Republican saying that. I believe there is tremendous waste, fraud, and abuse in our military system. I think it's immoral to have that waste, fraud, and abuse and not get every possible dollar we can to the troops.

But having said that, even if we had no military, it would only solve 20 percent of our Federal spending; and, of course, one of our first constitutional duties is to provide for the common defense. A military is necessary. It needs to be run a lot better. And there's a lack of leadership right now amongst our military ranks. It's not leading when you come here to the Congress asking for more money for your pet projects and not doing what you can to eliminate the waste, fraud, and abuse in the military.

I know there's waste, fraud, and abuse in the military because they can't even be audited. It's not because there's a statute, Mr. Speaker, against them being audited. It's because they can't even bring themselves to an audit table to be audited. They're so big and they're so sloppy; they don't know what they spend their money on most of the time. That is wrong. That's wrong for our troops.

Regarding the social entitlement programs, regarding our health care programs, many folks come to me and say, Wait a minute, I paid into those programs. I've been paying into those programs through my paycheck all my life. Don't you dare call them ''social entitlement programs.'' You know what? They're right. We do pay into these programs—most of us—through our working lives.

Here's another truth, and here's a more specific truth, Mr. Speaker. Look at this graph. On average, a couple who made $71,000 or so per year through their working lives—this is about Medicare—will have paid in about 35 percent of what they're actually taking out of Medicare. And that 65 percent difference, Mr. Speaker, that comes out of our kids. That comes out of the grandchildren that don't exist yet. That's part of our national debt. That's part of the $17 trillion and the $100 trillion that's coming. That's what's wrong.

We are taxing the children of tomorrow who don't have any voice in this, except for mine, yours, and others who decide to stand for them. They don't have any voice in this. We're taxing them so, frankly, we can have more on our plate now. That's what's got to stop. It's got to stop with the debt ceiling that's going to come up probably for a vote this fall.

Which way will we go, Mr. Speaker? What will we do to ensure that the children of tomorrow don't have to pay for the bills of today? It will take courage. Frankly, it will take, Mr. Speaker, more than this Congress. We can't wait for Washington to do this alone. We need the help of the people; and that's why I take to the floor tonight ultimately, Mr. Speaker, to get the word out.

I know that this American family, once they know the facts, once they know the truth, they will speak that truth to power. They will demand change; they will demand to live within their means again because that's what every American generation has done before, wanting the next one to be better off. That's what Americans today want too.

I tell this to you, Mr. Speaker, and all the Members of this House, that when there's a direct conflict between the people in the here and now and the people of tomorrow—those without a voice, those who don't exist yet—that's why they don't have the voice—when there's that direct conflict in terms of a vote on an issue, on a bill, at every turn we ought to be thinking about the kids. We ought to be thinking about the grandchildren; we ought to be thinking about those who don't yet exist. And we ought to vote for them, even if it means voting against us in the here and now.

And the debt ceiling is an opportunity to do that, because if and when we raise this debt ceiling, the amount we raise it by will simply be another tax on top of a debt that we've already given them.

What are we going to get for that? If they have to pay that tax, how can we ensure through reform that these programs and other items, that by the time they become an age of majority, that they won't have to pay that kind of debt load? That's the question before us.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time. I thank this House for the time. I thank the staff for their work, and I look forward to talking with this House again about these issues throughout the summer.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and for the balance of the week on account of a minor surgery due to unforeseen medical reasons.

Mrs. WAGNER (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and for the balance of the week on account of her son, Stephen Wagner's graduation from Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 17, 2013, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1505. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter regarding the Department's support of the National Boy Scout Jamboree; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1506. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Native

American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act Regulation [NPS-WASO-NAGPRA-11600; PPWOCRADN0-PCU00RP14.550000] (RIN: 1024-AD99) received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1507. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Recreational Closure Authority Specific to Federal Waters Off Individual States for the Recreational Red Snapper Component of the Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Fishery [Docket No.: 130213132-3132-01] (RIN: 0648-BD00) received May 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1508. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Taking of Marine Mammals Incidental to Commercial Fishing Operations; False Killer Whale Take Reduction Plan [Docket No.: 110131070-2626-02] (RIN: 0648-BA30) received May 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1509. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Griffin, GA [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1219; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASO-43] received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1510. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; West Palm Beach, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0922; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASO-38] received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1511. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Immokalee, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1051; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASO-39] received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1512. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0288; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-214-AD; Amendment 39-17435; AD 2013-08-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1513. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0936; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-269-AD; Amendment 39-17433; AD 2013-08-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1514. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1073; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-078-AD; Amendment 39-17430; AD 2013-08-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1515. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0937; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-270-AD; Amendment 39-17432; AD 2013-08-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1516. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1303; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-049-AD; Amendment 39-17434; AD 2013-08-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1517. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0631; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-021-AD; Amendment 39-17282; AD 2012-25-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1518. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0951; Directorate Identifier 2007-SW-52-AD; Amendment 39-17437; AD 2013-08-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. LONG, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. JONES, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. YODER, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. HALL, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DAINES, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. PERRY, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 2009. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. STUTZMAN):

H.R. 2010. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to apply to Delegates and Resident Commissioners to the Congress, and to employees of committees and leadership offices of Congress, the requirement of such Act that the only health plans that the Federal Government may make available to Members of Congress and congressional staff are plans created or offered through an Exchange established under such Act; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DELANEY (for himself and Mr. RENACCI):

H.R. 2011. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a two-year extension of the Veterans' Advisory Committee on Education; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 2012. A bill to improve the integrity and safety of interstate horseracing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself and Mr. CHAFFETZ):

H.R. 2013. A bill to repeal the wage rate requirements commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. AMASH (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2014. A bill to repeal section 2703(c)(2)(C) of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORSFORD (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 2015. A bill to provide for certain land conveyances in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BENISHEK (for himself, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. HANNA, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 2016. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify various authorities relating to procedures for courts-martial under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. VARGAS):

H.R. 2017. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to improve the operations of the Election Assistance Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. TIBERI, and Mrs. BEATTY):

H.R. 2018. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to identify the persons who are eligible to request headstones or markers furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and or other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MESSER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. KLINE):

H.R. 2019. A bill to eliminate taxpayer financing of presidential campaigns and party conventions and reprogram savings to provide for a 10-year pediatric research initiative through the Common Fund administered by the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 2020. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require certain institutions of higher education to provide notice of tuition levels for students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia (for himself, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FLEMING, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 2021. A bill to amend section 1951 of title 18, United States Code (commonly known as the Hobbs Act), and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. HALL, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2022. A bill to prohibit the implementation or enforcement of any requirement of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act until certifications are made that taxpayer information is not and will not be used for targeting any individual or group that provides information to the Internal Revenue Service for political reasons or on the basis of political views, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2023. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a national strategic action plan to assist health professionals in preparing for and responding to the public health effects of climate change, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 2024. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to require disclosure of ownership and transfers of ownership of patents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 2025. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the termination of employment of IRS employees for discrimination against any taxpayer on basis of political affiliation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER (for herself, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BENISHEK, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. JONES, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington):

H.R. 2026. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to exempt certain silvicultural activities from national pollutant discharge elimination system permitting requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. YODER):

H.R. 2027. A bill to amend section 1877 of the Social Security Act to modify the requirements for hospitals to qualify for the rural provider and hospital exception to physician ownership or investment prohibition in order to take into account hospitals that were under construction or development at the time of imposing such requirements, hospital expansions, and hospitals in financial distress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BASS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 2028. A bill to prohibit discrimination in adoption or foster care placements based on the sexual orientation, gender identity, or marital status of any prospective adoptive or foster parent, or the sexual orientation or gender identity of the child involved; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 2029. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the Secretary of Labor, to establish a program to provide for workforce training and education, at community colleges, in sustainable energy; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. FARR, Ms. CHU, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. HAHN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 2030. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to prescribe rules prohibiting deceptive advertising of abortion services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2031. A bill to amend title IV of the Public Health Service Act to expand the clinical trial registry data bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 2032. A bill to prohibit certain transfers of radioactive metal by the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 2033. A bill to provide for medical neutrality and to establish accountability for violations of the principle of medical neutrality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MICHAUD (for himself, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 2034. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of Advanced Composites Development Centers; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, Armed Services, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 2035. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand personal saving and retirement savings coverage by enabling employees not covered by qualifying retirement plans to save for retirement through automatic IRA arrangements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2036. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to help alien children in the child welfare system apply for all available forms of immigration relief, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 2037. A bill to establish a demonstration grant program to recruit, train, deploy, and professionally support psychiatric physicians in Indian health programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. VARGAS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 2038. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to expand the eligibility of certain veterans while they have disability claims pending under title 38 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. COLE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 2039. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish headstones and markers for certain deceased veterans buried in veterans' cemeteries of Indian tribes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2040. A bill to simplify the process for determining the need and eligibility of students for financial assistance under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. PITTS, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H. Res. 218. A resolution calling on the Secretary of State to list the Socialist Republic of Vietnam as a ''Country of Particular Concern'' with respect to religious freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

26. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 4 urging the Congress to maintain operation of the 179th Airlift Wing at Mansfield-Lahm Regional Airport; to the Committee on Armed Services.

27. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of North Dakota, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 4017 expressing opposition to the current form of the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

28. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, relative to Senate Resolution No. 18-09 asking the Governor to appoint a special representative for the purpose of commencing discussions on issues and matters that are currently affecting the relationship between the United States and the Northern Mariana Islands; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

29. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial No. 1 requesting that the Congress overturn the Department of Veterans Affairs regulation prohibiting the provision of service or therapy dogs for veterans with emotional and mental disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

30. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 3 encouraging the Congress and the President that the congressional intent of the federal Uniform Controlled Substances Act is not to prohibit the production of industrial hemp; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 2009.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Consistent with the original understanding of the commerce clause, the authority to enact this legislation is found in Clause 3 of Section 8, Article I of the Constitution. The bill stops the IRS implementation of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, which exceeds the authority vested in Congress by the Constitution. Finally, the bill removes government intrusion into the doctor-patient relationship, which is protected by the Nine and Tenth Amendments to the Constitution.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 2010.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3, which provides Congress the power to ''regulate commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States.''

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 2011.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to law and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States, but All Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throught the United States . . .

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2012.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I. Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 2013.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Because this legislation adjusts the formula the federal government uses to spend money on federal contracts, it is authorized by the Constitution under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, which grants Congress its spending power.

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 2014.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill helps guarantee the rights secured by the First Amendment to the Constitution (''Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press'') and the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution (''The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated'').

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 2015.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause, 18.

Article IV, Section 3, Clause, 2.

Amendment V

By Mr. BENISHEK:

H.R. 2016.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2017.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 4 and Section 5 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 2018.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 2019.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2020.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 (relating to the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.)

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 2021.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 2022.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution as well as Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution which grants Congress the authority to lay and collect taxes and duties. It is the inherent duty of elected members of Congress to protect U.S. taxpayer information from misuse.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 2023.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 2024.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section 8(8) of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 2025.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The 16th Amendment, Section 5; Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:

H.R. 2026.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2027.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United Stat,es Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).''

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 2028.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 2029.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2030.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 2031.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 2032.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 3

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 2033.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8—To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 2034.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 2035.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Afticle I and the 16th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 2036.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 2037.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 2038.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce among the states, and provide for the general welfare.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 2039.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Amendment XVI, of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2040.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all ther Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in an Department or Officer thereof..

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 7: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 12: Mr. KILMER and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 45: Mr. POMPEO and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 164: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 184: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 241: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 301: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 322: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 354: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 358: Mr. CLAY, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H.R. 367: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 375: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 419: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 433: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 436: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. RADEL, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. JONES, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 451: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 485: Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 494: Mr. MCKEON, Mr. KLINE, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 508: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 526: Ms. TSONGAS and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 580: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 630: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 640: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 647: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 655: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 664: Mr. ENYART, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MENG, and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 671: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 685: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 693: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 708: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 712: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 724: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 728: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 732: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 736: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 769: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 792: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 798: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 811: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 846: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 850: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 888: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 904: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 920: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 940: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 946: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 949: Mr. VEASEY and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 955: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 963: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 979: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. BARROW of Georgia.

H.R. 983: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 996: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1000: Mr. FARR and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1009: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1014: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 1020: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 1024: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 1029: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1122: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1128: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 1129: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1151: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 1153: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1155: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1205: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1209: Mr. BARBER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. COLE, and Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 1214: Mr. JONES, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 1250: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. NUNES, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1252: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. McGovera, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. CHU, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1303: Mr. WELCH, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1313: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 1322: Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 1339: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1344: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 1346: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1390: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1403: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1416: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1440: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1441: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1449: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 1451: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1461: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 1462: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 1485: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 1494: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1496: Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1509: Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 1518: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1523: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1528: Mr. RADEL.

H.R. 1529: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1554: Mr. FATTAH and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 1555: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1556: Ms. CHU, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. BASS, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1565: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. COSTA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. RICHMOND, and Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 1573: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1588: Ms. TITUS and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1594: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 1595: Mr. POCAN, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1598: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1632: Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 1652: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1678: Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1692: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1706: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1708: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1714: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1726: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 1731: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. NADLER, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HOLT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. POLIS, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. BASS, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1738: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ENYART, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1742: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1751: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1755: Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 1761: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1768: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 1771: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1780: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1787: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 1797: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 1799: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 1809: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 1825: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
H.R. 1830: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. YODER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. HAHN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. RIBBLE, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 1838: Mr. CONYERS and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1845: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1847: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 1848: Mr. RADEL, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1851: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 1854: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 1855: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1856: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 1864: Ms. FOXX, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 1867: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 1874: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1882: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. ELLMERS, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 1892: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1900: Mr. RADEL.
H.R. 1902: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1904: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. OLSON, Mr. COLE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. PETERS of California, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1911: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 1918: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1933: Mr. RUSH and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 1940: Mr. WAXMAN and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1941: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 1946: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 1950: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 1961: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 1963: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 1971: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. ENYART, Mr. JONES, and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 1972: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 1976: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 1979: Ms. WATERS and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1992: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. RADEL, and Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 1995: Mr. RADEL.
H.R. 2005: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 2008: Mr. JONES.
H. Con. Res. 27: Ms. KAPTUR and Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. BERA of California and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H. Con. Res. 34: Ms. TITUS.
H. Res. 24: Mr. WITTMAN.
H. Res. 36: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H. Res. 104: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. ENYART.
H. Res. 109: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H. Res. 131: Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. WOLF.
H. Res. 167: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H. Res. 190: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. VEASEY.
H. Res. 214: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 107: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 1550: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H. Res. 36: Mr. MICA.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

17. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Miami Beach, Florida, relative to Resolution 2013-28195 urging the Congress to support National Immigration Reform; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.