

from the House for family medical reasons. Due to my absence, I did not record any votes for the day.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall 373, rollcall 374, and rollcall 375.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) to inquire of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 2042, the Ratepayer Protection Act, sponsored by Representative ED WHITFIELD. This bill is essential for families all across the Nation. If we do not act, the electricity bills could skyrocket as a result of EPA's clean power plan rule.

The House will also continue the annual appropriations process with consideration of fiscal year 2016 Interior appropriation bill sponsored by Representative KEN CALVERT.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information.

I note that the Export-Import Bank, which, of course, expires on June 30, is not among the scheduled pieces of legislation.

As the gentleman knows, Speaker BOEHNER has been quoted as saying that, if we don't pass the Export-Import Bank, that there are thousands of jobs on the line that would disappear pretty quickly if the Ex-Im Bank were to disappear. He then again said, as the Chamber closest to the people, "The House works best when it is allowed to work its will."

The majority leader knows that I am absolutely convinced that the Export-Import Bank is supported by a majority of Members of this House, but this House has not been allowed to work its will on the Export-Import Bank.

Predecessors of yours and a very dear friend of mine, Senator BLUNT, said not too long ago that he believed that, if a bill were brought to the floor of the House, it would have the votes. More importantly, because he is now, of course, in the other body but is among

the leadership in the other body, he said that the bill had the votes in the Senate. I believe he is right on both of those observations.

I understand the majority leader is not for the bill. It is my understanding that the Speaker is. I would hope that those of us who support it and, frankly, those who oppose it would have the opportunity, as the Speaker indicated, for the House to work its will.

Can the gentleman tell me whether there are any plans prior to June 30, when the Export-Import Bank authorization to give loans expires, are there any plans to bring that legislation before this House in a timely fashion so that the authorization would not expire?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman did say he knows my stance on this issue; and, no, there is no action scheduled before the House.

Mr. HOYER. I apologize. Could the gentleman repeat himself?

Mr. MCCARTHY. There is no action scheduled for this House, no.

Mr. HOYER. Does the majority leader intend to, therefore, have the authority of the Export-Import Bank expire, notwithstanding the Speaker's observation and that it will cost thousands of jobs?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Again, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There is no action scheduled at this appropriate time.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for repeating his answer. I heard that answer, but my question to the gentleman was: Is it his intention that the Export-Import Bank expire and, therefore, not bring legislation to the floor?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding for the third time with the same question.

There is no pending action before this House for next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for repeating for a third time his answer to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply observe, sadly, that the representation the House can work its will on an issue of great importance to the United States and to jobs in the United States will not be brought to this floor, notwithstanding the fact that 180 Democrats have signed a discharge petition and 60 Republicans filed a bill to extend the Export-Import Bank.

That is 240 votes, Mr. Speaker, as the Speaker well can add himself. Two hundred and forty votes is a majority of this House. They reflect in my view, Mr. Speaker, the will of this House.

It is extraordinarily regrettable that, when the Speaker of the House says that, if we don't do something, thousands of American jobs are going to be lost—it is particularly regrettable, just after we had a vote on a bill that many people believe is going to lose us jobs and, therefore, they opposed.

How sad it is that we don't bring to the floor a bill which will, like 85 other

countries—85 other countries—help us export goods? Those 85 countries, Mr. Speaker, are not going to stop helping their countries export goods, so the loss will be to our exporters and those they employ.

I very much regret that that won't be brought to the floor. As the majority has told me, it is not scheduled; I know it is not scheduled. I lament the fact that it is not scheduled.

Representative CHRIS COLLINS of New York said: I can't figure out for the life of me why my party, the Republican Party, that stands for jobs, and in every conference meeting, it is jobs and the economy.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee is on the floor; he talks about jobs and the economy.

Here I am, says CHRIS COLLINS, in the majority of my own Conference, fighting to defend the Export-Import Bank, which is the best example of creating jobs in America.

I regret that that is not being brought to the floor. I won't ask the question again because he has already told me it is not scheduled, and apparently, there is no intent to schedule. I regret that.

Now, Mr. Leader, if I can ask you, we passed now six appropriations bills. Yesterday, the Labor, HHS bill was marked up in subcommittee and the Financial Services in full committee.

Can the gentleman tell me whether it is the intention, whether they are scheduled right now or not, to bring all 12 appropriations bills to the floor before—well, whenever—all 12 bills to the floor?

I yield to my friend.

□ 1245

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, this is the earliest we have ever started the appropriation process. The gentleman is correct that we are halfway through the 12 bills, having passed 6 already, and we are bringing up Interior next week. It is our intention to do the work that we are responsible for in finishing the appropriation process.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that.

Let me ask him further as he knows what is happening in the Senate and whether they can take those bills up: Does the gentleman contemplate, as the majority leader, or does he know whether the Speaker contemplates any effort to come to a bipartisan agreement as was done when Mr. RYAN and Senator MURRAY met and came to grips with a resolution and a compromise on what otherwise would be the sequester 302(a) allocations on discretionary spending, which the chair of the committee, as you know, Chairman ROGERS, has called ill-conceived and unrealistic?

Does the majority leader know whether there is any plan to try to get us from the gridlock, which we are apparently in one more time on the appropriations process, to a place as

Ryan-Murray got us where we moved ahead in a bipartisan way and, in fact, funded the government?

Although, it was not until December, and we had a stopgap measure in there. Is there anything scheduled to discuss that or to pursue that compromise?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, there is no gridlock here. We have passed half of the appropriation bills already. We have started the process earlier than ever before. As the gentleman knows, with just the bill before—very bipartisan—more than 46 Democrats joined us in repealing the medical device tax.

I would probably tell the gentleman that his question really goes to the minority leader on the Senate side, HARRY REID. In reading some of his statements, he wants to create a shutdown, which I think would be wrong for the American people.

I think the best way forward is for the Democrats and the Republicans in the Senate to take up DOD appropriations and move that to the President's desk.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend.

There is no Democrat in this House, in the Senate, or in the White House who wants to shut down this government. As a matter of fact, we have not done that. It was done in '95 and in early '96. It was done last year when many in your party said "shut it down" if the President doesn't change his immigration policy. Any suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that Democrats want to shut down the government is simply incorrect.

Now, what the minority leader has said in the Senate, I believe, is that, until such time as sequester is changed that it is not useful to waste time on bills that will not become law as we did, of course, many years during the Ryan budgets, which were never implemented, and they were never implemented in the House of Representatives fully—not once. Why? It is because, as Mr. ROGERS said, they were ill-conceived and unrealistic.

I just want to make it clear to the majority leader that I am prepared to work with him and with others to get us to a compromise on levels of funding that are realistic and well conceived by Mr. ROGERS, by Mr. COCHRAN, and by others.

Until we do that, we are going to be in a place where we are going to be, I predict, in late September, on the threshold of giving some fear that the government is going to shut down again, the greatest government on the face of the Earth. I am not sure what people around the world thought when we shut our government down for 16 days. It was not a confidence builder. That is for sure.

We have another item that we are losing confidence on, the highway bill. You didn't mention, Mr. Leader, anything about the highway bill being scheduled. I understand it does not ex-

pire until July 31, so we have about 6 weeks, maybe a little longer than that.

Does the gentleman know whether there is any compromise being achieved so that we can give confidence to States, counties, municipalities, contractors, the business community that they will have a funding stream to invest in building, repairing, and maintaining our infrastructure in this country?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I will answer your question, but, first, I just want to make sure I clarify as to your earlier question.

I am just reading here from Politico, as you have been able to read other statements. It says here that the Senate Democrats are prepared to shut down the government. Leader REID outlined Senate Democrats' obstructionist plan for the summer.

They have a title and a time for it, obstructionists for the summer, warning that, because of the Democrats' plan to block appropriations bills, we are heading for another shutdown.

Unfortunately, as I read in other articles of this same time period, I believe the incoming leader on the other side, too—Senator SCHUMER—said he was actually working with the administration on this. I do not think this is helpful.

For the history of why we are where we are, sequester was an idea from this administration. The President is the one who put that into the bill. We are writing appropriation bills to the law. That is what our rules are and what we are doing. We are getting our work done, and we are hopeful that this Democratic plan of obstructionists throughout the summer will not come true.

Now, you asked about the highway bill. This is a very good question and is one that I do want to work with you on because we were working together on this, Republicans and Democrats, from our committee.

Unfortunately, as the gentleman may know, a month or so ago, your side of the aisle said they had to stop working with us. Part of the reason we were given was that it fell into the obstructionist plan for the summer, that it wasn't just about appropriations, but that you wanted to somehow shut down transportation, which we do not want to do.

We want to get to a 5-year plan, and we were working with you on offsets to be able to pay for this throughout the rest of the year. Unfortunately, when the Democrats decided to stop this program, we had to just go to July.

We know we have some time left, and we are very committed to getting this done. We think it is important for America to keep them working, and we hope you will come back to the table and work with us because we will be more than willing to work with you.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his observation. I think that is my

reputation, that of wanting to work to constructively achieve joint objectives—in this case, the highway bill.

Mr. RYAN is on the floor, but I won't ask him to yield for a question as to whether or not the Ways and Means Committee has come up with a way to finance the highway bill.

I know he said that there is not going to be a gasoline tax, which, historically, Republican Presidents have been for. I am not suggesting this be it, but maybe tax reform, as my friend has said publicly for that.

I will repeat, Mr. Leader, there is no Democrat who wants to shut down the government. I hear what you said. I know the quote. What they have said is they are not going to shut it down indirectly as you want to do. Now, you have done it directly.

I do not mean you, personally, but the only two times that I have served in the Congress of the United States over the last 34 years when the government was shut down as a policy was in 1995 under Newt Gingrich and in the last Congress. Those were the only times, and I have been here 34 years.

Has it happened inadvertently for a couple of days? Yes, it has, because the legislation was not agreed to or we couldn't get it to the President in time or things of that nature.

Let me say something because, on your side of the aisle, you love to say this. You love to place sequestration at the feet of President Obama's. Now, my friend, the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, has not been here as long as I have, but sequestration originally started certainly in Gramm-Rudman—or it may have even started before then—with Phil Gramm, a Republican from Texas, and Mr. Rudman, a Republican from New Hampshire. That is when it started. Then we see all the time the across-the-board cuts—the 1 percent, the 2 percent, the 3 percent. Now, we have defeated them, but that is a part of sequestration.

More importantly, on 7/15/11, your side, in charge of the Congress, offered a bill that you called Cut, Cap, and Balance. Now, this was 5 days or 6 days before your allegation that Mr. Lew went to the majority leader then, Mr. REID, and said maybe sequestration will help get this bill through.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, we were confronting the failure to reauthorize the payment of America's bills, the debt limit. That was what we were facing. What Mr. Lew was suggesting was that the Republicans liked sequestration, so maybe if we put that in the bill, even though we don't like it, they will vote for not defaulting on the national debt.

In fact, that is what happened; but if you look at your Cut, Cap, and Balance bill—your bill I voted against—the fallback that you suggested was sequestration. That was about a week before Mr. Lew said to Mr. REID that maybe that will get our Republican friends to support paying the national debt.

That passed, by the way, on the July 19, 2011. It was 6 days later that Mr.

Lew, in trying to get something done to make sure that America did not default, suggested to Mr. REID maybe putting that in the bill will get the Republicans' votes so that we will pay our debts.

The problem is, if you know the facts, you get a little frustrated with hearing this representation, the President was for sequester. Let's just, for the sake of argument, say that nobody here was for sequester. Then let's get rid of sequester. If you are for sequester, I get it. You don't want to change it.

There are a lot of your Members who certainly don't want to change it. I tell people all over this country when I talk to them that sequester is a complicated word. It starts with an S. It stands for "stupid." It is a policy unrelated to opportunities, to challenges, and to needs. It was a number pulled out of the air.

I would hope, Mr. Leader, that we don't talk about "you did it" and "you did it." Let's talk about how we solve the problems confronting our country. Ex-Im is one of them. Appropriations bills that we can agree on is another and highway bill funding to give confidence to our economy and to our entities that have to keep people moving and commerce moving.

Let's give them confidence. Let's sit down. Let's get these done. Let's bring it to the floor. As Speaker BOEHNER said, let this House work its will.

The gentleman referred to the 46 Democrats who voted with him and his party on the most recent bill, which was a tax reduction and which is, as are all of the tax reductions that you have brought to the floor, unpaid for.

Very frankly, as the father of three daughters, as the grandfather of three grandchildren, and as the great-grandfather of three great-grandchildren, I don't like the fact that the expectation is they will pay the bill. They don't vote, of course, so they can't vote for or against us.

My daughters can, notwithstanding the 46 people who voted for it on our side of the aisle because they are for the policy. I will tell you I have talked to a lot of them, and they are not for not paying for it, but they were put in the position of either being for something, therefore, or being against something because it is not paid for and is hurting future generations.

The only reason I mention that is the gentleman brought it up, and I will tell him that there is very broad, almost unanimous sentiment on our side that we ought to pay for things, and when that policy was in place, we balanced the budget for 4 years in a row.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. Hopefully, I can take from the gentleman's comments that he is willing to work with us on highways and on coming back to the table. I appreciate that.

We may disagree on whether the administration put it in the bill in se-

quester, but I think history will prove me right. I look forward to it just as we worked throughout this week and passed two bills today on a bipartisan level.

You may have disagreed with one, but 28 on your side of the aisle agreed with it, so did your President. We look forward to getting this work done for the American people. We work within the current law. That is what we look to do, and I look forward to continuing to work with you.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the gentleman's observations.

I would simply say, Mr. Speaker, that in that spirit, there are 240 people in this House who think the Ex-Im Bank ought to be extended and reauthorized. I hope we will follow that process. I would reiterate, yes, I am willing to work with the gentleman on highways or on anything else which will benefit the American people and our country.

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

□ 1300

—
 HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW; AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JUNE 19, 2015, TO TUESDAY, JUNE 23, 2015

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon tomorrow, and further when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, June 23, 2015, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PROTECTING SENIORS' ACCESS TO MEDICARE ACT OF 2015

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 319, I call up the bill (H.R. 1190) to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board, 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 319, the amendment printed in part B of House Report 114-157 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 1190

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF THE INDEPENDENT PAYMENT ADVISORY BOARD.

Effective as of the enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act

(Public Law 111-148), sections 3403 and 10320 of such Act (including the amendments made by such sections) are repealed, and any provision of law amended by such sections is hereby restored as if such sections had not been enacted into law.

SEC. 3. RESCINDING FUNDING AMOUNTS FOR PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND.

Section 4002(b) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 300u-11(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking "2017" and inserting "2016";

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by striking "2022" and inserting "2026"; and

(B) by redesignating such paragraph as paragraph (7); and

(3) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4) and inserting the following:

"(3) for fiscal year 2017, \$390,000,000;

"(4) for each of fiscal years 2018 and 2019, \$487,000,000;

"(5) for each of fiscal years 2020 and 2021, \$585,000,000;

"(6) for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2025, \$780,000,000; and"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chairs and ranking minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1190, Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

What we are bringing to the floor today is Dr. ROE's bill to repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board. This is a bill that came out of the Committee on Ways and Means with a bipartisan vote. This is an agency that Members on both sides of the aisle believe does not have the right to exist, should not exist, and does not follow our democratic process.

Let me explain why we are doing this. There is no greater example of the conflict of visions than this. ObamaCare created something called IPAB, the Independent Payment Advisory Board. It is a board of 15 people who are not elected or appointed.

They have the power to cut Medicare's payments for treatment. They have a quota which they have to hit in order to find the same number to actually cut. Every year, a formula kicks in, and the 15 unelected bureaucrats