That judge's ruling indicated that when Republicans in Congress, as part of the GOP tax scam, repealed the individual mandate of the Affordable Care Act—that part of the law that required all to have proof of health insurance or pay a penalty—they in effect invalidated the whole law, rendering it unconstitutional.

This is absurd. First, it ignores the fact that the Affordable Care Act has twice been upheld by the Supreme Court.

Second, despite the fact that the Supreme Court has twice ruled on the ACA, it has never endorsed the perverse reasoning underlying this district court's ruling.

To be clear, in NFIB v. Sebellius, 567 U.S. 519 (2012), the Supreme Court held that the penalty for failing to buy health insurance was a constitutional exercise of the Congress's tax and spending power, not that it must be, or that the provision of the law at issue from the tax is otherwise unconstitutional in the absence of it.

It follows that a district court invalidating a law as unconstitutional based on this provision, without giving to the Congress the opportunity to fix the infirmity, smacks of the type of judicial activism which the American political right often laments, especially when the Supreme Court has twice ruled on the law's constitutionality.

The ruling was met by cheers and applause by the President and Congressional Republicans, whose singular policy mission over the last eight years has been to end the Affordable Care Act, and in the process take away the health care that millions of individuals receive through it.

Let me first state that the Affordable Care Act, which House Republicans derisively call Obamacare, is still the law of the land.

The ruling issued by a federal district court judge in the Northern District of Texas is wrong on the facts, the law, and will not stand.

Unfortunately, the present administration occupying the White House is a sworn opponent of the Affordable Care Act, and the provisions it contains, like protecting people with preexisting conditions and ensuring that young adults can stay on their parents' healthcare plans until Age 26.

That is why, with respect to Texas v. United States, Democrats offer H. Res. 6, which would: permit the Speaker, on behalf of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group, to intervene, otherwise appear, or take any other steps in any other cases involving the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, to protect the institutional interests of the House and to defend such act and the amendments made by such Act to other provisions of law, and any amendments to such provisions, including the provisions ensuring affordable health coverage for those with preexisting conditions.

The title directs the Office of General Counsel of the House of Representatives to represent the House in any such litigation and authorizes the Office of General Counsel to employ the services of outside counsel, including pro bono counsel, or other outside experts.

This is not an unprecedented action and in fact is contemplated by federal authority.

Rule 24 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure prescribe permissive intervention in a federal action by a government entity to vindicate a real interest.

The need to protect the healthcare interests of tens of millions of Americans—which was made possible, in part, by an act of this body, is a real interest as contemplated by Rule 24.

And this approach has bipartisan history.

As recently as 2011, when the Obama Administration refused to uphold the validity of the discriminatory Defense of Marriage Act, which I did not support, House Republicans invoked Title III to hire outside counsel in defense of an ultimately unconstitutional bill—the first time the Supreme Court had ever ruled on the law's validity.

In contrast, in this case, the Affordable Care Act has withstood many legal challenges by the Supreme Court and has emerged from them intact.

The need to intervene in this case is informed by the millions of Americans whose peace of mind about their healthcare security is in doubt, including the countless Texans in my home state.

I urge my colleagues to approve H. Res. 6, and authorize intervention in this case, to vindicate the healthcare interests of tens of millions.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, January 10, 2019 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JANUARY 15

9:30 a.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of William Pelham Barr, of Virginia, to be Attorney General, Department of Justice.
SH–216

JANUARY 16

9:30 a.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
To continue hearings to examine the nomination of William Pelham Barr, of Virginia, to be Attorney General, Department of Justice.
SH–216

10 a.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Organizational business meeting to consider committee rules for the 116th Congress.
SD–106

Committee on Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Andrew Wheeler, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.
SD–406

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development
To hold hearings to examine the future of nuclear power, focusing on advanced reactors.
SD–138