

yet, it is being imposed upon us today. This is our only opportunity to improve the bill, and as meager as this might be, this is important.

This motion is really simple. It just adds \$2 million to the Treasury Department's Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, which would match the House past levels that we passed last year of \$161 million.

This important office is fighting on the front lines to enforce economic sanctions against rogue nations like Iran, North Korea, and Russia. Mr. Speaker, you and I agree on how important that is, and they must have the resources necessary.

The Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act which created this office, passed this House in 2017 by a vote of 419 yeases to just 3 noes. So it was very bipartisan. That is about as good as it gets around here. And it passed the Senate 98–2—another great mark as well—and President Trump signed it into law. It is an amazing needle to thread all through there that we had great bipartisan support here in the House, the Senate, and the President signing this into law.

This is overwhelmingly bipartisan, Mr. Speaker, and it brings the full force of our Nation's sanctions against countries that seek to do us harm. This is something we should support.

It is so important that OMB Director Mick Mulvaney sent us a budget amendment requesting more funds to stand up this office. And that is not a request we often get from Mr. Mulvaney to increase spending anywhere. But, yet, he did that.

And you know the former Director himself, as he served here, he doesn't like to spend a penny more than needed, so this is certainly a very important priority.

The Treasury has also made a strong case that to comply with the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, the Department needs these funds. So as we debate about the importance of the moment and where we are in time, I could see nothing more important for us to focus on than to put an additional \$2 million into this program and offset it, as has been described in the amendment from the GSA's rental payments.

I hope every Member can support this commonsense improvement. We are just improving on the Senate bill. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a "yes" vote on the motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, responsibly funding the Federal Government is one of the most important duties of Congress. The previous majority failed to do the most basic task of keeping the lights on.

□ 1515

On day 19 of the 116th Congress, we Democrats are here to reopen Federal

agencies shuttered by the President's shutdown.

This legislation, which has already garnered strong bipartisan support in the Senate, will ensure that the Federal Government is open and working for the American people.

Now, as to perfection, it is not perfect. I have not been here for a perfect piece of legislation. What is critical to take from that argument, though, is the fact that any one of us can argue that there isn't some measure absolutely critical to them and they are not going to vote for it because of that.

Respectfully, someone has to be the adult in the room and get things done. Someone has to respect the process, the importance of what the government does, and the needs of the American people. You can't kick the ball in the forest preserve and go home. You have to move forward.

This is the way to operate, the manner in which the Senate has already done, a manner in which we can accomplish and move forward together to try to get this better, hopefully, next year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit because I think it is important we remember President Trump has always wanted a shutdown. He boasted a year and a half ago that what the government needs is a good government shutdown. There is no such thing, as we now know.

On December 11—not ancient history—he sat in the Oval Office, getting red in the face, shouting: "I will be the one to shut it down."

He then followed through on that promise by torpedoing a government funding agreement that passed the Senate with unanimous support.

Once again, Federal employees and Federal contracts were being held hostage by this President, all because of a broken campaign promise. He said Mexico was going to pay for his wall. Now he needs a bailout from the American taxpayer. Fortunately, the new Democratic majority in this House is going to stand up to this President and has offered a sensible plan to fund the government.

The bill that passed in the Senate is part of a four-bill package and, by a vote of 92–6, provides a 1.9 percent badly needed pay increase for all Federal employees and guarantees backpay to the Federal employees furloughed during this unnecessary Trump shutdown.

I support the underlying bill because we can and should end this Trump shutdown now.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I simply encourage my colleagues to vote "no," and 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.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ADOPTING THE RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE 116TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts). Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 5, proceedings will now resume on the resolution (H. Res. 6) adopting the Rules of the House of Representatives for the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When proceedings were postponed on Friday, January 4, 2019, the portion of the divided question comprising title II had been disposed of.

Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 5, the portion of the divided question comprising title III is now debatable for 1 hour.

The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the ability of the Speaker, on behalf of the House of Representatives, to intervene and defend the Affordable Care Act in the case of Texas v. United States.

This case is a backhanded way to do what Republicans could not do legislatively: repeal the ACA and take away comprehensive health insurance from millions of Americans.

Madam Speaker, I represent a district that has the highest number of people—more than 100,000—enrolled in the ACA. Whether you get your health insurance from your employer, from Medicare, from Medicaid, or from the marketplace, you have something to lose if this disastrous court case is upheld.

Not only will insurance companies again be able to deny coverage to people with preexisting conditions, young people will no longer be able to stay on their parents' insurance until they are 26. Preventive services like flu shots and annual checkups will not necessarily be covered without cost. Women may, once again, face buying insurance that doesn't cover maternity care.

Our bipartisan efforts to phase out the Medicare doughnut hole could

come to an end. Our seniors should not have to choose between paying exorbitant costs for prescription drugs and buying food or paying rent.

An overwhelming majority of Americans support all of these provisions.

Madam Speaker, with this rule, we simply want to stand in court and defend the valuable protections in the Affordable Care Act that this case threatens to take away.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to begin by welcoming my good friend from Florida, first, to the Rules Committee, congratulate her on her first rule on the floor, and, finally, thank her quite sincerely for the distinguished service she rendered to our country when she was a member of the Cabinet for former President Clinton. It is wonderful to have the gentlewoman in the people's House.

Madam Speaker, we are here again, this time on the third and final title of the rules package for the 116th Congress. Title III authorizes the House to intervene, otherwise appear, or take any other steps in the case *Texas v. United States*, the lawsuit currently pending over the legality of the Affordable Care Act. In essence, if this passes, the House will be giving Speaker PELOSI the authority to intervene in this lawsuit on behalf of the entire House of Representatives.

I spoke briefly about this matter during the debate of the overall rules package last week, and I am sure my opposition to title III comes as no surprise to my friends on the other side of the aisle. Today, we have several speakers on our side from the Ways and Means Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee, all of whom are deeply familiar with these issues and who will be able to tackle this in more detail. But for now, I will make a few key points.

First and foremost, it really isn't a surprise that the Democrats' poorly written healthcare law finds itself, once again, in legal trouble. The lawsuit this time arises from Texas where 20 States have filed suits on the grounds that, because there is no longer a tax penalty in place for failing to purchase health insurance under the individual mandate, and because there is no severability clause, the law itself is unconstitutional.

Last month, a district court judge in Texas agreed with the States and struck down the Affordable Care Act. That ruling has been stayed pending appeal.

This really should not have come as a surprise to the majority. At the time the Affordable Care Act was passed, many of us on the Republican side raised similar concerns. The act, as drafted, was too poorly written and too precariously balanced to stand up under its own weight.

The succeeding 9 years have caused those predictions to come to pass. Pre-

miums have skyrocketed; insurers have fled the market; and for many Americans, the care they thought they were accessing under the Affordable Care Act has become anything but affordable.

Before Republicans acted last Congress to repeal the tax penalty for the individual mandate, literally millions of taxpayers made the decision to pay that penalty instead of buying health insurance they could not afford.

No matter what the outcome of this lawsuit will be, House Republicans have over and over again expressed their support for protections for those with preexisting conditions. Should the Texas decision be upheld, Republicans stand ready to work with Democrats to build an insurance system that protects people with preexisting conditions, increases transparency and choice, and lowers costs across the country.

That is exactly what we tried to do in the last Congress with the American Health Care Act, which we in the House proposed and passed as a solution to the broken law that is the Affordable Care Act. While it fell short in the Senate, its passage in the House clearly shows Republicans were ready to take steps to fix this broken system.

Rather than taking those steps today, Democrats are asking us to grant Speaker PELOSI a blank check to intervene in this lawsuit. Rather than allowing the States to continue to pursue this litigation, as is their right under the Constitution, Democrats want this House to intervene. But the majority has not said why intervention is necessary and why the House of Representatives must jump into this litigation against some of the States. Other States have already made the decision to intervene in support of the Affordable Care Act, rendering intervention by this House unnecessary.

At best, this proposal is a political exercise intended to allow the majority to reiterate their position on the Affordable Care Act. At worst, it is an attempt to pressure the courts. Either way, there is no real justification for doing what the majority wishes to do today.

Madam Speaker, the best way for the majority to protect Americans and to protect access to healthcare is to pass a constitutionally sound law that is well considered, well structured, and that will result in lower premiums and better access to health insurance. It is not what they have proposed here, which is a wasteful expenditure of taxpayer dollars to defend the indefensible.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for his kind words at the beginning of his comments.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), who is the distin-

guished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. Shalala) for yielding me the time.

It is an honor to serve with her on the House Rules Committee. As the longest serving HHS Secretary in U.S. history, she spent much of her life leading on the issue of healthcare.

Madam Speaker, the American people have been living in fear for years, worried that Washington Republicans would make good on their promise to repeal the Affordable Care Act and that the President and his allies in Congress would take away their ability to see a doctor or afford care, including for pre-existing conditions from asthma to domestic abuse.

Who can blame them?

When the minority controlled this institution, they voted 69 times to undermine the Affordable Care Act. Sixty-nine times they tried to take away healthcare from more than 23 million Americans. Thankfully, the Senate thwarted these efforts, and Republicans weren't successful.

Now the Trump administration is using the legal system to try to do what the Republican Congress could not: strike down the Affordable Care Act. Its Justice Department has asked in a legal filing for the courts to invalidate this law and, in doing so, erase protections for preexisting conditions.

Now, I have heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle try to pretend that they are somehow champions of this provision, despite working relentlessly to abolish it and voting nearly 70 times to undermine the ACA.

Madam Speaker, who are they kidding?

This Democratic majority doesn't deal in alternative facts. The American people are smarter than that.

Thankfully, it is a new Congress, and this majority isn't trying to abolish preexisting condition coverage. Instead, we are moving swiftly to protect it on the opening days of this Congress.

□ 1530

This measure will allow this House to legally intervene to protect preexisting condition coverage in the Affordable Care Act. If you support coverage for preexisting conditions, then you will support this measure to try and protect it. It is that simple.

Enough with the sound bites. It is time to vote. I urge all my colleagues to vote for this measure.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a member of both the Rules Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee, who also happens to be perhaps the foremost expert on the ACA in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let's get one thing clear from the start: the majority should not be acting like they are doing something that

hasn't already been done. It is not something new. Nothing we do on title III of the rules package will change what the House has already voted on and how the court will receive it.

Title III of H. Res. 6 would authorize the Speaker of the House of Representatives to intervene or take any other legal actions in cases involving the Affordable Care Act, but in particular, the Texas v. United States case, where a court recently ruled that the Affordable Care Act was unconstitutional due to the elimination of the individual mandate.

If this all sounds familiar to you, it should. Last week, at the start of the 116th Congress, the House voted on title I of the rules package that included the same provisions giving the Speaker the same authority to intervene in the same case.

Actually, the Speaker has already filed three motions to intervene in the Texas case the same day the rule was passed last week. The fact is, nothing has changed between last week and today, and the Speaker does not need to be given this authority again.

But what are the facts?

The facts are that this bill, the Affordable Care Act, was sold to the American people on a misrepresentation. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. You may remember that. If you like your insurance, you can keep your insurance. Your premium is going to be down by \$2,500. And, of course, famously: We've got to pass the bill to find out what is in it.

As a practical matter, people are forced to buy insurance that they may not want; that they certainly cannot afford; and, in fact, that they are afraid to use because the deductible and the copay is so high.

So, again, I am not sure how the House is intervening in the judicial process to support a failing policy while millions of Americans are functionally uninsured. I don't understand how that helps us to deliver better access to care in north Texas and across the country.

Americans should see this for what it is: a facade of the Democrats who want to revive the individual mandate under the guise of protecting Americans with preexisting conditions. I think the House can be more effective in delivering on the promises of the American people. That should be the goal of this House. It is not the goal of the House today, unfortunately.

I urge my fellow Members to vote "no" on this bill.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for her distinguished service as the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and I thank her for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. Legal scholars

from across the ideological spectrum agree that this latest challenge to the Affordable Care Act is legally frivolous. However, because of the devastating impact that it will have on Americans, it is critical that we use our authority to intervene on their behalf.

If Republicans successfully dismantle the Affordable Care Act, the consequences will be felt by all Americans, including the millions of people with employer-sponsored coverage. They will lose protections for patients with preexisting conditions; they will lose prohibitions on annual and lifetime coverage limits; they will lose access to low- or no-cost preventive care; and they will lose the popular provision which allows young people to stay on their parents' insurance policies up to the age of 26.

These protections are all a product of the Affordable Care Act, and they are all at risk. We can't take the chance on this lawsuit being successful and then wait for a replacement, because we already know what the replacement will be. The House-passed replacement for the Affordable Care Act from a few years ago would have resulted in millions of fewer people with insurance and according to CBO, the costs would go up 20 percent the first year, insurance would cover less than it covers now; and those with preexisting conditions would lose their protections. That is what would happen if this lawsuit is successful.

This vote is about fulfilling our responsibility to act in the best interests of the American people. I encourage my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), my good friend, who is also the former chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee and current ranking member.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to title III of the Democrats' rules package which, as you have heard, paves the way for Speaker PELOSI to unilaterally take legal action on behalf of the entire House of Representatives in the ongoing court case surrounding the constitutionality of the Affordable Care Act and any future court cases on the ACA as she sees fit. That is a pretty big blank check.

Madam Speaker, first of all, I object to this vote on the grounds of pure common sense. The authority we are voting on today was already given to the Speaker last week under title I of the Democrats' rules package. You can look it up. It is right there, beginning on page 30. You will find it after the provisions that make it easier for House Democrats to increase taxes and to set up automatic debt limit increases. Not to mention, Speaker PELOSI has already filed three motions to the court to intervene in the case since last week's vote.

Moreover, Democratic Attorneys General from intervening States are al-

ready defending the law in the case, and the judge's ruling has already been stayed and appealed. So this is an unnecessary waste of time, paper, and ink.

I can only assume part of the reason for today's show vote is to distract from Democrats' real radical views on healthcare.

Madam Speaker, where is the single-payer, \$32 trillion government takeover of healthcare bill which ends employer- and union-sponsored healthcare and forces the 158 million Americans who get their healthcare through their job into a one-size-fits-all government-run plan?

A majority of House Democrats supported that proposal—or one very like it—in the last Congress. When will they keep their promise to bring that plan up for a vote?

Madam Speaker, today's vote to repeal the authorities given the Speaker last week is just for show. It is not a serious exercise in legislating. Meanwhile, last week, Republicans brought a powerful but simple amendment to the floor that would have actually called on this body to legislate on something we all could agree needs to be done, and that is to lock in protections for patients with preexisting conditions. But, unfortunately, in a fit of partisanship, Democrats voted that down.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to reject this unnecessary political theater today and vote "no" so we can work together expeditiously to guarantee preexisting condition protections for all Americans, and do so in a manner that can withstand judicial scrutiny.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, Trump and his apologists are so very good at breaking things. It is just fixing them they can't seem to find an answer to.

This underlying lawsuit is little more than a conspiracy between a criminally-indicted Texas Republican attorney general and the Trump administration that couldn't find its voice when it was time to defend protections for preexisting conditions for so many American families.

There is no doubt there is collusion. There is Republican collusion right here. It is collusion to strip away life-saving protection from so many Americans.

Intervening in this lawsuit is an important step in protecting families from the uncertainties of fine-print denials, excessive premiums, inadequate coverage, and just basic access to affordable healthcare.

We must intervene because of a preexisting condition—and it is a rather unusual one. It is called amnesia. These Republicans have political amnesia. They cannot remember before the Affordable Care Act how many families got a diagnosis of bankruptcy at the same time they got a diagnosis

of a severe disease or experienced an accident.

They had over 60 votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act, but they never could come up with a plan to present to this House to replace the Affordable Care Act because, for all of its shortcomings, it is the best answer right now to the needs of the American people.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), my good friend, the former chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and now its current ranking member.

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to title III of the Democratic rules package, which will allow House Democrats to file a motion in Texas v. United States defending the constitutionality of the ACA.

This lawsuit, which was filed by more than 20 State Attorneys General, is about individual liberty and whether the Federal Government can force individuals to purchase a product.

When the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the ACA 6 years ago, it did so under the logic that the individual mandate was a tax. I disagreed with that rule then, but because we now have repealed the tax, the Supreme Court's rationale for upholding the law was applied by the district court when it found the mandate inseparable from the law and struck it down.

The promise of the ACA, which we can all agree on, was to increase access to, and lower the cost of, healthcare. In my State of Tennessee alone, the average premium prices have gone up 176 percent in 8 years, with deductible levels that are nothing more than the equivalent to catastrophic coverage.

Let me give you an example, Madam Speaker. The majority of the uncollectible debt in the hospital where I work are people with insurance, not without insurance. Giving people access to a card does not necessarily equal coverage. That is why, in my district alone, you had nearly the same number of people who paid the tax that actually got the benefit.

In the ruling in Texas v. U.S. the courts are giving Congress an opportunity for a much-needed do-over. I spent over 30 years of my life taking care of patients, and in that time I never saw a Republican or Democratic disease. Preexisting conditions can affect anyone. All of us in the House want to ensure those affected by serious illnesses can access affordable care.

Rather than keeping the cost burden on the middle class, let's work together to protect those with preexisting conditions while also trusting Americans to make their own decisions when buying coverage that best fits the needs of their family.

How can we find common ground?

Well, if you have ever received your health insurance from an employer in the private sector, you were covered by

ERISA and its updates under HIPAA, which protect people with preexisting conditions from being denied coverage. Unfortunately, the rules weren't the same for the individual and small-group markets, and that is where the problem arose.

A simple solution to this problem is to apply those large-group ERISA protections to individual and small-group markets and the preexisting coverage question is solved.

Whether you are for or against the passage of the ACA, it should be clear that the law is broken. Instead of continuing to support a law that clearly isn't working, why don't we come together and enact a real patient-centered, free-market healthcare system that treats individuals and small groups like big corporations.

The bottom line is that the ACA has failed, at least in my State. The House of Representatives has more important work to focus on than getting involved in litigation to resuscitate a law that is broken and is causing problems for many individuals and families across America.

If we defeat title III of the Democratic rules package, I am hopeful this will be the first step in agreeing that we should be focusing on bipartisan reforms to our healthcare system, instead of wasting our time on litigation. I urge opposition to the rule.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rules package before us. This package includes, among other things, a critical provision defending the affordable healthcare of Americans.

I came to Congress with a resounding message from my constituents to protect and expand affordable, quality healthcare. Parents should not have to choose between paying rent or healthcare for their children. Students should not have to choose between paying for school or health insurance. Children should not have to spend sleepless nights worried about paying for aging parents' healthcare.

□ 1545

It is unacceptable that American families are one healthcare emergency away from financial ruin.

This administration is once again undermining the Affordable Care Act and ignoring a clear message from the American people. Quality healthcare is a right and should not be the privilege of the few who can afford it.

I will continue using my voice in Congress to advocate for those who need us most, pushing this body to protect the healthcare of my constituents.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP), my good friend, who not only provided lifesaving care to men and women in uniform in another

career, but has actually done that in this body as well.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I will admit I am a little bit confused here today because the part of the rule package that we are debating was already passed by the Democratic majority last week. So why are we here again?

I hear some people say: "I stand in strong support of this." Well, good. You did last week, too.

I suspect some see it as trying to falsely claim that Republicans are opposed to protecting Americans with preexisting conditions. I guarantee you, as a doctor, there is no part of me that doesn't want people in America to have insurance and coverage for their conditions. There is no part of me. In fact, it is just the opposite.

Just last week, in one of our first votes this year, every Republican in this Chamber voted for the House to take action this month that—word for word, our Republican amendment said—"guarantees no American citizen can be denied health insurance coverage as the result of a previous illness or health status" and "guarantees no American citizen can be charged higher premiums or cost sharing as the result of a previous illness or health status."

Curiously, not one of my Democratic colleagues voted for this.

This is only the most recent action of many we have taken to support and protect Americans with preexisting health conditions in the last few years.

Rather, this rule package allows Speaker PELOSI to use the U.S. House as a shield to try and defend the individual mandate, the same mandate that this very Chamber has already zeroed out.

The individual mandate, in its original form, forced Americans to buy something simply because they are alive, or they will be penalized. This said that Congress has the authority to penalize Americans for not buying something, penalize you just because you are alive. How is that for freedom?

By the way, there is a difference between dismantling a flawed bill, the flawed Affordable Care Act, and mending its every flaw, which we have tried to do and, in some cases, we have done.

But going back to the rule, this takes away each Member's right to vote on how we want the House to engage in litigation. Rather, it gives more power to one person and takes power away from this body as a whole to have a say in the matter.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this title of the rules package. It is bad policy, bad posturing.

And since this vote is a repeat, I repeat: Republicans are and have been and have supported and have voted for coverage for Americans with preexisting conditions, period.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution authorizing the House to defend the Affordable Care Act in court against baseless but potentially devastating litigation designed to dismantle the law.

Because of the ACA, which passed without a single Republican vote, millions of Americans now have access to health insurance, including those with preexisting conditions. Yet ever since it became law, the ACA has been the target of nonstop attacks by Republican politicians intent on stripping Americans of the important protections guaranteed by the law.

For the last 8 years, when the Republicans controlled the House, they voted 62 times to repeal the ACA but never once came up with a proposal to protect Americans with preexisting conditions.

Despite all the Republicans' efforts, the ACA still stands today, continuing to guarantee access to affordable, quality health insurance. But now, 21 Republican State attorneys general have launched a new attack on the law, based on tortured logic and flimsy legal reasoning.

The Department of Justice has a duty to defend every duly enacted law, absent exceptional circumstances. The Trump administration, however, has broken this well-established norm and now refuses to defend the law from this latest challenge, a decision that caused several career Justice Department attorneys to resign in protest.

The Judiciary Committee will be investigating how the Trump administration made this blatantly political decision to abdicate its responsibility, and the committee will be holding those responsible accountable for their actions.

While the administration turns its back on people with preexisting conditions and people who would go bankrupt without the law's cost-sharing subsidies, with this resolution, the House of Representatives has an opportunity to provide the defense that the ACA and the millions of Americans who depend on it every day deserve.

Although legal scholars across the ideological spectrum find the plaintiffs' arguments laughable, it has found a sympathetic judge in Texas who recently ruled the entire law must be overturned.

This resolution would authorize the House to intervene in the case as it works its way through the courts on appeal to ensure that the law's vital protections are properly defended in court.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and to allow the House to fend off this latest Republican assault against the health and well-being of Americans.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON), my good friend.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rules package authorizing the House to intervene in the lawsuit against ObamaCare, *Texas v. United States*. The American people sent us here to do a job: to solve problems, to improve their lives, and to move this country forward. However, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to be more interested in playing partisan games than problem-solving.

Why do I say this? Because Democrats have already voted to pass this exact provision last week. They have even filed three motions to intervene in the ObamaCare lawsuit.

On the substance of the matter at hand, ObamaCare is one of the worst, most destructive pieces of legislation to have ever passed this House, and the facts on that are indisputable. Just ask some of my hardworking, God-fearing farmers and ranchers and small businesses in west Texas.

ObamaCare has ruined our healthcare system; it is crushing our economy; and it is breaking the backs of our small businesses and our working families.

Madam Speaker, we shouldn't spend another day nor should we spend another dime on attempting to prop up this top-down, government-controlled healthcare system that is collapsing under its own weight. It is unconscionable to me and the American people to continue to throw good money after bad policy like this.

Instead of doubling down on ObamaCare and its flawed framework of mandates, taxes, and regulations that drove healthcare costs to the Moon, we should be working on policies together that truly reduce costs and continue to provide access to the greatest quality of care in the world here in the United States.

No government plan, no government program can divine these desired outcomes. Only a healthy market with robust competition and maximum consumer choice can achieve them.

Now, my colleagues on the other side talk a lot about protecting Americans with preexisting conditions. I agree. My colleagues on the Republican side agree. That is why we passed our Healthcare Reform Act with protections for folks with preexisting conditions. That is why, last week, Republicans voted to ensure Americans with preexisting conditions are protected.

This is a game. We have already done it. We have already voted. We stand firm to protect people with preexisting conditions.

But today's vote isn't about protecting people with preexisting conditions. It is about Democrat-produced political theater. That is what it is. It is about trying to save what is left of ObamaCare, and it is actually in preparation for a single-payer system, for socialized medicine, and for complete government control of our healthcare economy.

Madam Speaker, the American people deserve real solutions to affordable

care. They deserve real solutions: markets that are free to create any number of products and services.

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Texas an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I repeat: The American people deserve real solutions to the desired outcome of affordable care, and that is markets that are free to create any number, any variety of products and services and people who are free to choose those products and what is best for them and their families.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ALLRED).

Mr. ALLRED. Madam Speaker, I rise today to correct an injustice and to urge passage of this resolution that will put the United States House back on the side of the people and protecting their healthcare.

For far too long, seeking to fulfill empty partisan promises at the expense of the American people, politicians in Congress have sought to tear apart the Affordable Care Act and its protections for people with preexisting conditions. That ends today.

When the American people chose this new Congress, they said: Enough with the sabotage and the kowtowing to special interests seeking to divide us.

Too many times this very body has voted against the American people to repeal the Affordable Care Act and, with it, the protections for people with preexisting conditions. Now, a Federal court has put at risk those same protections.

That brings me to the story of Natalie. As I traveled around my district, which I am now truly honored to represent, I met Natalie. She told me her story.

She was a lawyer with young children, Hugo and Mia, and was married to a law professor at Southern Methodist University. I met with her on the same day that the House had voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act. I learned that Natalie had stage IV cancer and that she had come to my event from her chemotherapy treatment. She explained to me that her goal was to fight her cancer as long as possible so that her children would know her.

Natalie came to my event that day because she was worried about future moms like her who would lose their care if the Affordable Care Act was repealed. Natalie was worried about a return to the bad old days, with lifetime caps and discrimination against people with preexisting conditions. She knew that, because of her treatment, she would have blown through any lifetime cap in a matter of weeks.

Stories like Natalie's are all too common across America.

Tomorrow will be 1 year, to the day, since we lost Natalie, and she is still an inspiration to me and to many other north Texans and Americans across the

country. You see, Madam Speaker, Natalie spent her final days, while she was in pain, while she was saying her good-byes, emailing and posting on social media and talking to her community about the need to protect the Affordable Care Act so that other moms could get the care that they need.

That is who we are as north Texans, and that is who we are as Americans. We believe in something larger than ourselves. We believe in protecting 130 million Americans and more than 320,000 people in my district in north Texas who have a preexisting condition.

Let me be clear. The Affordable Care Act is not perfect, and this resolution does not solve all the healthcare problems facing our country. But, as one of our first acts, I hope that this measure tells the American people that we are on their side.

I know I speak for many of my colleagues when I say that this Congress will not stop working for the American people. We will not relent to the special interests and the forces of cynicism. The American people now, more than ever, need us to work together to address the rising cost of healthcare. Americans like Natalie and her family deserve no less.

Madam Speaker, it is truly an honor to address this body for the first time, and it is my first act to lead this resolution to defend the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES), my very good friend and former chairman of the House Intelligence Committee and current ranking member of that committee.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, I am struggling to understand what we are doing here today. We already know that the Democrats go to great lengths to defend the unconstitutional Affordable Care Act.

They really believe that Congress can and should force the American people to buy something, whether they want it or not. We know this because they made everyone vote on this same provision in title I of the rules package last week. Now we are here voting on the same thing this week.

“Why?” some Americans may ask. Because Democrats are trying to sell this farce as a vote to protect people with preexisting conditions.

But this is not a healthcare vote. This is a vote to give cover because the law they passed was unconstitutional, and the individual mandate was deeply unpopular.

They could put an end to this by passing a law that abides by the Constitution, but they are not willing to do that. Instead, we are wasting time here today voting on something for the second time.

Republicans know that we can protect the people with preexisting health conditions without infringing on basic freedoms. This is why, last week, we

voted on an amendment to the rules package to guarantee no American citizen can be denied health insurance coverage as a result of a preexisting condition.

□ 1600

I voted to ensure that no American citizen can be charged a higher premium or cost sharing as a result of a preexisting condition.

But the majority would rather spend time and taxpayer money defending the constitutionality of the ACA’s individual mandate. They seem to have forgotten that the Supreme Court told them, back in 2012, that Congress does not have the power to make the American people purchase a product.

The Democrats should not spend more taxpayer money defending the indefensible.

Congress should focus its energy on making healthcare more affordable and giving people meaningful choice in healthcare again.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA).

Mr. BERA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of title III of the House rules package. A district court recently ruled that the entire Affordable Care Act was unconstitutional, and, sadly, President Trump’s Justice Department did nothing to defend the Affordable Care Act. They even urged the judge to strike down protections to those with preexisting conditions.

Now, I have heard and I understand my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don’t like the Affordable Care Act, but not to defend it, not to talk about the benefits, is not defensible. I have heard many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about how they want to protect those with preexisting conditions. Well, this is one way to protect those with preexisting conditions.

I see this as a doctor. I don’t want to go back to the days when I would see patients who had cancer, had diabetes, had heart conditions, and through no action on their own, lost their health insurance. I don’t want to go back to the days where the health insurance companies could deny people those coverages—often necessary lifesaving therapies and coverage. This is about doing the right thing for America’s patients. That is why we are here.

Now, what title III of the rules package does is it says that the House of Representatives should intervene in *Texas v. United States*. If this lawsuit succeeds, it is going to repeal the Affordable Care Act with no solution. None. Millions of Americans are going to lose their health insurance coverage.

The American public spoke loud and clear. They want this body to sit down, to come together to provide coverage for America—affordable coverage. That is what we need to do as Democrats and Republicans. I urge my colleagues to vote for title III and to make it clear this Congress will protect those with preexisting conditions.

I have got friends on the other side of the aisle. I heard many of them talk about how they want to protect those with preexisting conditions. A vote against title III of the rules package is a vote against protecting those Americans.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume simply to make a quick point.

Actually, a vote against this provision is not a vote against preexisting conditions. It is a vote to limit the power of the Speaker—not to allow the Speaker to, on her own, decide whether she is going to intervene in law cases where, frankly, the intervention of this House isn’t necessary. There are States litigating against the ACA. There are States litigating for the ACA. The idea that either side is unrepresented, I think, just doesn’t bear serious scrutiny.

So, you know, not only is it an exercise in futility, in my opinion, it is an exercise that is totally unnecessary because we have already given the Speaker that power. The majority has already seen fit to do that. So why we are wasting time, money, and effort in this particular exercise eludes me.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I thank Secretary SHALALA for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I feel like I have a preexisting condition. It is arguing about the Affordable Care Act. For 10 years we have argued about the Affordable Care Act. A campaign is part of forming a government, and no issue resonated with the American people in the last election like the issue of preexisting conditions.

My friend, the gentleman from California, previously said he didn’t understand why people had to buy something that they didn’t want. Well, we require people to buy automobile insurance. And, by the way, you don’t buy automobile insurance the day after you have been in an automobile accident. And we probably don’t want to buy homeowners insurance, but, guess what; we don’t buy it the day after our house is burned down. We buy it because the genius of insurance is the spreading of risk.

So I ask the following rhetorical question, and that is, why should the rest of us annually put \$1,000 into our premiums for health insurance to take care of those who don’t want to buy health insurance?

So what this discussion and argument is really about, for the moment, is the following: The child who is born with diabetes is then told, under the old system, that they can never buy health insurance, or, if they do, it has to be rated—back to the old actuarial argument about how do we spread risk.

The protections that were built into the Affordable Care Act, which I helped

to write, were based upon the idea of using the best principles of the marketplace while simultaneously using the ability of the Federal Government to prod certain behaviors, and those behaviors included a ban on preexisting conditions as an option for people who didn't want to buy health insurance.

So what did the other side do? They filed the lawsuit. Now, they generally lecture us on activist judges. They decided that they would challenge what has become okay with the American people, the Affordable Care Act. They would challenge it in the Federal courts and really didn't want to bring down the entire Affordable Care Act. Instead, they wanted to disassemble piece by piece parts of the Affordable Care Act that really, in a lot of ways, have made for its success.

There is no argument with the following statistic that, today, between 17 and 20 million Americans have health insurance that didn't have it before the Affordable Care Act.

And back to those people who, by the way, their system of healthcare was the emergency room. So, in the emergency room, we all know, it is a pretty poor way to get health insurance because it really doesn't emphasize preventive care.

So all of these options that we built into the Affordable Care Act, including making sure that people that had preexisting conditions couldn't be exploited in the marketplace with undue costs, this argument that we continue to have, Madam Speaker, here about the Affordable Care Act could be rectified in short order by both sides just working together to improve the Affordable Care Act.

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

Madam Speaker, to my good friend, the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means, I think that offer is made quite sincerely, and I think it will be taken up by our side. We can work together in a bipartisan way to do exactly what the gentleman suggests.

In my opinion, this particular measure doesn't do that. It doesn't get us anywhere. It involves us in litigation unnecessarily, and it doesn't—by the way, for the second time, since we gave the Speaker this authority—I didn't vote for it, my friends did, that is their right, she has it, so why we are here on the floor today arguing about it mystifies me.

But, again, I know my friend's offer is made in good faith. I think it will be taken up in good faith. We should work together to do exactly what my friend suggests, that is, guarantee that every American is protected from preexisting conditions and able to go into the marketplace and buy insurance at a practical and reasonable rate that they can afford.

So, with that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from

New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I thank—I call her the Secretary. She is one of my colleagues now. Congresswoman SHALALA knows more about healthcare, and, I should say, probably is more of an expert on it than anybody else in this body.

I want to basically contradict what my Republican colleagues have been saying. They are saying that this is not about preexisting conditions. That is exactly what this debate is about.

We have seen the Republicans in the House, the President, consistently try to sabotage the Affordable Care Act. And what does that mean? That means sabotage to make it more difficult for people with preexisting conditions to get coverage. It means bringing out junk insurance that doesn't have good benefits. It means bringing back all the discriminatory practices that existed before the ACA, like lifetime or annual limits or rescissions.

You know, before the Affordable Care Act, you could actually buy a policy and the insurance company could come in and rescind the policy because they were spending too much money on your insurance policy. We worked very hard with the ACA to get rid of all these discriminatory practices. They would come back again if this lawsuit succeeds.

I don't think there should be any mistake. This lawsuit, brought by a group of Republican attorneys general, is nothing more than a continuation of Republican efforts to sabotage the healthcare of millions of Americans. Having failed to repeal the law through the legislative process, Republicans are attempting to invalidate the law through the Federal courts, and they have, at least for now, succeeded at the district court level.

Last month, Judge Reed O'Connor of the Northern District of Texas declared the entire ACA was invalid. His decision would eliminate the law's protections for preexisting conditions, as well as entirely unrelated provisions, such as the Medicaid expansion and the closing of the Medicare prescription drug donut hole.

This decision has been roundly criticized by legal scholars. Conservative scholars, like Jonathan Adler, joined with other scholars in writing that the decision was a mockery of the rule of law and basic principles of democracy. Judge O'Connor's decision is an exercise in raw judicial power. It is not the job of the Federal judges to strike down entire statutes without considering what Congress intended.

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

Madam Speaker, I am always delighted when my friends on the other side believe in judicial restraint, so it is nice to see we have some new converts in that.

I just make my basic point again, Madam Speaker. We are here for no

particular reason debating something that we did last week, giving that power to the Speaker. I didn't agree with that vote. We had an opportunity last week, actually, to take up a Republican measure that would have legislatively guaranteed protections for preexisting. The majority chose not to do that. So I have just forced back on the conclusion that this is much more about political theater than it is about genuine substance.

I will say, though, in disagreeing with my good friend from New Jersey, I am not a lawyer. I don't pretend to be able to be an expert judge of the legal merits, but I do think I would not so blithely dismiss 20 State attorneys general and a court that ruled in their favor. It tells me that there are significant legal issues here and that those legal issues are going to be litigated in due course.

What mystifies me is why we need to be involved in it since there is high-powered law from different States with different points of view that are in this right now.

So, again, I see no particular reason to do this, although, with all due respect, my friends have already given the Speaker the power to do it, so I don't know why we need to do it a second time. But, again, I am here to represent my colleagues on my side of the aisle, and we will continue to do that.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the majority whip.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to support this resolution to intervene against the egregious Texas v. United States lawsuit that seeks to end the Affordable Care Act, or, as I like to call it, the Civil Rights Act of the 21st Century.

In a few days, we are going to be celebrating the birthday of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who once said: "Of all the forms of inequality, injustice in healthcare is the most shocking and inhumane."

Since the ACA was enacted, significant progress has been made to lessen the inequality in our healthcare delivery system. To dismantle those life-saving protections now is unfounded and unjust.

It is unjust to deny those with preexisting conditions access to healthcare. It is unjust to cut off insurance coverage to a child with cancer because she has reached her maximum lifetime benefits. It is unjust to charge women more than we charge men for healthcare simply because of their gender. It is unjust to increase the cost of seniors' medications by reopening the gap known as the donut hole in their Medicare prescription drug coverage.

□ 1615

It is unjust to tell young people just starting out in life that they can no

longer remain on their parents' insurance policies.

It is unjust to reinstitute charges for preventative healthcare, costing more money in the long run when illnesses go undetected for too long.

It is unjust to ask the working poor not eligible for Medicaid to purchase private insurance at the market rate when they are struggling to feed their families and keep a roof over their heads.

Access to quality healthcare ought not only be for those who can afford it; it ought to be for those who need it. It is unfortunate for us to deny healthcare to people just because they were born unhealthy.

A vote against this resolution is a vote against providing the basic human right to fair and equitable access to quality, affordable healthcare for all Americans.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, let me advise my friend, I am prepared to close. I see she has additional speakers, so, for the moment, I will simply reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, being sort of last in this debate gives you an opportunity to hear all of the arguments.

The question has been asked: Why should we allow Speaker PELOSI to intervene? Well, she authored the bill. We need her to defend this bill, and we believe that she has standing.

Another question that was raised was about an initiative that was offered last week and that this is just a theater here today. Well, I was here the 60-plus times that we tried to repeal the Affordable Care Act. That is the true theater.

And let me tell you something, Madam Speaker. Why do we think that there was such a strident effort to destroy the Affordable Care Act? Because our colleagues have told us it cost a lot of money, and we have tried to prevent insurers from maximizing their profits.

And how do they maximize their profits? By denying the sickest people with preexisting conditions—like the people I met today, the kids with neurofibromatosis, a serious illness that causes tumors all through your body and causes you to wake up in pain every single day—if you can get rid of them, then you won't have to pay much money; to impose lifetime limits on coverage not just for people under the ACA, but for everybody, including those folks who get employer-based insurance.

Why have they tried to deny health coverage to consumers, to provide essential health benefits? Because they want to provide these skeletal benefits, this fig leaf of provisions for folks.

So I think that we need someone like Speaker PELOSI to intervene, and I think that she should have standing, and this body ought to authorize it.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, last month, a judge delivered a ruling to gut the Affordable Care Act, a warning shot that was fired at millions of Americans of all ages, backgrounds, and beliefs. The decision changed little immediately, but that didn't matter. Patients again panicked because, yes, they have been here before.

The family with a young child who will spend their entire life battling diabetes, the father in remission, the young woman facing addiction desperately seeking treatment, over the past 2 years, they have watched their government, led by a Republican Congress and a reckless President, come after their healthcare coverage again and again and again.

So families wake up wondering if this is the day. Is this the day where they succeed, the day the President finally wins, the day my coverage goes away, the day I have to face my loved ones, my kids, my ailing parents, and tell them that we can't afford the care to make their suffering go away?

They deserve better, and that is why I ask everyone to support this rules package.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to remind all Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I inquire whether the gentleman from Oklahoma is prepared to close. I am prepared to close on my side.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, actually, I know I informed the gentlewoman differently, but my good friend, Mr. BURGESS, got so excited by the debate he came back and asked for an additional minute. So if I may, Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I would just ask a simple question: What has happened to your insurance premium since the passage of the Affordable Care Act? They have gone up. They have gone up a lot.

What has happened to the cost of prescription drugs since the passage of the Affordable Care Act? They have gone up. They have gone up a lot.

All I would suggest is there was a better way to go about this. Republicans have offered ideas. It really, really would behoove us to work on behalf of the American people to solve these problems rather than to continue to push this bill that has been so unfavorable in the eyes of so many Americans.

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

Madam Speaker, in closing, I urge opposition to this measure. The majority is asking the House of Representatives to authorize the Speaker to intervene in a lawsuit over the legality of the Affordable Care Act. Such an act is unnecessary and wasteful.

It should have been obvious to the majority that the Affordable Care Act

was and is poorly written and precariously unbalanced as Republicans warned them at the time it was passed, and the intervening years have brought those predictions to come about. Premiums have skyrocketed. Insurers have fled the market. The American consumers have suffered as a result.

The appropriate solution is not to intervene in a lawsuit but, instead, to spend time working with Republicans to craft a replacement fix to this broken system. And moreover, it is certainly not to do today, in a rule, what we have already done in the same rule last week.

Madam Speaker, I have enjoyed the debate, but I am not exactly sure why we had it. Again, it is always worthwhile to spend time on the floor with my friends.

So, Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" on the previous question, "no" on the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I thank my distinguished colleague.

It has been more than 9 years since Congress passed the Affordable Care Act. It has withstood dozens of repeal attempts, and the Supreme Court already has held it constitutional. Now a district court in Texas has determined that the whole law should be null and void.

But the ACA is now so enmeshed in our society that we sometimes forget the numerous benefits that are now threatened by this case. It is not simply protections for preexisting conditions. It is subsidies to help the middle-class families and small businesses to buy health insurance. It is caps on out-of-pocket health insurance costs. It is an end to annual and lifetime limits.

No matter where someone gets their healthcare, they have something to lose if this case is upheld. Madam Speaker, that is why the House of Representatives must intervene in this case. We need to stand with the American people, the overwhelming majority of whom support the crucial benefits of the Affordable Care Act.

The administration is unwilling to intervene in this case and protect the rights of Americans; thus, it is up to Congress to defend and uphold this law and all of the crucial protections it provides for our citizens.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 5, the previous question is ordered on the portion of the divided question comprising title III.

The question is on that portion of the divided question.

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

Mr. COLE. 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, this 15-

minute vote on the portion of the divided question comprising title III will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

The motion to recommit on H.R. 264; and

Passage of H.R. 264.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 192, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—235

Adams	Golden	Ocasio-Cortez
Aguilar	Gomez	Omar
Allred	Gonzalez (TX)	Pallone
Axne	Gottheimer	Panetta
Barragán	Green (TX)	Pappas
Bass	Grijalva	Pascrell
Beatty	Haaland	Payne
Bera	Harder (CA)	Perlmutter
Beyer	Hastings	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Hayes	Peterson
Blumenauer	Heck	Phillips
Blunt Rochester	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Bonamici	Hill (CA)	Pocan
Boyle, Brendan	Himes	Porter
F.	Horn, Kendra S.	Pressley
Brindisi	Horsford	Price (NC)
Brown (MD)	Houlihan	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Raskin
Bustos	Huffman	Reed
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Carbajal	Jayapal	Richmond
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Rose (NY)
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Rouda
Cartwright	Johnson (TX)	Roybal-Allard
Case	Kaptur	Ruiz
Casten (IL)	Katko	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Keating	Rush
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Ryan
Chu, Judy	Kennedy	Sánchez
Cicilline	Khanna	Sarbanes
Cisneros	Kildee	Scanlon
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kim	Schiff
Clay	Kind	Schneider
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Clyburn	Krishnamoorthi	Schrier
Cohen	Kuster (NH)	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Lamb	Scott, David
Cooper	Langevin	Serrano
Correa	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Costa	Larson (CT)	Shalala
Courtney	Lawrence	Sherman
Cox (CA)	Lawson (FL)	Sherrill
Craig	Lee (CA)	Sires
Crist	Lee (NV)	Slotkin
Crow	Levin (CA)	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Levin (MI)	Soto
Cummings	Lewis	Spanberger
Cunningham	Lieu, Ted	Speier
Davids (KS)	Lipinski	Stanton
Davis (CA)	Loebsock	Stevens
Davis, Danny K.	Lofgren	Suozzi
Dean	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Lowe	Takano
DeGette	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Luria	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Malinowski	Titus
Delgado	Maloney,	Tlaib
Demings	Carolyn B.	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Maloney, Sean	Torres (CA)
Deutch	Matsui	Torres Small
Dingell	McAdams	(NM)
Doggett	McBath	Trahan
Doyle, Michael	McCollum	Trone
F.	McEachin	Underwood
Engel	McGovern	Van Drew
Escobar	McNerney	Vargas
Eshoo	Meeks	Veasey
Espallat	Meng	Vela
Evans	Moore	Velázquez
Finkenauer	Morelle	Visclosky
Fitzpatrick	Moulton	Wasserman
Fletcher	Mucarsel-Powell	Schultz
Foster	Murphy	Waters
Fudge	Nadler	Watson Coleman
Gabbard	Napolitano	Welch
Galleo	Neal	Wexton
Garamendi	Neguse	Wild
Garcia (IL)	Norcross	Wilson (FL)
Garcia (TX)	O'Halleran	Yarmuth

NAYS—192

Abraham	Allen	Amodei
Aderholt	Amash	Armstrong

Arrington	Graves (LA)	Palmer
Babin	Graves (MO)	Pence
Bacon	Green (TN)	Perry
Baird	Griffith	Posey
Balderson	Grothman	Ratcliffe
Banks	Guthrie	Reschenthaler
Barr	Hagedorn	Rice (SC)
Bergman	Harris	Riggleman
Biggs	Hartzler	Roby
Bilirakis	Hern, Kevin	Rodgers (WA)
Bishop (UT)	Herrera Beutler	Roe, David P.
Bost	Hice (GA)	Rogers (AL)
Brady	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (AL)	Hill (AR)	Rooney (FL)
Brooks (IN)	Holding	Rose, John W.
Buchanan	Hollingsworth	Rouzer
Bucshon	Hudson	Roy
Budd	Huizenga	Rutherford
Burchett	Hunter	Scalise
Burgess	Hurd (TX)	Schweikert
Byrne	Johnson (LA)	Scott, Austin
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Sensenbrenner
Carter (GA)	Johnson (SD)	Shimkus
Carter (TX)	Jordan	Simpson
Chabot	Joyce (OH)	Smith (MO)
Cheney	Joyce (PA)	Smith (NE)
Cline	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NJ)
Cloud	Kelly (PA)	Smucker
Cole	King (IA)	Spano
Collins (GA)	King (NY)	Stauber
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger	Stefanik
Comer	Kustoff (TN)	Steil
Conaway	LaHood	Steube
Cook	LaMalfa	Stewart
Crawford	Lamborn	Stivers
Crenshaw	Latta	Taylor
Curtis	Lesko	Thompson (PA)
Davidson (OH)	Long	Thornberry
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Timmons
DesJarlais	Lucas	Tipton
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Turner
Duffy	Marchant	Upton
Duncan	Marino	Wagner
Dunn	Marshall	Walberg
Emmer	Massie	Walden
Estes	McCarthy	Walker
Ferguson	McCaul	Walorski
Fleischmann	McClintock	Waltz
Flores	McHenry	Watkins
Fortenberry	McKinley	Weber (TX)
Foxx (NC)	Meadows	Webster (FL)
Fulcher	Meuser	Wenstrup
Gaetz	Miller	Westerman
Gallagher	Mitchell	Williams
Gianforte	Moolenaar	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs	Mooney (WV)	Wittman
Gohmert	Mullin	Womack
Gonzalez (OH)	Newhouse	Woodall
Gooden	Norman	Wright
Gosar	Nunes	Yoho
Granger	Olson	Young
Graves (GA)	Palazzo	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—6

□ 1650

Mr. MARCHANT changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the portion of the divided question comprising title III was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 264) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 200, nays 227, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

YEAS—200

Abraham	Gosar	Palazzo
Aderholt	Gottheimer	Palmer
Allen	Granger	Pence
Armstrong	Graves (GA)	Perry
Arrington	Graves (LA)	Posey
Babin	Graves (MO)	Ratcliffe
Bacon	Green (TN)	Reed
Baird	Griffith	Reschenthaler
Balderson	Grothman	Rice (SC)
Banks	Guthrie	Riggleman
Barr	Hagedorn	Roby
Bergman	Harris	Rodgers (WA)
Biggs	Hartzler	Roe, David P.
Bilirakis	Hern, Kevin	Rogers (AL)
Bishop (UT)	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (KY)
Bost	Hice (GA)	Rooney (FL)
Brady	Higgins (LA)	Rose (NY)
Brindisi	Hill (AR)	Rose, John W.
Brooks (AL)	Holding	Rouzer
Brooks (IN)	Hollingsworth	Roy
Buchanan	Hudson	Rutherford
Bucshon	Huffman	Scalise
Budd	Huizenga	Schweikert
Burchett	Hunter	Scott, Austin
Burgess	Hurd (TX)	Sensenbrenner
Byrne	Johnson (LA)	Sherrill
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Shimkus
Carter (GA)	Johnson (SD)	Simpson
Carter (TX)	Jordan	Smith (MO)
Chabot	Joyce (OH)	Smith (NE)
Cheney	Joyce (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Cline	Katko	Smucker
Cloud	Kelly (MS)	Spano
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Stauber
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Stefanik
Collins (NY)	King (NY)	Steil
Comer	Kinzinger	Steube
Conaway	Kustoff (TN)	Stewart
Cook	LaHood	Stivers
Crawford	LaMalfa	Taylor
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Thompson (PA)
Cunningham	Latta	Thornberry
Curtis	Lesko	Timmons
Davidson (OH)	Long	Tipton
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Turner
DesJarlais	Lucas	Upton
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Wagner
Duffy	Marchant	Walberg
Duncan	Marino	Walden
Dunn	Marshall	Walker
Emmer	Massie	Walorski
Estes	McCarthy	Waltz
Ferguson	McCaul	Watkins
Fleischmann	McClintock	Weber (TX)
Flores	McHenry	Webster (FL)
Fortenberry	McKinley	Wenstrup
Foxx (NC)	Meadows	Westerman
Fulcher	Meuser	Williams
Gaetz	Miller	Wilson (SC)
Gallagher	Mitchell	Wittman
Gianforte	Moolenaar	Womack
Gibbs	Mooney (WV)	Woodall
Gohmert	Mullin	Wright
Golden	Newhouse	Yoho
Gonzalez (OH)	Norman	Young
Gooden	Nunes	Zeldin
	Olson	

NAYS—227

Adams	Boyle, Brendan	Cicilline
Aguilar	F.	Cisneros
Allred	Brown (MD)	Clark (MA)
Amash	Brownley (CA)	Clarke (NY)
Axne	Bustos	Clay
Barragán	Butterfield	Cleaver
Bass	Carbajal	Clyburn
Beatty	Cárdenas	Cohen
Bera	Carson (IN)	Connolly
Beyer	Cartwright	Cooper
Bishop (GA)	Case	Correa
Blumenauer	Casten (IL)	Costa
Blunt Rochester	Castor (FL)	Courtney
Bonamici	Castro (TX)	Cox (CA)
	Chu, Judy	Craig