In 1978, he enlisted in the United States Army before becoming a member of the Hawaii Army National Guard in 1983. He served honorably until 2001, when he chose to continue his commitment to the United States as a member of the Hawaii Air National Guard. He also served as an officer in the Honolulu Police Department for 25 years.

As a veteran of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, Derrick truly understood what it meant to sacrifice for others. A true patriot, he was a man of compassion, understanding, and unwavering resolve. His wife, JoAnn, and two sons, Michael and John, are his greatest legacy and will continue to share Derrick's aloha.

On behalf of the First Congressional District of Hawaii, and the entire State of Hawaii, I would like to bid a fond aloha to Derrick and thank him for his selfless contributions to the defense of our country. As we say in Hawaii, ''a hui hou,'' Derrick—until we meet again.

□ 1230

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE BOULDER WEEKLY

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Boulder Weekly—an alternative newspaper based in my hometown of Boulder, Colorado—on 20 years of publication, a challenging feat for any newspaper, even more so for a newspaper that's freely available to readers both in Boulder County, where print editions are freely distributed, as well as nationally over the Internet.

They've had a number of in-depth, incisive reports that have uncovered human rights abuses within our own prison system in Colorado. They've given detailed coverage on the impact of organic farming practices and GMOs and fracking.

It's very difficult these days to find a trusted investigative news source. The Boulder County community is very fortunate to have one in the Boulder Weekly, and I rise to congratulate them on their 20th anniversary.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2775, NO SUBSIDIES WITHOUT VERIFICATION ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 339 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 339

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2775) to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 339 provides for the consideration of H.R. 2775, the No Subsidies Without Verification Act of 2013. This is a critical bill as the Obama administration begins to implement and sign up people for the insurance exchanges in literally less than 3 weeks' time.

I am a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. Speaker. I can tell you that the Secretary of Health and Human Services appears ill prepared to verify that the people qualifying for the numerous government handouts and subsidies included in the Affordable Care Act actually meet the income requirements for those subsidies. Because fraud and abuse have been rampant in just about every program that is administered by the Department of Health and Human Services, including Medicare and Medicaid, a certified verification system being in place prior to the implementation of the Affordable Care Act is critical. This bill addresses this extreme deficiency in the inappropriately named Affordable Care Act.

The rule before us today provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the majority and the minority. Further, the rule makes a correction to the underlying bill, clarifying that the Inspector General for Health and Human Services, rather than the Secretary, which is a partisan position, is better equipped to oversee the verification process for the eligibility of subsidies. Finally, the minority is afforded the customary motion to recommit, allowing for yet another opportunity to amend the legislation.

H.R. 2775, the No Subsidies Without Verification Act, introduced by Mrs. BLACK from Tennessee, is an important piece of legislation to protect taxpayer dollars from inappropriate expenditure. With less than 3 weeks until enrollment in the health insurance exchanges and they go live, the Obama administration continues to tinker and twist the dials on the Affordable Care Act, exposing the executive branch's lack of readiness for such a massive and fundamental change of the way health care is delivered and administered in this country. In an effort to save their misguided health care takeover, the administration has significantly scaled back the original scope of the Affordable Care Act—cutting corners and delaying any piece of the legislation which becomes inconvenient or, perhaps, embarrassing to the President.

The President has chosen to delay the employer mandate included in the Affordable Care Act; yet has not given that same reprieve to everyday Americans. Why? Why should that be? Because enforcing the employer mandate was inconvenient. The President announced that he could not implement the CLASS Act portion of the Affordable Care Act. Why? Because it was inconvenient. Now the President simply will not enforce the verification requirements to prevent the fraudulent acceptance of subsidies. Why? Because, again, it is inconvenient.

Just 3 months before the exchanges are supposed to go live, on January 1, Health and Human Services decided that on July 5 of this year it would simply accept an applicant's attestation of household income without any certifiable verification. The President's strategy on the health care law is now ''trust; don't verify.''

The Secretary of Health and Human Services has made the opening of the exchanges on October 1 her central priority. However, in facing tight deadlines and daunting workloads, the administration has instead drastically lowered their standards. It's clear from the final rule issued late in the day on July 5, 2013, that the administration will allow any type of flexibility necessary to ensure that their law appears that it is being implemented as planned. Regardless of what you may believe, the administration has been very clear.

The rule states explicitly:

> The exchange may accept the attestation of projected annual household income without further verification for the purposes of the exchange's eligibility determination.

> The administration is more than comfortable with letting over $1 trillion go out the door without verifying that it's going to the correct individuals.

They even state in the final rule:

It is an ideal approach to provide flexibility in the case of many verifications.

Since it's apparently too much work to verify everyone's income, the administration has determined that it is okay with spending over $1 trillion just based on what individuals think they may make in the next year. Instead of admitting that they won't be ready on time, the administration decided that it will just spend the money anyway.

While the constant delaying and changing of the law is worrisome, what should concern all of us the most is what this new change in regulation will do. By eliminating the verification requirement, the only way the government will determine who gets Federal subsidies now is by whoever claims that they, themselves, need the subsidies. Quite frankly, with premiums rising at the rate they are across the country—and they're set to rise even more for calendar year 2015—it seems like everyone will be telling the Department of Health and Human Services that they need subsidies because, quite frankly, no one will be able to afford the President's health insurance. Maybe then it will be good that no one in the administration is checking to see who might be lying about their household income.

While the constant delaying and changing of the law is worrisome, another concern is what this new change in regulation will do. By eliminating the verification requirement, the only way the government will determine who gets Federal subsidies now is by who says they need them. This will open the exchanges to a staggering amount of potential fraud. It's also blatantly political. By doing this, the Obama administration has made it clear they want as many people to sign up for the exchanges as possible no matter their eligibility status. Taxpayers, unfortunately, will be charged with over $1 trillion over the next decade to pay for the exchange subsidies. With over $1 trillion going out the door, shouldn't the American people have the assurance that the government is sending the money to the people who actually need it?

All of this is so the President can reap the public relations benefit of talking about the popularity of exchanges, and so he can salvage his failed signature policy initiative.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the underlying bill. Stand up to this health insurance subsidy fraud.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. This bill is redundant, and it's a waste of time. The Department of Health and Human Services already has a plan in place to review individual information submitted to health care exchanges and to ensure that no one is able to get health insurance tax credits that they aren't eligible for. So, instead of considering these redundant bills, let me talk about what we're not considering here today which would actually solve a problem the American people are demanding that this institution address.

The time to pass comprehensive immigration reform is now. We can do it now. Instead of debating something that's redundant here today, there is a bill that has received more than two-thirds support in the United States Senate. If this body can act on it and can send it to President Obama's desk, finally we will be able to do something to create jobs and increase our competitiveness in the global economy, lower our deficit, ensure our security, and reflect our values as Americans and prevent the undermining of the rule of law that occurs every day, for we have over 10 million people in this country who are undocumented and lack documentation. They're violating our laws. This institution can fix that now. The Senate has acted. Let the House act.

As economists across the political spectrum have found, the economic benefits of immigration reform are tremendous. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation, if we act now to pass the Senate comprehensive immigration reform bill, we would reduce the deficit by over $135 billion and, in the following decade, by over $600 billion. Why aren't we spending our time discussing that and passing that here on the floor of the House today? Further, the Senate bill is estimated to boost the output of the U.S. economy by 3.3 percent. It is a 3.3 percent increase to GDP and a reduction in the deficit. That's $700 billion in additional gross domestic product by 2023.

As a June Wall Street Journal article citing Stephen Goss, Social Security's chief actuary, pointed out:

The future fiscal immigration windfall is likely to exceed $4 trillion.

We can shore up Social Security and protect our seniors, and we can prevent any cuts to Social Security by passing immigration reform now. That's what the country wants us to do. Why does it shore up Social Security? Because immigration occurs at a young age. Immigration reform ensures that there are people paying into Social Security—young, healthy workers—particularly as baby boomers retire. As for immigrants, we're talking about people who are already here. Let's make sure they pay their taxes. By not taking this bill up, we are preventing people from paying into Social Security like they should and from paying their taxes like they should. They live in this country. They should pay taxes. According to The Wall Street Journal, immigration reform will result in an extra $600 billion into the Social Security trust fund and will result in over $4 trillion over 75 years.

Another urgent reason that this body should be taking up immigration reform instead of redundant measures around health care reform is our national security. We currently have a porous border; and while progress has been made—in fact, in 2011, the number of illegal border crossings was the lowest since 1972—it was still 327,000. There were 327,000 people who illegally crossed our border. What does that say about our security as a country and about our ability to enforce our immigration laws when over 300,000 people have illegally crossed the border?

There is a solution. It's ready to pass. Let's talk about it, not about redundant bills that don't do anything and aren't going anywhere. The Senate comprehensive immigration bill, while, of course, not perfect, includes unprecedented border and interior enforcement measures.

The bill includes increasing the number of full-time Border Patrol agents from 21,000 to 38,405; mandating an electronic exit system at all ports where Customs and Border Protection agents are deployed; constructing at least 350 additional miles of fencing, bringing the miles of high-tech border fencing to 700; constructing additional Border Control stations and operating bases; mandating 24-hour surveillance of the border region; using mobile, video, portable systems as well as unmanned aircraft; and deploying 1,000 distress beacon stations in areas where migrant deaths occur.

□ 1245

Look, it takes getting serious to secure the border, and this costs money. We can do it in the context of reducing the deficit by over $100 billion, such as the windfall from immigration reform that we effectively get to secure our southern border for free and reduce the deficit by $100 billion and improve the Social Security trust fund to the tune of $4 trillion, giving American seniors the security that they need in their retirement. That's what we can do by bringing the Senate immigration reform bill to the floor of the House right now.

The Senate immigration reform bill also increases American competitiveness. Immigration is the economic engine that's grown our economy for generations. Unfortunately, under our current immigration system, it's not designed to foster job creation. All too often, it undermines American workers, takes jobs away from American workers, leads companies to offshore jobs, to outsource jobs overseas.

I represent a district that has two excellent universities: Colorado State University and the University of Colorado at Boulder. They have great graduate programs in math, engineering, and the sciences. We graduate students with advanced degrees from countries all over the world such as India, Mexico, and China that have the skills that we need to keep America competitive and create jobs. Yet, the day after they

graduate, without any access to a green card, many of these talented young Ph.D.s and master's degree students have to return to their home country. Guess what? The jobs follow them back home in the information economy. The employers don't care whether they're here or there, as long as they contribute to bits and bytes. We want those jobs here in America. We want that income here in America. The bipartisan Senate bill addresses that, as well.

Another component that we have for job creation in America is a start-up visa. This is a way that entrepreneurs with ideas can come to America to start their companies here and employ Americans. For goodness' sake, do we want the great companies of tomorrow employing tens of thousands of people to be overseas just because we don't let the founders come here to start their companies? That's common sense. It creates jobs for Americans. Let's do it.

We also have improvements to the EB–5 program to facilitate in foreign investment and raising capital for American companies to grow jobs here in America.

This body should take up the comprehensive immigration reform bill now—not tomorrow and not in 5 minutes. Now. Let's do it so that we can finally move forward on creating jobs, improving border security, reducing our deficit, and shoring up Social Security.

Another reason that we urgently need to bring up immigration reform now is because the current system is simply out of sync with our values as Americans, our faith values as Jews, Christians, Muslims, every other faith in our country, as well as our American values, the values of our Founding Fathers.

Faith leaders from across the spectrum have been among the most vocal supporters of the Senate comprehensive immigration bill. Over the August recess, the Evangelical Immigration Table, a coalition of faith groups, continued the drumbeat for a vote on the Senate bill and called for an end to the ''cruelty'' perpetuated by the current immigration deportation system. It's completely arbitrary.

Young American children—American citizens, kids, 8, 10, 12 years old in my State and across the country—to our great shame, come home from school to find that their parents are in detention, their parents are not there, their parents are facing deportation proceedings. Why? Perhaps a taillight was out on their car. This is all at a cost to taxpayers of tens of thousands of dollars. They now wait in line for a costly deportation while their American child returns to a home with no parent. How does that reflect our values? As Americans, what is the solution? Pass the Senate comprehensive immigration reform bill now.

The Senate comprehensive immigration reform bill will halt more than 400,000 costly deportations, each one costing taxpayers tens of thousands of dollars, tearing families apart. The bill removes the limitations to the number of visas that legal permanent residents can request for their minor children, for their spouses, ensuring that families aren't separated for years, for generations, while awaiting legal status. It creates a process to clear the estimated 4.4 million person backlog in the family- and employment-based visa system within a decade. It replaces our broken immigration system with one that works, one that reflects our values, and one that respects the rule of law in this country.

The Senate-passed bill would help people like Gabriela, a 20-year-old woman in Colorado, undocumented, recently graduated from high school. Gabriela and her younger sister were brought to the U.S. as young children by their mother. They didn't have a say in the matter. They were brought here. Their mother was deported several years ago, leaving her two children behind. Gabriela is now homeless but has, nevertheless, taken on the responsibility for caring for her younger sister. The Senate bipartisan bill would ensure that families like Gabriela's won't be torn apart. That's not American. That doesn't reflect our values as a country, as a people.

The Senate bill would also assist the young, courageous DREAMers, individuals who were brought to this country as children, completed high school, some college, even military service, grew up in this country, know no other country, and have no pathway to legal status, young people like Javier in my district that I represent who graduated from high school in Summit County. He was the president of the student body. Javier grew up in this country, was brought here when he was young, doesn't have documentation. Javier is an Eagle Scout. Javier is the first in his family to get into a good college, a 4-year university, but his lack of status has made it difficult not only to pursue his dreams of a higher education, but to figure out how he can live his life in a way that contributes to his country, the United States of America. If only we allow him to fully contribute, he will. Young DREAMers across this country will contribute great things to our Nation and make us proud if only we let them.

It's time to stop talking about these redundant, senseless bills and bring up comprehensive immigration reform now. It's a big part of the solution to our fiscal problems: reducing the deficit, shoring up Social Security, and finally getting serious about enforcing our border and enforcing employment verification to prevent companies from hiring people illegally. It improves American competitiveness, creates jobs, and ensures that the great companies of tomorrow will be here in this country instead of overseas; that the people we need to make our economy grow, create jobs for Americans, are here and doing it legally; and to respect the rule of law in this country, rather than undermine the rule of law every day as our current travesty and broken immigration system does.

Finally, we know, Mr. Speaker, that as a people we are better than this. We need an immigration system that reflects our values, our faith values, our American values, our founding principles as a Nation of immigrants and a Nation of laws.

Mr. Speaker, today's debate is really not about the Affordable Care Act or even health care in general. It's politics. It's redundant. I would ask my friends on the other side of the aisle: Why are we not focused on fixing our broken immigration system when we have a bipartisan bill that two-thirds of the Senate has supported, that 75 percent of the American people support, that the President has expressed a willingness to sign? Let's bring that bill up, debate that bill, pass that bill, and solve a problem that the American people are crying out for a solution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Senate-passed bill, in my understanding from recent discussion with the House Parliamentarian, has not arrived in the House. The reason it has not arrived in the House is because it has an origination problem. The Senate, in its haste to rush a bill through, didn't get it right. As a consequence, that bill cannot come in the House.

We're here today to debate the rule for H.R. 2775. One of the things that I do feel obligated to point out—whether it's comprehensive immigration reform, whether it's any of the other things that people talk about—if you have an executive branch that only selectively enforces parts of laws that it wants to, why wouldn't the American people fear what might come out of the selective enforcement of a comprehensive immigration law?

Let me quote to you from the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act signed into law by President Obama on March 21, 2010. This is section 1513, section (d). This is a section that deals with the employer mandate. Section (d):

> Effective date—The amendments made by this section shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013.

That doesn't sound ambiguous. That doesn't sound difficult to comprehend, yet we are told that selectively the President has decided he doesn't want to enforce this, that it is inconvenient for him to enforce this, it runs counter to what some of his friends in some of the largest corporations in this country are telling him that they want—not what the American people want, but what they want—and the President simply suspends this part of the law in a blog post on July 2 of this year.

This is a fear that people have in my district: How do we trust that this President is going to enforce the laws that, under the Constitution, he is told that he must enforce? How do we trust

the Attorney General, who has sort of selectively decided what laws suit his purpose and what laws don't and selectively enforces those laws?

Why we are here today is because of the administration's selective enforcement of their law. I wasn't in favor of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. I voted against it. I voted against it in committee. I voted against it in the House version. I voted against it after it came back from the Senate. I'll vote against it every chance I get.

The fact of the matter is the President signed it into law and then decided it's inconvenient. So when the effective date reads, ''The amendments made by this section shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013,'' the President decides that's inconvenient and he doesn't want to do that anymore. He just suspends it, even though the law is the law. We never took a vote on that. We never said, Mr. President, we're with you or against you on this. He simply decided.

That's not the way this country is to run. That's not our constitutional Republic that our Founders envisioned for us. This is unilateral government by a ruler, which, by definition, is not allowed under our Constitution.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the rule, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Are we serious about border security? Is the border going to secure itself? There were 300,000 illegal crossings last year. That's almost 1,000 a day. That's 1,000 tomorrow. While Congress is sitting around discussing this stuff, that's 1,000 the next day. It's 1,000 the next day. Every day there will be 1,000 people illegally entering this country. Who knows who they are. Who knows if they represent a security risk.

There's a solution. Let's get serious. Let's increase the number of Border Patrol agents. Let's implement high-tech measures at the border. It's not rocket science.

Guess what? Our friends in the Senate have figured it out. They passed an immigration reform bill that includes provisions that get serious about enforcing our southern border that will substantially reduce—not eliminate—illegal crossings. It won't happen by itself. We have to pass it. We have to bring up that bill and pass it, rather than redundant measures that don't do anything.

Mr. Speaker, the Coalition of Evangelicals have put together an excellent statement of principles on immigration reform. The evangelical Christian leaders have called for a bipartisan solution that respects the God-given dignity of every person, protects the unity of the immediate family, and respects the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, I submit this policy statement to the RECORD.

EVANGELICAL STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM

Our national immigration laws have created a moral, economic and political crisis in America. Initiatives to remedy this crisis have led to polarization and name calling in which opponents have misrepresented each other's positions as open borders and amnesty versus deportations of millions. This false choice has led to an unacceptable political stalemate at the federal level at a tragic human cost.

As evangelical Christian leaders, we call for a bipartisan solution on immigration that:

Respects the God-given dignity of every person

Protects the unity of the immediate family

Respects the rule of law

Guarantees secure national borders

Ensures fairness to taxpayers

Establishes a path toward legal status and/or citizenship for those who qualify and who wish to become permanent residents

We urge our nation's leaders to work together with the American people to pass immigration reform that embodies these key principles and that will make our nation proud.

For signatories, go to evangelicalimmigrationtable.com.

It's not only people of faith. It's every American who, as we stare in the mirror at night, a vast majority of whom know that our grandparents, our great-grandparents, perhaps great-great-great-grandparents from the Mayflower, somewhere along the line, Mr. Speaker, our predecessors, our parents and our grandparents, came to these shores seeking opportunity, hope, and freedom, just as so many immigrants do today.

□ 1300

We can create a pathway to citizenship for people who are already here and who already contribute to our country to ensure that they do so legally instead of extralegally. Of course, getting behind those who are already in line in our current legal system. There is no citizenship that becomes anybody's right through this Senate immigration reform bill. It simply creates a line, a line behind those who are already in line, but a light at the end of the tunnel to show that some day those who aspire to give back to this country, to make this country wealthier and more prosperous, those who aspire to pay taxes, those who aspire to contribute to Social Security, those who aspire to live within the rule of law, are able to do so someday.

That families are reunited now, not in 10 years, not in 20 years, and we don't have to ever again tell a young girl coming home from school, sorry, your parents have been removed over a taillight or because they were in the wrong place at the wrong time or because their workplace was raided because of an unscrupulous employer.

We can and we must do better. The urgency is now. Not only are families torn apart every day, not only are there close to a thousand people a day crossing that border illegally, which will continue until we act, but we're costing Americans jobs and opportunities every day as well. Entrepreneurs and founders and folks that are looking at where to start their great next company that will employ thousands or tens of thousands of people are turning away from our shores. We're turning them away from our shores.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to take up comprehensive immigration reform and pass the Senate bill now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, let me just remind my colleagues here on the floor of the House that we are considering House Resolution 339 that provides for consideration of H.R. 2775, the No Subsidies Without Verification Act of 2013. And despite all of the tactics to distract from that debate, that is what the debate centers on today.

I would like to point out to my colleagues an opinion piece in The Wall Street Journal from today called ''Stopping ObamaCare Fraud.'' I'm going to read a little bit of the opinion piece:

Every politician claims to hate fraud in government, and the House of Representatives will have a chance to prove it Wednesday when it votes to close a gigantic hole for potential abuse in the Affordable Care Act. The Health and Human Services Department announced in July that it won't verify individual eligibility for the tens of billion in insurance subsidies that the law will dole out. Americans are supposed to receive those subsidies based on income and only if their employer doesn't provide federally approved health benefits. But until 2015 the rule will be: come on in, the subsidy is fine.

Health and Human Services will let applicants ''self attest'' that they are legally eligible. No further questions asked. The new ObamaCare exchanges will also be taking the applicant's word on their projected household income. It seems that what it calls ''operational barriers'' continue to prevent Health and Human Services from checking applications against Internal Revenue Service income data.

The administration argues that the fear of later HHS audits will keep applicants honest, though the threat of such checks has hardly prevented other fraud. The Treasury Inspector General estimates that 21 to 25 percent of earned income tax credits go to people who aren't eligible. An equivalent rate of fraud in the Affordable Care Act could mean $250 billion in bad payments in a decade. And does Health and Human Services really plan to claw back overpayments from individual exchange participants?

House Republicans by contrast will offer a vote that matters on Tennessee Representative DIANE BLACK's bill to require the administration to have a verification system in place before it hands out subsidies. Democrats have been unusually quiet in their opposition, perhaps because it is hard to justify voting in effect to give Americans subsidies to which they have no legal entitlement. Savings for taxpayers aside, the political merit of the House bill is that it puts a spotlight on a major ObamaCare failure and makes Democrats vote either to fix it or to simply go along with the failure. It also highlights another case in which with the Obama administration is refusing to enforce black-letter law. Republicans are asking that a vast new entitlement be held to the most basic due diligence, or be prudently delayed until it can. If Democrats can't support that vote, voters should know.

Again, that was from today's Wall Street Journal Review & Outlook.

Mr. Speaker, it's pretty apparent that the administration is only enforcing those parts of the law that it finds in its own best interest, and if something is inconvenient or embarrassing, it suspends the enforcement.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague says we are discussing some bill related to the Affordable Care Act or health care. It's simply not true that this House is working on health care. The Affordable Care Act is being implemented. It wasn't repealed. I know there was a candidate that ran for President against Mr. Obama that wanted to repeal it. Had he been elected, it still would have had to pass these Chambers. It didn't happen. Elections happened. The health care reforms are being implemented. I just met with some of the folks in the exchanges from my State of Colorado in my office earlier this morning. I realize the House of Representatives has voted 40 times—41 times—to repeal ObamaCare. It's just talk.

The shopping period in the exchanges begins on October 1. Coloradans, like many across the country, are rolling up their sleeves, going to work and figuring out what the Affordable Care Act means. We even had bipartisan support in my State for our law that created the exchange as well. When Connect for Colorado goes online next month, more than 817,000 Coloradans will have access to choosing a health care insurance product through the exchange, more than 80,000 people in my district.

Again, these things are just happening. I mean, this is information that I'm sharing here with the public. This has nothing to do with these bills that we're talking about, 40 repeals of ObamaCare, this redundant bill here today, where they like or don't like what the President is doing, they want to do it themselves they like what President Obama is doing so much.

I mean, these things are nothing. These things aren't going to the Senate. These things aren't being signed. They are absolutely symbolic and a complete waste of time, while this body hasn't spent 1 minute on the floor in consideration of an immigration reform bill; not 1 minute, which is why I'm taking this time, instead of talking about nothing—nothing, nothing, nothing—41 repeals of Affordable Care Act when it ain't going to happen because elections matter and have consequences—nothing—not 1 minute on something, something big: securing our border, restoring the rule of law, reducing our deficit, shoring up Social Security, improving our national security, making sure that our system is aligned with our values.

These are big deals. Not 1 minute. Not 1 minute. A lot of time on nothing, nothing, nothing, nothing. That's what we're doing today; it's what we did yesterday. I sure hope it's not what we're doing tomorrow, but, sadly, I'm not optimistic.

We need to act, Mr. Speaker, on so many pressing national issues. Surely we can spare 1 minute or 10 minutes or 15 minutes to discuss and pass the Senate immigration reform bill instead of this nothing. This nothing going nowhere, just like yesterday, just like tomorrow.

We can do better, Mr. Speaker. This Nation deserves an institution in the House of Representatives that serves the people of this country, serves the people in addressing real issues that they face; people that are tired of the undermining of our law by people working illegally, people that are tired of families being torn apart, and people that are tired of a thousand people a day illegally crossing our southern border today, and yes, tomorrow because of the refusal of this body to allow even 1 minute to discuss or debate a bill on immigration reform.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I would remind everyone in the House Chamber that seven times the House has voted to restrict, delay, defund a portion of the Affordable Care Act; seven times those have passed into law and been signed by the President.

This is an important effort. This was a massive overtaking of the country's health care system that was passed in not a bipartisan fashion but a single-party vote in March of 2010. The President has decided now even with his own law, he got everything he wanted in the law, he's going to selectively enforce. If we're going to talk about the rule of law, let's talk about the rule of law.

The bill rule before us today is a good rule. It ensures that those taxpayer subsidies are going to individuals who are deserving of those subsidies. And for crying out loud, let's stop the crooks.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I would inquire if the gentleman has any remaining speakers?

Mr. BURGESS. The gentleman from Texas has unlimited speakers in himself; but beyond me, no.

Mr. POLIS. Okay. The hordes of people coming to speak on this bill were not apparent to me here, but I'm prepared to close, Mr. Speaker, seeing no speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, despite spending hours and days of debate here on the Affordable Care Act, repealing it, defunding it, it's being implemented. That's happening. Elections have consequences. As the Speaker of this esteemed body himself has said, to paraphrase, it is unlikely we'll repeal ObamaCare with a fellow named Obama in the White House. That's simply a truism. Yet here we are today discussing something that will go nowhere and does nothing, instead of something that goes somewhere and does something.

This bill before us fails to replace our broken immigration system with one that works. If this bill before us today passes, I guarantee you that a thousand people will continue to cross illegally into the country tomorrow, the next day, and the next day. This bill does not secure our border at all. This bill does not reduce our deficit by over $100 billion. This bill does not reflect our values in our immigration system. This bill does not allow us to look in the mirror at night knowing that we are a Nation of immigrants and a Nation of laws, and we must reconcile those two.

The Senate passed a bipartisan comprehensive immigration bill last June, a bill that holds true to these principles, these principles of fiscal responsibility, reducing our deficit, shoring up Social Security, the principle of national security, of finally getting serious about securing our southern border, implementing mandatory workplace authentication to ensure that employers are following the law, the principle of job creation and competitiveness, ensuring that the great companies of tomorrow are based here and that we have access to the talent we need to be great and grow our economy as a country. The Senate comprehensive immigration reform bill would grow our GDP by over 3.3 percent. This bill will not. This bill will not.

And finally, this bill does nothing to address the concerns that have been raised by the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, by the Evangelical Immigration Table, by faith-based groups in a broad coalition across this country, and by those who value our traditions and our values as Americans.

This bill does nothing to reconcile our immigration system with our values; and the Senate immigration bill does. We can take it up now. We can pass it now. The President has expressed a willingness to sign it now. I encourage my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question, to vote ''no'' on this restrictive rule and unnecessary bill so that finally we can bring forward the Senate immigration reform bill, pass it, and send it to the President of the United States to get serious about addressing problems the American people by an overwhelming majority actually want us to solve.

□ 1315

The Senate bipartisan bill would bring people like Javier out of the shadows, reunite Gabriella and her sister with her parents, and provide them with an accelerated 5-year path to earn permanent residence so that they can contribute to making our country even greater.

Mr. Speaker, today's debate isn't really about the Affordable Care Act, or even health care in general. What's happening is happening. Some people like it; some people don't. It's happening.

This debate is purely politics. I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle, Why are we not focused on replacing our broken immigration system with one that works?

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle, join me in voting ''no,'' defeating this rule, and defeating the previous question. Perhaps we can finally get to work on the people's business here in the House of Representatives and finally fix our broken immigration system and replace it with one that works for our prosperity, our security, and for job creation for Americans.

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

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

Again, let me remind you why we are here today. We are here today because the President, who signed the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act into law in March of 2010, on July 2 of this year decided he was not going to enforce a portion of the law. Unilaterally, the President made the decision, didn't consult with Congress, put it out in a blog post on one of their White House Web sites on July 2.

Then 3 days later, on the Friday before the Fourth of July weekend, they came out with a raft of regulations; and buried within that raft of regulations was the fact that, oh, by the way, we're not checking anybody who comes in. We'll rely on self-attestation.

They were required to do that because, by not enforcing the employer mandate that was in their law that they signed, by not enforcing the employer mandate, the data would not be collected and, in fact, there was no way to enforce that data.

So we simply don't need the data. We'll trust; people are going to be honest. If they come in and say they need a subsidy, of course they need a subsidy. We'll give it to them. And, yeah, at some point, it might even be checked against their IRS records.

How are you going to call that back from someone who doesn't have the money anymore because, after all, the dollars and the subsidy don't go to the individual; they go to the insurance company. It's not like that individual went and deposited that in a bank account. It went to their insurance company to buy their health insurance.

The money's been spent, the policy has been utilized or not, but that water is under the bridge.

I didn't ask for this debate. I didn't ask for the President to sign the health care bill into law, but he did. But then I sure didn't ask him to just delay parts of it.

If anything is inconvenient to you, Mr. President, just kind of put it away, put it to the side.

All kinds of things have fallen off the Affordable Care Act as it's bucked and burped down the road towards implementation. You may remember the debate about preexisting conditions. What about the Federal preexisting condition program?

Anyone who showed up after February 1 of this year to be covered under the Federal preexisting condition program was told, sorry, the window is closed; we're not signing up any more individuals because we're out of money. So they had to wait 11 months until the Elysian Fields of the Affordable Care Act spread out before them.

But what are they to do for that 11 months if they've got a diagnosis which is incompatible with life unless they get treatment?

But the administration didn't care about that. They simply suspended enrollment to the preexisting condition program.

Well, what about the caps on out-of-pocket expenses that an individual could incur during a year?

Under the Affordable Care Act there were caps signed in law by the President. Well, the caps were excluded because it's kind of inconvenient, and we don't want to do that anymore.

The small business health exchanges are delayed for a year. What else is going to fall off this thing as it lurches towards implementation on January 1?

I don't know. But I do know this: we have an opportunity today to vote on a rule that allows the bill to come to the floor that will require that the Department of Health and Human Services, the Inspector General, ensure that those individuals who come and say, hey, I'm eligible for a subsidy, to ensure that they are, in fact, eligible for that subsidy.

We fight all the time in committee with money going out the door at the Department of Health and Human Services, the pay-and-chase model. It clearly doesn't work.

Medicare and Medicaid, inappropriate payments, inefficient expenditures happen all the time. Let's not make that worse. Let's stop paying the crooks. We have an opportunity today to stop paying the crooks.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for the consideration of a critical bill to protect taxpayer dollars from the rampant fraud inevitable in an undertaking as massive as the health insurance overhaul that is known as ObamaCare.

I congratulate my colleague from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) for her thoughtful piece of legislation. And for that reason, I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the underlying bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. BURGESS. 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.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1410

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on H. Res. 339; adoption of H. Res. 339, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2775, NO SUBSIDIES WITHOUT VERIFICATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 339) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2775) to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 196, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 456]

YEAS—227

Aderholt	Carter	Fleischmann
Alexander	Cassidy	Fleming
Amash	Chabot	Flores
Amodei	Chaffetz	Forbes
Bachmann	Coble	Fortenberry
Bachus	Coffman	Foxx
Barletta	Cole	Franks (AZ)
Barr	Collins (GA)	Frelinghuysen
Barton	Collins (NY)	Gardner
Benishek	Conaway	Garrett
Bentivolio	Cook	Gerlach
Bilirakis	Cotton	Gibbs
Bishop (UT)	Cramer	Gibson
Black	Crawford	Gingrey (GA)
Blackburn	Crenshaw	Gohmert
Boustany	Culberson	Goodlatte
Brady (TX)	Daines	Gosar
Bridenstine	Davis, Rodney	Gowdy
Brooks (AL)	Dent	Granger
Brooks (IN)	DeSantis	Graves (GA)
Broun (GA)	DesJarlais	Graves (MO)
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart	Griffin (AR)
Bucshon	Duffy	Griffith (VA)
Burgess	Duncan (SC)	Guthrie
Calvert	Duncan (TN)	Hall
Camp	Ellmers	Hanna
Campbell	Farenthold	Harper
Cantor	Fincher	Harris
Capito	Fitzpatrick	Hartzler