

the best start possible, I was happy to cosponsor, along with a majority of my colleagues in the House, the Achieving a Better Life Experience, or ABLE, Act, which was signed into law last year.

This law allows people with disabilities and their families to create a flexible account to help save for medical and dental care, education, community-based support, employment training, housing, and transportation.

In my home State of Pennsylvania, State legislation that will allow deductions of account contributions from State taxable income has been introduced in the Commonwealth's house and senate. I urge their passage to complete the work the Federal Government has started.

DOWN SYNDROME AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, this month we recognize Down Syndrome Awareness Month. As we celebrate the abilities of more than 400,000 Americans living with Down Syndrome, it is important that we address some of the problems these individuals and their families face.

Families and patients who are affected by Down Syndrome face many related health issues. I had the privilege of meeting a very inspiring patient during the Energy and Commerce's work on 21st Century Cures legislation. Madison, a young girl diagnosed with Down Syndrome, had four major open-heart surgeries all before her 3rd birthday.

An estimated 50 percent of children born with Down Syndrome have some form of heart defect, like Madison; yet, her surgeries are still fairly new in the medical world. Our Cures legislation encourages additional research for medications and procedures that could benefit children like Madison. We must continue our work to promote a better quality of life for all patients across the Nation.

□ 1230

RECOGNIZING INTERNATIONAL DAY OF THE GIRL AND THE GIRL UP MOVEMENT

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the International Day of the Girl and the Girl Up movement. Their mission is to raise awareness to the neglect and devaluation of girls around the world and to advance girls' lives and opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, in the Aw-Barre refugee camp in Ethiopia, girls under the age of 18 comprise about 30 percent of the

population. However, due to the lack of resources, many families of the Aw-Barre have stopped educating their girls. This leaves young women more vulnerable to be victims of sexual violence and significantly limits their lives and opportunities.

Girl Up, a local campaign in Illinois' Tenth Congressional District, is working to combat global crisis like the Aw-Barre refugee camp. Young women, like Celia Buckman of Glenview, are working with their high schools to provide resources like school uniforms, backpacks, and safe spaces to help young women succeed.

I am proud to work with Girl Up and recognize the International Day of the Girl to bring awareness to the complex challenges facing young women around the globe.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 22, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in clause 2(h) of rule II of the rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 22, 2015 at 10:47 a.m.:

That the Senate passed with amendments H.R. 208.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 774.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3762, RESTORING AMERICANS' HEALTHCARE FREEDOM RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2015; WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 483 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 483

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3762) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016. 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 further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of October 23, 2015.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of October 22, 2015, or October 23, 2015, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to start with the end of what our Reading Clerk read before I get to the excitement in the beginning.

At the end, what you heard was some blanket authority to consider what I will call housekeeping measures here in the House, and not because Republicans say so, not because Democrats say so, but because Republicans and Democrats come together, consult with one another, and try to find those issues on which we agree to bring forward.

I sit on the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker. The best thing that happens in this institution is when a bill comes through the Rules Committee, because my colleague Ms. SLAUGHTER and I always make it better. We always make it better.

But we include authority to avoid the Rules Committee for some of these issues that are going to come to the floor fast and furious. Here we are, at the end of a cycle. We are in a leadership change here in the House. You don't know what might happen. What the Rules Committee did last night was to create a pathway to allow the House to continue its business at a moment's notice, and I am glad that we included that provision in here. We also include same-day consideration authority.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that happened when the big freshman class that I was elected with in 2010 came is we said, for Pete's sakes, we need time to read the bills. We need to follow the rules and make sure that all Members have a chance to get deep into the information and legislation.

That persists still today. We have a process today that allows Members to get involved in that legislation. But we still have those emergency times here in this Chamber where something has to happen in a hurry. Whether we are talking about borrowing authority, spending authority, whether we are talking about something for our troops, something for our veterans, things still happen on a moment's notice.

What we have included in here is the ability to bring things more quickly to the floor here in the next short period of time. That is important from a housekeeping perspective, Mr. Speaker, but that is not what is important about this rule today.

What is important about this rule today is that 4½ years ago, the people of the great State of Georgia, its Seventh District, sent me to Congress. I was placed on the Budget Committee in this Congress, the Budget Committee, the committee that writes the framework by which the entire \$3.5 trillion Federal Government is funded. We got together and we worked hard here in the House, Mr. Speaker, and we produced a budget, but the Senate did nothing.

I came back that second year, 2012. We worked hard here in the House. Together, we produced a budget, but the Senate did nothing. We came back again 2013, worked hard here in the House, produced a budget, but the Senate produced nothing.

Mr. Speaker, what we are here today to do—what we are here today to do—is made possible for one reason, and one reason only. That is because, for the first time since 2001, Republicans and Democrats came together in the House; Republicans and Democrats came together in the Senate. We passed a budget; they passed a budget. We conferenced a budget, and America has a balanced budget which it lives under for the first time in 15 years—for the first time in 15 years.

Now, what does that mean?

It is not all that exciting to read the budget, Mr. Speaker. I recommend it to you if you haven't gotten into the details. I recommend it to anybody who hasn't gotten into the details.

But that is not what is exciting. It is not the numbers in the budget that are exciting. What is exciting is that, because we came together, not because we had our ideas and they had their ideas, but because we came together, we have triggered a process called reconciliation.

Now, I am saddened that reconciliation is now in the lexicon of the American people. It is not an important word that folks need to know ex-

cept for the fact that it gives us access to do things on their behalf that we wouldn't have been able to do before.

I am so pleased that the Secretary of the Senate sent that message over right before we got up to say that the Senate has just acted on two pieces of House legislation. One of those, enacted with no amendments, is going to be on its way to the President's desk. One, done with amendments, we are going to have to consider that again.

So often we do such good work, the 435 of us together in this Chamber, and it does not get past a Senate filibuster. Mr. Speaker, the filibuster is designed to protect the rights of the minority. Republicans use it when they are in the minority; Democrats use it when they are in the minority; but it prevents the people's business from moving forward.

Not so today. Not so today. Because we got together in the House with a budget and the Senate with a budget, because we brought a budget together, we are now in the process of reconciliation, which allows us to have the people's will be done. Fifty-one votes in the Senate now will move legislation forward, as it relates to balancing the budget.

You remember, Admiral Mullen, he said, Mr. Speaker, the greatest threat to American national security wasn't a military threat. He said it was our Federal budget deficit.

We have done such an amazing job collaboratively in this Chamber working on the one-third of the budget pie called discretionary spending. That is the spending that we have to work on here every year. What we have failed to do together is work on the two-thirds of the pie called mandatory spending, where the real growth in those budget programs occurs. But that failure ends today.

With the passage of this rule, we will move to consider the first reconciliation package that has come to Congress in the 4½ years that I have been here, made possible by the first balanced budget agreement that Congress has come to since 2001.

Mr. Speaker, this is why—this is why—I came to Congress, and we are doing it together here today.

Let me tell you what is in this bill. I have seen it described in the press as a complete and total repeal of the President's healthcare bill. That is nonsense. I would support such an effort if we could bring such an effort to the floor, but that is not what this bill is today. What this bill is today is a group of commonsense, budget-saving, spending-reprioritizing measures.

I will give you an example. There is a medical excise tax that the President's healthcare law put into effect. It is 2.3 percent. It is an excise tax, a gross receipts tax on all medical innovation in this country as it relates to devices. We all know the power to tax is the power to destroy. There is not one Member in this Chamber who supports destroying medical innovation, not one—not one.

But, back at the time when the Congressional Budget Office said the President's healthcare bill was going to cost \$1 trillion, the President said: I am not going to spend a penny more than \$1 trillion. I am going to make sure it is paid for.

He was out there looking hard for money. Turns out, medical innovation was a place he could look. We all see now, in retrospect, that was a terrible idea, much like the other nine bills that we have passed here in this House, that they have passed in the Senate, that the President has signed into law to repeal various unworkable parts of the President's healthcare bill. This is just yet another.

We can do this together here today, made possible by this first budget agreement that we have had since 2001.

The Cadillac tax it is called, Mr. Speaker, another provision that this bill will repeal. It is a Cadillac tax, Mr. Speaker.

As we all know, Cadillac is a fine American automobile. You get in a Cadillac, you feel good. We call it the Cadillac tax because it is on healthcare plans that are too good—too good. Turns out, Mr. Speaker, there are some labor unions in this country that are taking too good of care of their members. Turns out there are some businesses in this country that are looking after the healthcare needs of their employees too much. We want to keep that down. The last thing we want in this country, apparently, is folks having health care that is too good.

I tell people all the time, Mr. Speaker, I can make everybody in this country poor; I just can't pass a law to make everybody rich. We are so good at dumbing down the system for everybody. Well, that is what this Cadillac tax was designed to do.

The labor unions don't like it. Employers don't like it. We all know it is not the right thing to do, and in a bipartisan way we have introduced legislation to repeal it. This bill, this rule, gives us an opportunity to actually send that to the President's desk.

Mr. Speaker, I won't go on and on about all the good things that are in this bill. I am sure my colleague from New York is going to highlight a lot of those herself, and I don't want to steal all the thunder.

But we are here because 435 of us came together here, 100 came together there, and America is operating under a conferenced budget, and not just a budget, but a balanced budget for the first time since 2001.

A lot of disappointment has come out of Washington, D.C., Mr. Speaker, but we are here on the floor today talking about one of those things we get to celebrate, one of those successes on behalf of the families back home, that we have done together.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time

as I may consume. I really enjoy serving with him on the Rules Committee because he is always so cheerful and puts such a good face on everything, and heaven knows we can use that in the world.

But the truth is, Mr. Speaker, and my colleague knows it, that by taking away the funding for the healthcare act, you are killing the healthcare act. That means that people would go back to not having preexisting conditions covered.

That means that women in eight States and the District of Columbia would face the fact that their insurance companies consider domestic violence to be a preexisting condition, which translates out, if you are beaten up once, maybe they will cover you. The second time, it is obviously your fault. You have that propensity.

We can't go back to the rising cost of health care with so many Americans using the most expensive kind of health care in the world, the emergency room. We are told that if this were to pass, 13 million Americans would lose their health care.

But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, this is not going to pass, and we know that. As a matter of fact, I find myself saying over and over again the very same things. I remember saying this is the 35th vote, this is the 40th vote. This, Mr. Speaker, is the 61st vote, using tax money and wasting time, to take health care away from people.

Now, I have asked many, many times in the Rules Committee: What is this great urge to prohibit people from having access to health care?

□ 1245

The best I can come up with is it is not particularly that they don't care about those people, but they want to do something to upset the President. There was a good deal of talk yesterday that, if we could add a few amendments on here, it would really cause him grief.

It is not going to cause him any grief. If this should pass, if the Senate should pass it, which is in control of Republicans—and, you know, if you complain about not passing the bill, take it up with them—what we are going to be doing is, if it gets to the President, he is going to veto it, and you know very good and well that we don't have the votes here to override. So we are wasting time.

We are just wasting time and wasting money. I don't know how many millions of dollars of tax money it has taken with these 61 bills, but then they throw in a little something else here.

They say: Let's defund Planned Parenthood for 1 year. Why? I don't know. Three committees in the House of Representatives are studying Planned Parenthood, and we have got to look forward to one of those other new select committees which will go over the same thing over and over again and come up with the conclusion that Con-

gressman CHAFFETZ came up with after they grilled the president of Planned Parenthood, Cecile Richards, for 5 hours, that there was nothing there, that they broke no law.

I don't know why the American public is not outraged over the fact that none of their business is taken care of, but over and over and over again we talk about taking health care away from people.

One in five American women and a lot of men have used Planned Parenthood and do today. And then you add to that the 13 million people that will lose their health care if this should become law, 3 million of them children.

Now, what should we be doing? Well, how about the Export-Import Bank. It doesn't cost the taxpayers a dime, puts money back into the Treasury. It allows small companies in the United States to be able to afford to export their goods to other countries.

The loss of that bank has already received from both General Electric and Boeing words that they are going to take jobs out of the United States because we don't have it. There is no earthly reason not to have it. As I said, it doesn't cost us anything. It makes us money. It is just that for some Members of Congress they just don't like it.

Now, this is the same majority that has produced no highway bill. We really are on a road to nowhere. For the first time that I have been in Congress—a highway bill was always something everybody joined. It was always bipartisan.

But we have got roads and bridges crumbling. We have no high-speed rail. Airports are overcrowded. Everybody needs help. But we are working here to do something about the healthcare bill that is already working and Planned Parenthood.

Now, this is the same majority that brought us the 7 legislative days away from risking the full faith and credit of the United States. What that means is that we are refusing—the majority is—to bring up a bill here to pay the debt that they have already incurred. It is the Congress that spends the money, and now they decided they don't want to pay for it. So they are putting that off.

We have heard talks that tomorrow we are supposed to have a bill, but we all know—because we all hear everything that is going on—that there are only 170 votes for that bill, which won't pass it. So we may not see it.

So what we are going to do today is give everybody in the House of Representatives an opportunity to protect the full faith and credit of the United States and not risk another downgrade of our credit rating. To downgrade the credit rating of the United States was something that all previous Congresses felt was an impossible thing for them to allow.

But while this is all festering out there and nothing is being done about it, we are hurling toward another shutdown in mid-December.

So once again we find ourselves: Let's take away that health care. Let's shut down that thing over there. But let's not deal with the issues that we have been sent here, the things that we have been elected to do.

And one of those has to be to protect the full faith and credit of the United States of America, which has always been done and was a responsibility of all previous Congresses.

Now, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the reconciliation bill before us will take health care away from 16 million people, 3 million children, and I might add most of them didn't have any health care at all before the ACA was passed. As I said, it would also defund Planned Parenthood and endanger the health of men and women across the country. If I haven't said it enough, again, this defunds Planned Parenthood.

A scant 3 weeks ago we stood on the floor as the House majority threatened to shut down the government over the funding for Planned Parenthood. The American public gave a very resounding message to Congress: Don't do it. In fact, nearly seven in ten Americans oppose a government shutdown over Planned Parenthood funding, according to a Quinnipiac poll.

With this 61st vote to dismantle the ACA—and make no mistake about it. It doesn't say in there we are going to kill this thing. We are just going to take the money away from it.

And if you are smart enough to be a Member of Congress of the United States, you know that, if you take the money away from it, you have killed that bill. We all understand that. But as the majority continues to beat their head up against the brick wall of health care, the American people get the headache.

This budget reconciliation bill before us does two things. One, it takes health care away from, as I said, 16 million Americans. Two, it attacks women's health by defunding Planned Parenthood.

I believe that governing this body is a serious job with serious consequences. The brinkmanship that this majority continues to display is dangerous to our economy and unsettling to our Nation. The last time the majority shut down the government over the debt limit, it took \$24 billion out of this economy.

The consequences of this kind of brinkmanship are real. They are not imagined. We have been through it once. Why in the world would we self-inflict that wound on ourselves again?

We should not be pushed to the edge over and over again. We should be planning what we need to do, follow regular order. My dear colleague Mr. WOODALL talked about how wonderfully well Democrats and Republicans work together. I don't know where that is.

I know that the chair of the Benghazi Committee kept talking about he had 7 members. There are actually 12 on there. But it just demonstrated again

that the 5 Democrats on there did not signify with them.

We need to focus on the urgent needs of the Nation, not manufactured crises that we are insisting on creating.

To address the real issues, we have got a plan to allow us to pay the bills that this Congress has incurred and to protect the full faith and credit of the United States. We always call for this on rules. We do something called the previous question, which everybody sort of glides over.

This today, what we are doing—when the previous question on this rule vote is called, I hope that every Member who wants to do something about the debt limit and the full faith and credit of the United States will vote “no” so that our side can bring this up and give everybody an opportunity to go home for a weekend without worrying about whether this is going away.

By the time we get back here next week, there will be even fewer legislative days to deal with it. But our troops, national security, the whole Federal Government, and most of the people in the United States are very much concerned with what will happen if it shuts down.

Let’s relieve us of that burden and vote today to deal with the debt limit. I invite all Members to vote for the Democrats’ clean, simple bill. It doesn’t do anything about taking away regulations from the government, nothing. It simply deals with the most important matter at hand at this point, and that is the full faith and credit of the United States.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I confess. I was sitting over here going through my papers. I was afraid I had come down here on the wrong bill here today, listening to my friend describe it. I tell you that, if you listen to that description and you believe it, you ought to vote “no.” But it is just not true. It is just not true.

In fact, I will go line by line just a little bit. You will not find a CBO document over there that says House Resolution 483 is going to take health care away from 16 million Americans. We are not going to find it.

In fact, you won’t find a CBO document that says the underlying bill of H.R. 3762 is going to take health care away from anybody because such a document does not exist.

CBO did say that the President’s healthcare bill would provide health care for 16 million Americans. Yet, the President has joined with this House and that Senate nine times so far to repeal errant provisions of that healthcare bill, and that is what we are going to do here in this legislation today.

You won’t find any language that suggests that House Resolution 483 is going to deal with preexisting conditions to set back preexisting conditions coverage in any way whatsoever, nor will you find any paper that suggests

the underlying bill, H.R. 3672, is going to set back the conversation on pre-existing conditions.

Why? Because the President led on the issue of preexisting conditions, Mr. Speaker, much like a great Georgia speaker of this House, Newt Gingrich, and Bill Clinton got together and did in 1996. They got together and outlawed all preexisting conditions for federally regulated plans.

What President Obama did in his healthcare bill has said: Well, as States haven’t done it on their own, we are going to do it for all State-regulated plans, too.

This bill doesn’t dial that back one iota, not one bit. The President, I believe, won that debate in America. I don’t think we are ever going to revisit that debate.

I think that is a success story for families with preexisting conditions and, again, something else we ought to be celebrating here today, Mr. Speaker, not holding our heads low about.

Mr. Speaker, when the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff tells you that the greatest threat to America’s national security is our budget deficit—and, at the time that I arrived here in Congress, Mr. Speaker, in 2010, America was running its largest budget deficit in American history, three times the size that they are today—I tell you a bill like this that goes after those deficit numbers is a critically important bill. It is the business that my constituents back home sent me to be about here in this institution.

Now, of course, in the 4½ years that the folks in the Seventh District have lent me their voting card, Mr. Speaker, we have brought budget deficits down each and every year—each and every year—year after year after year after year. But that has been primarily on that discretionary one-third of the pie I talked about, Mr. Speaker.

There is so much more work to be done, and reconciliation is the tool we use to get around the filibuster, to allow the people’s will to be done with simple majorities on both sides of the Hill.

Good news. If you don’t believe what is in the underlying bill is good for America, you can vote “no,” and if 51 percent of your colleagues agree with you, this bill will not go forward. But that is not going to happen because this is good policy.

And good news, Mr. Speaker. When it goes over to the Senate, if the Senate does not believe this is good policy for America and 51 Senators vote against it, this bill will not go to the President’s desk.

But that is not going to happen because there is good policy in the underlying bill. This will go to the President’s desk.

As the President sits today, Mr. Speaker, contemplating vetoing the National Defense Authorization Act—in fact, that may be happening even as we are standing here now, that bill that provides authorized funding for all

of our troops—I can’t possibly predict what he will do when this bill arrives on his desk.

But what my friend from New York fails to mention every time she mentions that 61 times in this House we have dealt with trying to clean up the messes that the Affordable Care Act has created is that 9 of those times the President agreed with us.

It is just so critically important, Mr. Speaker. We get wrapped around the partisan axle in this body in ways that are tremendously discouraging to me, as if it is always an us against them proposition. It is not. It is just a proposition about us—about us—320 million of us.

And nine times so far, Mr. Speaker, just in the short time that I have been in Congress, the House, the Senate, and the President have gotten together and said the Affordable Care Act is broken and together we can begin to fix it.

I believe this is going to be one of those opportunities as well, Mr. Speaker. It is going to be a tremendous vote, I hope, on passing this rule, which will allow us to begin debate. Pass that underlying resolution.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I just say once again, no, they don’t say: We are going to take away pre-existing conditions. They just say: We are taking away the funding for the bill.

When the funding is taken away, it dies. I think almost all Americans understand that.

I am pleased now to yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

□ 1300

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to discuss the rule for reconciliation, which I believe we are wasting on a doomed attempt to repeal ObamaCare for the 61st time. That we are doing this again for the 61st time is a problem. But that we are wasting our one shot at budget reconciliation on this is a tremendous shame. We should be using this opportunity to avoid the Senate filibuster to actually make law, not make a point to our bases. The way to do this is by focusing on a bipartisan issue: canceling the sequester.

Mr. Speaker, the sequester is a unique problem in American public policy, a program that is intentionally designed to be a bad idea. It cripples the programs that made the 20th century one of unprecedented progress, and it weakens the bravest military in the world. It is bad for us at home, and it is bad for us overseas.

Its blundering destructive approach to deficit reduction was supposed to push this Congress to compromise. Unfortunately, we have not gotten there

because a few intransigents refuse to give up this hostage. But it isn't this body that is paying the ransom for our inaction on the sequester; it is the American people of all walks of life. It is the millions of workers, businesses, public servants, and soldiers who are facing uncertainty and inadequate support.

Mr. Speaker, I would encourage us to stand up and use this one shot on something that matters and can pass, and canceling the sequester is something that both sides could actually agree on. So I urge my colleagues, please, to bring this theater to a close and to return to something we can all support. Let's use reconciliation to cancel the sequester once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

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

Mr. Speaker, if I could say to my friend from Michigan, I think there is a lot of wisdom in what he had to say. My friend has been here, Mr. Speaker, since 1965, I believe. I can't remember if he was elected in 1964 and began service in 1965. He has seen a lot of failures and a lot of successes in this institution.

Reconciliation exists for one reason and one reason only, and that is to do the really hard things that we can't get done in other times. I would say to my friend, Mr. Speaker, that the die has been cast on reconciliation for 2015. But as a member of the Budget Committee, I will commit to you that we are going to come back, and we are going to get a conferenced balanced budget next year as well. I hear that drumbeat beginning around this institution: What is it that we can get done together? I hope we get this done.

Make no mistake, I believe this is good underlying legislation. But the past, well, three decades now since 1980, as I think of the big reconciliation measures that have gone through have been things that have changed America for the better forever, and I am grateful to the gentleman for reminding us all of the power of this tool.

Mr. Speaker, 61 times we have had a vote on the President's healthcare bill, that is true. But it is because there are real problems there—again, nine times of which the President has agreed with us about those real problems.

The folks who crafted the President's healthcare bill were smart. I don't have any concerns about the funding that my friend from New York has, Mr. Speaker, because the bill has funding buried in it in such a way we don't have any access to it from this institution. That is why we passed 4½ years' worth of legislation here without getting our arms around that funding.

What we are talking about here, Mr. Speaker, are budget deficits. What we are talking about here is an opportunity to move the needle on mandatory spending. What we are talking about here is about \$81 billion in static scored money, closer to 130 in dynam-

cally scored money, moving the needle on the budget, as Admiral Mullen, then the Chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, encouraged us to do.

I don't know where the vote is going to come out, Mr. Speaker. I feel pretty good about it. I feel pretty good about it because it is good underlying policy. I feel pretty good about it because we did this the right way. We started in the Budget Committee. We conferenced it with the Senate. We then sent those reconciliation instructions out to the Energy and Commerce Committee, the Education and Labor Committee, and the Ways and Means Committee. Each committee did its work, sent that work back to the Budget Committee, and we then brought all that legislation together. Mr. Speaker, if you want a textbook case of how it is supposed to work around here, this is it.

Now, as a fellow who has been disappointed many times in 4½ years in this institution, I am just going to tell my colleagues that if any of my new colleagues believe they are going to have it their way every day of the week, the answer is no. I was disabused of that notion in week one.

But what we can do is bring the collective wisdom of the body together, the collective wisdom of the body and the collective wisdom from our committee structures, and this bill does that. There is only one way to get to this bill, though, Mr. Speaker, and that is to pass this rule today, House Resolution 483, and I encourage my colleagues to do that.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. I do so as somebody who comes from a State which, unlike maybe the gentleman from Georgia, actually embraced this law. The Governor set up an exchange right away, and we have had what Forbes Magazine has described as the highest functioning exchange in the country. Our uninsured rate went from 8 percent down to 4 percent. We have more insurers in the marketplace today than we did before the ACA was passed.

On Labor Day, I was at a picnic with some friends, and there was a gentleman there who was the head of HR for the second largest employer in this community that I was at. It was about a 300-employee firm, a trash hauler, who was actually quite concerned about the ACA's definition of part-time and full-time in terms of raising his rates. For the last 2 years, his rates have gone down. He yelled from the pool where he was playing with his kids, splashing around in the water, saying: Tell President Obama thank you for the Affordable Care Act because our rates have gone down for the 275 people that worked there.

So, Mr. Speaker, then the question is: What does this bill do? The fact of

the matter is, by eliminating the individual mandate, by basically destroying the financing of tax subsidies, which is precisely the way that you broaden the insurance market so that you can implement an elimination of preexisting conditions, you, in fact, are totally capsizing the market.

I know that because the State of Connecticut insurance department and the exchange have looked at what this bill is going to do to the individual mandate, and that is precisely what they said the outcome would be, that it would send rates through the roof and basically shatter the success that our State has accomplished.

What is so ironic about this is that the design of this bill with an individual mandate and tax subsidies for insurance came from the Heritage Foundation. Stuart Butler was the mastermind of this back in the 1990s. I was chairman of the Public Health Committee back then, and I remember vividly that that was the Heritage Foundation, the conservative alternative to healthcare reform, to the Clinton healthcare plan. But, obviously, for political reasons, that is not mentioned very much by the majority as we again debate this ad nauseam.

What is sad is that 2 weeks ago we passed a bill, H.R. 1624, sponsored by my good friend, Mr. GUTHRIE from Kentucky, which amended the Affordable Care Act. It changed the definition of "small employer," and it was done on a bipartisan basis, completely unanimous. It sailed through the House, and President Obama signed it.

Why did that work? Because they did it surgically, because BRETT was smart enough to understand that if you want to get people to come together, you don't load it up with a bunch of poison pills, that you actually present an idea with focus and with logic behind it. Guess what will happen. You will actually get bipartisan support, the complete opposite of the bill that we have before us here today.

Now, I want to point out, though, that there are some signs of intelligent life in this reconciliation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, section 305 does, as the gentleman from Georgia points out, eliminate the excise tax on high-class plans.

It is interesting to note that 5 years ago it was the House Members who pushed hard against that proposal with the administration, and we delayed that tax for 5 years. H.R. 2050, which I am the lead sponsor of, I am proud to say we have 166 bipartisan cosponsors. It is verbatim the language that was incorporated into the reconciliation bill.

So I point that out because I do think that it, in fact, will basically sharply increase people's out-of-pocket

deductibles because that is what actuaries tell us is the only way you can respond to that kind of tax. It is true that 83 organizations, including organized labor, business groups, and small-business groups have said this is not a workable plan. I mention that here because there is an opportunity here to do what Congressman GUTHRIE did, which is to take an individual component, an idea, and not load it up with a lot of other baggage which is going to capsize the insurance market, which we know is going to happen if other provisions of the reconciliation bill are passed, that we can actually get it done.

You are giving the White House a perfect excuse to veto this bill and robbing us of the ability to actually address this real problem, which section 305 does recognize, and H.R. 2050 is out there and is on standby for us to move forward on. So let's get rid of the blunt instruments, the baseball bats, and the butchering of this law, and let's focus on bipartisan surgical fixes to real problems.

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

Mr. Speaker, I say to my friend from Connecticut that the point that he made was made very well by the gentleman from Oklahoma last night while we were in the Rules Committee. You only get to use this procedure once—actually, you can use it three times; but for a variety of different reasons, it is only going to come together for us once this year—and you have to choose how to do that.

I am thrilled—thrilled—that the story that the gentleman from Connecticut tells is of success for his constituents back home in Connecticut. I think that is fabulous. I think that is fabulous.

Mr. Speaker, I don't get to tell as many of those stories. I tell stories of folks who had plans that they liked, and those plans were outlawed by their government. I tell stories about folks who have doctors that they had had relationships with for decades, who were promised that if they liked their doctor they could keep their doctor, who lost access to their doctor because their government told them "no more for you."

I tell stories of the small businesses in the district that were doing the right thing by providing health care for their employees who have now been priced out of that marketplace. They are not required by law to do it, but rates have gone up so much they can't do it themselves—not because of our efforts to provide health care to people, but because of our efforts to tell people what kind of health care is good for them and what kind isn't.

Mr. Speaker, you may not know, the chairman of the Budget Committee is Georgia Congressman Dr. TOM PRICE. Dr. TOM PRICE, in H.R. 2300, has a replacement plan. Dr. TOM PRICE wants to see preexisting conditions out of the marketplace. Dr. TOM PRICE, in H.R.

2300, wants to see individuals able to move their policies from business to business, from place to place.

Mr. Speaker, it is a doctor-patient relationship. It is not a Federal Government-patient relationship. It is not a Federal HHS, Health and Human Services-patient relationship, and it is not an insurance company-doctor relationship. It is about me and my physician, you and your physician, our families and our family physician, 320 million Americans at a time.

We have it right here in this institution. We have replacement options right here.

Do not let it be said that in the name of trying to bring sanity to our Federal spending, in the name of trying to fix the errors that were created in the Affordable Care Act, do not let it be said that any Member wants to trample on the healthcare opportunities that families have back home. Our goal is to expand those opportunities, not to contract them.

I celebrate what has happened in Connecticut. I only wish that folks in Connecticut, New York, and elsewhere would support us in Georgia with the challenges that we are having and help us get back to that very personal doctor-patient relationship that we believe is the right of every American.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the budget reconciliation bill avoids the real problems before us, including the debt limit, the Export-Import Bank, a highway bill, a looming shutdown, and more. Instead of addressing the urgent needs of the Nation, the bill doubles down on attacking women's health and marks the 61st time that the House majority has voted to repeal, to defund, or to undermine the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, let's try to salvage something from the money we have spent on this hour here at a time that we have literally wasted again, for the 61st time. Let's salvage something from it by voting "no" on the previous question. We can actually accomplish something then.

If the previous question is defeated, we will be able to vote to take care of the issue of debt limit, the full faith and credit of the United States of America.

□ 1315

A simple vote "no" allows us to bring that up, vote for that, go home this weekend not having to be chewing everybody's nails and then everybody in the country wonders what in heck is going to be going on here.

Why don't we for a change here on this day, on this Thursday, do something positive, do something that needs doing, do something we know sooner or later we will do. Do it today on a clean bill, no additions of any kind, just to do it. It is an opportunity that I certainly hope people will take advantage of. I urge them to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" so that we can vote "yes" on a vote to deal with the debt limit issue and a "no" vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe there is more that unites us than that divides us not just in this Chamber, but in this Nation.

As I have listened to my colleague from New York talk about some of the priorities that America has, I think she is spot on. I think she is spot on.

I am missing votes in the Transportation Committee right now where we are moving that long-term transportation bill so that I can be down here on the floor moving this reconciliation bill.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of rust in the gears around here. There is a lot of rust in the gears. It has been since the 1990s that Congress—House and Senate combined—have sent all the appropriations bills to the President before the end of the fiscal year. It has been since the 1990s.

Newt Gingrich ran this institution the last time we did that. Bill Clinton was in the White House the last time we did that. There is a lot of rust in the gears that has accumulated under both Republican and Democratic leadership in this place.

But this year we passed more appropriations bills earlier in the fiscal year than at any point since 1974. This year we are moving the first long-term highway bill that we have seen in almost a decade.

This year we have conferenced a balanced budget for America for the first time in a decade and a half. That is not just a notch to put on the belt of America to say this is what we have done. This is an opportunity to move this budget reconciliation bill.

Mr. Speaker, I do. I am saddened that reconciliation is a word that folks have to go and look up and learn, but it is the only way—the only way—in divided government that the people's voice can be heard.

There is no other procedure in the United States Congress that allows 51 percent of America to prevail. There is no other ability in the United States Congress for the majority of Americans who have lent their power to Washington to express their views and change the law of the land, save this one.

Mr. Speaker, budget deficits have gone down each and every year since Speaker JOHN BOEHNER stood right there where you are standing today

and NANCY PELOSI handed him the gavel—every year—from record high levels now to the lowest budget deficit in the Obama administration, and we have an opportunity today to do more.

I have heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, talk about those things that we can do together, and I agree. I agree.

I have heard my colleagues on the other side talk about their priorities in terms of raising the debt limit and not seeing the government shut down. I halfway agree.

I don't want to see the government shut down either. We avoided a government shutdown 2 weeks ago and got a little thank you note from a young lady who was in the office.

She said: Dear Congressman, It was good to see you today. Thank you for not letting the American History museum close down while my family was in Washington.

There are real impacts to that. But the fact is the reason we are having the conversation is not because anybody wants to shut the government down. It is because folks want to borrow more money. Mortgaging our children's future to the tune of \$18 trillion apparently is not mortgaging it enough. We are going to be back and make it \$19 trillion or \$19.5 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about a debt limit that is coming around today. We are talking about one that came around in the spring. The government has just been borrowing and borrowing and borrowing even beyond that debt limit, and they are borrowing because we are spending too much.

Mr. Speaker, look at the tax rolls right now. Do you realize, as we are standing here today, not only is America collecting more in constant dollars—not static dollars, but constant dollars adjusted for inflation—we are collecting more money than at any time in American history, any time.

Per capita in this country, Americans are paying more in taxes than they have ever paid in the history of the Republic, not in inflated 2015 dollars, but in constant dollars adjusted for inflation. The real impact on American families is greater today in taxes than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, the problem is not that we don't raise enough money. The problem is that we spend too much money. I can't count the number of good pieces of legislation that have gone to the Senate and failed not on their merits, but because a Democratic filibuster would not even allow the bill to be debated.

With this rule and with this underlying bill, we allow the people's voice to be heard, we allow the American majority's voice to be heard, and we have an opportunity to put a bill that will make a difference for American families on the President's desk for the very first time.

I encourage all of my colleagues' strong support of the rule. Upon pas-

sage of that rule, Mr. Speaker, I encourage their strong support for the underlying reconciliation measure. We have an opportunity today together to make a difference.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 483 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3737) to responsibly pay our Nation's bills on time by temporarily extending the public debt limit, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 2. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3737.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a

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

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

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

Mr. WOODALL. 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

NATIONAL STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS PRODUCTION ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 481 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on