

Now, thanks to Terry's House, over 3,600 families from 42 States and 23 countries, who would otherwise have found themselves in similar circumstances, have been provided with an affordable, comfortable place to stay across the street from the hospital where their loved ones are.

Terry's House is dependent on generous supporters. I would like to thank them and their staff for all that they do for a positive difference for the families who are going through this very, very difficult time.

We cannot say thank you enough to my friend, Tom Richards, and his mother, Marie. Their efforts have made this important home a reality for all as a living memory for Terry, who is no longer with us. Thank God for them and thank God for Terry's House.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3700, HOUSING OPPORTUNITY THROUGH MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 594 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 594

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, 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. 3700) to provide housing opportunities in the United States through modernization of various housing programs, 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 Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-42. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments 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.

Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. 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.

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

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), 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. STIVERS. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

□ 1230

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported out a rule for H.R. 3700, the Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act of 2015. House Resolution 594 provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 3700.

The resolution provides 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. Additionally, the resolution provides for consideration of 14 amendments offered to H.R. 3700. Finally, Mr. Speaker, the resolution provides a motion to recommit for the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution and the underlying legislation. H.R. 3700 is a package of several bipartisan provisions that have been voted on by the House Financial Services Committee and received bipartisan support multiple times since 2006 in both Republican and Democratic Congresses.

H.R. 3700 cuts down on inefficient and duplicative regulations. The bill employs a commonsense approach to mitigating the overlapping and redundant procedures that have made rental assistance programs unnecessarily burdensome for some tenants as well as private owners and investors in affordable housing.

The portions of H.R. 3700 that are particularly important to me and many of the large metropolitan housing authorities around the country create positive changes based on project-based vouchers.

The Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority, in my hometown, does a lot of vouchers. They have a strong record of converting slums into mixed-income neighborhoods. They help make sure that the needs of those who live there come first and that we help build strong communities around them.

An integral part of this approach is often project-based vouchers that can be provided to encourage the development of mixed-income housing facilities. However, because the Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority is approaching its cap for project-based vouchers, as many metropolitan housing authorities around the country are, their capacity to build new mixed-income communities that are thriving and strong is at risk.

This bill authorizes public housing authorities to project-base up to 20 percent of its authorized voucher allocation rather than 20 percent of its voucher funding. This change ensures that the unauthorized number of vouchers is more stable. It will help make it easier for housing authorities to plan their future investments in the communities they serve.

Knowing Charles Hillman and the great people at the Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority and the great work they do, I would sure hate to see them taken off the front lines in our war against poverty. We need to make this change. It is just one example of something that is really good in this bill.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, this bill is projected to actually save \$311 billion in discretionary spending over just the next 5 years. The savings associated with the flexibilities and regulatory burden relief provided to local housing authorities will result in substantial improvement in the return on investment for taxpayers and help make sure that the affordable housing programs we have are sustainable.

Mr. Speaker, the bill passed the Financial Services Committee, which I serve on, with a vote of 44-10—a strong bipartisan vote.

It is my understanding that the sponsor of this legislation has worked over the past few weeks with the ranking member of the committee, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, to address an amendment that she offered—which has been made in order under the rule—which will alleviate the concerns of some Members about this legislation.

So, even though it only passed 44-10—which is pretty good—I think we can actually see a bigger improvement when it hits the floor, because I think the sponsor has worked with the ranking member, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, to alleviate some of those concerns.

I look forward to debating this bill with our House colleagues, and I urge support for both the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

I thank my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss H.R. 3700, the Housing Opportunity

Through Modernization Act of 2015. This bill includes modifications and updates to several existing laws pertaining to housing—and low-income housing, in particular.

Many of these changes clarify and improve specific regulations for the benefit of those providing low-income housing and those benefiting from the availability of low-income housing. In fact, this bill improves access to affordable housing for the most vulnerable, such as low-income families and veterans.

It is apparent that much work has been involved in finding a balance, and the authors and committee members of both parties are to be commended for their efforts. With that being said, it is important to note that a provision of this bill will effectively raise rents for thousands of families with children and, ultimately, make it more difficult for some low-income parents to maintain employment.

The deduction provisions in this bill, as it is currently worded, raise rents for some of the lowest income families in the country. A quarter of households facing rent increases of \$25 or more a month are families with children whose childcare deduction would be reduced.

I hope that this important issue of childcare deductions will be addressed. My colleague from Ohio just spoke about the work that our colleagues, the chair of this committee and the ranking member, have done to perhaps cause this measure to go forward and not be derailed because of the measure of reducing the childcare deduction for families.

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

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

I want to quickly address the issue raised by the gentleman. I alluded to it, but I didn't speak to it maybe as clearly as I should have.

I believe that there is an agreement between the chairman of the subcommittee as well as the ranking member of the full committee on an amendment that Ms. WATERS is offering with regard to the provision that you refer to. I will tell you, I am going to be voting for that amendment, and I would urge you to vote for it. I believe it is going to pass. It may just be a voice vote. If you are here, vote on it by voice.

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

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

This is an example, in my view, of what can happen here when parties work together. Obviously, on this issue, the Financial Services Committee has done a tremendous job.

If we defeat the previous question, I am going to pivot for a moment and offer an amendment to the rule to bring up a bill to help prevent mass shootings by promoting research into the causes of gun violence, making it easier to identify and treat those prone to committing these acts.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, this morning at 9, I held a gun violence roundtable. We had extraordinary presenters from those who are gathering information and disseminating that information around the country to address this subject.

What the Gun Violence Research Act would do is give the Centers for Disease Control the authority to research the causes, mechanisms, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of injuries with respect to gun violence. It would also encourage the improvement and expansion of the National Violent Death Reporting Systems and empower healthcare providers by not inhibiting a physician or other healthcare provider from asking a patient about the possession of a firearm and speaking to a patient about gun safety or reporting to authorities a patient's threat of violence.

If there is anyone in the House of Representatives who does not believe that we have a gun violence epidemic in our society, then I would ask him or her if they would speak with me and other Members of Congress that have been about the business of trying to cause there to be a reduction.

This actually does fit into the circumstances that we are addressing in the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Many of the violent acts that take place—not just mass shootings, but on a day-to-day basis—regrettably, take place in some of the low-income areas, where we have inadequate housing, inadequate education, and inadequate educational opportunity.

I hope at least the research can be done that may give us the data for this Congress to have the courage to tell the American people that, yes, we have a gun violence epidemic, and, yes, we are going to do something about it.

The bill underlying this rule would enact several incremental reforms to the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Section 8 tenant- and project-based rental assistance and other public housing programs. Many of these reforms have been around for several years and have, as my colleague from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) has pointed out, broad support from a wide range of stakeholders as well as both parties in Congress.

However, returning again to the subject of the matter of deductions for child care, it is an important issue that needs to be addressed. Representative WATERS has an amendment that was made in order yesterday by the Rules Committee to resolve this issue. Like my colleague from Ohio, I plan to vote for that amendment, and I would urge Members to recognize that this makes

a good bill better, and I would urge my colleagues to support Ms. WATERS' amendment.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as my colleague from Florida said, this is a good bill. It is a commonsense bill. It reforms our housing programs so they make sense for people. It makes them more efficient. It saves \$300 billion. It is a no-brainer.

I hope that we can pass the previous question so that we can actually move to passing this bill and doing important reforms that will make government more efficient and help people in the war against poverty.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule, support the previous question, and support the resolution.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 594 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. 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. 3926) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for better understanding of the epidemic of gun violence, 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 Energy and Commerce. 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. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3926.

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. STIVERS. 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. HASTINGS. 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.

□ 1245

RESTORING AMERICANS' HEALTH-CARE FREEDOM RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2015—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 25, 2016, the unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President on the bill (H.R. 3762) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

(For veto message, see proceedings of the House of January 8, 2016, at page H210.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the veto message of the President of the United States to the bill, H.R. 3762.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic day. It is not often that the House has the opportunity to so clearly fight to defend the will of the people. This is a day that embraces our Constitution and one of its fundamental tenets, our system of checks and balances.

This issue, the issue of health care, is vital to every single American. Health care is so very personal. The American people are offended by a Federal Government that says that they know best, that they know and should dictate to folks what kind of health care we should have, who should be treating us, where we should be treated, and on and on and on.

The American people have always opposed the current law. From the very day it was passed and was signed into law, a majority of the citizens of this country opposed this law.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, more people oppose the law now than they did when the bill was passed. This is truly remarkable. More people oppose it now than did when it was passed, which is why we have worked and fought so very hard to represent them, to represent our constituents, and to carry out our

solemn responsibility as their Representatives.

The House and the Senate voted to veto this destructive law, a law that is not only destructive to the health and well-being of our citizens, but destructive to the health of our economy, taking jobs away, forcing people into part-time work, forcing businesses to downsize or limit who they hire. It is remarkably destructive.

In fact, the House voted to repeal it by larger numbers than it voted to pass it originally. However, the President vetoed our repeal.

The President is the only person standing in the way of what the American people want. Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker. The President is the only person standing in the way of what the American people want.

So our job now is to stand up for them, to demonstrate for them who is on their side, and who is standing in the way of positive, patient-centered reform.

We favor a healthcare system where patients and families and doctors are making medical decisions, not Washington, D.C. We favor a healthcare system that gets everyone covered with policies that they want for themselves and for their families, not that the government forces them to buy.

We favor a healthcare system that embraces the principles of health care, accessibility, affordability, quality, responsiveness, innovation, and choice, principles that are all violated by the current law.

So today, Mr. Speaker, we stand with the American people. We will vote to override the veto of the President, an action that runs absolutely counter to the will of the majority of our country.

I urge my colleagues to support this veto override vote and stand with positive solutions based on the principles of health care that we all embrace.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The only thing historic about this vote today is it probably breaks the record for the number of times a Congress has voted to try to overturn existing law that has been twice upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, here we go again and again and again. How fitting it is that we are here, on Groundhog Day, for the 63rd vote in the House of Representatives to overturn the Affordable Care Act.

And make no mistake. The Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan entity that analyzes bills, has told us and told the American people that, in overturning the Affordable Care Act, you will eliminate affordable health care for 22 million Americans.

So this is a historically callous action that, in 1 day, our colleagues are proposing that we would deny affordable health care to 22 million Americans. It is also the 12th vote this House