I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 7. The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired. Pursuant to House Resolution 55, the previous question is ordered on the bill. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill. The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT
Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill? Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Yes, I am opposed to the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion to recommit. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit. The Clerk reads as follows:

Ms. Schakowsky moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7, the Co-called No Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end of title I the following new section (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 1. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act may be construed to permit any health plan to charge women higher premiums than men for coverage, under which health plans were determined to repeal the Affordable Care Act, which would, once again, permit the motion to discriminate against women. The higher costs will take a big whammy for women. Not only would women, restrict access to health services, and make their care more expensive. We also know that Republicans are determined to repeal the Affordable Care Act, which would, once again, allow insurance companies to discriminate against women.

Repealing the ACA would be a triple whammy for women. Not only would they have to pay more for their insurance, but their insurance would be less likely to cover the services they need. And these higher costs will take a bigger chunk out of their budget. Before the ACA, insurance companies were able to exclude services critical to women’s health. And we are not just talking about preexisting conditions, which, by the way, often included having a baby or being the victim of domestic violence.

The benefit package itself left out medical care critical to women. Only 12 percent of plans in the individual market offered maternity coverage. And some insurance plans that offered that coverage imposed waiting periods of a year or charges of up to $10,000 just for maternity care. And even when maternity care was put from an insurance plan, insurers still used gender rating to discriminate against women, charging women more just because they were women, regardless of their benefits. Because a woman was a pre-existing condition.

Thankfully, the ACA prohibits gender rating. Before the ACA, women were forced to pay between 10 to 57 percent more than men for essentially the same insurance. In my home State of Illinois, women were charged 55 percent more than men for the same coverage. In fact, a 2012 National Women’s Law Center study found that 92 percent of best-selling insurance plans were gender rated. A 25-year-old woman in Arkansas was charged 81 percent more than a man for similar coverage. A 40-year-old woman in South Dakota was charged over $1,200 more a year than a 40-year-old man for the same coverage. In Kentucky, women were charged 57 percent more than men for the same coverage. In Texas, they were charged 56 percent more. In Indiana, they were charged 54 percent more. And the list goes on.

This study even found that over half of all insurance plans charged women who didn’t smoke significantly higher premiums than men of the same age who did smoke. Overall, gender rating cost American women about $1 billion a year. It also harmed businesses with predominately female employees who were routinely charged significantly higher premiums.

Finally, charging women more for health care is even more devastating when you take into account that women still make only 77 cents to the dollar compared to men. We cannot go back to the days when insurance companies were free to discriminate against women. But that is exactly what H.R. 7 would do. They want women to pay more for insurance coverage that doesn’t include the services they need.

So I am asking my colleagues to support the motion to recommit and protect women from discrimination by insurance companies. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, today I am simply asking my colleagues across the aisle not to flip-flop on this issue. This legislation isn’t just the right thing to do; it also has broad support. Polling shows that 6 in 10 Americans agree that taxpayer dollars should not fund abortions. Despite this fact, a 2016 study found that abortions could be funded with taxpayer dollars through ObamaCare, and this demands a response.