

Mr. Baldwin served honorably in the U.S. Army from 1952 to 1955 during the Korean war. After the war, he pursued his lifelong project, the Baldwin Angus Ranch. Starting with 40 acres, the ranch now spans 620 acres and has taken the Florida Angus breed all over the world.

Mr. Baldwin thanked God each and every day for the blessings his family and business enjoyed.

God, family, and country are the words he lived by, words vitally important to our Nation today. We have lost a true giant.

Mr. Baldwin, may God bless you, your family, and thank you for what you have done for Florida and our Nation's agriculture.

PATHWAY OF DESTRUCTION

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, today, in the Senate, the other body, unfortunately, joined the pathway of destruction for most Americans and voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act. These are not my words, the pathway of destruction, but is evidence what will happen to millions and millions of Americans. By repealing without a replacement, which does not exist, insurance will be taken away from 32 million working families. Now, some 4 million uninsured children will have no insurance.

Let me be very clear that many of these individuals do not have college degrees. Many of them, the voters of those who now will take the rein of government. Healthcare premiums will increase by 50 percent for millions of Americans. Hundreds of billions of dollars will go to tax breaks for insurance companies while eliminating the tax credits and subsidies for millions of working families.

It will take healthcare coverage away from millions of low- and moderate-income Americans by cutting Medicaid, and it will close rural hospitals and public hospitals that provide the lifeline for many Americans. It will cut off Federal funds for health care for women through Planned Parenthood. And yes, it will eliminate and have cuts in Medicare and Medicaid.

Mr. Speaker, this is a pathway of disaster. We should not repeal the Affordable Care Act.

STEMMING AVALANCHE OF REGULATIONS

(Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that, in my first week as a Representative of Michigan's 10th Congressional District, we have passed two important pieces of legislation to stem the avalanche of Federal regulations.

The top concern I hear from employers of all sizes across my district is

that regulation from Washington is making it harder for them to do business. I spent my career in business, so I have firsthand knowledge of the damage caused by excessive Federal regulations.

The Midnight Rules Act and the REINS Act will provide much-needed regulatory relief to families and businesses alike. Both pieces of legislation will make unelected bureaucrats accountable to Congress.

The American Dream is achievable, and, as the son of a General Motors line worker, my life is proof of it. But that dream is only possible when we give Americans the freedom they need to be successful and unleash their capabilities in our economy.

TRAVEL TO CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BANKS of Indiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to talk about a bill that JIM MCGOVERN of Massachusetts and I have that we will be offering tomorrow. I think it is an important bill from the standpoint of advancing and perpetuating this American notion called freedom. It is a bill that had 130 sponsors in the last Congress. I am joined on the bill by TOM EMMER and Mr. POE and Mr. AMASH as original cosponsors as we drop the bill tomorrow. It is quite simply entitled the Freedom to Travel to Cuba bill. It does what the name suggests, to lift the current restrictions in encumbering Americans' ability to travel to Cuba.

Why is that important?

I think it is important for a number of different reasons, first of which is tied to the basic, fundamental notion of American liberty. American liberty is built of many different things. The Supreme Court has actually determined that as real as what you choose to wear, what you choose to eat, or what you choose to read is this basic, fundamental right to travel.

In the American system, we can travel as we see fit. I can go here, I can go there. I am going to visit my grandmother in Des Moines, my cousin in Chicago. We choose without government control and without government edict where we come and where we go. It is a far cry from what we saw in the former Soviet Union where you had to have your papers to determine where you could travel.

I have a map of the globe here. Did you know that you or I could travel to any country on this globe except one? You or I could travel to North Korea. You or I could travel to Syria. You or I could travel to Iran. You or I could travel to Iraq. It may not work out well for you, it may not be the best of trips, but you or I could travel without government prohibition to any spot on

this globe except one, and that one is Cuba.

That may have made sense in 1960. For security reasons in the time of the cold war, it may have made sense to have that prohibition in place. But the question is: Does it make sense today? I don't think it does for a whole variety of reasons.

One, this is about the basic, fundamental American right of travel as we see fit, not as government sees fit.

Two, this is about the American liberty and this fragile notion of, if we don't protect it, government tends to grow. Jefferson talked about this theme a long time ago. He talked about the normal course of things for government to gain ground and for government to yield. So if we don't push back—and this is what the REINS Act was all about—if we don't push back about the government edict or laws that have outgrown their usefulness, what we are doing is we are allowing government to encroach on this fragile notion of liberty.

Fundamental to the notion of common sense is, if you tried something for 50 years and it has not worked, may we not try something different? I was here in the 1990s. I signed onto Helms-Burton. But it didn't work, and so we asked: Why not try something different?

What Ronald Reagan proposed at the time of the Iron Curtain was for Americans, kids with backpacks, to travel on the other side of that curtain. That personal diplomacy, that one-on-one diplomacy, would be key in bringing down that wall. That was the notion of engagement.

So I think this is about saying American policy has been the excuse that the Castros have used for 50 years. We have almost the longest-serving dictatorship in the history of globe there with the Castro brothers. What was oftentimes the case is they would blame the blockade, the embargo, Americans' inability to travel, whatever was going wrong with the country rather than simply addressing the real issue. The problem was communism and the way that it encumbers people and their hopes and their dreams. We gave them an excuse. So this is about pulling back the excuse and trying something different. It is about pushing back on a regulation that has not served its purpose.

Three, this is about engaging because that is part and parcel to American liberty. You know, I don't like some of the things that are going on in Russia. I don't like some of the things that are going on in China. I don't like some of the things that are going on in Vietnam. You can pick your country. But what we have chosen, as an American policy, is this notion of engagement, that we ultimately are going to be able to solve more by engaging with other countries. Again, that is why Ronald Reagan embraced it with countries of the former Soviet Union in helping to bring down that wall. So this is about