even less coverage, by eliminating essential health benefits like preventative care, like hospitalization, like prescription drugs. Somebody might have a healthcare card, but it won’t provide them healthcare when they need it. If you are 50 to 64 years of age, get ready. You will pay enormously higher costs as a result of this ill-conceived piece of legislation. This steals from Medicare, undoes the promise.

This is a bad piece of legislation. It ought to be rejected.

THANKING ANDY LEUNG FOR HIS SERVICE

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank a very special member of my team, Andy Leung, who is an intern in my office. Andy comes to us through the Congressional Internship Program for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities. This is a unique program designed to give students with varying intellectual disabilities an opportunity to gain congressional work experience. It is part of George Mason University’s LIFE Program. To date, 150 congressional offices from the House and Senate have participated in this wonderful program.

Mr. Speaker, Andy is a part of our team, and we look forward to the hours he spends with us each week. He quickly settled into the office, and he is always in great spirits. Andy is hardworking and curious. He is interested in the projects the full-time staff are working on. He loves picking up the flags from the Capitol, and we are truly fortunate to have such a dedicated intern.

I would like to thank Andy for his service and thank his employment assistant and the Congressional Internship Program for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities for making this possible.

TRUMPCARE IS A PRESCRIPTION FOR DISASTER

(Ms. McCOLLUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, TrumpCare is a disaster for children, families, seniors, and people with disabilities.

The bill we are considering today has been strong-armed through this House with hasty hearings. Today as we vote, we don’t have an updated estimated cost from the Congressional Budget Office, but here is what we do know:

Under TrumpCare, families will pay more for their insurance premiums and their deductibles.

Under TrumpCare, older Americans will be forced to pay higher insurance premiums, five times higher than what others pay.

Under TrumpCare, health care for vulnerable children, seniors, and people with disabilities will be rationed.

Unbelievably, TrumpCare even attacks the promise of Medicare. It will be weakened by giving big tax breaks to billionaires.

TrumpCare was made even worse overnight. Now insurance companies will be able to sell policies that exclude basic health care like cancer screening and preventative care and even some hospitalizations.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a healthcare bill. It is a prescription for disaster. I urge my colleagues to strongly oppose TrumpCare.

AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT IS A WAY FORWARD

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, as we contemplate the American Health Care Act, here are a few things we do know: The Affordable Care Act, as it is called, has driven premiums for working families up and up each year. There are fewer choices of plans, especially in rural America, and millions of people are choosing not to opt to be enrolled at all, paying the penalty instead.

Premiums will keep going up, as projected. Even more will drop out, and more will pay the penalty instead. More will become uninsured.

This death spiral is not choice; it is not an American value.

Mr. Speaker, as the American Health Care Act moves forward, we know the Democrats will not be helpful, as they are clinging to the failing ACA at all costs. We know that middle-income families are begging us for relief and more choices. We know this bill represents the best chance to achieve cost relief, achieve achievement, and keep the commitment under Medicaid to children in need with reauthorizing the bipartisan SCHIP later this year.

More affordable options come about with unsheathing what the ACA has wrought. It is this or that.

Mr. Speaker, we must keep this dialogue, this option, this bill, the American Health Care Act, as a way forward to bring choices and relief to Americans who have worked for the American Dream and are feeling like they are losing it.

Let’s keep our pledge and help President Trump keep his pledge by taking this one of three important steps with the American Health Care Act.

TAX CUTS FOR MILLIONAIRES

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I say good morning to America.

This is not a health bill that we are readying ourselves to vote on. It is a tax bill for wealthy people.

I just left the Committee on Rules. We started our session there at 7 this morning. I have in hand a closed rule that will allow for 4 hours of debate. Later on this afternoon, the Republicans will accomplish what they set out to do.

The bill provides $274.9 billion in tax cuts for the highest income Americans. Over half of the tax cuts in the bill go to millionaires. In the year 2020, 61 percent of the cuts go to those earning more than a million dollars.

At the same time, Republicans cut Medicaid by more than $880 billion. That is money for poor people that will not have those benefits. Republicans cut Medicaid by that amount for working families.

Donald Trump’s people and his Cabinet will do very well.

AMERICA CAN DO BETTER

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this is the Republican bill: a trillion dollars in lost health care for millions; at the same time, a trillion dollars in tax breaks, mostly for the very wealthy and corporations.

The Republican majority says their bill is to provide patient-centered health care, but for patients there is no healthcare center when there is no insurance.

The Republican bill robs millions of needed insurance for their health and, in many cases, would rob them of their life.

The Republican plan would create death panels for numerous unknown Americans.

This is not our America. America can do better. We must.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1628, AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT OF 2017

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115–58) on the resolution (H. Res. 228) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1628) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1628, AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT OF 2017

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I shall call up House Resolution 228 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:
Resolved. That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1628) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendments specified in section 2 of this resolution shall be considered as ordered on 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) four 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 amendments referred to in the first section of this resolution are as follows: (a) The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution modified by the amendment printed in part B of that report. (b) The amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution modified by the amendments printed in part D and part E of that report.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern), my friend, 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. SESSIONS. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying legislation.

This rule is a fair rule that adequately provides both sides of the aisle with ample time to debate the merits of the underlying legislation. In fact, the Rules Committee thought it was so important that it provided 4 hours of general debate on the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, in honor of our former President, Ronald Reagan, I wear brown today, the former President, when he was President, believed that wearing brown was good luck to him and good luck for the things which he was undertaking. So, in honor of Ronald Reagan, I, too, wear my brown jacket today.

Mr. Speaker, it has become abundantly clear that ObamaCare has failed the American people. Our Nation’s healthcare system today is broken and only getting worse under the current law, known as the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare.

Simply put, ObamaCare is collapsing, and it is collapsing fast. Options and choices are disappearing for consumers, and an anticompetitive marketplace has been created that firmly harms patients.

How bad is it? Nearly one-third of all U.S. counties currently have only one insurer offering plans on their State’s exchange. That is a government-created monopoly, Mr. Speaker, and that kills the free market, meaning no choice for the American people and higher costs are what the American consumer and the healthcare market are finding.

And it is only continuing to get worse. As more and more insurers leave the marketplace, prices will continue to rise, forcing healthy individuals to make economic decisions not to purchase health care, creating a self-defeating spiral of rising costs and less choice.

The American people want independence, they want to make their own choices, they can do it with a better healthcare plan to provide the middle class and low-income families who have been left behind on either side of the aisle, and it gives them an opportunity to have tax advantages in the employer marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, today, we will be dissecting this into three separate areas. We will have Members of the Republican majority here to explain that and the bill.

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

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

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Sessions), my friend for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the majority is rushing to congratulate itself for finally having a bill to repeal the Affordable Care Act. For 7 years, Republicans had nothing to do with the law. It has been the majority that didn’t stop them from making one empty political promise after another.

And after all that, what do we have in front of us today? This bill will take away health care from 24 million hard-working Americans. It forces families to pay higher premiums and deductibles, increasing out-of-pocket costs. It is a crushing age tax, forcing Americans age 50 to 64 to pay premiums five times higher than what they currently pay for health insurance. This is unfair, whether they are healthy or not. But then again, I come from the old-fashioned school of thought that we should actually take care of people, not just to the point of paying for health care, but so that they can get the care they need.

And after all that, what do we have in front of us today? This bill will take away health care from 24 million hard-working Americans. It forces families to pay higher premiums and deductibles, increasing out-of-pocket costs. It is a crushing age tax, forcing Americans age 50 to 64 to pay premiums five times higher than what they currently pay for health insurance. This is unfair, whether they are healthy or not. But then again, I come from the old-fashioned school of thought that we should actually take care of people, not just to the point of paying for health care, but so that they can get the care they need.

And after all that, what do we have in front of us today? This bill will take away health care from 24 million hard-working Americans. It forces families to pay higher premiums and deductibles, increasing out-of-pocket costs. It is a crushing age tax, forcing Americans age 50 to 64 to pay premiums five times higher than what they currently pay for health insurance. This is unfair, whether they are healthy or not. But then again, I come from the old-fashioned school of thought that we should actually take care of people, not just to the point of paying for health care, but so that they can get the care they need.

And after all that, what do we have in front of us today? This bill will take away health care from 24 million hard-working Americans. It forces families to pay higher premiums and deductibles, increasing out-of-pocket costs. It is a crushing age tax, forcing Americans age 50 to 64 to pay premiums five times higher than what they currently pay for health insurance. This is unfair, whether they are healthy or not. But then again, I come from the old-fashioned school of thought that we should actually take care of people, not just to the point of paying for health care, but so that they can get the care they need.
night to try to appease the conservative and moderate holdouts, including the infamous Buffalo bribe. The Republican leadership has been trying to strong-arm their conference into voting for this bill all week, and nobody knows how many votes will stick. The only thing we do know is that this is a terrible bill that is only getting worse, not better.

This thing has been a mess from beginning to end. Now, I know our President believes himself on his negotiating skills, but this seems more like the art of no deal to me, no matter what the final vote tally looks like.

That brings us to this early morning, when we met at 7 a.m. in the Rules Committee to report out this rule, which rewrites the bill to make it far worse.

Last night, we were presented with a provision, concocted in some back room, that boggles the mind with its cynicism. So what is this mysterious grand bargain that will appease the Republican Conference and finally buy Speaker Ryan enough votes to pass this disaster of a bill? Well, Mr. Speaker, it is sublimely malicious, and I can picture someone twirling their mustache as they drafted it in their secret Capitol lair last night.

Republicans are killing the requirements that insurance plans cover essential health benefits—essential health benefits. Now, perhaps you are wondering: What are these so-called essential benefits? Well, I will give you a partial list: emergency room trips, maternity health care, mental health care and substance abuse treatment, and prescription drugs. These are the types of exotic, extravagant benefits that Republicans apparently don't think are important for working Americans to be able to afford.

It would be literally unbelievable if we weren't here considering it right now, Mr. Speaker. Now, I have been awake since before dawn—thanks to our Rules Committee meeting—so I know what a nightmare this is. We are actually voting on a bill with a backroom deal, made in the dark of night, that would take away any guarantee that plans would cover these basic essential benefits.

And, of course, we have no idea what the costs will be or how many people it will affect. We can't know those things until we get an analysis from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, which, obviously, we will not have before we vote on this reckless legislation.

And that is the real problem. Because every time you come out of a back room, this bill gets worse. For the sake of our country, maybe we should consider putting locks on the back rooms you huddle in.

President Trump keeps talking about crowd size. My colleagues across the aisle keep talking about page size. This morning, in the Rules Committee, Republicans kept saying that the fifth manager's amendment is only 4 pages long. How bad could it be?

Well, they need to stop worrying about size and pay more attention to how this bill will affect regular, working Americans. These 4 pages are the worse 4 pages on this planet because of the terrible consequences it will have on the real people it will be devastating for millions and millions of Americans.

So, Mr. Speaker, instead of rushing this horrendous bill, patched together with backroom deals, to the floor and voting on it just hours after seeing the final original, it's time for us to work together in a bipartisan way to improve people's lives, and certainly not putting them at risk. My colleagues seem too concerned about winning at any cost to stop and think about the consequences for millions upon millions of Americans. This is a lousy bill.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Lewisville, Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee, a gentleman who sits on both the Energy and Commerce and the Rules Committee. He is quite literally the most knowledgeable person on health care in the United States Congress.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we all know why we are here—the problems that exist within the Affordable Care Act. It is simply not working for the American people—limited choice, costs going up, millions without access to care. Unfortunately, these are not just talking points, but real issues affecting real Americans.

The Affordable Care Act has damaged the individual market. It has driven insurers away from offering coverage. The individual markets are a death spiral. The Patient and State Stability Act, laid out the policies to stabilize the markets. To change this, we are relaxing the ratio to 5-to-1. It will lower premium costs and provide necessary opportunities to stabilize the markets.

Additionally, we are repealing the actuarial values mandate to provide insurers with additional flexibility to offer more coverage options.

To further supplement these efforts, we are establishing the Patient and State Stability Fund. This fund provides States with $100 billion over 10 years to promote innovative solutions to lower cost and increase access to health care for unique patient populations in each State. It is simple: to provide States with maximum flexibility as to how they address the cost of care for their citizens.

The Congressional Budget Office estimated that a combination of the Stability Fund and other proposed changes to the market would reduce premiums by 10 percent by calendar year 2026. We all want patients to have access to high-quality, affordably priced coverage. The Patient and State Stability Fund can help to lower costs.

In Medicaid, in addition to supporting the insurance market, the American Health Care Act provides needed reforms to the Medicaid program. Without changes, the Medicaid expansion alone is expected to cost $1 trillion over the next decade. Medicaid desperately needs reform so that States can continue to provide coverage to children, people with disabilities, and other vulnerable groups.

To address these concerns, the American Health Care Act phases out the Medicaid expansion, the expansion that has crippled State budgets and limited States' ability to ensure that...
resources will continue to be available for those vulnerable populations.

Additionally, our bill helps further bend the Medicaid cost curve by shifting programs toward per capita allotments. The per capita allotments, an idea that originated during the Clinton administration, will set limits on the annual cost for growth for per capita expenditures for which the States will receive matching funds from the Federal Government.

The Affordable Care Health Act increases the amount of flexibility that States have in managing their Medicaid programs. The bill scales back the Affordable Care Act mandates that have limited a State’s ability to tailor their plans to the needs of their beneficiaries. States can and should be trusted to manage the needs of their beneficiaries, and this bill allows States to do that.

Additionally, the bill before us today furthers the goal of providing the States with greater flexibility in managing their Medicaid programs by providing States with the option to implement two additional opportunities: work requirement and block grants for Medicaid.

The theme around which we chose to engage our State counterparts in the discussion and listen—listen—to their input as we designed this bill. At the top of their list were the desire to see the work requirement built in and the opportunity to work with Medicaid as a block grant.

We don’t tell them what to do. They are given the permission to do what they feel is best for their citizens. Republicans trust the States and trust the Governors and the elected leaders in those States.

Finally, the American Health Care Act provides additional resources to bolster State safety net providers. The bill provides increases in the community-based grant funding, offers enhanced funding to support safety net providers in States that did not expand Medicaid, and ends the cuts to the disproportionate share hospital payments.

We are committed, Mr. Speaker, to ensuring that our local providers can continue to deliver lifesaving care. The American Health Care Act turns this commitment into action. For millions of Americans in rural and medically underserved areas, these actions will provide relief from the budget cuts that was undercut by the Affordable Care Act.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, it has been an interesting process. We had a 27½-hour markup in the Energy and Commerce Committee. We have had over 15 to 16 hours in the Rules Committee. This bill has been almost talked to death. I want to just acknowledge that I appreciate the input of the administration. I appreciate the fact that the directive to us last night was to put our pencils down and turn our papers in. It is time, Mr. Speaker.

This is a good bill. The rule deserves our support. The underlying bill deserves our support.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the AARP; a letter from the National Rural Health Association; a letter from the American Society of Addiction Medicine; and a letter from the American Medical Association—all strongly opposed to the Republican bill.


HON. GREG WALDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce;
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

HON. KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means;
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

HON. FRANK PICASSO,
Ranking Member, Committee on Energy and Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

HON. RICHARD NEAL,
Ranking Member, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMEN AND RANKING MEMBERS:

AARP, with its nearly 38 million members in all 50 States and the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands, is a leading nonpartisan organization that helps people turn their goals and dreams into real possibilities, strengthens communities, and makes the futures of millions of individuals who depend on Medicare programs for long-term services and supports and other benefits.

MEDICARE

Our members and older Americans believe that Medicare must be protected and strengthened for today’s seniors and future generations. We strongly oppose any changes to current law that could result in cuts to benefits, increased costs, or reduced coverage.

According to the 2016 Medicare Trustees report, the Medicare Part A Trust Fund is solvent until 2028 (11 years longer than pre-Affordable Care Act (ACA)), due in large part to changes made in the ACA. We have serious concerns that the American Health Care Act repeals provisions in current law that have strengthened Medicare’s fiscal sustainability. Specifically, the repeal of the additional 0.9 percent payroll tax on higher-income workers. Repealing this provision could hasten the insolvency of Medicare by up to a decade, and the Administration’s ability to pay for services in the future.

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

Americans use prescription drugs more than any other segment of the U.S. population, typically on a chronic basis. We are pleased that the bill does not repeal the Medicare Part D coverage gap (“donut hole”) protections created under the ACA. Since the enactment of the law, more than 11.8 million Medicare beneficiaries have saved over $238.8 billion on prescription drugs. We do have strong concerns that the American Health Care Act repeals the fees on manufacturers and importers of branded prescription drugs, which currently is projected to add $25 billion to the Part B trust fund between 2017 and 2026. The plan must do more to reduce the burden of high prescription drug costs on consumers and taxpayers and is willing to work with you on bipartisan solutions.

INDIVIDUAL PRIVATE INSURANCE MARKET

About 6.2 million older Americans age 50–65 currently purchase insurance in the non-$log.$750,000 current law that have strengthened Medicare’s fiscal sustainability. Specifically, the repeal of the additional 0.9 percent payroll tax on higher-income workers. Repealing this provision could hasten the insolvency of Medicare by up to a decade, and the Administration’s ability to pay for services in the future.

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

Americans use prescription drugs more than any other segment of the U.S. population, typically on a chronic basis. We are pleased that the bill does not repeal the Medicare Part D coverage gap (“donut hole”) protections created under the ACA. Since the enactment of the law, more than 11.8 million Medicare beneficiaries have saved over $238.8 billion on prescription drugs. We do have strong concerns that the American Health Care Act repeals the fees on manufacturers and importers of branded prescription drugs, which currently is projected to add $25 billion to the Part B trust fund between 2017 and 2026. The plan must do more to reduce the burden of high prescription drug costs on consumers and taxpayers and is willing to work with you on bipartisan solutions.

INDIVIDUAL PRIVATE INSURANCE MARKET

About 6.2 million older Americans age 50–65 currently purchase insurance in the non-
activities such as eating, bathing, dressing, managing medications, and transportation).

Of these 17.4 million individuals: 6.9 million are ages 65 and older (which equals more than 10.5 million adults living with disabilities; and about 10.8 million are those with a disability who qualify for both Medicare and Medicaid (dual eligibles). Dual eligibles account for almost 33 percent of Medicaid spending. While they may currently be pursuing cost-effective strategies to reduce their Medicare premiums, many of these enrollees, they account for a disproportionate share of total Medicare and Medicaid spending.

Individuals with disabilities of all ages and older adults rely on critical Medicaid services, including home and community based services (HCBS) for assistance with daily activities, bathing, dressing, housekeeping, laundry, and home modifications; nursing home care; and other benefits such as hearing aids and eyeglasses. People with disabilities of all ages also rely on Medicaid for access to comprehensive acute health care services. For working adults, Medicaid can help them continue to work; for children, it allows them to stay with their families and receive the help they need at home or in their community. Individuals may have low incomes, face high medical costs, or already spent through their resources before the age of 65. Poorer and lower-income, older voters in conservative, rural states, state taxpayers, and families unable to shoulder the costs of care without sufficient federal support. This would result in cuts to program eligibility, services, or both—programs that are already at capacity's most vulnerable citizens. In terms of seniors, we have serious concerns about setting caps at a time when per-beneficiary spending for poor seniors is likely to increase in future years. By 2025, when Boomers start to turn age 80 and older, they will likely need much higher levels of services—including HCBS and nursing home—moving them into the highest cost group of all seniors. As this group continues to age, their level of need will increase as well as their cost of care. Care that caps will not accurately reflect the cost of care for individuals in each state, including for children and adults with disabilities and seniors—especially those with the most severe disabling conditions.

AARP is also opposed to the repeal of the six percent enhanced federal Medicaid match for states that take up the Community First Choice (CFC) Option. CFC provides states with a financial incentive to offer HCBS to help older adults and people with disabilities live in their homes and communities where they want to be. About 90 percent of older adults want to remain in their own homes and communities for as long as possible. HCBS and nursing home care in Medicaid, the cost of HCBS per person is one-third the cost of institutional care. Taking away the enhanced match could disrupt services for older adults and people with disabilities living in communities where they want to be. About 90 percent of older adults want to remain in their own homes and communities for as long as possible. HCBS and nursing home care in Medicaid, the cost of HCBS per person is one-third the cost of institutional care. Taking away the enhanced match could disrupt services for older adults and people with disabilities living in communities where they want to be. About 90 percent of older adults want to remain in their own homes and communities for as long as possible. HCBS and nursing home care in Medicaid, the cost of HCBS per person is one-third the cost of institutional care. Taking away the enhanced match could disrupt services for older adults and people with disabilities living in communities where they want to be. About 90 percent of older adults want to remain in their own homes and communities for as long as possible. HCBS and nursing home care in Medicaid, the cost of HCBS per person is one-third the cost of institutional care. Taking away the enhanced match could disrupt services for older adults and people with disabilities living in communities where they want to be.

VOTE NO TO THE AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT

The National Rural Health Association urges a NO vote on the American Health Care Act (AHCA).

Rural Americans are older, poorer and sicker than other populations. In fact, a January 2017 CDC report pronounced that rural Americans are more likely to have obesity, diabetes, cancer, and traumatic injury; they are more likely to participate in high risk health behaviors including smoking, poor diet, physical inactivity, and substance abuse. Rural residents are more likely to be uninsured and underinsured and less likely to receive employer sponsored health insurance. Rural communities have higher rates of poverty, and need the assistance of federal health care programs to provide an adequate network to serve the community.

Any federal health care reform proposal must address the fact that insurance providers are withdrawing from rural markets. Despite record profit levels, insurance companies are permitted to cherry pick profitable markets for participation and are currently not obliged to provide service to markets with less advantageous risk pools. Decreasing realities of the rural population make the market less profitable, and thus less desirable for an insurance company with no incentive to take on such exposure. In the same way that financial service institutions are required to provide services to underserved neighborhoods, profitable insurance companies should be required to provide services in rural America.

3. Stop Bad Debt Cuts to Rural Hospitals—Rural hospitals serve more Medicare patients (46% rural vs. 40.9% urban), thus the bad debt Medicare cuts have adversely impacted the entire board. A goal of the ACA was to have hospital bad debt decrease significantly. However, because of unaffordable cuts in rural payments, rural patients still cannot afford health care. Bad debt among rural hospitals has actually increased

improvements are critical for rural patients and providers:

1. Medicaid—Though most rural residents are in non-expansion states, a higher proportion of rural residents are covered by Medicaid (21% vs. 16%).

Congress and the states have long recognized the importance of rural health care and thus has steadfastly worked to protect it. And now, much of the protections created to maintain access to care for the 62 million who live in rural America, and Medicaid eligible populations by ensuring access to care.

Any federal health care reform proposal must protect access to care in Rural America, and must provide an option to a state to receive an enhanced reimbursement included in a matching rate or a per capita cap, specifically targeted to state stability among rural providers to maintain access to care for rural communities. Enhancements must be equivalent to the cost of providing care to every rural patient. A safeguard that ensures the enhanced reimbursement is provided to the safety net provider to allow for continued access to care. Rural safety net providers included in the AHCA: Critical Access Hospitals, Rural Prospective Payment Hospitals, Rural Health Clinics, Indian Health Service providers, and individual rural providers.

2. Market Reform—Forty-one percent of rural marketplace enrollees have only a single plan available and are required to provide services to underserved communities. Rural hospitals serve more Medicare patients (46% rural vs. 40.9% urban, thus the bad debt Medicare cuts have adversely impacted the entire board. A goal of the ACA was to have hospital bad debt decrease significantly. However, because of unaffordable cuts in rural payments, rural patients still cannot afford health care. Bad debt among rural hospitals has actually increased.

JOYCE A. ROGERS, Senior Vice President, Government Affairs.
50% since the ACA was passed. According to MedPAC “Average Medicare margins are negative, and under current law they are expected to decline in 2016” has led to 7% gains in Medicare spending for urban providers, while rural providers have experienced a median loss of 6%.

If Congress does not act, all the decades of efforts to protect rural patients’ access to care, could rapidly be undone. The National Rural Health Association implores Congress to act now to protect rural health care across the nation.

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF ADDICTION MEDICINE,
Rockville, MD, March 8, 2017.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. RICHARD NEAL,
Ranking Member, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY, CHAIRMAN WALDEN,
RANKING MEMBER NEAL AND RANKING MEMBER HALL,
On behalf of the American Society of Addiction Medicine (ASAM), the nation’s oldest medical specialty society representing more than 4,300 physicians and allied health professionals who specialize in the treatment of addiction, I am writing to share our views on the American Health Care Act (AHCA) that is being considered by the Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce committees.

ASAM is very concerned that the AHCA’s proposed changes to our health care system will result in reductions in health care coverage, particularly for vulnerable populations including those suffering from the chronic disease of addiction, and we cannot support the bill in its current form.

More than 20 million Americans currently have health care coverage due to the Affordable Care Act (ACA), including millions of Americans with addiction. This coverage is a critical lifeline for American individuals and families to afford needed treatment services for addiction treatment among low-income adults. Rolling back the Medicaid expansion and fundamentally changing Medicaid’s financing structure to block grants poses the potential to seriously harm and/or displace millions of previously eligible individuals, but the AHCA demands all or nothing.

The Medicaid expansion in particular has led to significant increases in coverage and treatment access for persons with addiction. In states that expanded Medicaid, the share of people with addiction or mental illness who were hospitalized but uninsured fell from about 20 percent in 2013 to 5 percent by 2016.

In states that expanded Medicaid, the share of the ongoing opioid epidemic. Moreover, ASAM has seen for decades how states underfund addiction treatment services and waste federal dollars on inefficient and ineffective care when they are left to decide whether to fund their federal Medicaid dollars without mandates for parity and accountability to cover appropriate care. Based on this experience, we commended the Congress for requiring accountability for the $4 billion in funding sent to the states to combat the opioid epidemic authorized by 21st Century Cures. This funding is an additional $4 billion to suffering communities, but it will come to an end while patients will continue to need treatment for the chronic disease of addiction. When it does, the Medicaid program must continue to fund appropriate addiction treatment at parity with medical and surgical services.

We are concerned that rolling back the Medicaid expansion will increase the EHB requirements for Medicaid expansion plans, and capping federal support for Medicaid beneficiaries will reduce coverage for and access to addiction treatment services. This will be particularly painful in the midst of the ongoing opioid epidemic. Moreover, while the AHCA retains the EHB requirements for private plans, it repeals the ACA’s actuarial value requirements for those plans. We are concerned that this will result in insurers offering addiction treatment benefits in name only due to higher costs and/or less robust benefits.

The Medicaid expansion in particular has led to significant increases in coverage and treatment access for persons with addiction. In states that expanded Medicaid, the share of people with addiction or mental illness who were hospitalized but uninsured fell from about 20 percent in 2013 to 5 percent by 2016. Medicaid expansion has been associated with an 18.3 percent reduction in

unmet need for addiction treatment services among low-income adults. Rolling back the Medicaid expansion and fundamentally changing Medicaid’s financing structure to block grants poses the potential to seriously harm and/or displace millions of previously eligible individuals, but the AHCA demands all or nothing.

Furthermore, it repeals the ACA’s mandate that Medicaid expansion plans, and its requirement that Medicaid expansion include addiction treatment benefits (EHB) including addiction treatment services at parity with medical and surgical services, and extension of parity protections for pregnant women, as well.

We are concerned that rolling back the Medicaid expansion and unwinding the EHB requirements for Medicaid expansion plans, and capping federal support for Medicaid beneficiaries will reduce coverage for and access to addiction treatment services. This will be particularly painful in the midst of the ongoing opioid epidemic. Moreover, while the AHCA retains the EHB requirements for private plans, it repeals the ACA’s actuarial value requirements for those plans. We are concerned that this will result in insurers offering addiction treatment benefits in name only due to higher costs and/or less robust benefits.

The Medicaid expansion in particular has led to significant increases in coverage and treatment access for persons with addiction. In states that expanded Medicaid, the share of people with addiction or mental illness who were hospitalized but uninsured fell from about 20 percent in 2013 to 5 percent by 2016. Medicaid expansion has been associated with an 18.3 percent reduction in

unmet need for addiction treatment services among low-income adults. Rolling back the Medicaid expansion and fundamentally changing Medicaid’s financing structure to block grants poses the potential to seriously harm and/or displace millions of previously eligible individuals, but the AHCA demands all or nothing.

Earlier this year, we shared with Congress key health reform objectives that we believe should be the foundation of any health care legislation, and the health of the nation. Among these objectives are ensuring that those currently covered do not lose their coverage, maintaining market reforms, and protecting tax credits and essential health insurance market, ensuring that low and moderate-income patients are able to secure affordable and adequate coverage, and ensuring that Medicaid and other federal safety net programs are maintained and adequately funded. While we appreciate that the bill’s authors have made efforts to maintain some of the market and coverage reforms and that efforts are underway to strengthen the individual insurance market, as a whole the legislation fails short of the principles we previously outlined.

Health insurance coverage is critically important. Without it, millions of American families could be just one serious illness or accident away from losing their home, business, or life savings. The AMA has long supported the availability of affordable and reliable health insurance coverage, as a means to assist individuals and families to purchase health insurance. The credits proposed under the AHCA are significantly less generous than the ACA credits, and would provide the greatest need than provided under current law. The reduced purchasing power with the AHCA tax credits will put insurance coverage out of reach for millions of Americans. We also remain deeply concerned with the reduction of federal support for the Medicaid program and the resulting significant loss of coverage for millions. The Medicaid expansion has provided access to critical services, including mental health and substance abuse treatment, for millions. Not only will the AHCA force many states to roll back coverage to these millions of previously ineligible individuals, but the significant reduction in federal support for the program will inevitably have serious implications for all Medicaid beneficiaries, including the elderly, disabled, children, and pregnant women, as well.

We continue to be concerned about proposals that eliminate important investments in public health, and those that inappropriately insert the federal government into personal decisions about where Americans suffering from addiction who may lose their health care coverage entirely or see reductions in benefits that impede access to needed treatment.

Sincerely,

R. JEFFREY GOLDSMITH,
MD, DLFAAPA, DFASAM,
President, American Society of Addiction Medicine.

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, IL, March 22, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI,
Due to projections that enactment of the American Health Care Act (AHCA) will result in millions of Americans losing health insurance, the American Medical Association (AMA) must express our opposition to the proposal currently before the House of Representatives. The need to stabilize the individual insurance market and make other improvements in the Affordable Care Act is well understood. However, as physicians, we also know that individuals who lack health care coverage live sicker and die younger than those with adequate coverage. We encourage all members of Congress to engage in an inclusive and thorough dialogue on appropriate remedies. We cannot, however, support legislation that would leave health insurance coverage further out of reach for urban and rural providers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Hastings), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, today is a sad day for this institution. Why are we here? Well, after 13 hours at the Rules Committee on Wednesday,
did we report to the floor the Republicans’ replacement to the Affordable Care Act? No.

And why not? Because the legislation was not extreme enough. It didn’t hurt enough people. It didn’t make enough people uninsured. It didn’t give a large enough tax break to the wealthiest among us.

That 13-hour exercise yielded nothing except to reveal the callous depths of the Republican Party’s attempt to deprive health care from 24 million people.

So after my friends on the other side of the aisle added yet another manager’s amendment, bringing the total to five, and after stripping away essential health benefits, we are here this morning to push this extreme, dangerous, and callous bill under martial law.

But why are we really here? Is this bill actually about improving health care in this country? By our exhaustive analysis of virtually every healthcare group—Mr. MCGOVERN has introduced some of them: hospitals, medical organizations, and the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office—the answer is a flat-out, resounding no.

Premiums are going to rise. Millions upon millions of people will lose health coverage. Essential benefits will be stripped away, and 400 of the wealthiest Americans will get a substantial tax cut while Medicaid is being cut by $880 billion.

Mr. Speaker, during that 13-hour marathon meeting that yielded nothing but a rule allowing Republicans to continue to ram this measure through Congress, I quoted from Scripture, from the King James Bible, Matthew 25:45. It says:

Then shall He answer them, saying, Verily, I say unto you, inasmuch as you did it not to one of the least of these, you did it not to me.

My friends on the other side of the aisle often cite Scripture in their legislative motivations. I ask them now: How does cutting the benefits from the least among us, while showering more wealth upon the wealthiest among us, square with these teachings?

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I noted to them that we hear from them all the time about liberty. So I noted that, in the Preamble to the Constitution, the document that guides our great Nation, and that we all swear an oath to uphold, that we are entrusted to also, and I quote from the Preamble, “promote the general welfare.” I also note for you that this charge is placed before the first mention of the word “liberty.”

Does stripping away of essential health benefits, which include maternity and newborn care, pediatric services, and emergency services, promote the general welfare?

Does cutting $880 billion from Medicaid promote the general welfare?

Does ensuring that, by 2026, 56 million people under the age of 64 will be left without coverage promote general welfare?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in the debate at committee on this shameful bill, I answered the Republican charge that this bill was about freedom when I quoted a verse from the Pimp and Bobby McGee.” What she was saying is: “Freedom’s just another word for nothin’ left to lose.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, if this extreme bill becomes law, a bill which has been rushed through Congress, amended without care, brought before us without hearings, without a CBO score, without thoughtful consideration, without a Democratic amendment being approved, and without a clue, I fear—I mean, I know—that the American people will find themselves with nothing left to lose when it comes to their and their family’s health care, which is the most pervasive and wrenching kind of freedom as you may have ever seen.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Florida very much. In fact, the gentleman is correct. We had an opportunity to quote the Bible, Janis Joplin, and ZZ Top when we were doing our hearings. I enjoyed much time with each other, and I enjoyed the hours and hours that we had to debate these essential items.

But the other side of the story is essential health benefits are not being done away with. They are being transformed entirely to States. States have asked for the ability to manage their own money, and manage their own people’s benefits of what would be required in the States. So in no way should a person take away, well, we just did away with $880 billion, transferred the authority and the responsibility of essential health benefits to the States because Governors have been asking for this.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a moment to explain what I believe is at the heart of the legislation and really, in reality, the key to fixing health care. It is the second part of this.

We heard the gentleman from Lewisville, Texas, Dr. BURGESS, speak about the tax credit available to States. States have asked for the ability to manage their own money, and manage their own people’s benefits of what would be required in the States. So in no way should a person take away, well, we just did away with $880 billion, transferred the authority and the responsibility of essential health benefits to the States because Governors have been asking for this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, look, first of all, this rather outrageous Republican healthcare bill still will cost 24 million Americans their healthcare insurance; and if you are lucky enough not to be one of those 24 million Americans, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the head of which was appointed by a Republican, said it will also increase the cost by 15 or 20 percent for those who are lucky enough to keep their insurance.
In addition to that, it has a crushing age tax that forces people aged 50 to 64 to pay premiums five times higher than what other Americans pay for health care.

As if that age tax wasn’t enough, in this new amendment, and look most of us only do for the first time at 6:30 this morning, they increased the Medicare tax for another 5 years by 1 percent, so Americans will have to pay even more in taxes.

The last manager’s amendment, which we just got the information on, actually would increase the deficit by over $150 billion more than their original bill, somehow without covering even one additional American.

What is going on here?

They are creating a bill that has more taxes with this manager’s amendment, creating a bill that costs the American people more and reduces the deficit more, and then pawns off the hard decisions to the States, without giving them enough to maintain the essential benefits that Americans rely on, like prescription drugs, rehabilitative and mental health services.

They are not giving the States enough money to maintain those. And then they are saying: But you, States, be the bad guys and you guys make the cut so we in Washington can pat our- selves on the back and look good, even while we increase the deficit by more than $150 billion more than the original healthcare bill that was introduced last week and even though we maintain the age tax that forces people between the age of 50 and 64 to pay up to five times more than other Americans.

This is simply the wrong way to go. Sometimes you need to reboot, restart, get together, look at real ideas that Democrats and Republicans have put on the table to reduce costs and expand coverage. What is that this discussion should be about. Yet, to do that, we need to defeat this rule now and go back to the starting point.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, 7 years ago yesterday, the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, became law. Since then, this law has resulted in canceled plans, higher premiums, fewer choices, increased deductibles, and less freedom for the American people.

Don’t just take my word for it. Former Democratic President Bill Clinton said this about ObamaCare:

“Our wonderful new HealthCare Bill is now out for review and negotiation.”

And that was true. It was out for review so everyone could read it, and it was out for negotiation so that everyone could improve it.

We did that in the Budget Committee. We had four motions to introduce that passed in the Budget Committee to provide Medicaid flexibility, to make sure the tax credits were targeted to the right populations, to ensure that able-bodied, working Americans had those incentives to both get health care and be able to go back to work.

Now, every committee didn’t have that experience. As my colleagues have asked for a bipartisan process, you will remember that the Energy and Commerce Committee did debating the title of the bill. They spent 10 hours debating Democratic amendments to change the title of the bill. Folks, we have opportunity after opportunity to make things better, but it is incumbent upon us to choose that opportunity to make things better.

So often we get wrapped around the partisan action. Folks let that opportunity slip away. I am glad that we did not.

Mr. Speaker, when I talk about what we did in the Budget Committee to make it better, I am talking about focusing on the real problems. There is not a member in this body that doesn’t understand that what is contributing to the ObamaCare death spiral is that young people are not enrolling. Young people are not enrolling.

More Americans rejected ObamaCare and filed for an exemption or agreed to pay the penalty than enrolled in ObamaCare. I don’t care how big your heart was when you passed the bill, you have to concede that wasn’t what you intended. And we can do better.
My friends are talking about the essential health benefits plan today. Young people are particularly sensitive to that. They are price sensitive in that way. We are talking in the Budget Committee about how to preserve that flexibility for States to design plans that are right for them.

How many times today have we heard folks say that prices are going to increase for Americans between the age of 54 and 64? I have heard it at least a dozen times. At the same time, my friends are demanding that every healthcare plan in the State of Georgia cover maternity benefits for those women between the age of 54 and 64. At the same time, my friends are demanding that every plan in Georgia cover pediatric benefits for those empty nesters between 54 and 64. That doesn't make sense. It doesn't make sense. We in Georgia know it doesn't make sense, and we can do better.

Mr. Speaker, 45 percent of the almost 20 million people who rejected the Affordable Care Act and agreed to pay the fine or file an exemption instead were under the age of 35. There is not a serious thinker in this room who believe that the insurance crisis in this country without getting these folks back into the marketplace. And that is what we did in the Budget Committee. That is what we have done throughout this entire amendment process to what the amendments we considered in the Rules Committee this morning did as well.

Mr. Speaker, since the passage of the Affordable Care Act, many States have had to pass a lot of legislation in order to conform their plans to new one-size-fits-all Federal mandates. But that is not the story. The story is that, at the same time, States were passing their own benefit mandates to serve their constituency better.

Mr. Speaker. Chairman SESSION's State of Texas passed a mandate that orally administered anticancer medication be covered. The gentleman from Texas has seen those groups in his office. He has seen those families struggling. And what Texas said is: To respond to our people, we are going to require every plan sold in the State of Texas cover these issues.

In my home State, Mr. Speaker, we created a commission to look at annually how to add more benefits, change those benefits, make sure we are being responsive to folks in the best way that we can.

The gentleman from Colorado, his State did the very same thing. They required coverage for acupuncture services. They required the selling of child-only plans. They required coverage for fetal alcohol syndrome. We do those things collaboratively, and we do these things together.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the rule and passage of the underlying legislation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I notice the gentleman from Georgia relied on a tweet from Donald Trump for his facts in explaining the bill. I might suggest a more scholarly source, maybe, like, beginning with the Congressional Budget Office, which says that 24 million people will lose their health coverage as a result of the bill.

I refer you to the Quinlan poll that says only 17 percent of the American people approve of what my Republican friends are doing. Seventeen percent is lower than Trump's rating. That is quite an accomplishment.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS). Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it has been hard keeping up with all the changes over the last 24 hours. This process has been far from transparent.

The CBO released a revised score last night that said that the changes made to appease the Freedom Caucus will cost about $300 billion more without doing or adding anything to increase coverage.

So how is that possible? The latest edition to this healthcare disaster, the elimination of minimum essential benefits, is something that I want to focus on very briefly.

This is especially hard. Insurance companies will no longer have to cover maternity care, provide direct access to an OB/GYN, or cover preventative services like cancer screening or birth control.

Mr. Speaker, I have a chance call this a mommy tax? Is this a mommy tax to finance a millionaire tax cut? I don't know.

Earlier this week, I gave my colleagues the opportunity to demonstrate their commitment to women's health in a related bill, and Mr. Speaker, they didn't even allow a vote. I hear my colleagues claiming that these changes are about choice. Forcing women to pay more for the care they need is a choice I think we could do without.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this healthcare disaster.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), the vice chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his remarkable leadership in this important debate.

Seven years ago, I was on this floor and I heard that, if you liked your plan, you could keep it. I heard, if you liked your doctor, you could keep that doctor. And I heard that healthcare costs were going to drop by $2,500 per family. None of it was true. I sit here now and look at my State, and I know what is happening next year. The rates on the ObamaCare exchanges are going up by 69 percent. We are down to a single provider. That is what 7 years ago brought us.

Today we have a chance to do something different, and everybody from my State will do something different. They will vote for a plan that actually does what it says it is going to do. Number one, they will be able to actually have plans that are designed by Oklahomans, not by bureaucrats in Washington, D.C. They will be able to have a tax credit, if they are not already insured under Medicare or from their employer. They will be able to have an individual tax credit to purchase a plan that they design, that they like. They will be free of the mandates of ObamaCare, free to make their own decisions, free of the mandates that require them to buy insurance products that they simply don't need.

I have got a lot of people in my district that are in their fifties and sixties. Some of them might like to have children again, but they are not likely to have children again, and they mostly don't want maternity care.

So it is a pretty simple choice for us. It is a choice to be free and make our own decisions. It is a choice to design plans. It is a choice to have Federal assistance where we need it, but to be used under our direction. It is an easy choice.

I urge the passage of this rule, and I urge the passage of the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this healthcare disaster.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), the vice chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his remarkable leadership in this important debate.

The AHCA cuts Medicaid spending—an essential source of care for millions of children, seniors, people with disabilities, and people experiencing poverty in our nation—and a per-capita cap would force states to ration care. The legislation would also increase costs for older and sicker patients and burden low- and moderate-income families with much higher premiums by cutting $122 billion of financial assistance for people purchasing health insurance on the individual market. This is far from the Gospel mandate to care for our most vulnerable sisters and brothers.

For any replacement to the ACA to be sufficient, it must meet these 10 conditions—a true mandate of healthcare if you will—and the AHCA breaks nine of 10 mandates:
The mental health crisis in our nation is well documented. Half of all Americans with mental illness go without treatment. Last year, Congress passed significant bipartisan legislation to address the crisis in our nation’s mental health system. However, addressing the needs in our country relies on a foundation of affordable, quality health coverage with fair and equal coverage of mental health and substance use conditions. Thus, the importance of Medicaid and insurance safeguards for individuals living with mental illness cannot be overstated. Unfortunately, the proposed reforms in the AHCA threaten to undermine the historic progress being made to improve mental health and substance use care.

Restructuring Medicaid Threatens Mental Health Care.

Medicaid is the single largest payer of mental health and substance use services in the United States. Medicaid is also the largest single source for the country’s public mental health system. One in five of Medicaid’s nearly 70 million beneficiaries have a mental health or substance use disorder diagnosis. NAMI is deeply concerned with proposed provisions to convert Medicaid financing into a per capita cap model. This would limit federal funding to a lump sum for all enrollees and, instead of providing more flexibility, would shift financial risk for health care costs—including unexpected costs, such as promising new innovations in treatment—towards states. Current estimates are that the per capita cap provisions would shift an alarming $450 billion in federal funding to states over the next ten years. In the face of budget shortfalls, states will be forced to cut people from coverage, reduce health benefits and access, and, even when already low provider payments, escalating our nation’s healthcare workforce crisis.

The AHCA would set per capita caps for Medicaid enrollees in all states, adjusted for medical inflation. Funding for mental health and substance use services is already inadequate in Medicaid programs and, under this model, could even be cut further without cutting other health care. Further, the deep reductions in federal Medicaid funding would mean that people with mental illness will face severe financial hardships when trying to access critical mental health care.

Freezing Medicaid Expansion Puts Lives at Risk.

Nearly 1 out of 3 people covered by Medicaid expansion lives with a mental health or substance use condition. Medicaid expansion has proven to be a lifeline that helps people with mental illness who typically fall through the cracks. Medicaid expansion provides coverage to people with mental health conditions who are too sick to navigate the traditional Medicaid application process, who are just stable enough not to qualify for disability (often because they are coming out of a psychiatric hospital), or who have first symptoms of a serious mental illness. NAMI strongly urges the Committee to take further steps to preserve enrollment in Medicaid expansion, rather than the proposed freeze to in 2020. Expanded eligibility has brought mental health treatment and the hope of recovery to millions affected by mental illness. It is helping keep people from relapsing and rehospitalization in their communities. Congress should not abandon this important means of improving coverage for and access to critical mental health treatment.

NAMI also urges the Committee to reject provisions in the AHCA that would eliminate Medicaid expansion coverage. They experience a lapse of coverage for more than one month. This is a high price to pay for forgetting to pay a premium while in the hospital, could mean more symptoms of mental illness. Denying coverage only serves to further de-stabilize lives with costly consequences for individuals, families and communities.

Finally, NAMI is very concerned that the AHCA removes the requirement for Medicaid expansion plans to cover essential health benefits, including mental health and substance use treatment. Congress’s significant commitment to mental health and substance use disorders in recent legislation did not suggest that the Medicaid program be jeopardized by making these vital services optional in Medicaid. Our country can ill afford to weaken coverage at a time when the need for mental health and substance use treatment is so high.

Continuing Insurance Subsidies and Protections.

To help Americans afford quality health insurance, NAMI strongly urges the Committee to continue current levels of federal support, tied to income, to purchase health care coverage. Without income, more people with mental illness will be unable to afford coverage for mental health care. This threatens their overall health care, and enrollers receive from the Federal government to maintain continuous insurance coverage, and impose a significant penalty for not maintaining continuous coverage. We are also very concerned that the legislation would eliminate requirements for preventive and treatment of mental illness and substance use disorders under state Medicaid managed care and alternative benefit plans. AHCA is the primary source of Federal funding in every state for mental health and substance use services.

Sincerely,

MARY GILIBERTI, J.D.,
Chief Executive Officer, NAMI.

Mary Giliberti, J.D., Chief Executive Officer, NAMI.
The MHLG is a coalition of dozens of national organizations representing consumers, family members, mental health and substance use treatment providers, state behavioral health authorities, and other stakeholders committed to strengthening Americans' access to mental health and substance use services and programs.

The elimination of the Medicaid expansion under the AHCA would leave without coverage the 1.3 million childless, non-pregnant adults with serious mental illness who were not able, for the first time, to gain coverage under Medicaid expansion. It would also leave uncovered the 2.8 million childless, non-pregnant adults with serious substance use disorders who also gained coverage under expansion for the first time. These are populations that Congress promised and worked to serve by passage of 21st Century Cures and the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act (CARA) of 2016, respectively.

It is important to remember that untreated mental health and substance use disorders intensify and serve to increase the number of co-morbid medical conditions in those populations, thereby multiplying total Medicaid costs.

Medicaid is the single largest payer for behavioral health services in the United States. Medicaid is the single largest payer for behavioral health spending, and is the largest source of funding for the country’s public mental health system. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the Medicaid provisions of the AHCA would reduce Medicaid funding over 10 years by $380 billion, or about 25 percent. With an estimated 14 million people—one in five of Medicaid’s 70 million enrollees—living with mental illness or substance use disorders and depending heavily on Medicaid services, allowing states to determine which services can be covered could very well leave many low-income Americans without access to medically necessary prevention and treatment services.

Medicaid covers a broad range of behavioral health services at low or no cost, including but not limited to psychiatric hospital care, case management, day treatment, evaluation and testing, psychosocial rehabilitation, medication management, as well as individual, group and family therapy. In three dozen states, Medicaid covers essential peer support to help sustain recovery. Additionally, because people with behavioral health disorders experience a higher rate of chronic physical conditions than the general population, Medicaid’s management of primary care is critical to help this population receive needed treatment for both their behavioral health and physical health conditions.

In states that have expanded Medicaid and which have been particularly hard hit by the opioid crisis, such as Kentucky, Maine, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia, Medicaid pays between 35 to 50 percent of medication-assisted treatment for substance use disorders under the 21st Century Cures Act to increase payment for those services, but the elimination of mandated coverage under Medicaid would likely result in state cost shifting, so that CARA moneys (should they be appropriated) and moneys provided under 21st Century Cures for prescription opioid addiction prevention and treatment services would subsume, rather than supplement, the existing Medicaid coverage of services in the states.

Similarly, converting Medicaid into a per capita cap program or a block grant program will shift significant costs to states over time. Ultimately, states will be forced to reduce their Medicaid rolls, benefit levels, and substance use disorder prevention and treatment programs, and an already scarce workforce of behavioral health providers. Mental health and substance use disorder treatments and programs will be at high risk because, even though they are cost-effective, they are intensive and expensive. Furthermore, the elimination of the ACA’s required Medicaid managed care coverage of mental health and substance use disorder services and the long-term reduction of real funding dollars will leave states with no alternative but to reduce or eliminate services in order to balance state Medicaid budgets and operate within managed care organization’s caps.

In addition, these cuts will hit children with serious emotional disorders, as well as adults with mental illness. Fifty percent of Medicaid beneficiaries are children. Seventy-five percent of mental illness emerge by late adolescence. The loss of Medicaid-covered mental and substance use disorder services for adults would result in more family disruption and out-of-home placements for children, significant trauma which has its long-term health effects, and a further burden on a child welfare system that is struggling to accommodate this high demand for foster home capacity. In addition, we estimate $1 to $5 billion in Medicaid assistance would be lost by schools for specialized instructional services for mental and behavioral health services.

More directly, the rollback of the maximum eligibility level for children ages 6 to 19 from 1.2 million percent of the Federal Poverty Level to 100 percent FPL will undoubtedly have the result of reducing access to mental health and substance use disorder services, and critical Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnostic, and Treatment (EPSDT) services, for those older children. This is a particularly problematic change since 5 percent (1.2 million) of adolescents between the ages of 12 and 17 are diagnosed with seriously disabling conditions in 2015 and EPSDT screening is the most effective early identifier for emergent mental health issues.

**AHCA CHANGES TO PRIVATE INSURANCE COVERAGE**

If Medicaid is not to provide the avenue for recovery for individuals with mental health or substance use disorders, then the private insurance market may have to serve as an alternative, but the $2,000 to $4,000 refundable tax credit offered through the AHCA to subsidize insurance premiums constitute a significant reduction in the advance premium tax credits paid under the ACA, which averaged $1,900 per year. Further, the 30 percent premium surcharge required under ACA to be imposed for a failure to maintain continuous coverage will likely hit hardest the lowest-income enrollees who will be struggling to maintain premium payments for coverage. It will be particularly destructive for those enrollees whose substance use disorders or whose substance use disorder services may render them cognitively impaired and thus unable to maintain premium payment schedules until they recover, when the sizeable surcharge will leave them unable to pick up coverage. For the foregoing reasons, these provisions of the AHCA leave us very concerned for the continued well-being of the individuals with serious mental illness and substance use disorders we have been better able to serve since the implementation of the ACA’s expanded coverage.

We urge you to continue to protect these vulnerable Americans’ access to and coverage of vital mental health and substance use disorder care and services, and to not remove the expansion of key mental health and substance use disorder prevention and treatment re-forms under the 21st Century Cures Act and CARA.

Sincerely,

American Art Therapy Association, American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy, American Association for Geriatric Psychiatry, American Association for Medical Health and Disability, American Dance Therapy Association, American Foundation for Suicide Prevention, American Nurses Association, American Psychological Association, American Psychiatric Association, American Psychological Association (APSAA), American Psychological Association, American Society of Addiction Medicine, Anxiety and Depression Association, Association of Hospital Social Services, Association of Maternal, Infant, and Child Health Programs (AMCHP), Association of Maternal, Infant, and Child Health Programs (AMCHP), Behavioral Healthcare, Association for Behavioral Health and Wellness, Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law, Campaign for Trauma-Informed Policy and Practice, Children and Adults with Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (CHADD), Clinical Social Work Association, Clinical Social Work Guild 49–OPEIU, Depression and Bi-Polar Support Alliance, Eating Disorders Coalition, EMDR International Association, Global Alliance for Behavioral Health and International Certification & Reciprocity Consortium (IC&RC), The Jewish Federations of North America, Mental Health America, National Association for Children’s Behavioral Health, The National Association of County Behavioral Health and Developmental Disabilities Systems (NACBHDDS), National Association for Rural Mental Health (NARMH), National Association of Social Workers, National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors (NASMHPD), National Alliance on the Mental Illness (NAMI), National Council for Behavioral Health, National Disability Rights Network, National Federation for Children’s Mental Health, National Health Care for the Homeless Council, National Register of Health Service Psychologists, No Health Without Mental Health (NHMH), School Social Work Association of America, Trinity Health of Livonia, Michigan, Young Invincibles.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 23, 2017]

**LATE G.O.P. PROPOSAL COULD MEAN PLANS THAT COVER AROMATHERAPY BUT NOT CHEMOTHERAPY.** (By Margot Sanger-Katz)

Most Republicans in Congress prefer the type of health insurance market in which everyone could “choose the plan that’s right for them.”

Why should a 60-year-old man have to buy a plan that includes maternity benefits he’ll never use? (This is an example that comes up a lot.) In contrast, the Affordable Care Act imposed a list of benefits that have to be in every plan, a reality that makes insurance comprehensive, but often costly.

Now a group of conservative House members is trying to cut a deal to get those benefit requirements eliminated as part of the bill to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act. The vote in the House is expected later today.

At first glance, this may sound like a wonderful policy. Why should that 60-year-old man have to pay for maternity benefits he will never use? (This is an example that comes up a lot.) In contrast, the Affordable Care Act imposes a list of benefits that have to be in every plan, a reality that makes insurance comprehensive, but often costly.

Now a group of conservative House members is trying to cut a deal to get those benefit requirements eliminated as part of the bill to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act. The vote in the House is expected later today.

At first glance, this may sound like a wonderful policy. Why should that 60-year-old man have to pay for maternity benefits he will never use? (This is an example that comes up a lot.) In contrast, the Affordable Care Act imposes a list of benefits that have to be in every plan, a reality that makes insurance comprehensive, but often costly.
can start to become a little murky. The second is that, in a world in which no one has to offer maternity coverage, no insurance company wants to be the only one that offers it.

Here is the list of Essential Health Benefits that are required under the Affordable Care Act.

- Ambulatory patient services (doctor’s visits)
- Emergency services
- Hospitalization
- Maternity and newborn care
- Mental health and substance abuse disorder services, including behavioral health treatment
- Preventive and wellness services, and chronic disease management
- Pediatric services, including oral and vision care

The list reflects some lobbying of the members of Congress who wrote it. You may notice that dental services are required for children, but not adults, for example. But over all, the list was developed to make insurance for people who buy their own coverage roughly, like the kind of coverage people get through their employer. A plan without prescription drug coverage would probably be cheaper than one that covers it, but most people wouldn’t think of that plan as very good insurance for people who have health care needs.

Under the Republican plan, the government would give people who buy their own insurance money to help them pay for it. A 20-year-old who doesn’t get coverage from work or the government, for example, would get $2,000. If the essential health benefits go away, insurance companies would be allowed to sell health plans that don’t cover, say, hospital care. Federal money would help buy these plans.

But history illustrates a potential problem. In the 1990s, Congress created a tax credit that helped low-income people buy insurance for their children. Quickly, it became clear that unscrupulous entrepreneurs were creating cheap products that weren’t very useful, and then trying to sell them to people eligible for the credit. Congress quickly repealed the provision after investigations from the Government Accountability Office and the Ways and Means Committee uncovered fraud.

Mark Pauly, a professor of health care management at the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, who tends to favor market solutions in health care, said that while the Obamacare rules are “paternalistic,” it would be problematic to offer subsidies without standards. “If they’re going to offer a tax credit for people who are buying insurance, well, what is insurance?” he said. Noting that you might end up with a system that shifts more of the costs of care away, insurance companies would be allowed to sell health plans that don’t cover preventive services, with everything else as an add-on. Plans would be allowed to cover only the essential health benefits.

And then healthy people who develop mental illness, or drug addiction, will also learn that their insurance doesn’t cover it. The result could be a sort of market failure: “If you are young and healthy and have insurance, and you’re not going to use the services that are required, you can get insurance that doesn’t cover much medical care,” he said.

Before Obamacare passed, there were few federal standards for health insurance bought by individuals, and it was not uncommon to find plans that didn’t include prescription drug coverage, mental health services or maternity care. But plans tended to cover most of the other benefits. That was in a world where health insurers could discriminate against sick people. In that era, insurers in most states could simply tell the mother of a mentally ill child that she couldn’t buy insurance. That made it less risky for insurance companies to offer mental health benefits to everyone else.

David Cutler, a professor at Harvard who helped advise the Obama administration on the Affordable Care Act, said he thinks the kind of insurance products that would be offered under the proposed mix of policies could become much more bare-bones than plans before Obamacare. He envisioned an environment in which a typical plan might cover only emergency care and basic preventive services, with everything else as an add-on. “We’re talking about much as $6,000 or $8,000 a year,” he said, as a starting point, for the kind of insurance products that would be offered under the proposed mix of policies.

“Think of this as the if-you-have-rheumatoid arthritis-and-you-should-buy-$30,000-provision,” he said. Such a system would mean that Americans with costly problems—cancer, opioid addiction, H.I.V.—would end up paying a substantially higher share of their medical bills, while healthy people would pay lower prices for insurance that wouldn’t cover as many treatments.

There is, of course, a middle way. Republican lawmakers might be comfortable with a system that shifts more of the costs of care onto people who are sick, if it makes the average insurance plan less costly for the healthy. But making those choices would mean engaging in very real trade-offs, less simple than their talking point.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Visclosky).

Mr. Visclosky. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying legislation. I believe the purpose of any healthcare legislation should be to improve the well-being of our Nation’s citizens and to allow for access to quality and affordable health care for all. I think, particularly, the gentlemen from Massachusetts and Florida ably describe why today’s legislation fails those tests. I would add that it will also jeopardize the healthcare coverage of over 429,000 Hoosiers currently enrolled in Indiana’s expansion of Medicaid, the Healthy Indiana Plan.

Further, I believe it is disingenuous that, if this bill is successful, the House will have pushed numerous adverse consequences until after the next congressional election.

Congress should work to improve the Affordable Care Act. Congress should work to ensure affordable pharmaceutical products. Congress should act for the health concerns still facing ordinary Americans. But today’s legislation does no such thing.

I find it unacceptable, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the American Health Care Act.

I believe that the purpose of any health care legislation should be to ensure the health and well-being of our nation’s citizens, and to allow for access to quality and affordable health care for all.

That is why in the 111th Congress I was proud to support the Affordable Care Act. As we are considering today will leave approximately 14 million more Americans without health care insurance by 2018, and this number will continue to rise to an estimated 24 million by 2026.

I am especially concerned that the American Health Care Act will jeopardize the health care coverage of the over 429,000 Hoosiers currently enrolled in Indiana’s expansion of Medicaid, also known as the Healthy Indiana Plan.

Further, I believe it is especially disingenuous that if this bill is successful, the institution will have pushed the financial cuts to programs like the Healthy Indiana Plan conveniently until after the next congressional election.

The Act before us also would negatively impact the health of millions of women and men who receive the medical services provided by Planned Parenthood. Additionally, it would not improve the well-being of our nation’s elderly by allowing providers to charge older enrollees up to five times as much as younger individuals.

Finally, I would note with great concern that a provision was just added to the American Health Care Act today that would remove the requirement that insurers cover life-saving, essential health benefits, including maternal and pediatric services, rehabilitative therapy, and mental health and substance abuse treatment.

Congress should work to improve the Affordable Care Act and address important health concerns facing ordinary Americans, such as the rising cost of prescription drugs. Today’s bill does no such thing.

It is unacceptable and I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. Sessions. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Matsui).

Ms. Matsui. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of rhetoric about how this bill is bad. Republicans stuck in a provision to strip away essential health benefits for American families.

The list of services in jeopardy is long, devastating, and cruel. Services like emergency services, hospitalization, prescription drugs, preventive care, and many other guarantees.

These are basic health services that every person in the country deserves, like my constituent Elizabeth, whose daughter is guaranteed pediatric care because of these essential benefits. Without coverage, out-of-pocket costs would add up to more than her entire year’s salary. I can’t stand here and allow my Republican colleagues to say they are saving her type 1 diabetes because while they are stripping away essential care for families like Elizabeth’s. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. Sessions. Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, this is a bad joke. This bill should be defeated. This is a bad joke. This bill should be defeated.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. Kelly).

Ms. Kelly of Illinois. Mr. Speaker: “Of all the forms of inequality, injustice in healthcare is the most shocking and inhumane.”

Dr. King spoke these words because the health of our fellow Americans is a moral imperative. What we have before us today is a morally corrupt bill: morally corrupt because it leaves nearly 1 million of my fellow Illinoisans without health insurance, morally corrupt because it leaves 240,000 Illinois kids will no longer have the safety and security of their current coverage.

When you cast your vote today, know that you own its aftermath here, for the interests of the American people. This does not have to be better off. Does this bill do right by them? Will you cast your vote to do what is best in the lives of the people you represent?

The last-minute backroom changes have made this bill worse. Republicans stuck in a provision to strip away essential health benefits for American families.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. Perlmutter).

Ms. Perlmutter. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad joke on America. Here’s why: the choice act: the choice is get sick or go broke. The choice is more coverage for average Americans or more tax cuts for the rich, higher costs for families.

Twenty-four million people, at least, lose their coverage under the choice act, or TrumpCare.

That is a bad joke. That is a bad choice.

Here is something: discrimination against older Americans. They have five times the cost of younger Americans under TrumpCare, under their choice act.

This hurts Medicare.

There are no savings in this bill—that was what the whole thing was all about—but less coverage for average Americans. We get many people cut off their coverage, but we get big tax cuts for the rich.

This is a bad joke. This bill should be defeated. This rule should be defeated.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Texas, if I can.

I know he has a few more speakers than he did yesterday, but we have a ton over here, and if there is additional time that he could share with us, we would appreciate it.

Mr. Sessions. Mr. Speaker, we are going to keep moving on. We were allocated the same amount of time. I guess the answer would be no.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Rhode Island (Mr. Langevin).

Mr. Langevin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican effort to gut the Affordable Care Act, an effort that will result in millions of people across the country and tens of thousands of my constituents in Rhode Island to lose their health coverage, and it will ultimately result in costs rising.

Before the ACA was passed, the House held 79 hearings over the course of a year. Today’s Republican plan was pushed through three committees without a single hearing and with substantial changes being made behind closed doors in the dead of night.

Mr. Speaker, I am a veteran of many healthcare debates, and I can tell you this is not how sound policy is made, especially policy that will have real consequences for hardworking Americans.

Since the passage of the ACA, I have had faith that Republicans and Democrats could come together to strengthen the law and further improve healthcare for all Americans. There is still that opportunity to come together, Mr. Speaker, but the rule, along with the underlying bill, has shaken that faith.

Supporting this rule means putting ideology above the well-being of the American people. This does not have to be a zero-sum game. I know that we can come together.
Let’s defeat this rule and the bill. Come together in a bipartisan way to fix the problems of the ACA.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, people in my State of Hawaii and all across the country are in desperate need of serious healthcare reform to bring down costs and increase access to quality care.

The legislation before us, though, is not the answer. It perpetuates the problems. It is a handout to insurance and pharmaceutical companies that literally pulls the rug out from those who are most needy and most vulnerable in our communities.

While corporations rake in over $600 billion in tax breaks, many low-income Americans will see their coverage drop completely.

Medicaid, a program that one in five Americans depend on for basic care, would lose hundreds of billions of dollars, shifting costs to already-strained State and local governments.

Our kupuna, our seniors, could see their premiums increase up to five times more than young, healthy people under these new age rating rules in this bill.

Simply put, we need a healthcare system that puts people before profits. I urge my colleagues strongly to vote "no" against this legislation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the CBO score for the underlying bill and the first four manager’s amendments. We just got it last night, and it is already out-of-date given the fifth manager’s amendment that was just submitted late last night.

U.S. CONGRESS
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Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: At your request, the Congressional Budget Office and the staff of the Joint Taxation Committee have prepared an estimate of the direct spending and revenue effects of H.R. 1628, the American Health Care Act, as posted on the website of the House Committee on Ways and Means and the House Committee on Energy and Commerce (which were combined into H.R. 1628) would yield a net reduction in the Federal deficit of $537 billion over the 2017-2026 period. CBO estimates that enacting the legislation would affect direct taxes and Medicare spending, partly offset by a reduction of $99 billion in Medicaid spending, over the 2017-2026 period.

The legislation's impact on health insurance coverage: Estimates differ by an estimated $8 billion over the period.

CBO and JCT estimate that, in 2018, 14 million more people would be uninsured under the legislation than under current law. By 2026, average premiums for single policyholders in the nongroup market before 2020 and lower

EFFECTS ON PREMIUMS
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KEITH HALL,
Director.

Mr. MCGOVERN. This analysis confirms that the Republicans will give a trillion-dollar tax break to the wealthiest people in this country, and they will use that to give the block grant for Medicaid to take care of those people. I will say that is why we are packed with speakers on this side, and there is probably only a couple of people on the gentleman’s side, because we are standing with the American people who are outraged by this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, last night we watched as the President and the House Republicans scramble to achieve political points at the expense of the American people, working through the night. Imagine if they worked this hard on a jobs bills or a bill that raised family incomes or a bill to rebuild our infrastructure. But instead they are trying to pass a tax cut for the rich disguised as a healthcare bill, a bill that will require us to provide big, gigantic tax cuts.
Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DeLauro).

Ms. DeLauro. Mr. Speaker, the healthcare proposal proposed by President Trump and Speaker Ryan raises premiums and deductibles. It imposes an age tax on Americans, making their health care unaffordable. It throws millions—24 million—Americans off of their insurance. It shifts the cost of health care to the States, and it covers less and less people.
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It raises people’s fears and insecurities about what this will do if they get sick. It ends maternity care. It is quite outrageous when it tells you that you can’t go for emergency services any longer. It would allow insurance companies to, once again, reimpose lifetime limits and annual caps. It allows insurance companies to charge women 48 percent more for the same insurance that any man would pay for.

So why would you be for this? Why? Who benefits? Who benefits?

We are going to provide 400 of the richest families in this Nation with a $7 million tax cut every year. Those are not my words. Take a look at what Families USA says. Take a look at what the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities says about that.

Working people and older Americans are going to pay a tax cut for the richest people in this Nation. Older Americans are going to be hit the hardest. Not only are they going to get an age tax, but they are going to shift $170 billion out of the Medicare trust fund—a lifetime for older Americans.

Do you know what? It makes me believe that this is the case: What does the GOP stand for? Get Old People.

Priorities says about that. Families USA says. Take a look at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities says about that.

Mr. Connolly. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. Kuster).

Ms. Kuster. Mr. Speaker, all due respect to my colleague from Wyoming, it is not liberty for a woman to get a job within weeks of having a child. That is what this bill would do.

Mr. Speaker, it is not liberty for people over 50 years old to be required to pay increased fees and increased expenses simply to go to the hospital, and it is not liberty to have their essential health benefits stripped away. They might not even be able to go to a hospital. It is not liberty for 7 million veterans to have their benefits stripped away from an amendment that was introduced in the middle of the night. That is not liberty. Vote “no” on this bill.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Connolly).

Mr. Connolly. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

The Hippocratic Oath says “primum non nocere”: “first, do no harm.” This bill violates the Hippocratic Oath in all respects. Twenty-four million people losing their health care, our friend from Wyoming thinks that is a choice.

A string of benefits required to be covered by insurance companies to protect consumers, to protect our loved ones when they get ill, vitiates. Maybe that is popular in some parts of this country, but I don’t know where they are. This bill will unravel health care for all Americans. It is the wrong path to take, and I urge defeat of this legislation in its entirety.

Ms. Kaptur. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry. Ms. Kaptur. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask why the Democratic microphone is turned off. This happened to me the other day when the Republican microphone was on over there.

The last two speakers we have not been able to hear as well as we heard Ms. Cheney, and I want to know why that is.

I hope somebody hears my plea and that the Parliamentarian will take care of this problem. This debate is too important for us to have our microphones at a lower scale.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Crist).

Mr. Crist. Mr. Speaker, this bill we are talking about takes about $880 billion out of Medicaid. Medicaid is for the poor, and Medicaid is for the disabled. We are in Lent. It is supposed to be the holiest time. I want to read to you from Matthew 22, verse 45. Whatever you do to the least of my brothers, you do unto Me.

Think about that before you vote for this bill. Please vote against it. God bless.

Mr. Sessions. Mr. Speaker, this bill we remaining in this debate on the rule. Under this bill, Americans will have to the distinguished gentleman from Pasco, Washington (Mr. Newhouse), who is a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. Newhouse. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, under the ACA, 5 to 6 million Americans were kicked off their healthcare plans, including 300,000 of my fellow Washingtonians who lost coverage despite repeated promises that they could lose. A majority of Americans have faced skyrocketing costs, reduced access to quality care, and fewer choices for their families. I believe we can and we must do better.

Under this bill, Americans will have health care that fits individual and family needs instead of federally mandated, one-size-fits-all coverage that is simply unaffordable for far too many people. This bill strengthens and guarantees access for the most vulnerable in our communities.

The ACA has failed. I made a promise to the thousands of my constituents who have told me of the devastation this law has wreaked on their lives that I would not forget them. Americans in every election since 2010 have said loud and clear the same thing, and it is time that we listened.

Mr. Speaker, the American Health Care Act is the first major step in keeping that promise, and I think that we need to take it.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. Panetta).
Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of what has become basically the complete repeal of the ACA. Don't get me wrong. I have talked to small-business owners, and I have talked to patients who have talked about the expense of the ACA. But I also have talked to people in my district on the central coast of California how much it has benefited them, including 65,000 people who now have coverage under Medicaid and 25,000 people who have gained it through the expansion of the ACA.

If the AHCA becomes law, we are not making it cheaper, and we are not making it more accessible. Instead, all that is happening is that they are fulfilling a campaign promise.

Mr. Speaker, we must make sure that the ACA is here. We cannot take it away. We must make sure that we provide care, we provide coverage, and we provide the covenant that we promised our way of life.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I am prepared to close.

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

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

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

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of what has become basically the complete repeal of the ACA. Don't get me wrong. I have talked to small-business owners, and I have talked to patients who have talked about the expense of the ACA. But I also have talked to people in my district on the central coast of California how much it has benefited them, including 65,000 people who now have coverage under Medicaid and 25,000 people who have gained it through the expansion of the ACA.

If the AHCA becomes law, we are not making it cheaper, and we are not making it more accessible. Instead, all that is happening is that they are fulfilling a campaign promise.

Mr. Speaker, we must make sure that the ACA is here. We cannot take it away. We must make sure that we provide care, we provide coverage, and we provide the covenant that we promised our way of life.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I am prepared to close.

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

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

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

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of what has become basically the complete repeal of the ACA. Don't get me wrong. I have talked to small-business owners, and I have talked to patients who have talked about the expense of the ACA. But I also have talked to people in my district on the central coast of California how much it has benefited them, including 65,000 people who now have coverage under Medicaid and 25,000 people who have gained it through the expansion of the ACA.

If the AHCA becomes law, we are not making it cheaper, and we are not making it more accessible. Instead, all that is happening is that they are fulfilling a campaign promise.

Mr. Speaker, we must make sure that the ACA is here. We cannot take it away. We must make sure that we provide care, we provide coverage, and we provide the covenant that we promised our way of life.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I am prepared to close.

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

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

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

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of what has become basically the complete repeal of the ACA. Don't get me wrong. I have talked to small-business owners, and I have talked to patients who have talked about the expense of the ACA. But I also have talked to people in my district on the central coast of California how much it has benefited them, including 65,000 people who now have coverage under Medicaid and 25,000 people who have gained it through the expansion of the ACA.

If the AHCA becomes law, we are not making it cheaper, and we are not making it more accessible. Instead, all that is happening is that they are fulfilling a campaign promise.

Mr. Speaker, we must make sure that the ACA is here. We cannot take it away. We must make sure that we provide care, we provide coverage, and we provide the covenant that we promised our way of life.
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Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleagues that this is a sad day for this institution. This process has been awful. But this is even a sadder day for the American people. I remind my colleagues that we are supposed to care about one another, especially the most vulnerable in our society. In this era of Trump, Washington has become a mean place. It is a place where it has become unfashionable to worry about the poor, about older Americans, and about those who struggle.

There is absolutely no justification for giving huge tax breaks to billionaires—$1 trillion in tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires, and at the same time throwing 24 million people off of health care and denying millions more essential healthcare protections.

Twenty-four million people—my Republican colleagues have lost their human ability to feel what that means. That is the entire population of Australia.

Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for my colleagues, but when I look at this bill and I read this bill, I have to wonder: What are you thinking? How could you do this?

I have come to the conclusion there are only two reasons—there are only two ways you can vote for this bill. One is you don’t know what is in the bill; or two is you have to have a heart of stone, because this bill is shameful. It is going to hurt people. It is going to hurt your constituents.

Withdraw this bill or vote “no” on this bill, but this bill cannot become law. The health care and healthcare protections for the American people are too important.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues—both Democrats and Republicans—reject this. Vote “no.”

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking our colleagues, the gentlemen from Massachusetts leading the Rules Committee, and his ranking member, Mr. McGovern. And suspending from each of the committees, some 50 hours’ worth of hearings and markups, including some 16 hours in the Rules Committee to not only talk about and yet, but to understand more clearly what we would be voting on.

Mr. Speaker, today is a bill that is a compromise bill, no doubt about it. I had my own plan and I had my own ideas. I took 2 years to get involved in this process. It is difficult to write a healthcare bill. But it didn’t have to be my plan. It could have been a bill that we could all work together on.

President Trump has been a part of that. President Trump took time out of his schedule to do this. It is important to the American people. President Trump, more than any single Member of Congress, gave the message to the American people about what was necessary and what he would do. He is going to live up to that, and we should, too.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line to this whole thing is we are going to present a Republican plan, and we are going to stand behind what we sell. It is better for the American people. But make no mistake: We are transferring power, authority, and responsibility not just to States, but also to the American people. It will be up to them to make determinations about their own health care because, for the first time, we will allow some 50 million Americans to have a tax equity, an opportunity to use tax credits that will be available to families anywhere from $2,000 for an individual to $14,000 for a family.

This will empower people who have not found a fair shot at the tax advantages it will give them: small-business owners; average worker in this country, including those who work two or three different jobs; as well as those who are uninsured. We believe it is a better shot, an opportunity. We are willing to put our name on it and behind it.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge us to move forward. There will be 4 hours of debate that remain in this opportunity. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule governing House consideration of H.R. 1628, the “American Health Care Act of 2017,” better known as “Trumpcare.”

I oppose the rule, and the underlying legislation, for the following reasons:

1. The rule under consideration is brought pursuant to “martial law” rule passed yesterday which suspends the normal House procedure and allows for same day consideration, debate, and vote of legislation that will adversely affect the lives of everyone in America except for the top 1 percent.

2. The underlying bill is less than 2 weeks old and has not had a single hearing in any of the Committees of jurisdiction; and

3. The underlying bill does not reflect the input of nearly half the Members of this body because the legislation was drafted in secret, marked up in a single overnight session, and brought to the floor without incorporating a single amendment or idea proposed by the minority.

Mr. Speaker, none of us here has had a meaningful opportunity to review the bill, “Trumpcare 2.0,” we are being asked to vote on.

This bill has undergone significant revision from the one marked up just last week by the Budget Committee of which I am a member. Aderholt’s Amendment 2.0 neither preserves many sweeteners and olive branches granted by the Administration and House Republican leaders in backroom deals in a last ditch effort to secure the necessary votes of Republican members to take away health care from 24 million Americans, many of whom are among the most vulnerable persons in society.

None of these changes to the bill before us has been scored by the Congressional Budget Office so we do not know exactly how many more millions of Americans will be hurt.

But what is unlikely to change is that 14 million Americans will lose Medicaid coverage and more than 52 million persons will be uninsured by 2026 under this Republican plan.

In addition to terminating the ACA Medicaid expansion, the “Trumpcare” converts Medicaid to a per-capita cap that is not guaranteed to keep pace with health costs starting in 2020.

The combined effect of these policies is to slash $880 billion in federal Medicaid funding over the next decade.

In short, Trumpcare represents a clear and present danger to the financial and health security of American families, and to the very stability of our nation’s health care system overall.

We should follow regular order in the consideration of all legislation, but especially in a matter with great importance to the American people that could impact nearly 300 million people.

For these reasons, I believe the House should reject this rule and the underlying bill. Instead of trying to enact the largest transfer of wealth from the bottom 99 percent to the top 1 percent in history, House Republicans should work with Democrats to strengthen the Affordable Care Act which has and continues to make life-affirming differences for the better in the lives of more than 300 million Americans.

Mr. SESSIONS. 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 the previous question.

The question was taken; and the ayes appeared to have it.

For these reasons, I believe the House should reject this rule and the underlying bill. Instead of trying to enact the largest transfer of wealth from the bottom 99 percent to the top 1 percent in history, House Republicans should work with Democrats to strengthen the Affordable Care Act which has and continues to make life-affirming differences for the better in the lives of more than 300 million Americans.

Mr. SESSIONS. 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 the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes:

Adopting the resolution, if ordered; Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 1665; and, Agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 186, not voting 7, as follows:

YEA—236

Abraham (TX)  Aderholt (AL)  Allen (GA)  Amash (MI)  Amodei (NV)  Arrington (AL)  Bacon (VA)  Banks (IN)  Barletta (PA)  Barr (TX)  Brat (VA)  Bergman (MI)  Biggs (AZ)  Brooks (AL)  Brooks (IN)  Buchanan (PA)  Buck (GA)  Black (SC)  Blackburn (TN)  Broun (GA)  Byrne (NJ)  Brady (TX)  Calverton

[Roll No. 191]
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Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

The recorded vote was ordered.

The pro tempore announced that the previous question was ordered.

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 230, noes 194, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 192]

[AYE9—230]

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

The recorded vote was ordered.

The Speaker pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 230, noes 194, not voting 5, as follows:

[ROLL NO. 192]
The Speaker pro tempore (Ms. Foxx). The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H. R. 1365) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require certain acquisition innovation, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Speaker pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. Donovan) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The question was taken.

The Speaker pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Speaker pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 424, noes 0, not voting 5, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Represented by</th>
<th>Ayes</th>
<th>Noes</th>
<th>Not Voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aderholt</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguilar</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer (IN)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amash</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amodei</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrington</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburn (OH)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayotte</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayotte (IN)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacon</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banker (MD)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barletta</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barr (CA)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barragan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatty</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bera</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyer (CA)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biggs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billings (CA)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop (CA)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop (OH)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn (CA)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackman</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackman (CA)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn (CA)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blankenhorn</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blumenauer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucshon</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush (WI)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushman</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (VA)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (VA)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (IN)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (MD)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (CA)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (IN)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (OH)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (TX)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (KY)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (OK)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (MS)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (FL)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (MN)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (ID)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (CT)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (AZ)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (CA)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (IN)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (OH)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (TX)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (KY)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (OK)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (MS)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (FL)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (MN)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (ID)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (CT)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (AZ)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (CA)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (IN)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (OH)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (TX)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (KY)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (OK)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (MS)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (FL)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (MN)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (ID)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (CT)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (AZ)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (CA)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (IN)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (OH)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (TX)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>