



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 2, 2019

No. 57

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
April 2, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable G.K. BUTTERFIELD to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

### BROKEN PROMISES FOR HURRICANE MICHAEL RELIEF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on October 10, 2018, a Category 3 storm, Hurricane Michael, entered my State of Georgia with a devastating force.

It was harvest time for the 2018 crop, and it was the best yield, especially for cotton, that we had seen in years. Farmers who had been suffering in the

midst of low commodity prices, unfair trade prices, labor shortages, and consecutive years of storms now had relief in sight. Then entered Hurricane Michael, and it was all gone in a matter of hours. Not just the commodity crops like cotton, but the orchards, too.

Since day one post-Hurricane Michael, I have worked side by side with my friend and my colleague, Congressman SANFORD BISHOP. Hurricane Michael didn't discriminate between our district lines. I want to thank him for his help and his support of our State and our agricultural producers in Georgia.

Soon after the storm, the President, Vice President PENCE, and Secretary Perdue met with the two of us, our farmers, and our community leaders and promised to help them rebuild. Members of both parties, in both Chambers of Congress, echoed the same support. Six months later, and those promises of support have been broken. Never before have we seen communities that were wrecked with catastrophes neglected like this.

Those votes in the Senate yesterday showed a lack of honor and dignity and how truly ugly and partisan politics have become. The truth is, if Hurricane Michael had hit Americans who weren't farmers or farmers who aren't Americans, the stories of yesterday's cowardice would be the front page of every paper.

Whether the press likes it or not and whether the Senators from New York or Vermont like it or not, we are Americans, too. And what happened yesterday was cowardly, partisan politics and truly un-American.

### IMMIGRANT CONTRIBUTIONS TO NEW JERSEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIREs) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the hard work and dedication of

immigrant communities across New Jersey and across this country.

Earlier this month, the New Jersey Policy Perspective issued a report confirming something we have known for a long time in my district and in New Jersey: immigrants continue to serve as the backbone of Main Street.

Immigrants make up 22 percent of the total State population, and immigrants own 47 percent of Main Street businesses. Immigrant communities own 81 percent of household maintenance services, 79 percent of laundry businesses, and nearly 50 percent of child care centers and clothing stores. According to the study, immigrants contribute \$4.4 billion a year to just the New Jersey economy, employing thousands and driving economic growth.

This study is just another reminder that toxic rhetoric against immigration is a misguided attack against our neighbors, our teachers, our firefighters, and local shop owners. As a first generation American, I can attest firsthand to the grit and determination needed to succeed in this country. These brave families sacrifice everything to work hard in America and provide opportunities for their loved ones.

Supporting immigrant communities is the right thing to do to advance American values and boost job growth across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say thank you to the immigrants working hard across the State of New Jersey and across this country.

### FULL PROTECTION FOR BABIES BORN ALIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the House on an important issue, and maybe the most important issue, Mr. Speaker, and that is the issue of life.

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g.,  1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2941

We brought a bill forward, H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. This is a bill, Mr. Speaker, that many wonder why is it even necessary that we need a law to say that if a baby is born alive, outside of the womb, we need to give it the full protections under law.

Many people ask, Mr. Speaker, why isn't that already protected? If a baby is born alive, it should have the full protections of anybody else. And yet, as we see in States like New York and other States around the country, they allow, in those States, the baby, even after it is born alive, to be killed. To me, Mr. Speaker, that is murder, and yet, in many States, they don't have the full protection that all of us enjoy. How could that be, in the United States of America, that a baby born alive can still be killed after it is born outside of the womb?

This issue transcends the abortion debate. In fact, people across every spectrum—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents, even people who align themselves as pro-choice—believe it is wrong to murder the baby after it is born alive, and yet it is still allowed. There should be no reason that this is a gray issue.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I will be joining my colleague, ANN WAGNER, the lead author of this bill, to start a discharge petition: an opportunity for every Member of Congress to make their voices heard loud and clear that this bill ought to come to this floor for a full debate and, ultimately, for a vote.

We ought to pass this law, Mr. Speaker. There should be no doubt. It shouldn't be a partisan issue. It shouldn't be an issue that we have disagreement over, and yet we do. For whatever reason, the Speaker will not allow this bill, though, to come up for a vote. We have tried time after time to move unanimous consent to bring this bill to the floor and, for months, that motion has been denied.

The most vulnerable among us should no longer be denied that protection under the law. Mr. Speaker, this bill has to come up for a vote. This bill has to be debated by the people's House.

Why not allow people all across the country to participate in this debate? As they find out about it, the reaction I get is not a debate on political lines, it is shock that this isn't already law.

Every baby born alive, Mr. Speaker, ought to have the full protection under law that is currently provided to all of us. H.R. 962 should be one of the easiest things that we pass through this House, yet, unfortunately, it has become one of the most difficult. But that is okay, Mr. Speaker. We know that it is the difficult things that we come here to do, not the easy, because it would have already been done.

So we are going to be leading the charge today, standing with people all across the country. And, in fact, we are actually bringing in people, Mr. Speaker, who survived an attempted abor-

tion. It happens all across this country. And when that baby is born alive, that baby ought to have the full protection under the law. We will start the process today to ensure that that full debate happens and, ultimately, that the vote happens to pass the Born Alive Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to sign on to this discharge petition.

#### AMERICANS DEPEND ON CLEAN WATER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, as the chair of the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, I rise to celebrate Clean Water Week. I would like to take this opportunity to highlight the importance of water for our communities, not only in my home State of California, but across the country. Americans depend on clean water for their health, the health of their communities, and the health of the economy.

Our water resources are precious, and every drop matters, which is why we need significant Federal investment in our Nation's infrastructure and strong Federal protections for our Nation's water resources.

We need to protect our waterways, large and small, from pollution; ensure we conserve our water resources; recycle water where we can; and protect our groundwater resources for long-term reliance.

There are tremendous clean water infrastructure needs facing our country. Our communities, large and small, urban and rural, and tribal, as well as our American families are facing great challenges in meeting these needs.

Today, our Nation's network of sewers, stormwater conveyances, and treatment facilities are aging, often very outdated, and, in many places all over the country, not meeting the needs of our communities or water quality standards.

We, in Congress, need to do more, not only to renew the Federal financial commitment to repair, replace, and upgrade our water-related infrastructure, but also to ensure that this work remains affordable to all of our communities.

Today, too many Americans are uncertain whether their drinking water is safe for themselves and for their families. Now is not the time to cut back on the protections of our Nation's clean water. Yet, this administration is proposing to do just that.

For more than 45 years, the Clean Water Act has helped to protect our streams, our rivers, our wetlands, and our lakes, and provided States with the tools to keep our waters clean. This administration has proposed eliminating longstanding protections for small

streams and wetlands, which play a very important role in feeding our drinking water resources. They also help store water during storms and alleviate flooding, which, in turn, protects communities. These small streams and wetlands help recharge our groundwater supplies. They also filter pollution and provide habitat for fish and wildlife.

Clean and safe water is a very basic human need. Unfortunately, this administration has made it a priority to dismantle the Clean Water Act, regardless of what the science or the law provides. The President's #DirtyWaterRule puts our water and health at risk and must be stopped.

Our drought cycle in southern California continues, even though we have had repeated rain in March. We must continue to conserve. This must be the new norm for us in the West.

□ 1015

#### CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF EASTERSEALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Easterseals on its 100th anniversary.

Easterseals is a network of more than 70 leading nonprofit organizations that provide local services and support to children and adults with disabilities, veterans, and older adults.

Founded in 1919 in Ohio, Easterseals works nationwide, in almost every State, to help Americans achieve milestones, live independently, and be active members of their communities.

Easterseals employs more than 30,000 professional staff across the country, including therapists, nurses, employment specialists, and direct support professionals who deliver high-quality services.

Over the past century, Easterseals has helped millions of individuals and families by assisting children who have disabilities; helping them access early intervention, including physical and speech therapies, to help prepare them for successful learning; providing in-home and community adult day services for seniors and people with disabilities; helping individuals with disabilities, veterans, and seniors find meaningful employment; and providing camping and recreational opportunities to youth and adults with disabilities.

Mr. Speaker, Easterseals provides autistic individuals early education, employment, camping, caregiving, transportation, and other services to support Americans of all ages.

The number of children in the U.S. with developmental delays is on the rise. A recent study found that approximately 13 percent of infants and toddlers have a developmental delay. Research has also shown that one in

three children who receive early intervention services will not require special education in preschool.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the first few years of a child's life will lay the foundation for his or her long-term well-being and overall success. That is why I am a strong proponent of Head Start and Early Head Start programs.

We can't guarantee that every child will be successful in life, but we can give them the same access to early educational opportunities. This is just one of many reasons why I introduced H.R. 1695, the Community Services Block Grant Reauthorization Act of 2019. This legislation renews our Nation's commitment to reducing poverty through locally driven comprehensive approaches.

Head Start and early education programs are operated through community action agencies and promote school readiness through enhancing the cognitive, physical, behavioral, and social-emotional development of children from low-income families. Easterseals specializes in early childhood development where children with and without disabilities can learn together.

Another piece of legislation I am co-sponsoring is H.R. 1878, the IDEA Full Funding Act. This would ensure that individuals with disabilities are receiving an appropriate education.

In the 1970s, Congress promised to cover 40 percent of the extra cost of special education, but we never come close to fulfilling that promise. In fact, current funding remains only at 14 percent of the targeted amount. This bill would mandate gradual increases in IDEA funding to reach the full commitment—40 percent, a commitment made by Congress—by fiscal year 2029 and each subsequent fiscal year after that. Easterseals is also supportive of this legislation.

In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, three Easterseals affiliates serve 67 counties. They employ almost 700 people, and they serve nearly 27,900 individuals. Mr. Speaker, these are just some of the incredible services Easterseals works to provide to American families.

For the past 100 years, it has leveraged its network of nonprofits to improve the lives of others. In schools, workplaces, and communities, Easterseals has fostered environments where everyone is included and valued, regardless of age or ability.

I congratulate Easterseals for its contributions to improving so many lives over the past 100 years.

#### LET MY FARMERS GROW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I seldom come to this floor to stand in this well. To me, it is almost a sacred place where the great orators like Webster debated. But I have got to talk about this because it is something that is im-

portant to thousands and thousands of people I represent in my district.

In a recent letter from the President of the Missouri Soybean Association, farmers expressed their concerns regarding President Trump's ongoing statements on tariffs and the U.S.-China trade relationships, stating: "Missouri farmers have invested time away from their farm, family, and millions of dollars in developing their foreign markets, and it's imperative that we don't jeopardize these investments. . . ."

At what point do we call on one another to address the inevitable detriment these farmers are routinely placed in under this administration?

In Missouri alone, the restricted access to China, which is the number one trading partner for U.S. soybean farmers, has created a \$2 drop in soybean prices, resulting in nearly \$212 million in lost earnings, over 3,000 fewer jobs, and an estimated \$726.6 million annual reduction in State and local economic activity—for the State of Missouri alone. Imagine the combined impact this has had on other States that are major producers and exporters.

Using America's farmers as collateral in a trade war is wrong, and hard-working farmers, their families, and our communities deserve much better.

Farmers in Missouri and across this country working to not only provide for their families deserve market stability and access to the opportunity to forge trade relationships abroad. They deserve to have the backing of a Federal Government that supports and advocates for their success.

Simply put, farmers deserve not to be caught in the crossfire or become collateral damage in an imposed and impractical trade war.

Farming is a risky endeavor, and Mother Nature may at any time bring drought, flooding, hail, and other disasters. The last thing farmers should worry about is a reactionary trade and policy decision made by the President, whom most of the farmers supported.

Moreover, though farmers have been patient holding out for the situation to improve, each passing day that we fail to take into consideration the interest of American farmers only contributes to a mounting problem that we must not ignore any longer. Enough is enough.

As the Representative of a geographically diverse district that encompasses several rural communities, I fear what a continued, retaliatory imposition of tariffs on China would mean for the farmers in my district: that this is going to hurt.

Now, making a bad decision, Mr. President, is understandable, but not correcting it is untenable and unfertile.

Last Friday, the President decided to hit below the belt with his threats to shut down the southern border with Mexico. A border shutdown would wreak havoc on the U.S. economy. I didn't say this. This comes from just

about every major economist in the country.

A border shutdown is not in the best interests of the Midwest or this country. This is another blow to our farmers, and they cannot afford it. They will be forced to tap out.

Missouri farmers depend on foreign trade to market their crops. In my State, we have an \$80 billion industry called agriculture. When it is disrupted, the whole State is disrupted.

We have the largest export market, after China and Canada, to Mexico. The U.S. shipped \$19 billion worth of agricultural products to Mexico in 2018. Mexico is our top market for corn and our third largest market for U.S. beef.

Missouri pork producers cannot afford the loss of the Mexican market on top of all the financial losses from retaliatory tariffs from Mexico and China.

The very threat of a border closure creates uncertainty and depresses the trade of \$1.7 billion in goods and services, daily, that cross the border.

Missouri's economy has a direct connection to Mexico through Kansas City Southern Railroad.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by just saying we have a 2,000-mile border between the United States and Mexico. If we shut that down, we are shutting down the U.S. economy.

#### NAZIS WERE EVIL SOCIALISTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, for 75 years, America has been the greatest nation in world history. America's standard of living is envied by most. America's military is unmatched. America is a beacon of freedom for all.

Unfortunately, America's foundational principles are under attack—not by a foreign foe, but from within our own country.

Socialist Democrats oppose the rule of law that is essential to peace and prosperity by supporting open border policies that consume hundreds of billions in tax dollars and kill tens of thousands of Americans each year.

Socialist Democrats' spending sprees put America \$22 trillion in debt, thus risking a debilitating national insolvency and bankruptcy.

Socialist Democrats support dictatorial and guaranteed-to-fail socialism over the free enterprise economy that has created our prosperity.

If the Mueller report is accurate, for 2 years, socialist Democrats and fake news media allies used the big lie propaganda tactic to undermine our elections' legitimacy and falsely accuse President Trump of colluding with Russia.

History's most famous evil and horrific use of big lie tactics is by the National Socialist German Workers' Party, or Nazis, for short.

Not surprisingly, socialist Democrats and their fake news media allies recently objected to my quoting Adolf

Hitler's "Mein Kampf" to explain what the big lie propaganda tactic is and how horrific the consequences can be for those seduced by it.

Germany's Socialist Party's big lie killed tens of millions of people in the Holocaust and World War II, making it the most horrific and deadly big lie in history.

Also, not surprisingly, today's socialists tried to revise history by falsely claiming the Nazis were not socialists. Bunk.

Mr. Speaker, America can either learn from history or be doomed to repeat it.

By way of background, freedom and liberty are the essence of free enterprise, wherein supply and demand market forces determine which goods and services are offered and at what prices. Citizens who produce goods and services better, faster, or cheaper thrive, and everyone benefits from that.

Conversely, socialism is the mortal enemy of free enterprise. Socialist economies reject liberty, freedom, and market forces, artificially dictate economic activity, and determine which businesses and industries prosper and which do not. In a fully socialist economy, government owns and controls all means of production.

So was Germany's Socialist Party socialists? The founders thought so because they called themselves socialists. They certainly acted like socialists.

Germany's Socialist Party's foundational 25 point platform stated, in part:

Plank 13: "We demand the nationalization of all previous associated agencies, trusts."

Plank 14: "We demand a division of profits of all heavy industries."

Plank 16: "We demand the . . . immediate communalization of the great warehouses."

Plank 17: "We demand a land reform . . . for the free expropriation of land for the purposes of public utility."

Communalization, land seizure without compensation, nationalization and government ownership of industry—those are all socialist policies.

Further, the German Socialist Party hated capitalism and free enterprise. Nazi propaganda posters stated: "The maintenance of a rotten industrial system has nothing do with nationalism. I can love Germany and hate capitalism."

Nazi propaganda minister Joseph Goebbels wrote: "In the final analysis, it would be better for us to go down with Bolshevism than live in eternal slavery under capitalism."

Mr. Speaker, Germany's socialist Nazis are a heinous example of the marriage between big lie propaganda tactics and socialism, but they are not alone. Soviet Union and Chinese-style socialism also subjugated or exterminated tens of millions of people.

Mr. Speaker, America must learn from history. Socialism must lose and free enterprise must win if America is

to remain a free, prosperous, and great nation.

□ 1030

#### HUMANITARIAN CRISIS CANNOT BE SOLVED BY A WALL ALONE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise. I rise with love of country in mind and liberty and justice for all in heart.

I rise to remind us of the words of the great French intellectual, Voltaire, who reminded us that those who can make us believe absurdities can cause us to commit atrocities.

Mr. Speaker, I have been to the border. I have seen the security people who are there, the Border Patrol officers. They are victims, Mr. Speaker, victims of policies that, unfortunately, do not respect the humanity of many people. I have seen the children stacked in cages. I have seen the parents grieving.

Mr. Speaker, I know why people are fleeing the countries south of the border. They are doing so because they are, literally, many of them, running for their lives. They are seeking safe harbor in the United States of America because we have extended an informal invitation by and through our Statue of Liberty.

We have, with our words and our deeds, said to the world that we are people who you can trust and who you can depend on.

Mr. Speaker, I rise with liberty and justice for all in mind because those who would want us to believe that babies who are coming here are an invading army, if you will, they are wrong. Those babies are coming because their mothers believe that they can find safety in our country.

Mr. Speaker, would anybody deny that a mother who would send her child to this country or some distant place, possibly understanding that the child could be harmed along the way, can anybody deny that this is being done because that mother has such great love for that child that she wants her child to have the opportunity to have life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?

Can anybody deny that these parents who come, traversing harm's way, are doing so because they are trying to leave a circumstance that has greater harm?

Mr. Speaker, I rise with the understanding that Voltaire was right. It is an absurdity to believe that women and children and people who are fleeing harm's way are invaders.

I also would remind us of other words of Voltaire. He also reminded us that, "It is difficult to free fools from the chains they revere." I would not utilize the word "fools," but I will say that it is difficult to free people from chains that they revere. Those who want to

separate us from the rest of the world, especially the world of color, they revere these chains that bind and bond them to this notion. I think it is going to be difficult to separate them, but not impossible.

I believe that people of goodwill can always win and that we of goodwill must continue to preach the message and gospel of liberty and justice for all.

I believe that we can make a difference in the lives of people who we will never meet and greet. Those persons who are trying to get here will probably never vote for me. There is no reason for me to do this other than I believe in my heart that an injustice is being perpetrated at the border.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that this problem at the border requires greater scrutiny and greater attention from the American people and from those of us who represent them. It is my belief that if we want to do something about this problem, we have to acknowledge that it is a humanitarian crisis that we are dealing with and that the humanitarian crisis cannot be solved with a wall alone.

We cannot conclude that, if we leave the world alone, it will leave us alone. We are a part of this great world of humanity. There is but one race and that is the human race. We must do our part to protect all within the human race, especially our neighbors to the south.

#### VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

Since it was first enacted in 1994, the Violence Against Women Act has saved countless lives and supported millions of domestic violence and assault victims and survivors by funding critical programs.

In February 2019, the Violence Against Women Act expired. This is unacceptable. It is imperative that we fully reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act. A stopgap Violence Against Women Act does not address critical issues within the legislation and would seriously impact the life-saving programs needed across Indian Country.

Domestic violence affects every community in America. Tribal communities, though, face it at an alarmingly high rate. According to Federal data, at least 55 percent of American Indian and Alaska Native women have experienced physical violence at an intimate partner's hands.

We are here to make visible the unacceptable and glaring disparities that women and families across Indian Country face when it comes to violence, assault, and abuse. We are here to demand action because there are things we can and should do to help survivors.

In 2013, the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act created special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction. This was critical to holding perpetrators accountable on Indian Country, but it didn't go far enough. The special jurisdiction limits Tribes to prosecuting only crimes committed against intimate partners, not kids or police officers.

As a former law enforcement officer and homicide detective, I can tell you that responding to these types of calls was extremely and is extremely dangerous for police officers. Within the past 3 years alone, the Navajo Nation has lost three officers responding to domestic violence calls. We must honor their sacrifice with action.

Further, these gaps in jurisdiction put children who are victims or witnesses to violence in harm's way. It affects families dramatically. It affects our communities. It affects our country.

This reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act includes my legislation, the Native Youth and Tribal Officer Protection Act. This lifesaving provision would fix these jurisdictional gaps and expand current law regarding special jurisdiction. It would allow Tribes to prosecute and convict non-Indian offenders who harm children and law enforcement officers responding to domestic violence cases, as any town outside Indian Country can already do.

Few things have shaped my life more than the 13 years I served as a police officer. My first call as an officer involved domestic violence. I still remember it and other domestic violence and sexual assault cases. There are too many to remember. Our society has to change if we are to make life and our families successful.

We must protect children and other survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault. I join my colleagues in demanding a full reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation and urge all my colleagues to support its passage. It is long overdue.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 39 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Dr. Lora F. Hargrove, Mount Calvary Baptist Church, Rockville, Maryland, offered the following prayer:

Let us draw nigh unto God that God may also draw nigh unto us.

O God, author of all mercy and the provider of all peace, in times of uncertain and sometimes unrelenting national and global difficulties, look with favor upon these women and men who seek to serve with integrity from the people's House and bless them.

As the diligent work to silence ideological stalemates, to give voice to Ubuntu—shared humanity toward others—concretize concerns for all Americans, especially the multitude of the marginalized.

Help us all to understand the clarion call to be unified, not uniform; to embrace diversity, despite racial, religious, and gender differences, knowing that difference is never synonymous with deficiency.

Grant that all who are downcast and downtrodden be uplifted by Your unifying and amazing grace.

We ask this in the name of the One who is the creator of us all.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING DR. LORA F. HARGROVE

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. TRONE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. TRONE. Madam Speaker, it was a true honor to hear the wisdom of Dr. Lora Hargrove this afternoon. Her call for unity, shared humanity, and peace is perhaps more important today than ever before.

Dr. Hargrove is a native of Baltimore, Maryland, just like our distinguished Speaker. She holds a doctorate in ministry from Wesley Theological Seminary, and she is working towards her second Ph.D. in African Diaspora from Howard University.

Dr. Hargrove comes from a long line of servant leaders. Her father, the late Judge John R. Hargrove, Sr., was the first Black Federal prosecutor in Baltimore and the first Black deputy U.S. attorney. Her mother, Shirley H. Hargrove, was a teacher and guidance counselor.

Dr. Hargrove now serves as interim minister at Rockville's Mount Calvary Baptist Church, where my wife, June, and I have seen her practice many times what she preaches. From hosting HBCU college fairs to finding shelter for women and children, Dr. Hargrove lifts up our community every day.

Thank you, Dr. Hargrove.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CLARKE of New York). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

DEFENDING THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, Kerry from Tucson, Arizona, has a daughter in middle school who has type 1 diabetes.

The countless doctor visits, the fights with insurers and providers and doctors and back again, and the ache of watching her child struggle to be a normal kid on the playground is hard, but, as Kerry said, the fear of not being able to afford her daughter's treatment is a lot harder.

The Affordable Care Act saved Kerry's family. Before the ACA, there were no legal protections for those with preexisting conditions, and the cost of coverage was simply unaffordable.

President Trump continues his war on healthcare.

I ask my colleagues: When can our working families and mothers like Kerry feel safe from the fear of losing their healthcare? When can these families come up for air from the medical bills that drown them?

Arizonans and all Americans deserve a country that is there for them without question or condition. I will continue to defend the Affordable Care Act, its protections, and lowering healthcare costs for all families.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DESERVE THE TRUTH

(Mr. COLLINS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, thus far, I have released five transcripts from the Committee on the Judiciary's investigation into apparent wrongdoing at the FBI and the Justice Department. Today, I am releasing the sixth.

The American people deserve transparency. They deserve to know what transpired at the highest levels of the FBI and at the origin of the probe into President Trump's campaign.

Madam Speaker, I include the link [www.dougcollins.house.gov/priestap](http://www.dougcollins.house.gov/priestap) in the RECORD so the American people can review the transcripts of Bill Priestap's interview.

Out of an abundance of caution, this transcript has a limited number of narrowly tailored redactions related only to confidential sources and methods, nonpublic information about ongoing investigations, and nonmaterial personal information.

I will continue to work to release as many transcripts as possible. The American people deserve the truth.

#### THE SKYROCKETING COST OF INSULIN

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Madam Speaker, I rise today for my mother, my sister-in-law, and the millions of Americans living with diabetes.

Diabetes is an epidemic in which one in five healthcare dollars in the United States is spent caring for patients with this disease.

Communities of color are disproportionately affected by the disease. I know because, in my congressional district, we have the highest rate of diabetes, higher than any other congressional district in the State of California.

Those with diabetes use insulin to maintain blood sugar levels. Without it, it becomes a matter of life and death. This is why I am especially appalled at the skyrocketing cost of this lifesaving drug.

At this very moment, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is having an oversight hearing about the rising cost of insulin. Tomorrow, the whole committee will mark up legislation, which, if passed, will help reduce the cost of prescription drugs.

This should not be a partisan issue, and I call on my Republican colleagues and the President to work with us to help all Americans and work for the people.

#### UVA FINAL FOUR APPEARANCE

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

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Univer-

sity of Virginia Cavaliers, who advanced to the Final Four of the NCAA Men's Basketball Tournament last Saturday night.

Down three points with less than 6 seconds left, the Cavaliers, with what was one of the most exciting plays I have seen—because I am an alum—scored to tie the game and force overtime. This gave them an extra 5 minutes of life, an opportunity they seized, on the way to a historic victory.

It is as a proud alum that I congratulate Coach Tony Bennett and the team on reaching the program's first Final Four since 1984. A tremendous accomplishment for sure, but there is still business to attend to on the court.

I also wish the Cavaliers the best of luck this weekend. For sure, I will be here again in short order after they beat Auburn and win the National Championship game.

Go Hoos, and Wahoowa.

#### PROTECTING THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, today I rise to talk about America's healthcare system and the importance of protecting the Affordable Care Act.

Residents in my home State of California benefited greatly from the ACA. When it became law in 2010, California was one of the first States to implement it. At that time, 22 percent of my residents had no healthcare insurance whatsoever and 17 percent were uninsured.

The ACA greatly decreased that number by less than 10 percent, a big difference, while also providing coverage for those with preexisting conditions, which we all feel strongly about.

Now the President wants to strike down those protections and eliminate the last benefits. That is wrong. These repeated attempts to repeal the ACA are irresponsible, especially when there is no real proposal to replace it by the President of the United States or my Republican colleagues.

If he succeeds, one in seven people in California will lose their healthcare. That is a fact.

Yes, there are improvements that can be made to the Affordable Care Act, and we should address those deficiencies, and that is what I am committed to doing. The Congress and the administration should work together to fix the law and to make it better.

#### INCREASING ACCESS TO QUALITY, AFFORDABLE HEALTHCARE

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

Mr. KILMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Protecting Pre-Existing Conditions and Making Healthcare More Affordable Act.

I am proud to cosponsor this legislation, which is more important than ever following the administration's court filing last week that pushes for the complete and total repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

Now, I wasn't in Congress when that law was passed. I don't think it is a perfect law, but there are components of it that are undeniably positive:

It is a good thing that people with preexisting conditions can't be discriminated against by insurance companies;

It is a good thing that young people can stay on their parents' insurance until their 26th birthday;

It is a good thing that preventive care, like mammograms and cancer screenings, and even annual physicals, can be covered without copay;

It is a good thing that millions of people in our country that now have insurance for the first time are able to get the care they need.

Now, unfortunately, all of those positive steps are put in jeopardy as a consequence of the administration's court filing.

Now, rather than unwinding the progress that has been made, we are proposing to build on the success of the existing law. For example, we propose an expansion of the tax credits available under the law, reducing cost for low-income families and enabling more middle-class families to be eligible for assistance to make healthcare affordable.

This is the beginning of the effort on healthcare, not the end. Folks in D.C. shouldn't be sabotaging the American healthcare system; they should be making it work for the people of America.

#### RETAIN THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, well, the President says that Republicans are "the party of healthcare." I think it would be more accurate to say that they are the party of taking away your healthcare.

The Trump administration is moving to eliminate the Affordable Care Act in its entirety, every provision, which would mean millions of Americans would lose health coverage.

Let's remind ourselves what would happen if the ACA were eliminated:

Millions of Americans with preexisting conditions, including 1.7 million in Michigan, would be at the whim of big insurance companies who once again would be free to discriminate against them because they are sick or once had an illness;

Millions of Americans, including 690,000 Michiganders enrolled in the Healthy Michigan Medicaid expansion, would lose health insurance. If they prevail, they lose health insurance;

Eliminating the ACA would also hinder our ability to deal with the

opioid crisis, since the ACA requires insurance companies to cover substance abuse treatment.

And the Republicans have no plan. Take away the healthcare from Americans; no plan to replace it. We ought to reject that.

□ 1215

**HEALTHCARE SYSTEM THAT WORKS FOR ALL AMERICANS**

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, while traveling recently through my home State of Minnesota, I met a wonderful couple in their early 60s. They were both teachers who had dedicated their professional lives to enriching our community by educating our children.

They had done everything right, saved as much money as they could, and it was time to retire, until the husband was diagnosed with early-onset Alzheimer's. Now, the out-of-pocket costs for his care will wipe out all of their retirement savings—all of their savings.

Madam Speaker, I ask: What is our President thinking?

This is an all-too-common story played out in blue and red districts throughout our Nation. Yet, we have a White House determined to wipe out the Affordable Care Act. It is callous; it is wrong; and it is unacceptable. It is time for us to make the moral decision to ensure that all Americans have access to affordable, high-quality healthcare, no matter their circumstances.

That is why we just introduced a bill in the House, led by my Minnesota colleague, ANGIE CRAIG, to reduce premiums and lower healthcare costs. That is why I am a cosponsor of Congressman DOGGETT's bill to make prescription drugs more affordable.

There is hard work to be done to make our health system work for all Americans, and we are doing it in the House.

I say to President Trump and my Republican colleagues that it is not too late to abandon this misguided effort to dismantle the ACA and join us to work on real solutions. That is what we are sent here to do.

**DON'T GET VOTED OFF THE ISLAND BECAUSE OF HEALTHCARE COSTS**

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

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Speaker, last week in Federal court, President Trump radically expanded his war on American's healthcare, asking the court not only to strike down protections for people with preexisting

conditions, but to eliminate every last protection and benefit provided by the ACA.

I am a two-time cancer survivor. Two of my four kids have lived with Crohn's disease for 14 years. There is no way to spin this. Without the protections of the Affordable Care Act, my family would be in big trouble.

If America's healthcare system was a reality TV show, under this President's mean-spirited, every-person-for-himself approach, I guess my family would get voted off the island because, with the hand God dealt us, we simply cost too much.

This week, the people's House will vote to make clear that we don't believe in that vision of America, and we will not stand idly by while Mr. Trump does everything he can to take away the protections and the benefits that American families like mine depend on.

Madam Speaker, I implore my Republican colleagues to stand with us and improve the ACA for the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

**HEALTHCARE—REINSURANCE, PREEXISTING CONDITIONS, PRESCRIPTION DRUGS**

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

Mrs. CRAIG. Madam Speaker, we have an urgent problem that we must immediately find common ground on to solve. If healthcare isn't affordable, it is not accessible. That is why I led the introduction of the State Health Care Premium Reduction Act, a bill to lower the cost of health insurance premiums in the individual market by 10 percent, on average, across the country. But that is only part of the solution.

Fifty-one percent of nonelderly people in my congressional district have a preexisting condition. That is why it is critical that we pass the bill that I have cosponsored, the Protecting Pre-Existing Conditions and Making Health Care More Affordable Act of 2019.

I will fight this administration every day if they roll back healthcare in this country. It is not perfect, but we have to put aside the petty politics of the past and quit thinking that if we fix our Nation's healthcare, somehow we are handing the other side a victory.

People across this country need our help. They need us to fix the cost of prescription drugs. They need us to unleash generic competition.

**CONDEMN CRUSADE TO TAKE AWAY HEALTHCARE**

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

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, last week, the President put a five-alarm fire on American families by putting the government's weight behind a lawsuit designed to cripple many healthcare protections. The ordinary people whose lives will be upended by this decision have been offered a raw deal to blow up healthcare and fix it later, but even that is a false promise.

There is no plan to help the 316,000 people with preexisting conditions in coastal Orange County or the millions of Americans across our country. There has been no plan for 10 years.

We have to recognize that the inability to pay healthcare expenses is the leading cause of personal bankruptcy in the United States and a leading cause of homelessness.

I hope my Republican colleagues will have the chance to show the American people that Congress isn't completely without common sense and decency by voting for our resolution Tuesday condemning this ideological crusade to take away healthcare from millions of needy American families.

**UNIVERSAL HEALTHCARE COVERAGE**

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

Mr. DELGADO. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to highlight the need for our country to finally achieve universal healthcare coverage.

As the wealthiest country in the world, there is simply no excuse for us to be the only developed country left without universal healthcare. There are a lot of different ways to achieve universal healthcare, and I believe that a public option is the best way for us to get there. That is why I was pleased yesterday to introduce the Medicare-X Choice Act, which will finally bring our country to universal healthcare coverage.

My bill will combine Medicare physician networks and reimbursement rates with ACA coverage standards to create a new public option available to all Americans. My bill would allow those who are happy with their employer-provided insurance to keep it, while offering another more affordable coverage option to those in need.

With this bill, we are introducing more choice and more competition to the marketplace, starting in the places that need it most, like rural areas with provider shortages. This much-needed competition will drive down costs for everyone.

Our constituents expect us to take on the big issues impacting their lives. This should not be a partisan issue. We must roll up our sleeves and get to work so we can lower the cost of coverage for all Americans.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 7, DIRECTING THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES IN THE REPUBLIC OF YEMEN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 271, CONDEMNING THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION'S LEGAL CAMPAIGN TO TAKE AWAY AMERICANS' HEALTH CARE; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 274 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 274

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 7) to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 271) Condemning the Trump Administration's Legal Campaign to Take Away Americans' Health Care. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of April 4, 2019, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), 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. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 274. It provides for the consideration under closed rules for S.J. Res. 7, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and for the consideration of H. Res. 271, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. It also provides suspension authority for Thursday, April 4.

Madam Speaker, before I begin, I want to recognize that today marks the 230th anniversary of the Rules Committee being formally constituted for the first time.

Now, the Ways and Means Committee—which my Massachusetts friend and colleague, RICHIE NEAL, chairs—likes to point out that they are the oldest standing committee in the House. While that is true, I would like to remind my friends that the Rules Committee is the oldest committee in the House, being first created on this day in 1789 as a select committee. So it is especially appropriate that we are on the floor today to do some important work before us.

For the record, Madam Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee can celebrate their 230th anniversary on July 24.

Now that I have cleared that up, the first measure included in this rule is S.J. Res. 7, and we are taking action on this because Yemen is in crisis. In a country of roughly 28 million people, an estimated 22 million of them are in need of humanitarian assistance.

That is 75 percent of the population facing famine, disease, and displacement. Half the country is at risk of starvation.

The famine and disease facing children is particularly sobering. Save the Children estimates that as many as 85,000 children under the age of 5 have died because of hunger and disease since 2015.

All told, this is one of the world's worst humanitarian crises, the site of the fastest growing cholera epidemic ever recorded and the biggest food emergency on the planet.

Yet, it wasn't caused by some natural disaster. It is entirely man-made, the result of a Saudi-led military conflict. Seemingly every day, bombs fall on weddings, hospitals, buses, and homes, as civilian neighborhoods are regularly targeted.

This is not some abstract war happening half a world away. In fact, the United States is intimately involved in this conflict. We have supported the Saudi reign of terror by providing logistics, intelligence, ground support, and midair fueling of bombers. Virtually all the bombs that fall on Yemen say "Made in the United States of America."

Make no mistake, Madam Speaker, the United States is involved in a war

in Yemen today. But if our constituents look through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, they wouldn't find a vote authorizing it. That is because this body abdicated its responsibility to declare war when it began 4 years ago.

□ 1230

Now, we took one of our most sacred responsibilities and handed it to the executive branch. It is not the first time we have done it, but it is becoming a habit around here. We first let the Bush administration decide the contours of our involvement abroad, and that continues through the Trump administration today.

If that wasn't outrageous enough, past Republican Congresses used every legislative trick in the book to block Members from even debating our role there. On two separate occasions, they went so far as to strip War Powers Resolutions related to Yemen of their privilege. It was unprecedented.

But when it comes to Saudi Arabia, this administration and my Republican friends were all too content to look the other way when they murdered a Washington Post journalist. They lured him into a consulate in Turkey, they murdered him, and then they used a bone saw to dismember him. We know, based on our intelligence reports, that the highest level of the Saudi Government was involved in that terrible human rights atrocity, and the Trump administration did nothing. They rationalized it. They justified it. They basically turned a blind eye.

When it comes to human rights, this administration has abdicated its moral authority. That should be of concern to everybody in this Chamber, whether you are Democrat or Republican, because if the United States stands for anything, we need to stand out loud and foursquare for human rights. If the President of the United States and his administration don't want to do it, then we should.

No Congress should be complicit in abdicating our Article I constitutional responsibility. Thankfully, this Democratic Congress is doing the opposite. We are reasserting our power, and we are taking a stand when it comes to human rights.

Thanks especially to the dedication of Speaker PELOSI, Chairman ENGEL, Congressman RO KHANNA, Congresswoman JAYAPAL, Congressman POCAN, and the entire Congressional Progressive Caucus, we are considering a bipartisan measure that makes clear it is time for the United States' involvement in Yemen to end. No more excuses.

This is virtually identical to the resolution we passed in February. The difference this time is that this is the first opportunity that this House has had to send something on the war in Yemen right to the President's desk.

So I urge all of my colleagues: seize this opportunity. We have a constitutional responsibility and we have a moral obligation to get this done.

Don't let any legislative maneuvers deter us from ending our Nation's complicity in this humanitarian catastrophe. Let's pass this resolution free of changes that would prevent it from going right to the President.

Let me make that more clear: if we change a single word, we will derail this resolution.

Now, the second measure included in this rule is H. Res. 271, in response to a war of a different kind: the Republican war on healthcare. The Trump Justice Department recently moved in Federal Court not only to strike down pre-existing condition coverage under the Affordable Care Act, but to overturn this law completely.

If the President succeeds in *Texas v. U.S.*, the protections for preexisting conditions will be gone. The Medicaid expansion will be nullified. Insurance premiums will skyrocket. I could go on and on and on and on.

Striking down the Affordable Care Act would be a tragedy felt by every single American. We would return to the days when our health insurance marketplace was like the Wild West, when insurers were free to decline or limit coverage because someone had acne, or received an organ transplant, or even because they were a victim of domestic violence. That is how messed up our system was, and that is the system that this President and many of my colleagues want to return to.

Now, for the life of me, I cannot understand what President Trump and his allies in Congress have against Americans getting healthcare. For nearly a decade now, they have worked endlessly to sabotage the Affordable Care Act through Congress, the courts, and administrative actions. Apparently, they are not happy that 20 million people have gained healthcare coverage because of this law, or that 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions can get care. We should be celebrating these advancements. But, instead, some on the other side won't be satisfied until the Affordable Care Act is repealed completely.

Now, this Democratic majority has taken a different course. On the very first day of this Congress, we brought the full weight of the House of Representatives to bear in this lawsuit. As a result, the House Counsel has already intervened in this case to protect the healthcare Americans depend on.

Now, this resolution is our chance to speak with one voice against the administration's attempts to abolish the ACA. I have seen my friends on the other side issue sternly worded press releases and strongly worded letters to the administration. But now it is time to back up words with votes, and then I hope they will work with us moving forward as this majority takes action to reverse the administration's healthcare sabotage and strengthen healthcare for every single American.

Madam Speaker, I believe that healthcare ought to be a fundamental right for every single person in this

country. It is unconscionable to me that rather than working with us to strengthen the Affordable Care Act and rather than working with us to expand healthcare protections, my Republican friends have chosen instead to wipe it out. I don't know how anybody could think like that. I don't know what motivates the President of the United States and some on the other side of the aisle to move in that direction.

Now we are told by the President that even though he doesn't have a plan to replace this, if he succeeds in nulling and voiding the Affordable Care Act, he said: Well, we will provide you one in the year 2021.

So, Madam Speaker, the man who has spent all of his time trying to rip protections away from people with preexisting conditions, the person who wants to not allow you to keep your kids on their insurance until they are 26, the leader of our country who doesn't believe in capping insurance when it comes to people with lifetime illnesses, the person who doesn't want to lower the cost of prescription drugs—I could go on and on and on and on—says: I want to repeal it, I want it gone, I want the courts to null and void it; and then just trust me, and then we will come up with some magical plan, some secret plan, after the election.

I don't think the American people are going to fall for that kind of nonsense, and they shouldn't because healthcare is not a Democratic issue or a Republican issue. It is a moral issue. It is not even an issue, it is a value that all of us should share.

So I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support us in sending a message loud and clear to the administration that we have had enough of their attempts to sabotage the healthcare bill, we have had enough of their trying to take health insurance away from the American people, and that we are going to stand here and make it very clear that we do believe that everybody is entitled to good healthcare in this country.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank Mr. MCGOVERN for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, we are here again considering one nonbinding resolution and a second resolution that will never become law. Both of these prevent us from focusing on the real business of Congress, which is to legislate.

The first, H. Res. 271, is a resolution condemning the Trump administration's recent position in the case of *Texas v. United States*.

So let's revisit that for a minute. Republicans are supportive of protecting access to health insurance for individuals with preexisting conditions. This resolution today will not advance the development of any policies to improve healthcare for the American people. There are options that the Democrats could have brought to the floor to

lower healthcare costs and increase access to care; such legislation would indeed be worthy of our time. But, instead, we are debating expressions that basically amount to political posturing.

The first vote the Republicans called this year was a motion to require legislation protecting individuals with preexisting conditions. Surprisingly, the Democrats voted against that previous question. In 2017, as part of the proposed replacement for the Affordable Care Act, Republicans included legislation that would have preserved access for those with preexisting conditions.

Speaker PELOSI has already intervened on behalf of the House in *Texas v. United States*. While the Department of Justice has weighed in, the department is not litigating the case. As with every other legal case, this will play out in the courts. If Congress must act following the final legal decision, certainly we stand ready to do so. In fact, if the Democrats wanted to void this case, they know their options. They could repeal the individual mandate or they could reinstitute the tax on the individual mandate or they could provide a severability clause that was somehow left out when the Affordable Care Act was passed the first time. But we have seen them do none of those options.

The legal process will take time, and no Americans will lose access to their healthcare while the legal process is being heard. Unlike the case of *Texas v. United States*—which we know will not affect coverage because the judge in that case has issued a stay—individuals covered by what are known as association health plans may actually lose their coverage due to uncertainty in the legal outcome of that case. For last week, a Federal judge in the case of the State of New York, et al. v. Department of Labor, last week a Federal judge ruled that the Department of Labor's final rule on association health plans was not legal.

Association health plans provide employers who otherwise might struggle to provide health insurance for their employees to access the group market through an association, based either on geography or a line of business. The Washington Post recently reported that there are initial signs that association health plans are "offering generous benefits and premiums lower than found in the ObamaCare marketplaces."

Association health plans have provided additional choices for Americans seeking innovative healthcare options, but these choices may soon disappear as a result of the lawsuit State of New York, et al. v. the Department of Labor.

The Democrats are using the case of *Texas v. United States* to delay explaining their real ideas. Their real idea is a one-size-fits-all healthcare. The so-called Medicare for All would be a terrifying reality for our Nation. The Democrats' Soviet style, government-

run, single-payer healthcare bill would not provide access to quality healthcare for Americans. Instead, it would lead to a massive tax increase, eliminate private insurance, and bankrupt the already dwindling Medicare trust fund.

Constituents in my district back in Texas are struggling to afford their health insurance under the Affordable Care Act, and I am certain that we are not the only ones suffering from high premiums and very high deductibles.

Madam Speaker, what good is health insurance if you are afraid to use it because you can't afford your deductible?

This is an issue that I would actually like to see us tackle. But I am confident that a government-run, single-payer system would only further deteriorate our Nation's healthcare.

As the son of a physician who chose to leave Canada because of their system of socialized medicine, I worry that the central state control of healthcare would further damage the doctor-patient relationship. As a physician, I do not believe that the government should hinder a doctor's ability to act in the best interest of his or her patient. I wish the concept of government dictating a physician's practice and decisions was unthinkable, but I find myself here today having to deconstruct the idea of further government control of healthcare.

The House Democratic proposal would implement a global budget, and once that has been set, hospitals and institutions would be required to stick to that for all outpatient and inpatient treatment.

What happens if the budget runs out?

Are the patients simply told: Sorry, we ran out of money, you may try again next year?

Today we should be focusing on the parts of the health insurance market that are working for Americans. For example, 71 percent of Americans are satisfied with their employer-sponsored health insurance. This provides robust protections for individuals with preexisting conditions under ERISA law—a 1970 law, not the 2010 Affordable Care Act. Quite simply, the success of employer-sponsored insurance is not worth wiping out for single-payer healthcare.

Since President Trump took office—and this is important—since the President took office, the number of Americans in employer-sponsored health coverage has increased.

How much has that increased?

I can't precisely tell you because our Congressional Budget folks have not seen fit to give us new coverage numbers.

But since the President took office, how many people are employed that were previously unemployed?

The number is somewhere between 3 and 6 million, and a significant number of those individuals have employer-sponsored health insurance who had no insurance before.

□ 1245

The coverage numbers under President Trump, if the story is ever told, have gone up. Today, there is a greater percentage of Americans in employer-sponsored health coverage than at any time since the year 2000. That is why it is astonishing that House Democrats would want to abolish that insurance option entirely.

Instead of building on the success of our existing health insurance framework, Democrats' radical single-payer, government-run policy would simply tear it down. It would eliminate employer-sponsored health insurance, eliminate all private insurance, eliminate Medicaid, and eliminate CHIP.

Existing Medicare beneficiaries would not be exempt from harm, as the policy would raid the Medicare trust fund, which is already slated to go bankrupt in 2026.

Our Nation's seniors count on the existence of Medicare for their retirement healthcare needs. They have paid into it their entire working lives. How are we supposed to inform them that not only do the Democrats want to endanger their access to Medicare services, but, unbelievably, they will want to increase their taxes also?

There is no question that this policy could be catastrophic for America's patients today and for generations to come.

At least now there is some degree of honesty. Remember, a previous administration said, if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. Now at least there is some degree of honesty.

You can't keep your doctor. You can't keep your insurance. You can't keep your personal liberty. You get nothing. Effectively, it would end all the parts of our healthcare system that are, in fact, working for the American people.

Quite simply, single-payer healthcare would be another attempt at a one-size-fits-all approach to healthcare. We know this: Americans are all different. A universal healthcare plan will not meet the varying needs of each and every one of us as individuals. Single-payer is not one-size-fits-all. It is really one-size-fits-no-one.

Again, to restate the obvious: Since the beginning of this Congress, we have heard it. Through the last Congress, we heard it. Republicans support protections for individuals with preexisting conditions.

Instead of spending our time here today worrying about the judicial branch, we could focus on our job as members of the legislative branch. We should be actively working to better our healthcare system, not spending time taking votes that will fail to accomplish any real objective.

Madam Speaker, the second resolution included in this rule directs the removal of the United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress.

We considered this resolution once before. At that time, Republicans suc-

cessfully passed a motion to recommit that declared the House's opposition to anti-Semitism. However, this version of the bill does not include that important provision, and we are again debating legislation that is, in fact, based on a false premise.

The resolution is fundamentally flawed. United States forces are not engaged in hostilities between the Saudi-led coalition and the Iranian-backed Houthi forces in Yemen. Previously, the United States was providing midair refueling to Saudi Arabia but ceased this assistance in November 2018. The United States continues to provide limited intelligence-sharing and limited logistics support, which does not amount to engagement in hostilities.

The Trump administration is focused on countering al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula and the Islamic State, mitigating the humanitarian crisis in Yemen and assisting our allies.

The United States does not command, coordinate, accompany, nor participate in counter-Houthi operations or any hostilities other than those directed at al-Qaida and the Islamic State.

I might, here, just add: Those activities against the Islamic State have been significantly successful over the last 2 years.

This resolution sets a dangerous precedent. America has a security agreement with Saudi Arabia, just as we do with 117 other countries, including our NATO allies Canada, Australia, South Korea, and Israel. If this resolution were to become law, it could set a precedent that could prevent us from assisting allies and prevent us from meeting our treaty obligations. Rather than condemning a type of assistance that is no longer being provided by the United States, we should be finding ways to aid the millions of Yemenis at risk of starving to death.

Limiting how our forces can engage in the region will only further exacerbate this conflict and not help bring it to a conclusion.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I have to give the Republicans credit for one thing. They are consistent on the issue of healthcare, in trying to avoid talking about the issue at hand.

We are not talking about universal healthcare, although I support universal healthcare. We are not talking about Medicare for All, although I personally support Medicare for All. We are not talking about the Canadian system or the German system or any other system.

We are talking about preventing this President and his Republican allies from null and voiding the Affordable Care Act, thereby taking away healthcare protections for every single American. We are talking about preventing the President from throwing

tens of millions of people off health insurance. We are talking about protecting the over 100 million people in this country who have preexisting conditions. That is what we are talking about.

I loved it when the gentleman from Texas said that the first vote that the Republicans asked for in this Congress was a procedural motion to protect people with preexisting conditions. Does the gentleman not know that people with preexisting conditions already have protections under the Affordable Care Act?

I mean, it sounds to me—and it seemed to me at the time—that that Republican procedural vote was about covering your rear and not about serious legislating, about trying to get the American people to believe that we really do care about healthcare and we really do care about protecting people with preexisting conditions, even though we all know here that that is just not the case.

When I hear the gentleman say that the Republicans care deeply about people's healthcare and want to make sure that everybody gets coverage, it is just not true. The reason I say that so emphatically is because I have been around here for the last few years, and I have watched the dozens of votes that the Republicans have brought up, one after another after another after another after another, to repeal healthcare protections for people in this country without proposing an alternative.

Now, the President is saying: Trust us.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Politico article that just appeared that is entitled "Trump punts health care until after 2020."

[From POLITICO, April 1, 2019]

TRUMP PUNTS HEALTH CARE UNTIL AFTER 2020

(By Quint Forney and John Bresnahan)

JUST LAST WEEK THE PRESIDENT HAD SEEMED TO GO ALL IN ON A NEW EFFORT TO WIPE OUT OBAMACARE

President Donald Trump signaled Monday that congressional Republicans would wait until after the 2020 elections to vote on a GOP replacement for Obamacare—putting off a presumably savage legislative battle on a hot-button campaign issue until after his re-election bid.

"Everybody agrees that ObamaCare doesn't work. Premiums & deductibles are far too high—Really bad HealthCare! Even the Dems want to replace it, but with Medicare for all, which would cause 180 million Americans to lose their beloved private health insurance," the president tweeted.

"The Republicans . . . are developing a really great HealthCare Plan with far lower premiums (cost) & deductibles than ObamaCare," Trump continued. "In other words it will be far less expensive & much more usable than ObamaCare. Vote will be taken right after the Election when Republicans hold the Senate & win . . . back the House."

Trump claimed that the as-yet-unseen Republican proposal "will be truly great HealthCare that will work for America," writing online that "Republicans will always support Pre-Existing Conditions."

The unexpected string of tweets added drama to a week that has seen Obamacare return to the fore as a policy issue.

The president's pledge comes days after his Justice Department endorsed a federal court ruling to eliminate the Affordable Care Act in its entirety, moving to invalidate the landmark health care law despite objections within Trump's orbit from Health and Human Services Secretary Alex Azar and Attorney General William Barr. The ruling by District Judge Reed O'Connor had suggested that the Obamacare statute, which has passed muster with the Supreme Court, was actually wholly unconstitutional.

The president appeared on Capitol Hill the next day, saying that the Republican Party "will soon be known as the party of health care."

Trump's call to again put Obamacare repeal on the table for Hill Republicans was seen as a potential disaster-in-the-making by GOP leaders, who knew their incumbents and candidates were badly hurt by it last November. And it was an invitation to Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) to pound home the issue once more, as she plans to do with a House vote this week condemning the administration's decision not to defend Obamacare in court.

Trump's efforts to eradicate Obamacare have also endangered some of the administration's health initiatives, such as lowering prices for prescription drugs and combating opioid abuse and HIV.

In public and private, Republican leaders made clear that they didn't want anything to do with the president's most recent maneuver. They begged Trump to back down and made their displeasure known to other administration officials, as well.

GOP lawmakers even took the position that if Trump wanted to lay out his own health care proposal, then they would be willing to look at it. But Senate Republicans—facing a tough electoral fight to maintain their majority in 2020—have refused to sign on to a new administration drive before seeing the specifics, giving them room to disavow any Trump proposal if it hinders their own political outlook.

"I look forward to seeing what the president is proposing and what he can work out with the speaker," Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) said in a brief interview Thursday, adding: "I am focusing on stopping the Democrats' 'Medicare for None' scheme."

McConnell is up for re-election this cycle, as are vulnerable GOP incumbents including Cory Gardner of Colorado and Susan Collins of Maine, who said she doesn't want the Justice Department to push to strike down Obamacare.

The Affordable Care Act has been a thorn in the side of Republicans since it was enacted in 2010. After the GOP took back the House in the midterm elections that year, GOP lawmakers repeatedly passed legislation designed to repeal Obamacare.

Once Trump was elected president on a promise of different and better health care options, Republicans seemed on the path to finally scrapping the law, only to see a 2017 "skinny repeal" effort fail unexpectedly in the Senate. That attempt collapsed when Arizona Sen. John McCain—upset with the irregular way the legislation was being handled—stunned his colleagues by voting against it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. The President says: Repeal everything, and then we will share our secret plan after the election.

Give me a break. The bottom line is that the American people want us to be on their side, not on the side of big health insurance corporations, not on

the side of big drug companies. They want us to be on their side.

It wasn't too long ago when people would be provided insurance that didn't cover anything. It was junk insurance. There are people on the Republican side and people in this White House who are eager to get back to those bad old days.

Stop trying to take away people's healthcare. Stop trying to get in bed with corporate interests that basically are fighting every attempt to make sure that people have access to good, quality care in this country.

By the way, if they repealed the Affordable Care Act, that repeals essential benefits protections, which guarantee that every insurance company has to provide you coverage when you get sick. That wasn't always the case.

This is a ridiculous fight that we are having here. I cannot believe, after the midterm elections, after it was made crystal clear by the American people to the Republicans that they wanted no part of their effort to take away healthcare in this country, that here we are doing it all again.

Now, maybe they didn't intend it this way. The President wasn't on message and came out for repealing the Affordable Care Act outright, and now they have to kind of scramble to try to, again, cover their rears. That is what is happening here.

It is really disillusioning, I think, for people who are observing these proceedings that we are back again fighting over whether or not people are entitled to good healthcare, whether people are entitled to protections under our healthcare laws.

I think this is a ridiculous fight for the Republicans to be waging. But if they want to fight it, they own it. I think they will see, in 2020, that the American people are having none of it.

Madam Speaker, on the war in Yemen, we cannot wait. The starving children in Yemen cannot wait on this President or on my Republican colleagues to do the right thing.

Just to highlight how bad the war is, here are a few statistics. I noticed the gentleman from Texas barely talked about how horrific the situation is in Yemen, but let me give you a few statistics.

Madam Speaker, 130 children under 5 die each day from hunger and disease as a result of this war. The number of cholera cases in Yemen is 1 million. You heard that right. This is the largest cholera outbreak in recent history. Finally, 3-year-olds in Yemen have lived through 18,000 air raids already.

As I mentioned in my opening statement, the bombs that are dropping on civilian populations say "Made in the United States of America." All of us should be outraged by that, and not only by the Saudi Government's behavior in Yemen, but the Saudi Government's behavior in general.

Yet, what is the response by this administration and their Republican allies? Send Saudi Arabia more weapons.

Sell them more weapons. Turn a blind eye to what is going on in Yemen. Let's make believe that the murder of Washington Post journalist Jamal Khashoggi never happened.

Again, we need to stand firmly on the side of human rights.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Speaker, here is one of the uncomfortable truths of the Affordable Care Act: Under the law, every Member of Congress was supposed to be covered under the Affordable Care Act. Obviously, the pay and benefits of a Member in Congress exceed the subsidy limits, so these would be unsubsidized healthcare.gov policies. But then-Speaker of the House John Boehner, then-Leader of the United States Senate Harry Reid, and President Obama himself all intervened. They were fearful that Members of Congress might leave.

There might be a brain drain in Congress—if such a thing was, in fact, possible—if Members of Congress were required to put their health insurance under the Affordable Care Act, so they created an exception for Members of Congress, and Members of Congress only. They are the only people in the United States who can do this. There is a tax-free subsidy that a Member of Congress can walk into the D.C. exchange and get their coverage in the D.C. exchange.

I rejected that option because: Number one, I didn't think it was right. Number two, I didn't think it was legal. I thought it was going to be taken away from us. Apparently, no one else shared my concern because it still exists.

It does make me wonder why we would not offer a health reimbursement account, and I have brought this up several times in committee, where that same tax-free subsidy could be available to any American to walk into a health insurance plan of their choosing. Why not give the people of the country what Members of the Congress so generously bestowed upon themselves?

I didn't take the option to go into the D.C. exchange. I didn't take the option of the tax-free subsidy that went along with it. I bought an unsubsidized health insurance plan in healthcare.gov, signed up for it October 1, 2012. Many of you may remember that. We were in the process of shutting the government down at the time. It was in all the papers.

I started that process October 1, 2012. The check cleared the middle of January 2013. I went that entire time not knowing if I would have health insurance in healthcare.gov the next year because I couldn't get an answer to any questions.

You couldn't call the people at healthcare.gov. You would try, and you would be put on hold. You would stay on hold for a long period of time. You

would eventually get to talk to a person. You would get cut off. You would have to start all over at the beginning. It was a miserable process.

The point is, Members of Congress should have gone through that. We should have had to deal with what we pushed off on the American people, at least those people in the individual market.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1300

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

Let me just say you have got to love the Republicans. I mean, they have been in charge of this House for 8 years previously. They were in charge of the entire government the previous 2 years. They had the House, the Senate, and the White House. They didn't even need a supermajority in the United States Senate to be able to get whatever they wanted through, and they couldn't do it.

So the bottom line is this: You had your chance. The American people rejected your attempt to take away healthcare from millions of people. The American people believe people with preexisting conditions ought not to be discriminated against by insurance companies, and so they are having none of what you are selling here.

So you can make excuses all you want, but, unfortunately for the country, you were in charge of the House, the Senate, and the White House for the previous 2 years.

Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA), who has been a leader on the issue of Yemen, and I commend him for his efforts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman MCGOVERN for his leadership in finally bringing up for a vote this resolution on Yemen and for the terrific people on his team, Don Sisson; on Speaker PELOSI's team, Keith Stern, and Shuwanza Goff; and on Majority Leader HOYER's team, who finally allowed for a vote, with the work of Keane Bhatt and Geo Saba.

Let me explain why this matters. As the chairman alluded to, there are 14 million people in Yemen who currently face the possibility of famine—14 million.

I was with Martin Griffiths, the Special Envoy to the United Nations, about 2 weeks ago, and he said, if we do not act in the next couple of months, that situation will become irreversible.

The explanation for this famine is pretty simple. The gentleman from Texas said we need to get more aid in there. I respect that, sir, but the problem is that the Saudis have a blockade on Yemen; they are not allowing the aid to get in. Every day we wait, it makes it harder for us to reverse the famine.

So the solution is very simple: We need to have the Saudis lift the blockade and let food and medicine get to the people who need it to prevent the largest humanitarian crisis and the largest famine the world has ever seen.

Now, the gentleman from Texas said that the administration has already stopped the refueling, and in that, he is actually correct. The administration has stopped the refueling. But the reason they stopped the refueling is precisely because Congress acted, because the Senate passed the War Powers Resolution.

All we are asking to happen now is to codify that policy so that the refueling doesn't begin again. That is why this shouldn't be a partisan issue. The President should want to sign this War Powers Resolution.

The gentleman from Texas said, well, what difference will it make if we have already stopped? The difference this will make is sending a clear, unambiguous message to the Saudis that they can no longer continue a policy of intentional cruelty, of trying to have a nation, through starvation, submit to their will. That is why this is a bipartisan issue. If we pass this, then that message will be heard by the Saudis, and that is why we had bipartisan support in the Senate and in the House for this resolution.

The gentleman from Texas said, well, this is going to hurt our relationships with Israel or other allies. That is just false. That is just false.

The amendment, the Buck amendment, that was in our resolution, or the amendment that is in the Senate resolution, makes it clear that we still can have intelligence sharing with any ally and does not touch any of our treaties.

People often say why am I so passionate that, of all the issues, I decided to take up Yemen in my first term. I will tell you why.

In 1943, there was a famine in West Bengal; 3 million people perished. My grandfather was in jail in 1943 in India when that famine took place. And there was indifference—indifference—by the British Government. They let 3 million people die.

As the United States, we should not allow for another famine, and we should do everything in our power, as a House, to stop it.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the Republican leader of the second oldest committee in the United States Congress, the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. BURGESS for his leadership on healthcare in so many ways.

Madam Speaker, embarrassingly designed and hastily written by our Democratic colleagues, the Affordable Care Act, from day one, has come under legal and public scrutiny, and for obvious reasons. This disastrous healthcare experiment, written behind closed doors and stuffed with special

interest giveaways, has driven up healthcare costs for millions of working families so high that more Americans eligible for the Affordable Care Act have rejected it than have chosen it.

Now, as ObamaCare's ever-increasing failures continue to find their way into our courts, Democrats are asking us to condemn the Justice Department's handling of this process.

No matter how Democrats try to frame this stunt, the left is misleading the American people with this political and partisan move. The continuation, regrettably, of falsehoods that Democrats continue to elevate in order to protect this unconstitutional law is really a disservice to the Americans and the patients who hope to have affordable care. We can and must do better as we work to protect patients and lower healthcare costs.

Madam Speaker, the truth is Republicans, creators of the children's healthcare program; creators of part D, the Medicare prescription drugs for seniors; creators of Medicare Advantage, are committed to improving our healthcare system.

If the Court strikes down the Affordable Care Act, Republicans will act to protect those with preexisting conditions. We will work to make healthcare more affordable, guaranteeing that folks can see local doctors or go to their local hospitals, and we will preserve other important provisions, such as no lifetime limits and allowing kids to stay on their parents' plans till age 26. These are shared priorities that patients and families deserve to have secured.

If our Democratic colleagues who drafted this flawed law want to join Republicans, why not start fresh, this time, both parties working together to pass a law that is truly constitutional, that actually lowers costs and that will actually protect patients? We welcome that conversation with open arms.

So I am proud to join with my colleague, the Republican leader of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, GREG WALDEN, to introduce a resolution that calls for this Congress to work together to do just that, because one thing is crystal clear: Republicans won't let the courts take away preexisting protections or let Democrats take away your health plan at work.

I strongly urge all my colleagues to vote "no" on this political stunt so that we can actually start working together toward making our healthcare system more convenient and more affordable for families across this country.

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

I have great respect for the gentleman from Texas, the former chair of the Ways and Means Committee. But I just want to remind my colleagues again that my Republican friends have been in charge of this institution for 8

years. They were in charge for 2 years of the House, the Senate, and the Presidency, and they showed us what they were about.

The gentleman says that they are not going to let the courts take away protections for people with preexisting conditions. Well, my Republican friends tried to do that on dozens of occasions. They brought legislation to the floor that would have ripped protections away from people with preexisting conditions. That is their record. It is there for anybody to see.

Now they are saying: "Oh, we are now for protecting people with preexisting conditions"? Their whole existence in the majority has been about taking protections away from people. Give me a break. I mean, people know what is going on here.

I appreciate the resolution that the gentleman wants to offer to say we all should work together. Look, I am happy to work with my Republican friends to find ways to improve protections for people.

But I want to remind them, when they were in the majority, they didn't want anything to do with us because we wanted to protect people's healthcare. We wanted to protect people with preexisting conditions. We wanted to make sure that parents could keep their kids on their insurance until they were 26. We wanted to lower the cost of prescription drugs. We wanted to put a cap on people with chronic illnesses so that they wouldn't go bankrupt. We wanted to make sure that insurance companies had to offer you real protections. We had essential benefit protections there.

So we are happy to build on that. What we are not happy to do is to work with them to take these things away, and that is what their leadership has been all about for 8 years in the House. And then when they controlled the House, the Senate, and the White House, that is what they tried to do.

Thankfully, some thoughtful Republicans in the Senate didn't go along with it, so they didn't get their way. And now they are trying to use the courts to try to undermine what this body has done.

Madam Speaker, let me inquire of the gentleman from Texas how many more speakers he has.

Mr. BURGESS. I have as many as I need.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Okay. Then I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. It will be me.

Mr. MCGOVERN. We were expecting one more speaker, but she didn't show up. If the gentleman is ready to close, I am ready to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to move a resolution that reinforces our long-held views that every American should have preexisting condition protections.

On the opening day of the 116th Congress, House Republicans brought a measure to the floor that called on lawmakers to legislate on locking in protections for patients with preexisting conditions. Unfortunately, in a fit of partisanship, the Democrats blocked this effort.

If the Democrats were serious, they would take up legislation immediately to protect patients with preexisting conditions. Instead, Democrats are trying to score political points.

Our position is simple and clear: Republicans stand ready to protect those with preexisting conditions in a manner that will withstand judicial scrutiny. This is why, if the previous question is defeated, House Republicans will move a resolution that:

Maintains that no American should have their health insurance taken away or lose protections for preexisting conditions due to the Democrats in Congress enacting an unconstitutional law;

Instructs Congress and the Trump administration to immediately ask the Court for a stay in this decision;

Guarantees that no American citizen can be denied health insurance or coverage or charged more due to previous illness or health status;

Includes commonsense consumer protections;

Provides more choice and affordable coverage than the Affordable Care Act;

Lowers prescription drug prices for patients;

Strengthens Medicare for current and future beneficiaries; and

Rejects the Democrats' radical, one-size-fits-all, government-run healthcare that would outlaw the employer-based coverage of more than 150 million Americans.

Finally, it is important to note that *Texas v. the United States*, the case that is working its way through the courts, did not immediately end ObamaCare and will not affect insurance coverage or premiums for calendar year 2019. Several legal steps remain before the courts reach a final conclusion.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman is agreeable, I am prepared to close.

So, in closing, while Republicans stand ready to legislate, we are again considering unnecessary resolutions. The first seeks to condemn the position of the Department of Justice in *Texas v. the United States*, the case in which the Department of Justice is not a party.

As I have stated several times, Republicans support protecting coverage

for preexisting conditions. I would hope we could work together to find a way to make health insurance affordable for all Americans rather than considering a divisive messaging resolution.

The resolution to remove the United States Armed Forces from hostilities in Yemen is not only unnecessary, but may prevent future assistance for our allies.

□ 1315

The brave men and women who are assisting Saudi Arabia in the fight against al-Qaida and the Islamic State are working to find solutions to the humanitarian crisis that is unfolding in Yemen, a mission for which we should be unified in our support.

Madam Speaker, with that, I urge a “no” vote on the previous question, and a “no” on the underlying measures.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I just find it a little bit interesting that for the last couple of days, my Republican friends have been assailing us for introducing a sense of Congress resolution, and here we have a sense of Congress resolution from them.

I guess you can't make this stuff up.

But in any event, look, I will say to my colleagues, you don't need to defeat the previous question to make clear that you believe that people with preexisting conditions should be protected, because this sense of Congress wouldn't do that.

We have a law that does that now, a law that, unfortunately, my Republican friends have been trying to repeal for years.

So if Members want to protect people with preexisting conditions, then they ought to support us on our sense of Congress resolution.

So, Madam Speaker, when it comes down to it, both of these resolutions that we are offering today are about what this Congress is willing to tolerate, whether we are willing to tolerate our Nation's involvement in the Saudi-led war in Yemen, despite never having authorized it in the first place. Do we really want our Nation to be partners with a regime that murders journalists like Jamal Khashoggi?

President Trump has said of Saudi Arabia: “They have been a great ally.” Well, I disagree.

And I hope that this Congress will now speak with one voice that we will not look the other way when it comes to the murder of a U.S. reporter, that we will not look the other way when it comes to the murder of innocent people in Yemen, bombing school buses, bombing weddings, bombing funerals.

Enough. We have to say enough. We are no longer okay with the U.S. and Yemen going on unchecked for another year.

This is about whether this Congress is going to tolerate the administration

trying to rip away millions of people's healthcare as well. I know I am not—and many of my colleagues aren't either—willing to tolerate that.

This morning, I joined with many Members of Congress in the House and Senate, including Leader PELOSI and Senator SCHUMER. We marched from the House and the Senate to the Supreme Court to call on this administration to stop its assault on Americans' healthcare.

Abolishing the Affordable Care Act may be just a talking point to the President, but this law is literally a matter of life and death for people. Millions and millions of Americans could lose their insurance coverage. Premiums and out-of-pocket costs could skyrocket, and lifesaving healthcare could once again be out of reach.

The President and his allies claim to support protections for preexisting conditions, they claim that the Republican Party is the party of healthcare, but their actions say otherwise.

When this House voted on the first day of this Congress to allow us to intervene in *Texas v. U.S.*, more than 190 Republicans sided with the President on his brutal assault on Americans' healthcare.

The majority is not going to stand for it.

Enough is enough. Enough with the unauthorized wars abroad, enough with the assault on people's healthcare.

Madam Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the previous question, this rule, and the underlying resolutions.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong and unequivocal support for the rule governing debate on H. Res. 271 as well as the underlying resolution and ask all Members to join me in supporting this resolution which condemns the Trump Administration's ongoing legal campaign to take away health care from more than 100 million Americans and to make health care dramatically less affordable for those fortunate enough to be insured.

I thank Congressman ALLRED, my Texas congressional delegation colleague, for introducing this important resolution.

As a new member of Congress who unseated an opponent who voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act dozens of times, the gentlemen from Texas knows first-hand how important and critical access to affordable, high quality, accessible health care available to everyone, including those with pre-existing conditions, to the well-being of American families.

Because of the passage of the Affordable Care Act, the national uninsured rate has been slashed from 14.8 in 2012 to 8.89 percent in 2018.

Texas has long led the nation in rate of uninsured so the comparable rates are 24.6 and 15 percent, respectively.

Madam Speaker, I distinctly recall a candidate for the highest public office in the land saying “Obamacare is a disaster” and appealing for voters to support him with this question:

“What have you got to lose?”

The question deserves a response so I hope that person, who occupies the Oval Office, is listening to my answer.

The Affordable Care Act, or “Obamacare,” has been an unmitigated success to the more than 20 million Americans who for the first time now have the security and peace of mind that comes with affordable, accessible, high quality health care.

Madam Speaker, Tip O'Neill used to say that “all politics is local” so let me share with you how Obamacare has dramatically changed lives for the better for the people in my home state of Texas.

1.874 million Texans who have gained coverage since the ACA was implemented could lose their coverage if the ACA is entirely or partially repealed or invalidated.

1.1 million Texans who purchased high quality Marketplace coverage now stand to lose their coverage if *Texas v. United States*, No. 4:18-cv-00167-O (N.D. Tex.), the lawsuit brought by Republican Governors, and now whole-heartedly supported and aided by the Trump Administration were to succeed.

913,177 individuals Texans who received financial assistance to purchase Marketplace coverage in 2016, averaging \$271 per individual, are at risk of having coverage become unaffordable if the Republican Congress eliminates the premium tax credits.

1.1 million Texans could have insurance if all states adopted the ACA's Medicaid expansion; these individuals will not be able to gain coverage if the Republican Congress eliminates the Medicaid expansion.

508,000 kids in Texas who have gained coverage since the ACA was implemented are also at risk of having their coverage rolled back.

205,000 young adult Texans who were able to stay on a parent's health insurance plan thanks to the ACA now stand to lose coverage if the Republican Congress eliminates the requirement that insurers allow children to stay on their parents' plans until age 26.

646,415 Texans who received cost-sharing reductions to lower out-of-pocket costs such as deductibles, co-pays, and coinsurance are now at risk of having healthcare become unaffordable if the Republican Congress eliminates cost-sharing reductions.

10.28 million Texans who now have private health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductibles stand to lose this access if the Republican Congress eliminates ACA provisions requiring health insurers to cover important preventive services without cost-sharing.

Women in Texas who can now purchase insurance for the same price as men are at risk of being charged more for insurance if the ACA's ban on gender rating in the individual and small group markets is invalidated.

Before the ACA, women paid up to 56 percent more than men for their health insurance.

Roughly 4.5 million Texans who have pre-existing health conditions are at risk of having their coverage rescinded, being denied coverage, or being charged significantly more for coverage if the ACA's ban on pre-existing conditions is struck down.

346,750 Texas seniors who have saved an average of \$1,057 each as a result of closing the Medicare prescription drug “donut hole” gap in coverage stand to lose this critical help going forward.

1.75 million Texas seniors who have received free preventive care services thanks to ACA provisions requiring coverage of annual wellness visits and eliminating cost-sharing for

many recommended preventive services covered by Medicare Part B, such as cancer screenings, are at risk of losing access to these services if congressional Republicans go forward with their plan to repeal the ACA.

The Affordable Care Act works and has made a life-affirming difference in the lives of millions of Americans, in Texas and across the country.

This is what happens when a visionary president cares enough to work with a committed and empathetic Congress to address the real issues facing the American people.

You want to know why the American people have Obamacare?

It is because Obama cared.

The same cannot be said about this Republican president and congressional Republicans who have made careers of attacking and undermining the Affordable Care Act's protections and benefits for the American people.

I urge all Members to vote for H. Res. 271 and send a powerful message to the President and the American people that this House will not stand idly by as this Administration tries to take away health care from more than 130 million persons.

Instead, this House will resist by all constitutional and appropriate means, including opposing this Administration in the courts and by passing the "Protecting Pre-Existing Conditions and Making Health Care More Affordable Act of 2019," which will lower health insurance premiums with strengthened and expanded affordability assistance by:

1. strengthening tax credits in the Marketplace to lower Americans' health insurance premiums and allows more middle-class individuals and families to qualify for subsidies;

2. ensuring that families who don't have an offer of affordable coverage from an employer can still qualify for subsidies in the Marketplace; and,

3. providing funding for reinsurance, to help with high-cost claims, improve Marketplace stability, and prevent the Administration's sabotage from raising premiums.

The "Protecting Pre-Existing Conditions and Making Health Care More Affordable Act of 2019," will also strengthen protections for people with pre-existing conditions by curtailing the Administration's efforts to give states waivers to undermine protections for people with pre-existing conditions and weaken standards for essential health benefits.

These improper waivers leave consumers with less comprehensive plans that do not cover needed services, such as prescription drugs, maternity care and substance use disorder treatment.

Another way the "Protecting Pre-Existing Conditions and Making Health Care More Affordable Act of 2019," protects consumers is by prohibiting insurance companies from selling junk health insurance plans that do not provide coverage for essential medical treatments and drugs, or cover people with pre-existing medical conditions.

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 274

Strike section 2 of the resolution and insert the following:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 280), Protecting the health care of all Americans, especially those with pre-

existing conditions. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 280.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 191, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 140]

YEAS—231

Adams	DeLgado	Krishnamoorthi
Aguilar	Demings	Kuster (NH)
Ailred	DeSaunier	Lamb
Axne	Deutch	Langevin
Barragán	Dingell	Larsen (WA)
Bass	Doggett	Larson (CT)
Beatty	Doyle, Michael	Lawrence
Bera	F.	Lawson (FL)
Beyer	Engel	Lee (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Escobar	Lee (NV)
Blumenauer	Eshoo	Levin (CA)
Blunt Rochester	Españillat	Levin (MI)
Bass	Evans	Lewis
Boyle, Brendan	Finkenauer	Lieu, Ted
F.	Fletcher	Lipinski
Brindisi	Poster	Loeb
Brown (MD)	Frankel	Lofgren
Brownley (CA)	Fudge	Lowenthal
Bustos	Gallego	Lowey
Butterfield	Garamendi	Luján
Carbajal	Garcia (IL)	Lurla
Cárdenas	Garcia (TX)	Lynch
Carson (IN)	Golden	Malinowski
Cartwright	Gomez	Maloney
Case	Gonzalez (TX)	Maloney B.
Casten (IL)	Gottheimer	Maloney, Sean
Castor (FL)	Green (TX)	Matsui
Castro (TX)	Grijalva	McAdams
Chu, Judy	Haaland	McBath
Cicilline	Harder (CA)	McCollum
Cisneros	Hastings	McGovern
Clark (MA)	Hayes	McNerney
Clarke (NY)	Heck	Meeks
Clay	Higgins (NY)	Meng
Cleaver	Hill (CA)	Moore
Clyburn	Himes	Morley
Cohen	Horn, Kendra S.	Moulton
Connolly	Horsford	Mucarsel-Powell
Cooper	Houlahan	Murphy
Costa	Hoyer	Nadler
Courtney	Huffman	Napolitano
Cox (CA)	Jackson Lee	Neal
Craig	Jayapal	Neguse
Crist	Jeffries	Norcross
Crow	Johnson (GA)	O'Halleran
Cuellar	Johnson (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez
Cummings	Kaptur	Omar
Cunningham	Keating	Pallone
Davids (KS)	Kelly (IL)	Panetta
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Pappas
Davis, Danny K.	Khanna	Pascrell
Dean	Kildee	Payne
DeFazio	Kilmer	Perlmutter
DeGette	Kim	Peters
DeLauro	Kind	Peterson
DelBene	Kirkpatrick	Phillips

Pingree	Schrier	Tonko
Pocan	Scott (VA)	Torres (CA)
Porter	Scott, David	Torres Small
Pressley	Serrano	(NM)
Price (NC)	Sewell (AL)	Trahan
Quigley	Shalala	Trone
Raskin	Sherman	Underwood
Rice (NY)	Sherrill	Van Drew
Richmond	Sires	Vargas
Rose (NY)	Slotkin	Veasey
Rouda	Smith (WA)	Vela
Roy	Soto	Velázquez
Roybal-Allard	Spanberger	Visclosky
Ruiz	Speier	Wasserman
Ruppersberger	Stanton	Schultz
Ryan	Stevens	Waters
Sánchez	Suozzi	Watson Coleman
Sarbanes	Swalwell (CA)	Welch
Scanlon	Takano	Wexton
Schakowsky	Thompson (CA)	Wild
Schiff	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (FL)
Schneider	Titus	Yarmuth
Schrader	Tlaib	

NAYS—191

Aderholt	Gonzalez (OH)	Nunes
Allen	Gooden	Olson
Amash	Gosar	Palazzo
Amodei	Granger	Palmer
Armstrong	Graves (GA)	Pence
Arrington	Graves (LA)	Posey
Babin	Graves (MO)	Ratcliffe
Bacon	Green (TN)	Reed
Baird	Griffith	Reschenthaler
Balderson	Grothman	Rice (SC)
Banks	Guest	Riggleman
Barr	Guthrie	Roby
Bergman	Hagedorn	Rodgers (WA)
Biggs	Harris	Roe, David P.
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Rose, John W.
Bishop (UT)	Hern, Kevin	Rogers (AL)
Bost	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (KY)
Brady	Hice (GA)	Rooney (FL)
Brooks (AL)	Higgins (LA)	Rouzer
Brooks (IN)	Hill (AR)	Scalise
Buchanan	Holding	Schweikert
Buck	Hollingsworth	Scott, Austin
Bucshon	Hudson	Sensenbrenner
Budd	Huizenga	Shimkus
Burchett	Hunter	Simpson
Burgess	Hurd (TX)	Smith (MO)
Byrne	Johnson (LA)	Smith (NE)
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Smith (NJ)
Carter (GA)	Johnson (SD)	Smucker
Carter (TX)	Jordan	Spano
Chabot	Joyce (OH)	Stauber
Cheney	Joyce (PA)	Stefanik
Cline	Katko	Steil
Cloud	Kelly (MS)	Steube
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Stewart
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Stivers
Collins (NY)	King (NY)	Taylor
Comer	Kinzinger	Thompson (PA)
Conaway	Kustoff (TN)	Thornberry
Cook	LaHood	Timmons
Crawford	LaMalfa	Tipton
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Turner
Curtis	Latta	Upton
Davidson (OH)	Lesko	Wagner
Davis, Rodney	Long	Walberg
DesJarlais	Loudermilk	Walden
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Walker
Duffy	Luetkemeyer	Walorski
Duncan	Marchant	Waltz
Dunn	Marshall	Watkins
Emmer	Massie	Weber (TX)
Estes	McCarthy	Webster (FL)
Ferguson	McCaul	Wenstrup
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Westerman
Fleischmann	McHenry	Williams
Flores	McKinley	Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry	Meadows	Wittman
Fox (NC)	Meuser	Womack
Fulcher	Miller	Woodall
Gaetz	Mitchell	Wright
Gallagher	Moolenaar	Yoho
Gianforte	Mullin	Young
Gibbs	Newhouse	Zeldin
Gohmert	Norman	

NOT VOTING—9

Abraham	Mast	Perry
Correa	McEachin	Rush
Gabbard	Mooney (WV)	Rutherford

□ 1343

Messrs. RESCENTIALER and SCALISE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. BASS changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TITUS). The question is on adoption of the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 188, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

YEAS—230

Adams	Eshoo	Luria
Aguilar	Españillat	Lynch
Allred	Evans	Malinowski
Axne	Finkenauer	Maloney,
Barragán	Fletcher	Carolyn B.
Bass	Foster	Maloney, Sean
Beatty	Frankel	Matsui
Bera	Fudge	McAdams
Beyer	Gallego	McBath
Bishop (GA)	Garamendi	McCollum
Blumenauer	García (IL)	McGovern
Blunt Rochester	García (TX)	McNerney
Bonamici	Golden	Meeks
Boyle, Brendan	Gomez	Meng
F.	Gonzalez (TX)	Moore
Brindisi	Gottheimer	Morelle
Brown (MD)	Green (TX)	Moulton
Brownley (CA)	Grijalva	Mucarsel-Powell
Bustos	Haaland	Murphy
Butterfield	Harder (CA)	Nadler
Carbajal	Hastings	Napolitano
Cárdenas	Hayes	Neal
Carson (IN)	Heck	Neuse
Cartwright	Higgins (NY)	Norcross
Case	Hill (CA)	O'Halleran
Casten (IL)	Himes	Ocasio-Cortez
Castor (FL)	Horn, Kendra S.	Omar
Castro (TX)	Horsford	Pallone
Chu, Judy	Houlihan	Panetta
Cicilline	Hoyer	Pappas
Cisneros	Huffman	Pascrell
Clark (MA)	Jackson Lee	Payne
Clarke (NY)	Jayapal	Perlmutter
Clay	Jeffries	Peters
Cleaver	Johnson (GA)	Peterson
Clyburn	Johnson (TX)	Phillips
Cohen	Kaptur	Pingree
Connolly	Keating	Pocan
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Porter
Costa	Kennedy	Pressley
Courtney	Khanna	Price (NC)
Cox (CA)	Kildee	Quigley
Craig	Kilmer	Raskin
Crist	Kim	Rice (NY)
Crow	Kind	Richmond
Cuellar	Kirkpatrick	Rose (NY)
Cummings	Krishnamoorthi	Rouda
Cunningham	Kuster (NH)	Roybal-Allard
Davids (KS)	Lamb	Ruiz
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Ruppersberger
Davis, Danny K.	Larsen (WA)	Ryan
Dean	Larson (CT)	Sánchez
DeFazio	Lawrence	Sarbanes
DeGette	Lawson (FL)	Scanlon
DeLauro	Lee (CA)	Schakowsky
DelBene	Lee (NV)	Schiff
Delgado	Levin (CA)	Schneider
Demings	Levin (MI)	Schrader
DeSaulnier	Lewis	Schrier
Deutch	Lieu, Ted	Scott (VA)
Dingell	Lipinski	Scott, David
Doggett	Loeb sack	Serrano
Doyle, Michael	Lofgren	Sewell (AL)
F.	Lowenthal	Shalala
Engel	Lowey	Sherman
Escobar	Luján	Sherrill

Sires  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Speier  
Stanton  
Stevens  
Suozzi  
Swailwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)

Titus  
Tlaib  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres Small  
(NM)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Underwood  
Van Drew  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela

Velázquez  
Viscosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wexton  
Wild  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

NAYS—188

Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Armstrong  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Baird  
Balderson  
Banks  
Barr  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Bost  
Brady  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Cline  
Cloud  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Conaway  
Cook  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Curtis  
Davidson (OH)  
Davis, Rodney  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duffy  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Fox (NC)  
Fulcher  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Gohmert

Gonzalez (OH)  
Gooden  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Hagedorn  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hern, Kevin  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice (GA)  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill (AR)  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Joyce (PA)  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Kustoff (TN)  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latta  
Lesko  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Marchant  
Marshall  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCauley  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
Meadows  
Meuser  
Miller  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mullin  
Newhouse

Norman  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Pence  
Posey  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Rescenthaler  
Rice (SC)  
Roby  
Rodgers (WA)  
Roe, David P.  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rose, John W.  
Rouzer  
Roy  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Shimkus  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smucker  
Spano  
Staubert  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Steube  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Styers  
Taylor  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Timmons  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Waltz  
Watkins  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Wright  
Yoho  
Young  
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—13

Abraham  
Bergman  
Correa  
Gabbard  
Mast

McEachin  
Mooney (WV)  
Perry  
Riggleman  
Rooney (FL)

Rush  
Rutherford  
Woodall

□ 1353

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 140 and “nay” on rollcall No. 141.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, to protect the right to life for innocent children who are born alive instead of allowing the State-sponsored murder after birth, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, if that is the case, I would ask the Speaker and the majority leader to immediately bring that bill to the floor to allow us all to stand up for the sanctity of life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not been recognized for debate.

CONDEMNING THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION'S LEGAL CAMPAIGN TO TAKE AWAY AMERICANS' HEALTH CARE

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 271.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 274, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 271) Condemning the Trump Administration's Legal Campaign to Take Away Americans' Health Care, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 271

Whereas on February 26, 2018, 18 State attorneys general and 2 Governors filed a lawsuit in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Texas v. United States, No. 4:18-cv-00167-O (N.D. Tex.) (in this preamble referred to as “Texas v. United States”), arguing that the requirement of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148; 124 Stat. 119) (in this preamble referred to as the “ACA”) to maintain minimum essential coverage is unconstitutional and, as a result, the court should invalidate the entire law;

Whereas in a June 7, 2018, letter to Congress, then Attorney General Jefferson Sessions announced that the Department of Justice—

(1) would not defend the constitutionality of the minimum essential coverage provision; and

(2) would argue that provisions protecting individuals with pre-existing conditions (specifically the provisions commonly known as “community rating” and “guaranteed issue”) are inseverable from the minimum essential coverage provision and should be invalidated;

Whereas in the June 7, 2018, letter to Congress, Attorney General Sessions also advised Congress that “the Department will continue to argue that Section 5000A(a) is severable from the remaining provisions of the ACA”, indicating a difference from the plaintiffs’ position in *Texas v. United States*;

Whereas on December 14, 2018, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas issued an order that declared the requirement to maintain minimum essential coverage unconstitutional and struck down the ACA in its entirety, including protections for individuals with pre-existing conditions;

Whereas the decision of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas was stayed and is pending appeal before the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit;

Whereas on March 25, 2019, the Department of Justice, in a letter to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, changed its position and announced that the entire ruling of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas should be upheld and the entire ACA should be declared unconstitutional;

Whereas prior to 2014, individuals with pre-existing conditions were routinely denied health insurance coverage, subject to coverage exclusions, charged unaffordable premium rates, exposed to unaffordable out-of-pocket costs, and subject to lifetime and annual limits on health insurance coverage;

Whereas as many as 133,000,000 nonelderly people in the United States—

(1) have a pre-existing condition and could have been denied coverage, only offered coverage at an exorbitant price had they needed individual market health insurance prior to 2014, or had coverage for their pre-existing condition excluded prior to 2014; and

(2) will lose protections for pre-existing conditions if the ruling of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas is upheld in *Texas v. United States*;

Whereas contrary to President Trump’s public claims that he supports protections for people with pre-existing conditions, he has ordered his Department of Justice to actively pursue the destruction of these protections in Federal court;

Whereas employer-provided health plans cannot place lifetime or annual limits on health coverage, and if the Trump Administration succeeds in its argument before the court, more than 100,000,000 people in the United States who receive health insurance through their employer could once again face lifetime or annual coverage limits;

Whereas if the Trump Administration succeeds in its argument before the court, insurers would be allowed to impose an unlimited “age tax” on the health insurance premiums of older Americans;

Whereas prior to 2010, Medicare enrollees faced massive out-of-pocket prescription drug costs once they reached a certain threshold known as the Medicare “donut hole”, and since the donut hole began closing in 2010, millions of Medicare beneficiaries have saved billions of dollars on prescription drugs;

Whereas at a time when 3 in 10 adults report not taking prescribed medicines because of the cost, if the Trump Administration succeeds in its argument before the court, sen-

iors enrolled in Medicare would face billions of dollars in new prescription drug costs;

Whereas as of March 2019, 37 States, including the District of Columbia, have expanded or are in the process of expanding Medicaid to individuals with incomes up to 138 percent of the Federal poverty level, providing health coverage to more than 12,000,000 newly eligible people;

Whereas if the Trump Administration succeeds in its argument before the court, the millions of individuals and families who receive coverage from Medicaid could lose eligibility and no longer have access to health care;

Whereas as of March 2019, many people who buy individual health insurance are provided tax credits to reduce the cost of premiums and assistance to reduce out-of-pocket costs such as copays and deductibles, which has made individual health insurance coverage affordable for millions of people in the United States for the first time;

Whereas if the Trump Administration succeeds in its argument before the court, the health insurance individual exchanges would be eliminated and millions of people in the United States who buy health insurance on the individual marketplaces could lose coverage and would see premium expenses for individual health insurance increase exorbitantly;

Whereas if the Trump Administration succeeds in its argument before the court, people in the United States would lose numerous consumer protections in their coverage, including the requirements that—

(1) plans offer preventive care without cost-sharing;

(2) young adults have the option to remain on a parent’s insurance plan until age 26; and

(3) many health insurance plans offer a comprehensive set of essential health benefits such as maternity care, addiction treatment, and prescription drug coverage;

Whereas pursuant to section 516 of title 28, United States Code, the conduct of litigation in which the United States is a party is reserved to the Department of Justice;

Whereas public reports suggest that the President and his political advisors directed this course of action in direct contravention of the Department of Justice’s longstanding policy to defend Acts of Congress and duty to advance reasonable analysis of legal questions, for example—

(1) when the Department of Justice changed its litigating position on June 7, 2018, in the *Texas v. United States* case to ask the court to strike down the ACA’s guaranteed issue and community rating requirements, thereby eliminating protections for people with pre-existing conditions and reinstating legal discrimination based on health status, that position was found to be so legally indefensible that three of the four career attorneys representing the Government refused to sign the relevant briefs and removed themselves from the case; and

(2) when the Department of Justice again changed its litigating position on March 25, 2019, in the appeal of *Texas v. United States* to seek the invalidation of every provision of the ACA, it was reported that decision was made over the objections of both the Department of Justice as well as the Department of Health and Human Services; and

Whereas the Trump Administration has proceeded in the *Texas v. United States* lawsuit with total disregard for the consequences of its actions for the lives of millions of Americans: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the actions taken by the Trump Administration seeking the invalidation of the ACA’s protections for people with pre-existing conditions, and later the invalidation of

the entire ACA, are an unacceptable assault on the health care of the American people; and

(2) the Department of Justice should—

(A) protect individuals with pre-existing conditions, seniors struggling with high prescription drug costs, and the millions of people in the United States who newly gained health insurance coverage since 2014;

(B) cease any and all efforts to destroy Americans’ access to affordable health care; and

(C) reverse its position in *Texas v. United States*, No. 19–10011 (5th Cir.).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ALLRED), who is the sponsor of this resolution.

□ 1400

Mr. ALLRED. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman PALLONE for his leadership, and I am proud to lead the charge on this resolution condemning the administration’s attacks on American’s healthcare in Federal court.

With the support of so many of my colleagues, this resolution puts the United States Congress on the record as being on the side of the people. As this administration seeks to tear down our healthcare system, this Congress will not stand by while cynical and partisan interests attack our healthcare system and that of hard-working Americans.

Whether it is allowing young people to stay on their parent’s insurance until they are 26, or protecting people from lifetime caps, or ensuring that folks with preexisting conditions get the care that they need, this should not be a partisan issue.

The fight to protect preexisting conditions is personal for me. My mother is a breast cancer survivor and my wife Aly and I just celebrated the birth of our son. Both of those are preexisting conditions. And concern about healthcare is, by far, the number one issue that my constituents talk to me about back home.

That brings me to Natalie, a lawyer with young children, Hugo and Mia, who is married to Nathan, a law professor at Southern Methodist University. Nathan recently attended the State of the Union here with me in Washington.

I met Natalie on the same day that the House voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act. I learned that she had stage IV cancer and that she had come to my event from her chemotherapy treatment. She explained to me that her goal was to fight her cancer for as long as she could so that her two children would know her.

Natalie came to my event that day because she was worried about future moms who would lose their care if the Affordable Care Act was repealed. She was concerned about a return to the bad old days with lifetime caps and discrimination against people with pre-existing conditions.

Sadly, Natalie passed away last year, but her fight goes on, a fight that I am honored to carry forward on behalf of north Texans here in Washington. My home State of Texas has the highest uninsured rate in the country. One in five people in Dallas County, where I live, do not have health insurance. We can and must do better.

I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in the House and the Senate to join us in condemning these attacks on our healthcare system. We must make sure that we don't go back to the bad old days where people can get thrown off their healthcare just because they got sick.

This resolution is a good first step, but we must come together to help our constituents by working together to pass legislation that will stabilize our system and lower costs for everyone.

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

Madam Speaker, the American people expect us to come to this floor with solutions, not political "gotcha" statements. The resolution before us in this week's Democratic dosage of attack on the President is just that. It doesn't do a darn thing to protect people with pre-existing conditions; not one thing.

In the opening day of the 116th Congress, House Republicans brought a powerful, but simple, measure to the floor that called on this body to legislate on what we all agree needs to be done: locking in protections for patients with pre-existing conditions.

Let me repeat. Republicans acted on day one of this Congress to protect Americans with pre-existing conditions. Democrats blocked that.

In fact, I introduced legislation which has 45 cosponsors that protects people with pre-existing conditions. Period. This is something I have fought for my entire time in public service. It would lock in existing protections for patients. It is before the Energy and Commerce Committee, and I have worked since the first day of this Congress to get this measure passed so that if the court decision that found ObamaCare to be unconstitutional, if that judge's decision is upheld, we want to make sure that our citizens who have pre-existing conditions still have coverage.

The legislation I have sponsored would do that. Republicans and Democrats could get this done, and the question is: Why are we not voting on that today?

Instead, Democrats have rushed a resolution to the floor that has never had a hearing before the Energy and Commerce Committee. So much for the talk about due process and regular

order, Madam Speaker. No hearing, and it was rushed to the floor.

We only got to see it for the first time last Friday. So it is little more, in my opinion, than a political screed, not a public policy proposal. It will never go to the Senate. It is only here. Americans ought to know this, too: that the legal case working its way through the courts did not immediately end ObamaCare and will not affect insurance coverage on premiums for 2019.

Moreover, Democrat attorneys general and a couple of Republicans from intervening States are already defending the law in this case, and the judge's ruling has been appealed. This body has voted not once, but twice, to allow Speaker PELOSI to intervene in the case, and she has moved to do.

Just as my Democratic colleagues have repeatedly refused to let this House approve protections for people with preexisting conditions, they also know they could moot the lawsuit that they so decry today. All they would have to do is bring a bill to the floor and vote to repeal the individual mandate. That would turn off this lawsuit.

I am sure many on our side might be happy to join them in that effort. And if the Democrats didn't want to do that, they could vote to reinstate the individual mandate penalty. That, too, would moot the lawsuit. But we are not doing that either.

So they had policy options that could have been brought to the floor, three of them. Two would have ended the lawsuit that they decry today, and one would have given rock-solid security to those with preexisting conditions if the law is thrown out. There is no difference between us or among us about protecting people with preexisting conditions.

But, unfortunately, they chose not to actually legislate. Democrats control everything in this House. They decide what gets heard in committee or, in this case, not, and what is brought to the floor, or not. So it is clear they would rather play politics with healthcare and attack the President for political purposes rather than work with us on what could and should be bipartisan solutions.

A fact that my friends on the other side of the aisle must acknowledge is, for many Americans seeking coverage, healthcare costs keep getting more and more expensive. Last week, the Bend Bulletin, a newspaper in my district, reported on a recent analysis by the Kaiser Family Foundation about how insurance premiums are out of reach for many older, middle-class residents of our area, particularly in rural areas, including my home State.

They report: "In central Oregon, for example, a 60-year-old individual with an annual income of \$50,000 must pay at least \$703 a month, representing 17 percent of his or her income, and that would only buy a bronze plan with a deductible of \$6,500."

We should be focused on helping people like that be able to afford insurance.

When the Affordable Care Act passed, Democrats promised people their insurance premiums would actually go down by \$2,500. For many in America, that promise was false. For many Americans, healthcare costs, health insurance premiums, and, certainly, deductibles and copays have done nothing but gone up and up.

I was in Oregon over the weekend and held seven townhalls. Do you know what I hear about when it comes to healthcare? That insurance premiums are out of reach for too many of my constituents. And for those who cannot afford the premiums, many make difficult choices, from choosing which family members to cover, to changing jobs, or limiting income in order to continue to qualify for subsidies. This is a real problem. I think we can find a bipartisan solution if Democrats are willing to work with us on it.

But, plainly, the current healthcare system for too many Americans is not working. So we know we have more work to do, and I hope that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would agree with us that we need to improve State markets that, in some part, were damaged by ObamaCare; that we should work together to lower healthcare costs and increase access to private health insurance.

In the Energy and Commerce Committee, actually, there are some things we are working on, on drug costs. No President, in my memory, has ever leaned farther forward to get drug costs down for American consumers than President Trump. He has been an incredible leader in this effort, and we are going to see bipartisan work get marked up tomorrow in the Energy and Commerce Committee.

So on that topic of healthcare that is so crucial to survivability of American consumers, we can move forward. We have proven that.

But, meanwhile, the American people need to fully understand that the Democrats' one-size-fits-all, government-run plan itself would end the Affordable Care Act. You have to admit that. That is what your Medicare-for-all plan does.

They need to understand the \$32 trillion price tag for the Democrats' alternative and the tax increases that would be necessary to go with it; the doubling of the individual income tax; doubling of corporate tax; and providers would have to take a 40 percent reduction in their payments.

Think of what the wait lines will be if that were to become law. Americans need to know that when the Democrats Medicare-for-all plan ends, employer-sponsored healthcare and your union plans you negotiated for, 158 million Americans who have health insurance today, will lose it tomorrow. They need to understand how they would have to wait longer for access to care than they do today.

And for my older friends, they need to understand the worst-case scenario. Seniors in America need to fully understand how this plan does away with

popular Medicare Advantage plans and Medigap plans and impacts this proposal would have on access to their doctors and an earlier bankruptcy of Medicare altogether.

So we would be better served today, and so would the American people, if we stood down, parked our partisan swords and shields, and worked together to solve the real problems Americans face when they go to pay their family bills.

I had lunch today with a couple from the southern part of my district, professionals. They said the cost of health insurance for them is so high they have had to make the choice not to have it.

This is going on every day in the marketplace, and I wish we could come together and spend our time on this House floor with a solution we could agree upon, because I think we could. But that is not what we are doing today.

It is like every week there has to be a resolution on the floor to condemn the President, something he said or did; not a policy proposal that will actually solve the Nation's problems. That is all you are dealing with today, another screed.

So let's work together. Let's come together as this Congress can, and as the Energy and Commerce Committee has had a wonderful record of doing over the years, and can going forward, to address healthcare and other issues. We can do that.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this partisan, political resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would hope that we could do what the gentleman from Oregon wants to do and work together in a bipartisan fashion.

I will say to him, however, that his party was in control from 2011 to last year, and there was almost no effort to accomplish that objective. There were, however, over 65 votes to repeal, and there was no replace. When his party won the Presidency as well, there was no replace. We passed something through this House that couldn't get through the Senate. The Senate was controlled by the gentleman's party.

This is something that is not optional for any of our citizens. Healthcare is essential, and they expect us to sit down and work together.

Unfortunately, today, we saw in a tweet—the President who campaigned on the basis of everybody was going to be covered at less cost and higher quality. We are now, I suppose, in about the 29th month in the President's term. He has sent us no bill—and this morning, he has the gall, in my opinion, to tell the American people: I have got a plan. It is secret, and I will show it to you in 2021.

What is interesting about 2021? It is after the election.

Elections ought to be about policy. The election of 2018 was about policy, healthcare, and, very frankly, our argument prevailed. Our argument was that we wanted to protect the Affordable Care Act; that we wanted to make sure that the protections included in the Affordable Care Act were available to all Americans.

□ 1415

Madam Speaker, I want to thank Representative ALLRED for introducing this resolution, and I rise in support of it.

Since taking office, President Trump and his administration have been focused on doing everything it can to take affordable healthcare coverage options away from American families.

Madam Speaker, you can make healthcare a lot cheaper. Offer them no coverage—it is very simple—not hospitalization, not doctors' reimbursement, not this, not that, and not the other. We call them junk policies. They pretend to be health coverage when they are not.

The President did make two failed efforts along with his party to repeal the Affordable Care Act in Congress. They came after Republicans tried to repeal or undermine the bill in more than 65 votes during their years in the majority. The American people do not want to get rid of the Affordable Care Act, because if they did, then they wouldn't have us in the majority because they know we want to keep it. They want Congress, however, to work to improve and make our healthcare system work better for all Americans, and, yes, have it affordable and accessible.

Instead, President Trump and Republicans have doubled down and tripled down on their agenda of sabotaging the law through executive actions on an almost weekly and monthly basis and through lawsuits like the one now pending in Texas.

I am not sure who convinced the President to change his mind, but I have a suspicion Mick Mulvaney did. Mick Mulvaney, of course, voted 65 times—well, I don't know that he was here every one of those votes, but every time he had an opportunity, he voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act. If the Americans wanted to repeal the Affordable Care Act, then they would have voted against us.

Madam Speaker, I would tell my friend from Oregon that if it is partisan, it is partisan because none of you will support it, and so many of you campaigned on the basis of wanting to protect preexisting conditions. Obviously, the President changed his mind about doing that.

All this resolution does is express the sense of this House that such efforts are wrong and would harm tens of millions of Americans who benefit from the ACA. This includes the 133 million or more Americans living with preexisting conditions like asthma, diabe-

tes, cancer, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, who are protected in their ability to get healthcare insurance.

The actions taken by President Trump, however, and the Republicans would make these individuals uninsurable, forcing them and their families into financial hardship in order to pay for medical bills. It also includes older Americans for whom Republicans have proposed an age tax.

It would do harm to the 20 million Americans who are now covered because of the Affordable Care Act who would lose their coverage as a result of what President Trump and Republicans in Congress are seeking to do. That is what the lawsuit does. This says that we don't agree with the lawsuit—a pretty simple proposition.

By joining the Texas lawsuit, the Trump administration is seeking to allow women to be charged higher premiums than men as they used to be. It seeks to allow lifetime and annual limits on coverage, which the Affordable Care Act banned. In addition, it is trying to force Americans under age 26 to get coverage on their own, even if they don't have a job yet and are still in college.

Preventive health visits and screenings would, once more, require out-of-pocket co-pays. Plans would no longer be required to cover essential health benefits. Now, if you don't have to cover required health benefits, then you are going to get a cheaper policy, not a lot of coverage, but a cheaper policy. The objective is not just a cheaper policy, it is a policy that covers your risks. If we can make it cheaper, then we ought to do that. Plans would no longer be required to cover, as I said, essential benefits such as maternity care and prescription drugs.

This resolution is an opportunity to state on the RECORD whether Members support doing away with these reforms or not. Now, that doesn't mean you think that an alternative is perfect, it simply means that we either want to improve or replace it with something that is viable, passable, and good for the American people, whether to turn back the clock or look ahead, and whether to stand with the Trump administration as it seeks to dismantle every single piece of the Affordable Care Act, which it has done.

The gentleman mentions maybe a daily resolution, well, unfortunately, we have daily action by the President that does things that we don't think are appropriate. We voted on one of those the other day where we appropriated money to a certain object, and the President wants to change it on his own. We think that was unconstitutional. We didn't get a lot of help on the Republican side, the gentleman did, I agree with that, the gentleman who has spoken before me.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me and others in supporting Representative ALLRED's resolution in expressing bipartisan opposition to the

Trump administration's efforts—not to Trump, but to the policies. We ought to be talking about policies, not personalities. It is not about personalities. It is about policies and do we believe that we ought to repeal the Affordable Care Act without a replacement?

I think the answer to that ought to be an emphatic “no” for all of us. The gentleman is correct. We ought to work on a bipartisan basis to accomplish good objectives for our people. This vote will show every single American where his or her Representative stands on the question which is so consequential to the everyday lives of millions and millions of Americans.

The President clearly has no intention—he said in his tweet today—of sending a bill down here until 2021, 2 years and more from now. How sad to be the leader of our country and say: I am not going to tell you what I am going to do, just trust me.

Well, Mr. President, we don't have any reason based upon your performance to trust you to make sure that Americans have what you said you were going to give them, that everybody was going to be covered at lower cost or higher quality.

Vote for this resolution and tell the American people that when you said on the campaign trail: I am for preexisting conditions, you meant it; and when you said that there were other protections that you wanted to keep in the bill, you meant it.

If you do, then you will vote for this resolution and send a message—democracy is a lot about messages—by talking to one another. This is the way the Congress can talk to the administration—one way. We can talk a lot of ways.

Have that communication be clear: Mr. President, leave the Affordable Care Act alone and work with us to make it better and work for all Americans, which is what you said you would do during the course of the campaign.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 20½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 26½ minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to make a couple of comments.

First of all, the President is very good to work with, and we worked in a bipartisan manner last Congress to address the Nation's opioid epidemic. That is a healthcare issue and a life-and-death issue. We passed 60 bipartisan bills that became law, and President Trump signed them.

We extended health insurance for children in America—the CHIP program, the Children's Health Insurance Program—for 10 years. That is twice as long as ever had been done before. We did that on the Energy and Commerce

Committee, and the President signed that. In my State, that is 122,700 Oregon kids and pregnant moms who are covered for certainty for 10 years under that insurance program. We reauthorized and fully funded community health centers. Now 240,000 Oregonians in 63 sites in my district get their healthcare from community health centers, Madam Speaker, and we did that at a fully funded record level.

Now, I just want to address something my friend, the majority leader who schedules bills on the floor, said about how we voted to repeal ObamaCare 65 times. What he kind of failed to mention is Democrats voted for not quite half of those, I would wager, because 25 of those votes became law, signed in large part, if not totally, by one Barack Obama, because there were problems in the Affordable Care Act or ObamaCare, however you want to describe it, that this Congress interceded on and in a bipartisan way voted to repeal “ObamaCare.” That is what the leader said, the 65 were all to repeal.

I would argue he probably voted for a bunch of those, because some of them passed unanimously in the House and Senate. Even President Obama agreed there were mistakes in ObamaCare. Our argument is we can fix America's healthcare laws going forward, and we should.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE), who is a terrific new Member of Congress and of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Madam Speaker, I hear from hardworking Montanans in my office and throughout the State that they are worried about the rising cost of healthcare. Rising premiums and increasing deductibles force Montana families to spend more and more on healthcare and less and less on clothes, books, and food for the table.

Since my first day in office, I have made lowering healthcare costs, promoting rural access to care, and protecting those with preexisting conditions my primary priorities.

Unfortunately, the Affordable Care Act has been anything but affordable. In the first 3 years of ObamaCare, premiums in Montana rose by 66 percent, and they are still rising today. ObamaCare robbed consumers of choice and gave hardworking Montanans plans they can't afford.

As we work toward solutions that make healthcare more accessible and affordable, I will keep fighting to protect those with preexisting conditions. I cosponsored the Pre-Existing Conditions Protection Act that ensures patients with preexisting conditions have access to health insurance. I also voted to ensure those same protections. We need to ensure that those with preexisting conditions have coverage.

House Democrats have said they are for protecting those with preexisting

conditions. Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, it seems they are only interested in defending them if the solution includes preserving ObamaCare or pursuing a government-run, single-payer healthcare plan.

One of the earliest votes we took in this Congress was to lock in protections for Americans with preexisting conditions. It was a simple and straightforward measure that I enthusiastically voted for. It would protect Americans with preexisting conditions period—so simple and straightforward. We should revisit that approach.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, my friends across the aisle voted down that measure, because it appears the majority values trying to score political points more than providing certainty and peace of mind to Americans with preexisting conditions.

I hope they will come to the table in good faith and choose to work with us to find a bipartisan solution to bring down healthcare costs and protect people with preexisting conditions.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I continue to yield myself such time as I may consume to say that I appreciate the gentleman's comments and share them.

This is H.R. 692, legislation that would guarantee Americans with preexisting conditions are not discriminated against. We have a lot of cosponsors on this, but we don't have a single Democrat willing to cosponsor a bill that would provide protection to Americans should this judge's decision be upheld. That is my argument today.

Why wouldn't we go ahead and schedule this, pass this, and move this to the floor so that if by some means this judge's decision is upheld, Americans with a preexisting condition would have coverage?

Meanwhile, why don't we start hearings on the Medicare for All proposal that Democrats have championed?

I have asked for those hearings from my friend. We have not seen that happen, and I know there is a certain dust-up in the press even today about alleging the Speaker's own staff person here may have been saying things or not about whether this is a good idea or not.

We ought to have a hearing on that because close to 200 million Americans might lose their insurance under this plan. So there is lots we should be doing here.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who is the Speaker of the House and who was so much the force behind making the Affordable Care Act reality.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for the leadership role he played in making America healthier in the original passage of the Affordable Care Act and protecting it from the constant sabotage that the Republicans in the Congress and in the White

House have exacted on the Affordable Care Act.

I want to pay special tribute to the outside groups, the patient advocacy groups, the Little Lobbyists, the children, so many people who spoke and told their stories at 10,000 events across the country to oppose the Republicans' constant assault on the Affordable Care Act for the first 2 years of the Trump administration, a time when the President had the White House, the House, and the Senate and could very well have passed legislation to replace the Affordable Care Act, as they said they would do.

□ 1430

They didn't replace it because they don't believe in a government role. Much about the Affordable Care Act has to do with Medicare and how we prolonged the life of Medicare and adjusted funding so that we could reduce the cost of prescription drugs for our seniors.

The Republican approach to Medicare is that it should wither on the vine, that there is no place in a free society, in a free economy, for Medicare.

Let's understand this. This is not just about the issue or the legislation of the Affordable Care Act. This is about a value system in our country, about understanding that healthcare is a right for all Americans, not just a privilege.

Yes, they could get preexisting conditions coverage—with rates that go right through the ceiling and are a gift to the insurance industry, but not to make care affordable and accessible to all.

So, here we are, in an unusual situation where the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land, and it is the responsibility of the Justice Department and the administration to defend the law of the land in court, and what are they doing? Just the opposite. Why? Because they don't believe in governance.

That is why they are happy to shut down government for any reason. They don't believe in governance. They don't believe in a public role in the well-being of the American people. They don't believe in the Affordable Care Act.

What they are trying to do is strike down every last provision of the ACA: protection for preexisting conditions, which I will come back to; bans of lifetime and annual limits; the Medicaid expansion; Medicare solvency going out for many more years; savings for seniors on prescription drug costs; and the vital premium assistance that makes healthcare coverage affordable for millions of families. It all would be ended if the President and the Republicans in Congress get their way. I hope it is not all Republicans in Congress, because I hope that some of them will care enough about their constituents and meeting their needs.

On the subject of preexisting conditions, how many times during cam-

paigns did they say, "Oh, we are for preexisting conditions," having voted it down over and over and over again?

The misrepresentations were almost embarrassing. Let's look the other way, so we don't embarrass them any further. It is almost a joke, but it is not funny if you have a preexisting condition.

What was interesting about the Affordable Care Act is it wasn't just about expanding coverage to 20 million more people. That, in itself, would be a justification. It was about the more than 150 million families who had better coverage, on a trajectory of lower cost, better benefits, no preexisting condition barrier, no lifetime limits, no annual limits, and the rest. And if your child is up to 26 years old, your child could be on your policy.

Actually, the issue of subsidizing those so that everyone could participate and it would be affordable, can we do more there? We certainly can, and we certainly will.

I want to tell this story. As I said, the outside groups were so instrumental in saving us from the Republican sabotage of the Affordable Care Act and of the good health of the American people. The outside groups held, as I said, 10,000 events around the country, telling stories. Nothing conveys more information and more understanding than people telling their own stories.

The statistics are interesting. They are staggering. But the stories are powerful, and they make a difference.

I am going to tell the story that I have told before. It is about America's families paying the price and America's children paying the price for this Republican sabotage of the Affordable Care Act.

The story I would like to tell is about Zoe Madison Lihn. Zoe was born with a congenital heart defect in May 2010. She faced the first of her three heart surgeries at just 15 hours old.

By 6 months old, Zoe was halfway through the lifetime limit that her insurer had placed on her case. She faced a grim future, not just using up her lifetime limit by preschool—her lifetime limit was used up, but her preexisting condition had not gone away—but carrying the preexisting condition that would require attention and care for the rest of her life.

Under the ACA, Zoe is protected. She will celebrate her 9th birthday next month.

But the Republicans want to take all that away, not only from Zoe but from their own constituents.

Our Democratic House majority will not let that stand. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., said: "Of all the forms of inequality, injustice in healthcare is the most shocking and inhumane because it often results in physical death."

Our colleagues are used to our colleague, Whip CLYBURN, telling that story, which I think he heard Dr. King say.

On day one of this Congress, freshman Member from Texas Congressman

COLIN ALLRED led the way. House Democrats voted to throw the full legal weight of the House against the Texas lawsuit to destroy the ACA.

We salute Congressman ALLRED for his outstanding leadership to protect America's families' health and to reach out to the Republicans to join him in doing so. But more than 190 Republicans voted to be fully complicit in that attempt to overthrow the ACA and tear away those health protections.

Now, with this resolution led again by Congressman ALLRED, we call on our Republican colleagues to go on the record once more. Either they will vote for protecting their constituents' healthcare, or they will vote for taking it away. With this vote, we will see their values and their intentions.

House Democrats will always fight to protect families' affordable and quality healthcare. We don't see it as an issue or legislation. We see it as a value—a value. It is not just about healthcare. It is about the good health of America, a source of our strength.

After we pass this resolution, we will continue to advance our transformative legislation to reverse the GOP healthcare sabotage. We will lower healthcare costs and strengthen protections for people with preexisting medical conditions.

By the way, under the Affordable Care Act, being a woman is no longer a preexisting medical condition. As a mother of five, I can attest to that being a preexisting condition.

Democrats are for the people: lowering healthcare costs by reducing the costs of prescription drugs, preserving the preexisting condition benefit, increasing wages by building the infrastructure in a green way, and cleaning up government. Lower healthcare costs, bigger paychecks, cleaner government.

Once we can reduce the role of dark, special-interest money in Washington, D.C., people will have confidence that it is possible that their voices will be heard more strongly than the voices of those who stand in the way of progress.

Three months ago from tomorrow, the Members of this institution, Democrats and Republicans, took a solemn oath to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution of the United States, after the beautiful preamble of our Nation's purpose, is Article I, the legislative branch. The legislative branch's responsibilities are spelled out in the text of the Constitution.

This body, the first branch of government, voted to protect the health and well-being of the American people. It is the law of the land. It is the responsibility of the executive branch to protect the law of the land.

They have departed from that and, therefore, departed from our oath to the Constitution to protect and defend.

If they have a better idea, we haven't seen it. On top of that, the President has said we won't see it until 2021, after the 2020 elections.

That is just not good enough, Mr. President. The needs of the American people will not stop right now because you have stopped believing in them. The needs of the American people go on, and we will continue this fight. We will fight in the Congress; we will fight in the courts; and we will fight in the court of public opinion.

I hope that we can have some Republican support from the other side of the aisle to vote to protect America's families and their healthcare and, therefore, strengthen America.

Madam Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote.

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

Madam Speaker, I hope, before the Speaker of the House leaves, she will listen to this.

I was moved by her story about a young child with a congenital heart defect, but nobody is going to lecture me about the need to protect people with preexisting conditions or the need to repeal the lifetime caps.

Let me tell you a story about a young man with a heart defect. February 7, 1994, he was born in Portland, Oregon, at Oregon Health Sciences University, with hypoplastic left heart syndrome. It would require immediate surgery and multiple surgeries to try to save his life, or a complete heart transplant.

Tragically, that little boy did not live long enough to be flown to Loma Linda Hospital in California for that heart transplant.

His name: Garrison Daniel Walden. He died the next day.

Madam Speaker, nobody is going to tell me about the need to protect people with preexisting conditions. Nobody is going to lecture me about the need to get rid of caps on lifetime. My wife and I dealt with those issues directly, and I will always stand up for people who face similar challenges.

That is not what this is about today, and you can laugh if you want.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman WALDEN for his sobering words, for his actions. He has a bill that will protect preexisting conditions. The difference about that to today: It is actually a bill; this is a resolution.

I always thought, when you ran for Congress, you would want to do more than a press release. Apparently, it is different with the new election, Madam Speaker.

"Show me your budget, show me your values." It has been said so many times on this floor. Those were the words that have been recited by Speaker PELOSI quite frequently. You could have a whole ring of videos of her just saying those exact words.

But, of course, that was before the newly minted Democratic majority quickly decided they won't be introducing a budget.

Madam Speaker, I wonder if America will question the values. It appears they won't be sharing their values with the American people. But if we had questions as to what those values were, this week removes all doubt.

Madam Speaker, we are celebrating 40 years of C-SPAN, but I wonder if those who are watching today understand what is happening. You see, on this floor, they learned early on, even from a childhood of "Schoolhouse Rock," I'm just a bill on Capitol Hill.

This is not a bill we are talking about. This isn't even a resolution that goes to the Senate. This will never end up with the President. This will do nothing for your healthcare. What will it do? It will make a great press release.

The difference, Madam Speaker, in one election is what happens on this floor. The difference is: Do you really want to protect people with preexisting conditions? Because, Madam Speaker, there is an individual who has a bill that is filed, that has cosponsorship, that is sitting in committee, that the Democrats control. They didn't mark it up. They didn't talk about it. They wrote a resolution.

To those who are watching on C-SPAN, I know what they have watched on this floor before. I know what they watched in the last Congress, that we sat and talked about not a resolution for children's health, for the CHIP program, but we wrote a bill. We extended it longer than anyone has ever dreamed possible, a full decade.

Yes, Madam Speaker, we had to do it with one side of the aisle, because the majority on the other side of the aisle didn't even write a press release supporting it. They voted "no."

To those who are watching on C-SPAN and questioning what has gone on in this House, yes, they watched it the last Congress. When we had an opioid epidemic, we wrote a bill. We didn't write a press release, and we didn't write a resolution.

□ 1445

Or when the National Institutes of Health, where you could really care about an individual with healthcare and solve a problem, we didn't write a resolution about giving them more money. We actually voted for it. We actually moved it through committee, and we had a bill and we funded \$3 billion more.

To those who are watching on C-SPAN, don't change the channel. Don't wonder about the words that were used before, "show me your budget," "show me your values"; there is no budget, and you are probably going to question their values.

Show me the bill and show me your values. I guess that is the new line we should ask, because what does a resolution do?

Maybe we can all get together and go to the Rayburn Room today and have a press release. What? Let's go further. Let's have a press conference. Let's get

really serious about a problem, and let's write a resolution for the floor, because that problem will still exist.

A lot of people put a lot of effort into running for office. A lot of people make a lot of promises, and Americans expect legislation to solve them, not a resolution.

You know what is most ironic today? If they wanted to solve the problem, there are options there.

If we are worried about a lawsuit, if we are worried about preexisting conditions, go to Congressman WALDEN's bill. Let's bring that to the floor. It is not a resolution. We will have to vote for something different. We will have to actually vote for a bill.

It is interesting that, on the other side of the aisle, Madam Speaker, I heard people were concerned the Republicans were concerned about what ObamaCare has done, that premiums have risen, that the promise we were given that, if you liked your healthcare, you could keep it. For millions of Americans, that proved to be a lie and false.

We are not the only ones who believe that has been a failure. If that were not true, why do half the Members on the other side of the aisle cosponsor a bill that says Medicare for All? They must believe it is not working either.

Or maybe they want to take more healthcare from individuals. I am not quite sure. The way I look at Medicare for All, it has got a great name. Anybody who is 65, they should get Medicare, and I will stand with them. But they shouldn't take away 158 million Americans' private health insurance, because that is exactly what they do.

Why don't they make another promise to the American public and deny them their healthcare?

Or why don't they even go further? For everyone who is on Medicare Advantage, that goes away as well. Or for everyone who is on Medicare itself, you are going to bankrupt it.

You have got that in legislation. That is not a press release. Why don't we bring that to the floor or committee? Why don't we debate that?

And, Madam Speaker, when I sat on this floor and I heard the words used from the other side of the aisle, from the leader of that side of the aisle to say Republicans don't care about Medicare, that was a lie. Medicare part D; you know, when you talk to seniors, you know what they are most concerned about? The price of prescription drugs.

Or for those C-SPAN viewers who have more than 40 years to watch it, Republicans were in the majority. Do you know what they did? They didn't bring a press release down with a resolution. They brought a bill. They created Medicare part D to lower prescription drug prices. It has been one of the most effective programs around.

And do you know what we had to do? We had to do it alone because we passed legislation. We didn't pass a press release.

Madam Speaker, shame, shame on an individual who would lie to the American public about their own healthcare, lie about another side, but, more importantly, say they care about Americans' health and bring a resolution.

I want to see everybody go home this weekend, go back to their constituents and tell them what they did about preexisting conditions. They passed a resolution when they could have passed a bill.

I happen to be the leader of the Republicans, and I stand here in this well, in this body, and tell you we support preexisting conditions. I tell you to bring his bill up, Congressman WALDEN's, and we will support this bill on this floor.

We won't support shams. We won't support press releases, because we care about Americans' health. And we will not support kicking 158 million off their healthcare.

I know half the body on the other side has cosponsored that. That is even further than I have seen before. They want to end Medicare Advantage.

When are they going to say that to the seniors? And that is not a press release. That is something they are really going after.

If they are serious about their words, if they believe they care and are concerned about a court case because maybe they wrote a bill that isn't constitutional, they could have solved it today.

You know what we could be talking about today? They own the majority. They control the floor.

What is most interesting, the majority of bills that they brought to the floor in this new majority—they have brought more bills and resolutions to the floor than even passed the committee, but they sat here and told us it is for the people.

They are about to have 100 days, but it is 100 days of disappointment. I have never thought a majority would want to claim how many press conferences or how many resolutions they could pass on the floor, but they are setting a record. They are setting a record while they are failing the American public.

Do you know what they could be doing right now? If they really cared about fixing our healthcare system and protecting Americans with preexisting conditions, they could do one of the three things in the face of this lawsuit. And let's not lie to the American public. They could repeal the individual mandate. Boom, the lawsuit is gone.

They could reimpose the penalty. They voted for it before, so why don't they vote for it again?

Or they could put a bill on the floor that explicitly protects preexisting conditions. The difference is that is a bill, not a resolution.

Maybe if they had a lot of power, maybe if they really felt strongly about this, make a resolution that even goes to the Senate so the Senate can talk about it, too.

Or if they really care, make a bill. Write a bill. Don't write a press release. Don't lie to the American public. They are smarter than this.

You know, the words I have heard today, the line that will sit up to speak, not one of them will use the term of a bill; not one of them can look the American public in the eye and say they are protecting preexisting conditions. But what they can say, Madam Speaker, is they are denying a bill that would protect preexisting conditions to come to the floor because the Republicans offered it.

This is an honorable floor. This is a floor that makes history. This is a floor that has changed and shown the values of America to lead the world, but it has not done that by doing resolutions. It is a shame that we are trying to put a resolution on the floor.

Is this why you ran? Is this why you craved to become the majority?

I didn't hear any of my constituents say, "I want you to go there"—because I heard this language. I heard this language on the other side, Madam Speaker, just from the last speaker: We will fight in court. We will fight on the floor. We will fight in the public's opinion.

Do you know what fighting means if you want to succeed? Put a bill. I didn't know fighting was writing a press release. Don't take America's time and don't waste it, because that is exactly what they are doing.

Do you want to tell stories? Go tell the stories to the individuals who are concerned about this. Go tell those individuals you did nothing to solve it. Go tell those individuals you denied a bill to come to the floor that could solve the problem.

Be honest, but stop wasting our time. And if you don't want to lead, get out of the way, because we will definitely solve it.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD), who is the vice chair of our Health Subcommittee.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, I rise to support H. Res. 271. This resolution, I would say to the minority leader, is a statement. It is a statement by Democrats of our position on the Affordable Care Act.

It is not surprising to me that they would not want the facts to be before the American people. That is what this resolution is about.

On day one of his administration, President Obama announced he would address the critical need for affordable healthcare for millions of uninsured Americans.

He reminded us that nearly 50 million Americans were uninsured. Low-income, childless adults could not benefit from Medicaid.

Millions of seniors were not fully benefiting from prescription drug benefits under Medicare part D because of the doughnut hole.

He told us that parents needed insurance on their children to age 26.

And finally, Madam Speaker, President Obama stressed that insurance companies were increasing premiums and not providing quality coverage, and they were discriminating based on preexisting conditions, high copays, and higher deductibles.

After much debate, we passed ObamaCare. It has made a difference in health accessibility and health outcomes. It is not a perfect solution, but it has impacted millions of lives.

We want to make ObamaCare better; we want to make it more affordable. I would say to my friend from Oregon, with bipartisan cooperation, we can do that, and we can do it effectively.

But Republicans have repeatedly tried to legislate ObamaCare out of existence with no replacement. This Congress has repeatedly said "no" to any repeal.

On February 26 of last year, Republican plaintiffs filed a lawsuit in the Northern District of Texas contending that the minimum essential coverage provision is unconstitutional, and, since Republicans removed the mandate penalty, the entire law is unconstitutional. That was their claim.

Three months later, Attorney General Sessions announced that the Trump administration wouldn't defend the minimum essential coverage claim and that the Trump administration would argue that preexisting conditions protections should be invalidated. However, the Trump administration said that the remaining parts of the law could be severed or separated and the law could remain intact.

The Court heard the case and, as we all know, the Affordable Care Act was declared to be unconstitutional. It is now on appeal.

On March 28 of this year, President Trump changed his position. On appeal, he is now aligning with the Republican plaintiffs and thumbing his nose, Madam Speaker, thumbing his nose again at this Congress.

The Affordable Care Act, as the Speaker said a few moments ago, is the law of the land, and Republicans are refusing to defend it.

Protection of preexisting conditions is the law of the land, Mr. President.

The final insult came this morning when President Trump confirmed that he will ask the higher courts to throw out the entire law and that he will have a replacement ready the day after the election. I am outraged, and so should the American people be.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE) from the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, we stand here today with another in a series of weekly messaging bills. I wonder what, next week, we will deal with. I am sure it will be another whipsaw response to the headlines of the day.

If you truly want to protect people with preexisting conditions, as Republicans do, bring forth Mr. WALDEN's

bill. It has teeth. In the event that this lawsuit is upheld and the Affordable Care Act is unconstitutional, it will protect people with preexisting conditions.

The Speaker, Ms. PELOSI, a minute ago said that the Republicans' position on healthcare was a joke. Well, I will tell you what is a joke, and that is to call the Affordable Care Act successful.

The promises on which the Affordable Care Act were based were that we would cover all Americans; that the premiums would go down; that if you like your doctor, you could keep your doctor; and that if you like your insurance policy, you could keep it.

Clearly, almost every existing insurance policy was declared invalid. You could only keep your doctor if he is in your plan and your hospital. Premiums have gone from an average of \$225 in 2013, just before the Affordable Care Act was enacted, to \$475, average cost for an individual policy today, almost a 250 percent increase.

What did we get for that?

Before the Affordable Care Act, 85 percent of Americans were covered. Before the Affordable Care Act, 85 percent of Americans were covered. At the peak, after the Affordable Care Act, last year, 91 percent of the Americans were covered. We covered 6 percent more people, mostly because we gave them insurance policies with the Medicare expansion. We covered 6 percent more people.

But what was the cost of that? The 85 percent that were already covered had to pay 250 percent more for their health insurance. That is completely absurd.

And don't lecture me about people with preexisting conditions. I have a son who had a congenital heart defect. I had a son who, as a 7-month-old child, was in a car wreck and had a brain injury, both preexisting conditions.

□ 1500

Throughout their life, they were covered. For a brief period of time, South Carolina, like almost every other State in the country, had protections for preexisting conditions before the Affordable Care Act. Under the health insurance pool in South Carolina, they had to pay 30 percent more.

It irritated me as a father that my children had to pay 30 percent more for their health insurance, but guess what? Under the Affordable Care Act, instead of having to pay 30 percent more, they have to pay 250 percent more and their deductibles have tripled.

You call that a success? In what world is that a success?

Republicans want to protect people with preexisting conditions. We have voted repeatedly to do it. We have bills out there that will do it.

Stop with the messaging, stop with the lies, and let's move forward and do something that actually works. Let's move forward and protect people with preexisting conditions in the event that this law is declared unconstitutional.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I would just point out Gallup just announced in a survey, 65 million Americans, 20 percent, put off treatment this last year and borrowed \$88 billion to cover their healthcare costs. So we know there are problems out there we need to address.

Mr. Speaker, could I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARBAJAL). The gentleman from Oregon has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 22½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the chair of our Consumer Protection & Commerce Subcommittee.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, clearly, we have hit a nerve with the Republicans on the Affordable Care Act, which they opposed before it began, have been opposing it for 9 years, promising to come up with some sort of a repeal and replace, never being able to do it, and now standing up here and saying life was better before the Affordable Care Act. Amazing. People with preexisting conditions love the Affordable Care Act.

Why are we here in the majority today? Because the American people came to understand that before the Affordable Care Act, children born with preexisting conditions from the day of birth were not able to be covered by healthcare, that there were limits in how much insurance companies would pay per year or per lifetime caps, and making families live in fear of disaster and financial chaos.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the Trump administration and their decision to support the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, not in the Congress, but now in the courts.

They couldn't defeat it here. They tried when they had the majority in both Houses and could not repeal it.

When I came here, being a woman was essentially a preexisting condition. Women paid more for healthcare, sometimes 40 percent more, just because we are women. Pregnancy was very rarely covered by insurance, and now women are covered for those things like preventive services, mammograms, pregnancy.

The Affordable Care Act has let people 26 years old stay on their parents' policies.

No wonder the American people have completely turned around and understood the sham that the Republicans were offering and support the Affordable Care Act.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Oregon for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to this debate as it has gone on, and the bottom line is, if you listen to the Democrats, you would think that they had stuck it to the insurance industry with all of the rules and all of the laws that they passed.

As we talk about values, I thought I would give you a few values.

Aetna in 2010 was trading at \$27.39 a share. In 2018, it was \$187 a share.

You know who you stuck it to? You stuck it to the American citizens. You took the money out of our pockets and you put it into the hands of the insurance industry.

If you don't want to talk about Aetna, let's talk about United Healthcare: \$29 a share in 2010; in 2018, \$246.54 a share. How did that happen?

If the American citizens were getting a square deal before the legislation that you passed, that you could only pass if the insurance industry didn't object, how did United's stock go from \$29 a share to \$246 a share?

If that's not enough, how about Humana: \$29 a share in 2010 to \$246 a share in 2018. How did this happen?

This happened because you left the insurance industry exempt from the antitrust laws of the country.

Now, how did that work out for the American citizen? We got a mandate by the Democratic Party to purchase a product from an industry that is exempt from the antitrust laws of the country.

Now, there are flaws in the legislation that you passed. I am amazed at your refusal to accept that.

You can't even buy an Affordable Care Act contract today. Do you realize the next time you can buy it is January 1 of next year?

If you are uninsured right now—you all have been telling the American public, if you are uninsured and you go to the doctor and the doctor says you have got cancer, you can get a contract the next day. It is just not true. You can't get it until January 1 of 2020.

It is a poorly worded piece of legislation. Regardless of the intent, it is a poorly worded piece of legislation that moved money from the individual citizens of this country to the pockets of the insurance industry, and it needs to be rewritten.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the leadership of Congressman COLIN ALLRED, who has been an incredible advocate for his community in Dallas and for millions of Americans whose healthcare President Trump and our Republican colleagues are trying to take away.

President Trump has claimed over and over again that he wants to protect

access to healthcare, and he has even announced recently that he has a secret plan that he will make available to the American people after the 2020 election.

But as is true with any con man and charlatan, when you dig a little past the surface of the President's words, the facts tell a much different story.

Last week, the President's Justice Department asked a court to eliminate every single protection and benefit that the Affordable Care Act has provided.

Democrats won the majority because the American people understand that we are fighting to protect their healthcare. And now Republicans have moved away from the Congress to try to take away healthcare from millions and millions of Americans in the courts.

Let's be clear about what this means. President Trump wants to repeal the caps on out-of-pocket costs, he wants to eliminate the prescription drug savings for seniors and end the Medicaid expansion.

If he succeeds in this litigation, it will be legal for insurance companies to limit the amount of coverage someone can get in their lifetime, it will deny access to people with preexisting conditions, and it will allow insurance companies to sell junk plans that offer no real coverage for the American people.

Democrats have a better plan, and the minority leader will be happy to know there are actually bills to do it. We are going to strengthen the protections for people with preexisting conditions, we are going to expand access to insurance for more working men and women, and we are going to bring down the costs of prescription drugs with bills like my legislation, the CREATES Act, to allow more generic drugs into the marketplace.

Look, we take a lot of complicated votes in this Chamber. This is not one of them.

This vote is very simple. A vote in favor of this resolution is a vote for access to quality, affordable healthcare. A vote against it is a vote for the interests of insurance companies at the expense of working people.

I know where members of the Democratic Caucus stand. We ran on this, we are committed to it. We are fighting every day to protect the Affordable Care Act and to build on its success and to improve it.

The Republicans' last vote was TrumpCare, which took away health coverage from 23 million Americans, and that is why they were rejected in the midterms.

People want Members of Congress to stand up and fight to protect their access to quality, affordable healthcare, to protect their access to coverage for preexisting conditions, to drive down the costs of prescription drugs, and to end these junk plans that, in fact, don't provide coverage to the American people.

This resolution is a strong statement of our position on this.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues, don't be afraid of the resolution, don't be afraid that it is going to expose that you actually don't support efforts to protect access to healthcare, because you have an easy solution to that problem: vote for it. Show the American people you care about the quality of their healthcare, you want to expand access, strengthen the Affordable Care Act, and support this excellent resolution.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, President Trump's Department of Justice letter seeking the invalidation of the entire Affordable Care Act by the Fifth Circuit is nothing short of self-sabotage.

The Trump position in *Texas v. United States* would deny coverage for those with preexisting conditions, dismantle protections on out-of-pocket costs and the ban on annual and lifetime caps, and the return of the notorious donut hole for seniors on expensive medications would come forward again.

I support this resolution. It is important that we band together to protect the Affordable Care Act and its protections against junk insurance policies.

The American people deserve to know whether their Representative is going to fight for them and vote to condemn the DOJ's actions or if they will simply fall in line behind this President on his thoughtless and heartless mission to destroy access to the healthcare system for millions of Americans.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. WEXTON).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 271, a resolution condemning the Trump administration's legal campaign to take away America's healthcare.

Here is what healthcare means: it is the freedom and security to live your life the way you choose. It can be the difference between financial security and bankruptcy, or life and death.

Donald Trump and congressional Republicans want to use the courts to take health insurance away from 21 million Americans. They want to eliminate protections for the more than 133 million Americans with preexisting conditions.

Now, the Affordable Care Act is not perfect, but never in American history has the uninsured rate been lower than it is today.

But rather than be honest about what is working, rather than coming to the table to work across the aisle and

fix what is wrong, Republicans are fighting tooth and nail to overturn the ACA, with no plan except one that was so bad, they couldn't pass it when they controlled both houses of Congress.

Meanwhile, the Democratic majority is proposing real solutions and smart healthcare policies that will lower costs and expand coverage.

The contrast couldn't be more clear. Democrats want quality, affordable health coverage for every American, and Republicans don't.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on this resolution.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), our resident pharmacist on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act is not working for too many Americans.

I welcome all efforts to lower costs, to increase choice, and to protect those with preexisting conditions.

Remember, the very first thing, the very first floor vote we pushed as Republicans this Congress was to solidify protections for those with preexisting conditions. It was the first thing we did. We did it right out of the gate.

While Republicans have stood ready to work on lowering costs and increasing choices, so far the Democrats, the Democratic majority, have only tried to double down on the ACA.

On the Energy and Commerce Committee, the only solution we have seen from Democrats are partisan bills that throw billions of unpaid-for dollars at a broken system, at a failed experiment.

If my Democratic colleagues were serious about helping patients, they would work with us on reforms to lower costs and increase choices.

□ 1515

The fact is we could vote on independent legislation that protects patients with preexisting conditions. The fact is, if my Democratic colleagues were serious about their concerns over this lawsuit, they could, legislatively, end this lawsuit once and for all. We could vote to repeal the individual mandate. That would immediately invalidate the lawsuit. They could vote to reinstate the individual mandate penalty. That would also stop the lawsuit in its tracks.

But, instead, we are here to vote on a resolution about politics, not solutions. It is clear that Democrats would much rather score political points than to protect the ACA.

They would have surprised me 2 years ago, but now the Democratic Party seems to have already moved on from the Affordable Care Act. Instead of truly working on improvements to the ACA, Democrats are focused on their \$32 trillion plan to kick 152 million people off their insurance for their one-size-fits-all government-run healthcare plan.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my Democratic friends to stop the politics and to work with us to protect those with preexisting conditions, to lower healthcare costs, and to increase choices for patients.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire about the amount of time that remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 14½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oregon has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON).

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn this administration's latest attempt to do away with the healthcare provided by the Affordable Care Act.

The Department of Justice's decision to go after the healthcare of millions of Americans by seeking a ruling that the Affordable Care Act is unconstitutional underscores their belief that healthcare should be a luxury reserved for the privileged few, only now we have moved from repeal and replace to just flat-out repeal. I could not disagree more strongly.

In my home State of Pennsylvania, the ability to get health insurance regardless of chronic illness has saved countless lives. Tens of thousands of my constituents have gotten healthcare for the first time under the Affordable Care Act. Those with preexisting conditions have received peace of mind, and many, myself included, have been able to keep their children on their health plans even as they become adults themselves.

The administration's callous decision to continue undermining the Affordable Care Act endangers my constituents, just as it endangers the lives of Americans in every district of our country.

We were chosen to serve in this House to protect Americans who need us most, and that means protecting their healthcare. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "yes" on this important resolution.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor and privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the Republican whip of the House, and an incredibly important member of our committee.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on healthcare.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution, which has nothing to do with actually helping improve healthcare, the costs, especially, that so many millions of people are enduring, because the Affordable Care Act is anything but affordable.

Mr. Speaker, let's keep in mind what this resolution is about. It is not about changing any healthcare policy. It doesn't do that. It has been made clear. It is attempting just to try to take cheap shots at the President while di-

verting attention away from what this lawsuit that you see moving through the courts is really all about.

Mr. Speaker, if the healthcare law that my friends on the other side of the aisle rushed through Congress and passed is held unconstitutional, they have nobody to blame but themselves. Let's keep in mind—and they want you to forget this, Mr. Speaker—and let's go back to those days when they rammed this bill through and the infamous statement: You have to pass the bill to find out what is in it.

Nobody read that bill who voted for it. We said back then that it was unconstitutional.

And, oh, by the way, not only was it that, but it has actually led to dramatic increases in cost for families. So someone with a preexisting condition—whom we want to protect, by the way, Mr. Speaker. But we don't just want to protect the fact that they shouldn't be able to have costs go up. We want to help them lower the costs for health insurance and lower their premiums.

So many millions of Americans are not only facing double-digit increases, but people with preexisting conditions, in many cases, are facing a \$10,000 deductible, so they have no access to healthcare, Mr. Speaker.

Why don't we focus on the underlying problem?

We on the Republican side support protecting people with preexisting conditions, but we also want to lower their premiums and lower their deductibles. The other side wants to see their costs continue to go up. That is the biggest difference between the two sides.

We ought to focus on lowering premiums. Let families make those decisions, not unelected bureaucrats in Washington. That is what we ought to be focused on. This resolution falls short.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, too often, we forget what our healthcare system was like before we passed the Affordable Care Act.

Before the ACA, healthcare costs were skyrocketing; insurers could deny people coverage if they had a preexisting condition; policies did not have to provide essential benefits; and people were losing their insurance at alarming rates. Before the Affordable Care Act, insurers could place annual and lifetime caps on insurance coverage.

Today, the Affordable Care Act ensures that 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions can have access to the healthcare peace of mind and financial security that comes with quality, affordable health coverage.

Now, we have heard a lot about what we can do to make things better. We have heard about a bill that just protects those with preexisting conditions. The problem with that, Mr. Speaker, is, if you allow people to wait until

they get sick before they buy insurance, they will wait until they get sick before they buy insurance. Those buying insurance are, on average, sicker, and the costs tend to go up. Fewer people can afford it. The healthy people drop out, and the costs go up.

There is a name for this cycle. It is called the death spiral. Every time they try to protect those with preexisting conditions without the supports of the Affordable Care Act, there is a death spiral out of control.

In Washington State, for 3 years, they tried that. In the 3 years, nobody could buy insurance.

New York was in the death spiral when we passed the Affordable Care Act. When we passed the Affordable Care Act, the costs for individual insurance dropped more than 50 percent.

So we know we just can't protect those with preexisting conditions without the supports and tax credits available under the Affordable Care Act. But we do know what a replacement plan looks like.

The Republicans voted on such a thing. It was actually evaluated by the Congressional Budget Office, finding that, if the bill passed, about 20-some million fewer people would have insurance.

They talk about costs. Under their plan, the costs would go up 20 percent the first year. Insurance policies would not have to cover essential benefits, as they do now, and those with preexisting conditions would lose many of their protections.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and support people with preexisting conditions so that they can have access to the care they need to live healthy and fulfilling lives.

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I think we have had a very important debate today. I just wish that that debate had occurred on H.R. 692. This is the legislation that we should put in place in case the decision that the judge made in the Texas case that said ObamaCare was unconstitutional is upheld. If that is upheld, then there is going to be this problem, this gap that everybody is talking about.

This is an honest attempt to make sure there is a safety net for people with preexisting conditions, H.R. 692. You are welcome to cosponsor it. I wish we would move it. I always think maybe it is the old Eagle Scout in me that you are always supposed to be prepared and ready and that you help people.

I will tell you, Republicans also believed we should take care of people with preexisting conditions. Republicans also supported getting rid of lifetime caps on insurance policies and many of the other things you have heard about today, and we will continue to.

But we also led the effort to deal with the Nation's opioid crisis, made it

bipartisan, brought it to the floor, and it became law.

When seniors couldn't afford their medicines, it was Republicans, under George W. Bush, who put Medicare part D into law, and we had to fight Democrats to do that. Then seniors didn't have to go to Mexico or Canada or somewhere to get their drugs anymore. It has been highly successful. The costs are 40 percent or more less than what the Congressional Budget Office said it would be, and premiums have remained low. Now we need to do some modernization there.

Republicans also passed the longest extension of children's health insurance in the history of the country: 10 years, fully funded. Democrats voted against it over and over again on this House floor less than a year ago.

Community health centers, an incredibly important part of our network, I led the effort to get them funded at the highest levels ever. That funding is going to run out, but we don't have a plan from the Democrats yet. We are told we are not even going to have a budget on how to go forward. I think we can find bipartisan consensus there.

We are working together right now and will have a markup tomorrow in the Energy and Commerce Committee to address the drug issue and the cost of drugs. As I said earlier, I can't remember a President of the United States more engaged in getting better prices for consumers than this one. Donald Trump has led the country in an initiative to drive down the cost of drugs, and Congress is responding in a bipartisan way, and that is a good thing. We should do that here, Mr. Speaker.

The resolution before us today, if you are just watching or listening to my colleagues, is just that. It is a resolution. It will never leave the House because it is only for the House. It is the taxpayer-funded equivalent of a press release; that is all it is.

And we know that there are Members who never have accepted the outcome of the 2016 election, and no matter what the President says or does, they want to do a resolution or attack him. Yet the American people want us to come here and get our work done and stand up for them.

So rather than that resolution, I genuinely wish that H.R. 692, a bill that would protect people with pre-existing conditions, was what we were voting on today. We stand ready to work with Democrats to get that done and provide that safety net that these Americans need.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, before I talk about H. Res. 271 which is before the House today, I want to respond to my ranking member's statements about H.R. 692. This is the bill that he repeatedly has mentioned on the Republican side.

I want to point out that the Republican bill, H.R. 692, under that legislation, you could theoretically buy insurance if you have a preexisting condition; but it is very deceptive because the bill will still allow insurers to set premiums based on health status, resulting in individuals with preexisting conditions being charged substantially more or priced out of the market.

The Republican bill does not include critical ACA consumer protections, including community rating, essential health benefits requirements, and annual or lifetime prohibitions. Basically, the GOP bill would allow insurance companies to once again discriminate against 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions. They would be priced out of coverage because they wouldn't be healthy enough. Individuals with preexisting conditions like cancer or diabetes could face extremely unaffordable premiums and, again, be priced out of the care that they desperately need.

The GOP bill would also put a significant financial burden on older Americans, while doing very little to lower costs for young adults. This Republican bill leaves Americans worse off and does nothing, really, to protect people with preexisting conditions, in reality.

Now, if I could speak again in support of H. Res. 271, which is before us today, that condemns the Trump administration's legal campaign to take away Americans' healthcare.

As you know, last Monday night, the Justice Department filed a brief saying that they wanted the court to repeal the Affordable Care Act in its entirety.

□ 1530

The Trump administration's announcement last week that it would actively support this frivolous lawsuit striking down the entire Affordable Care Act shows the President's shameful disregard for the health and well-being of the American people, in my opinion.

If the Trump administration got its way in court and the ACA is struck down, tens of millions of Americans would lose their health coverage overnight. Hundreds of millions would immediately lose protections for pre-existing conditions, and we would be sent barreling back to the days of lifetime limits and price discrimination against women based on their gender.

Republicans had their chance to repeal and replace the ACA, and the American people overwhelmingly rejected their plan. And now by refusing to defend the ACA in court, the Trump administration is asking the courts to do what President Trump and the Republican Congress could not do, and that is repeal the ACA and all the protections that it includes for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle repeatedly claim that they stand for protections for people with preexisting conditions and for other protections in-

cluded in the Affordable Care Act. Well, now is your chance to show it.

We have an opportunity today to send a clear message that we will not support this reckless attack that imperils the well-being of millions of hardworking Americans.

The time for empty promises has expired. It is time to act. The Trump Administration is determined to destroy protections for preexisting conditions and to tear down every last benefit guaranteed by the Affordable Care Act, and today's vote is an opportunity to stand up in solidarity against this heartless attack.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 271, to send a clear message: We will not stand idly by while the Trump administration wages an all-out assault on Americans' healthcare.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments on my bill, H.R. 692, known as the Pre-Existing Conditions Protection Act of 2019.

As we've made clear today, Republicans have long believed that pre-existing condition protections are an essential part of our nation's health care markets.

These assurances give patients and families who have suffered from or are battling pre-existing conditions peace of mind. As a nation, we will not go back to the days when patients could be denied care or charged more than their peers because of their pre-existing condition.

The Pre-Existing Conditions Protection Act has 45 cosponsors and would lock in existing protections for patients.

It aims to achieve three important goals for patients: guaranteed access to coverage; a prohibition on pre-existing condition benefit exclusions; and, a ban on premium rating based on health status.

This bill reaffirms the commitment by House Republicans to uphold these three safeguards, commonly defined as the principle pre-existing condition protections in Obamacare.

And we can build on this foundation if necessary to adapt to potential changes in law or decisions from the courts in order to ensure our citizens who have pre-existing conditions are protected.

In the first few months of the new Congress, Democrats have already voted down multiple attempts to lock in a commitment to legislate on pre-existing condition protections. Instead, they'd rather score political points on an issue that we actually have agreement on.

This bill represents the desire of House Republicans to maintain these crucial protections for patients.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the first registered nurse elected to Congress, I can attest to the importance of the Affordable Care Act in improving our country's health care, especially for the 133 million Americans living with pre-existing conditions—of which 11.5 million live in my home state of Texas.

Today, we bring a resolution to the floor that reaffirms our support of the Affordable Care Act and defends its protections. It is clear as day that this president and his administration will stop at nothing to tear down the very law that has expanded critical health care coverage to millions of Americans.

I urge my Republican colleagues to join us to protect the health care of all our constituents. We cannot stand silent when our health care system is thrown into chaos.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 271, Condemning the Trump Administration's Legal Campaign to Take Away Americans' Health Care.

Last week, the Trump Administration launched a monstrous attack on our nation's health care system and on the people of our country when it was announced that they would be joining the 18 Republican state attorneys general in support of the *Texas vs. United States* lawsuit to strike down the entirety of the Affordable Care Act. By joining this lawsuit, the Trump Administration demonstrated they do not believe Americans should have access to comprehensive, affordable health insurance or that the 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions should be protected.

I've already heard from many constituents who are frightened about losing protections for their preexisting conditions, panicking about being able to afford their medical bills, and worried about where they can go to get their health insurance if this lawsuit succeeds.

For those enrolled in the Affordable Care Act, if this lawsuit is successful, 13 million Americans who gained health insurance through the Medicaid expansion will lose their health insurance; the 9 million Americans who rely on tax credits to help them afford their insurance plan will no longer be able to afford their insurance; and the 130 million patients with preexisting conditions could be denied coverage or charged more.

Since the Affordable Care Act was signed into law over 20 million Americans have gained health insurance that requires coverage for preexisting conditions; disallows charging sick consumers more; allows children to stay on their parent's health insurance until the age of 26; and provides coverage for preventive health services with no cost sharing.

The insurance reforms of the ACA protect every American, including those who get their health insurance through their employer. Every insurance plan today is required to cover ten basic Essential Health Benefits; there are no longer lifetime limits; and women can no longer be charged more because they are females. All of this is at risk if this lawsuit succeeds, and the Trump Administration demonstrated their total disregard for the consequences of its actions on the people of our country last week.

On the first day of the 116th Congress the House voted to intervene in this lawsuit on behalf of the tens of millions of Americans who rely on and have benefited from the ACA. Today, we renew our promise to the American people that we will fight this Administration's sabotage and do everything to protect, defend and improve the ACA.

The resolution we're considering today condemns the *Texas vs. United States* lawsuit and the Trump Administration's recent actions to intervene to seek the invalidation of every provision of the ACA. It calls on the Department of Justice to protect Americans with preexisting conditions, cease their efforts to destroy access to affordable health care, and reverse its position in the court case. I urge my colleagues to support this timely and critically important resolution we are considering today

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong and unequivocal support for H. Res. 271 as well as the underlying resolution and ask all Members to join me in supporting this resolution which condemns the Trump Administration's ongoing legal campaign to take away health care from more than 100 million Americans and to make health care dramatically less affordable for those fortunate enough to be insured.

I thank Congressman ALLRED, my Texas congressional delegation colleague, for introducing this important resolution.

As a new member of Congress who unseated an opponent who voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act dozens of times, the gentlemen from Texas knows first-hand how important and critical access to affordable, high quality, accessible health care available to everyone, including those with pre-existing conditions, to the well-being of American families.

Because of the passage of the Affordable Care Act, the national uninsured rate has been slashed from 14.8 in 2012 to 8.8 percent in 2018.

Texas has long led the nation in rate of uninsured so the comparable rates are 24.6 and 15 percent, respectively.

Mr. Speaker, I distinctly recall a candidate for the highest public office in the land saying "Obamacare is a disaster" and appealing for voters to support him with this question:

"What have you got to lose?"

The question deserves a response so I hope that person, who occupies the Oval Office, is listening to my answer.

The Affordable Care Act, or "Obamacare," has been an unmitigated success to the more than 20 million Americans who for the first time now have the security and peace of mind that comes with affordable, accessible, high quality health care.

Mr. Speaker, Tip O'Neill used to say that "all politics is local" so let me share with you how Obamacare has dramatically changed lives for the better for the people in my home state of Texas.

1.874 million Texans who have gained coverage since the ACA was implemented could lose their coverage if the ACA is entirely or partially repealed or invalidated.

1.1 million Texans who purchased high quality Marketplace coverage now stand to lose their coverage if *Texas v. United States*, No. 4:18-cv-00167-O (N.D. Tex.), the lawsuit brought by Republican Governors, and now wholeheartedly supported and aided by the Trump Administration were to succeed.

913,177 individuals Texans who received financial assistance to purchase Marketplace coverage in 2016, averaging \$271 per individual, are at risk of having coverage become unaffordable if the Republican Congress eliminates the premium tax credits.

1.1 million Texans could have insurance if all states adopted the ACA's Medicaid expansion; these individuals will not be able to gain coverage if the Republican Congress eliminates the Medicaid expansion.

508,000 kids in Texas who have gained coverage since the ACA was implemented are also at risk of having their coverage rolled back.

205,000 young adult Texans who were able to stay on a parent's health insurance plan thanks to the ACA now stand to lose coverage if the Republican Congress eliminates the requirement that insurers allow children to stay on their parents' plans until age 26.

646,415 Texans who received cost-sharing reductions to lower out-of-pocket costs such as deductibles, co-pays, and coinsurance are now at risk of having healthcare become unaffordable if the Republican Congress eliminates cost-sharing reductions.

10.28 million Texans who now have private health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductibles stand to lose this access if the Republican Congress eliminates ACA provisions requiring health insurers to cover important preventive services without cost-sharing.

Women in Texas who can now purchase insurance for the same price as men are at risk of being charged more for insurance if the ACA's ban on gender rating in the individual and small group markets is invalidated.

Before the ACA, women paid up to 56 percent more than men for their health insurance.

Roughly 4.5 million Texans who have pre-existing health conditions are at risk of having their coverage rescinded, being denied coverage, or being charged significantly more for coverage if the ACA's ban on pre-existing conditions is struck down.

346,750 Texas seniors who have saved an average of \$1,057 each as a result of closing the Medicare prescription drug "donut hole" gap in coverage stand to lose this critical help going forward.

1.75 million Texas seniors who have received free preventive care services thanks to ACA provisions requiring coverage of annual wellness visits and eliminating cost-sharing for many recommended preventive services covered by Medicare Part B, such as cancer screenings, are at risk of losing access to these services if congressional Republicans go forward with their plan to repeal the ACA.

The Affordable Care Act works and has made a life-affirming difference in the lives of millions of Americans, in Texas and across the country.

This is what happens when a visionary president cares enough to work with a committed and empathetic Congress to address the real issues facing the American people.

You want to know why the American people have Obamacare?

It is because Obama cared.

The same cannot be said about this Republican president and congressional Republicans who have made careers of attacking and undermining the Affordable Care Act's protections and benefits for the American people.

I urge all Members to vote for H. Res. 271 and send a powerful message to the President and the American people that this House will not stand idly by as this Administration tries to take away health care from more than 130 million persons.

Instead, this House will resist by all constitutional and appropriate means, including opposing this Administration in the courts and by passing the "Protecting Pre-Existing Conditions and Making Health Care More Affordable Act of 2019," which will lower health insurance premiums with strengthened and expanded affordability assistance by:

1. strengthening tax credits in the Marketplace to lower Americans' health insurance premiums and allows more middle-class individuals and families to qualify for subsidies;

2. ensuring that families who don't have an offer of affordable coverage from an employer can still qualify for subsidies in the Marketplace; and,

3. providing funding for reinsurance, to help with high-cost claims, improve Marketplace stability, and prevent the Administration's sabotage from raising premiums.

The "Protecting Pre-Existing Conditions and Making Health Care More Affordable Act of 2019," will also strengthen protections for people with pre-existing conditions by curtailing the Administration's efforts to give states waivers to undermine protections for people with pre-existing conditions and weaken standards for essential health benefits.

These improper waivers leave consumers with less comprehensive plans that do not cover needed services, such as prescription drugs, maternity care and substance use disorder treatment.

Another way the "Protecting Pre-Existing Conditions and Making Health Care More Affordable Act of 2019," protects consumers is by prohibiting insurance companies from selling junk health insurance plans that do not provide coverage for essential medical treatments and drugs, or cover people with pre-existing medical conditions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and the preamble.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on adoption of the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

**REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1585, VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2019**

Ms. SCANLON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-32) on the resolution (H. Res. 281) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1585) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

**LOUISE AND BOB SLAUGHTER POST OFFICE**

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 540) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 770 Ayrault Road in Fairport, New York, as the "Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 540

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. LOUISE AND BOB SLAUGHTER POST OFFICE.**

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 770 Ayrault Road in Fairport, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 540, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 770 Ayrault Road in Fairport, New York, as the "Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office".

Representative Louise Slaughter was a groundbreaking Member of this House. She served here for 32 years. She was the first female chairwoman of the Rules Committee, and she coauthored the landmark Violence Against Women Act. She was also a dear friend.

Born in Harlan County, Kentucky, in 1929, Louise Slaughter was the daughter of a blacksmith. After graduating from high school, she went on to earn a bachelor's degree in microbiology and a master's degree in public health, both from the University of Kentucky.

After moving to upstate New York and marrying her beloved husband, Bob, Louise became active in local community groups and, eventually, in politics. She served a number of years in local elected offices and in the New York State Assembly.

Louise was first elected to Congress in 1986, where she eventually rose to become the top Democrat on the powerful Rules Committee. Tragically and very sadly, Louise died in March of last year, and she is sorely missed by all of us.

Naming a post office in her honor in her hometown of Fairport, New York, is maybe the least we could and should do to honor the distinguished career in public service of this remarkable woman.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 540, which names a post office located in Fairport, New York, in honor of Louise and Bob Slaughter.

Louise Slaughter was a Member of the House body for over 30 years. From 1987 until she passed away last year, Representative Slaughter was a tireless advocate for the people of her upstate New York district.

In addition to her numerous legislative accomplishments, Representative Slaughter made a mark on this body as the first woman to chair the House Committee on Rules.

Representative Slaughter was an intellectual and a beloved Member of the House. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I took my colleague by surprise here. We just came down from a Rules Committee meeting, and I appreciate her yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, if you didn't have the pleasure of serving with Louise on the Rules Committee, it looks kind of strange to have the Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office.

I have been here only 8 years, but I can't recall us doing that after a couple out here. Perhaps it is done regularly, but to serve with Louise—you know, the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, goes into the wee hours of the morning; 2 a.m., 3 a.m., 4 a.m., the Rules Committee is working, and it is truly Louise and Bob Slaughter.

Since my first day on the Rules Committee back in 2011, Louise took me under her wing. Yes, I was a young conservative Republican. Yes, she was an older—we can say, I think, honestly—liberal Democrat. She began building those partnerships with the young members of the Rules Committee with each and every committee meeting that took place.

I don't know if she was the first one who said it to me, but she was certainly one of them. She said: You know, ROB, of your colleagues on the other side of the aisle, folks sometimes think that we are upset with each other and we are bad people.

She said: I always tell folks, it is not that the people on the other side of the aisle are bad people. They are really good people. They just have some bad ideas.

She would share that with me from time to time, that my ideas were amongst those bad ideas. Her picture hangs right across from my seat there today.

There are so many men and women in America, Mr. Speaker, who are worthy of celebration, and it seems like we always make time to talk about those things that tear us apart, and we just don't make enough time to talk about those things that bring us together.

Louise was a strident, a fighter for her beliefs, as is any man or woman in this institution, but she never missed a moment to try to bring people together instead of pushing people further apart.

This is a wonderful gesture that the committee is moving forward today.

I hope that all of my colleagues will find, amongst their very busy Tuesday, time to sit back and reflect that they have an opportunity to be a uniter or to be a divider. It doesn't mean you trade away one iota of who you are and what you believe. It is just how do you tell that story, and how do you go about persuading your colleagues that it is true.

Louise gave us a wonderful example every single day of her decade upon decade of service in this institution, and I am honored to have sat across the aisle from her there in the Rules Committee.

Mrs. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and Mr. WOODALL, whose words prompted me to want to come speak, because I served on the Rules Committee when we were in the majority a number of years ago. Louise was our leader, and she ran that thing with an iron fist. Excellent woman, articulate, powerful, in her tiny little frame. She was somebody who made us stay on task.

We worked a lot of hours on that committee, as I am sure my friend from the Rules Committee would agree, and she was indefatigable. The number of hours that the Rules Committee would meet, and she would make sure we were on task—and a great sense of humor, focused, and smart.

This is really a nice honor that the committee is bringing in her name and in Bob's name. He would be at the committee almost as much as Louise, and they were a great team. I just want to add my word of thanks for this honor for the Slaughters.

Mrs. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, on a personal note, Louise Slaughter was an extraordinary Member of this body. She had a marvelous sense of humor. She was an encyclopedia about the procedures of the Rules Committee, which often mys-

tified many of us. Her heart was in the cause every day.

The last few years she was here were tough. She lost her beloved Bob very suddenly, and she struggled with a lot of health issues in the last year of her life. None of it left her daunted.

□ 1545

She faced every day with an indomitable spirit and will, a commitment to her values and to fighting for her constituents and for those values.

This is the least we can do to honor Louise Slaughter and her husband, Bob. I hope we can do more as we progress, but it is an honor to have served with Louise, and it is a privilege to manage this bill today.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 540.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### ARMY SPECIALIST THOMAS J. WILWERTH POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 829) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1450 Montauk Highway in Mastic, New York, as the "Army Specialist Thomas J. Wilwerth Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 829

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. ARMY SPECIALIST THOMAS J. WILWERTH POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1450 Montauk Highway in Mastic, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Army Specialist Thomas J. Wilwerth Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Army Specialist Thomas J. Wilwerth Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 829 to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1450 Montauk Highway in Mastic, New York, as the Army Specialist Thomas J. Wilwerth Post Office Building.

Army Specialist Wilwerth's life was defined by a call to service. While still a junior in high school, Thomas felt the call to serve his country in the years after 9/11, and he made the decision to join the Army to defend his country.

After finishing his senior year, during which he also served in the Army Reserves, Thomas was assigned to the 4th Infantry Division based out of Fort Carson, Colorado.

In December 2005, Thomas was deployed to Iraq, and he served selflessly with his division as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom. While on deployment, he was tragically taken from us on February 22, 2006, when an improvised explosive device detonated near his Bradley Fighting Vehicle.

At just 21 years of age, Thomas' tragic death serves to remind us all of the human cost of war. He demonstrated in his short life, Mr. Speaker, the kind of commitment and service to this great country that is an example to all of us.

Naming a post office in his honor in his hometown of Mastic, New York, is the least we can do as a country to honor and remember a young man who made the ultimate sacrifice in service to all of us.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 829 introduced by Representative LEE ZELDIN. The bill names a post office located in Mastic, New York, in honor of Army Specialist Thomas J. Wilwerth.

Specialist Wilwerth joined the United States Army while he was still in high school. He felt called to defend our Nation after the terrorist attacks on September 11. After graduating high school, he was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 8th Infantry Regiment, 3rd Brigade Combat Team based out of Fort Carson, Colorado.

In December 2005, Specialist Wilwerth was deployed to fight in Operation Iraqi Freedom. On February 22, 2006, Specialist Wilwerth and two others in his unit were killed by an improvised explosive device.

Specialist Thomas Wilwerth was 21 years old when he gave his life in service to his Nation. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN)

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in strong support of H.R. 829, my legislation to honor the life and legacy of Army Specialist Thomas J. Wilwerth by renaming, in his name, the post office in his hometown of Mastic, New York.

Specialist Thomas Wilwerth always possessed a strong sense of duty to his country, having participated in the Junior ROTC program at William Floyd High School, where I once graduated as well. But it was in our Nation's darkest hour that 17-year-old Specialist Wilwerth was driven to enlist.

During his junior year of high school, Specialist Wilwerth bore witness to the unimaginable horror of September 11, with Ground Zero just under 100 miles from his high school. Instead of cowering in the face of terror, he shipped off to basic training that summer and actually finished high school while serving in the Army Reserve.

As a member of 1st Battalion, 8th Infantry Regiment, 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 4th Infantry Division based out of Fort Carson, Colorado, Wilwerth was deployed to Iraq in 2005 as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

It was only 3 months into his deployment on February 22, 2006, that 21-year-old Specialist Wilwerth and two of his fellow soldiers were killed in action when an explosive device detonated near his Bradley Fighting Vehicle while on a routine morning patrol near Balad, Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I wish there were more people who possessed such a strong sense of patriotism. Even fewer answer the call at just the age of 17 and sacrifice their entire lives and their entire future to serve in the U.S. military.

Specialist Wilwerth was the best of who we are. He is the embodiment of what makes this country the greatest in the world: the willingness to make the ultimate sacrifice serving this most exceptional Nation, and the willingness to lay down one's life for his neighbors, for his community, but most courageously, for those Americans he never knew.

Before serving in Congress, I was in the New York Senate, and I introduced a bill that also became law, the Specialist Thomas J. Wilwerth Military Dignity Act, to ban protests at military burials in my home State.

It is my greatest honor to stand here on the House floor today to speak about this new legislation in honor of Thomas.

Specialist Wilwerth is survived by his loving parents, Elaine and Terry Wilwerth, and his sister, Kerry. There are no words to describe the emptiness this loss left in their hearts and in the heart of our entire community.

Before I close, I would like to read a few words from the Wilwerth family that really drive home why this straightforward legislation will have such a profound impact.

The Wilwerth family said: "Tommy died so that his fellow Americans could live a better life. His deep-rooted sense of patriotism drove him to enlist in the aftermath of September 11, and he would have been so proud of his sacrifice on behalf of our entire Nation.

"To have his name and legacy displayed in the heart of the community he loved—the community he laid his life down for—will never bring him home, but it will ensure his memory and sacrifice live on in the hearts of those who call Long Island home."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I thank both Members who have spoken in its favor today.

Mrs. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, as Mr. ZELDIN indicated, there is nothing we can do, not this action, that can really make up for the loss of a loved one, even in the time of war. But we can, as a grateful Nation, explain our appreciation and gratitude for the ultimate sacrifice that was made, and that is what we are doing today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 829.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### CHANGING THE ADDRESS OF THE CAPTAIN HUMAYUN KHAN POST OFFICE

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 725) to change the address of the postal facility designated in honor of Captain Humayun Khan.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 725

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. CAPTAIN HUMAYUN KHAN POST OFFICE.

Section 1(a) of Public Law 115-347 (132 Stat. 5054) is amended by striking "180 McCormick Road" and inserting "2150 Wise Street".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in consideration of S. 725, a bill to change the address of the postal facility designated in honor of Captain Humayun Khan. Captain Khan was an extraordinary military officer and an American hero who lived in this country since he was 2 years old.

Mr. Khan represented the best of what it means to be an American. Growing up, he was captivated with the writings of Thomas Jefferson and his writings on freedom. It was at the school Jefferson founded, the University of Virginia, that Mr. Khan learned to put those ideas into practice. There, he joined the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

After graduation, Mr. Khan put his dreams of becoming a lawyer on hold to serve the American people on Active Duty in Iraq.

On June 8, 2004, while serving with the 201st Battalion of the 1st Infantry Division, tragically, Captain Khan was killed. While visiting the Guard personnel on his day off, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Khan was killed by an improvised bomb outside Forward Operating Base Warhorse.

It is to honor the life and memory of Captain Khan that we today dedicate this post office in Charlottesville, the home of his alma mater and the beginning of his distinguished military service, in his name.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill that makes a technical change to correct the address of a post office named last Congress.

The post office is named after Captain Humayun Khan, who sacrificed his life in service of our country.

Captain Khan served in the Army Reserves while he studied at the University of Virginia and was commissioned as an officer after he graduated in 2000. In 2004, he was deployed to Iraq, and he was killed on June 8, 2004.

This bill corrects the address, to ensure that the correct facility is named in Captain Khan's honor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1600

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from West Virginia. I

think this is an important honor, and it is an important technical correction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 725.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 540; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

**LOUISE AND BOB SLAUGHTER POST OFFICE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 540) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 770 Ayrault Road in Fairport, New York, as the "Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office", on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 7, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]  
YEAS—414

Adams	Biggs	Burgess
Aderholt	Bilirakis	Bustos
Aguilar	Bishop (GA)	Butterfield
Allen	Bishop (UT)	Byrne
Allred	Blumenauer	Calvert
Amash	Blunt Rochester	Carbajal
Armstrong	Bonamici	Cárdenas
Arrington	Bost	Carson (IN)
Axne	Boyle, Brendan	Carter (GA)
Babin	F.	Carter (TX)
Bacon	Brady	Cartwright
Baird	Brindisi	Case
Balderson	Brooks (AL)	Casten (IL)
Banks	Brooks (IN)	Castor (FL)
Barr	Brown (MD)	Castro (TX)
Barragán	Brownley (CA)	Chabot
Bass	Buchanan	Cheney
Beatty	Buck	Chu, Judy
Bera	Bucshon	Cicilline
Bergman	Budd	Cisneros
Beyer	Burchett	Clark (MA)

Clarke (NY)	Hern, Kevin	Meuser
Clay	Herrera Beutler	Miller
Cleaver	Hice (GA)	Mitchell
Cline	Higgins (LA)	Molenaar
Cloud	Higgins (NY)	Mooney (WV)
Clyburn	Hill (AR)	Moore
Cohen	Hill (CA)	Morelle
Cole	Himes	Moulton
Collins (GA)	Holding	Mucarsel-Powell
Comer	Hollingsworth	Mullin
Conaway	Horn, Kendra S.	Murphy
Connolly	Horsford	Nadler
Cook	Houlahan	Napolitano
Cooper	Hoyer	Neal
Costa	Hudson	Neguse
Courtney	Huffman	Newhouse
Cox (CA)	Huizenga	Norcross
Craig	Hunter	Norman
Crawford	Hurd (TX)	Nunes
Crenshaw	Jackson Lee	O'Halleran
Crist	Jayapal	Ocasio-Cortez
Crow	Jeffries	Olson
Cuellar	Johnson (GA)	Omar
Cummings	Johnson (LA)	Palazzo
Cunningham	Johnson (OH)	Pallone
Curtis	Johnson (SD)	Palmer
Davids (KS)	Johnson (TX)	Panetta
Davidson (OH)	Jordan	Pappas
Davis (CA)	Joyce (OH)	Pascrell
Davis, Danny K.	Joyce (PA)	Payne
Davis, Rodney	Kaptur	Pelosi
Dean	Katko	Pence
DeFazio	Keating	Perlmutter
DeGette	Kelly (IL)	Perry
DeLauro	Kelly (MS)	Peters
DelBene	Kelly (PA)	Peterson
Delgado	Kennedy	Phillips
Demings	Khanna	Pingree
DeSaulnier	Kildee	Pocan
DesJarlais	Kilmer	Porter
Deutch	Kim	Posey
Diaz-Balart	Kind	Pressley
Dingell	King (IA)	Price (NC)
Doggett	King (NY)	Quigley
Doyle, Michael	Kinzinger	Raskin
F.	Kirkpatrick	Ratcliffe
Duffy	Krishnamoorthi	Reed
Duncan	Kuster (NH)	Rice (NY)
Dunn	Kustoff (TN)	Richmond
Emmer	LaHood	Riggleman
Engel	LaMalfa	Roby
Escobar	Lamb	Rodgers (WA)
Eshoo	Lamborn	Roe, David P.
Españalat	Langevin	Rogers (AL)
Estes	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (KY)
Evans	Larson (CT)	Rose (NY)
Finkenauer	Latta	Rose, John W.
Fitzpatrick	Lawrence	Rouda
Fleischmann	Lawson (FL)	Roybal-Allard
Fletcher	Lee (CA)	Ruiz
Fortenberry	Lee (NV)	Ruppersberger
Foster	Lesko	Ryan
Foxx (NC)	Levin (CA)	Sánchez
Frankel	Levin (MI)	Sarbanes
Fudge	Lewis	Scalise
Fulcher	Lieu, Ted	Scanlon
Gaetz	Lipinski	Schakowsky
Gallagher	Loeb sack	Schiff
Gallego	Lofgren	Schneider
Garamendi	Long	Schrader
Garcia (IL)	Loudermillk	Schrier
Garcia (TX)	Lowenthal	Schweikert
Gianforte	Lowe y	Scott (VA)
Gibbs	Lucas	Scott, Austin
Gohmert	Luetkemeyer	Scott, David
Golden	Luján	Sensenbrenner
Gomez	Luria	Serrano
Gonzalez (OH)	Lynch	Sewell (AL)
Gonzalez (TX)	Malinowski	Shalala
Gooden	Maloney,	Sherman
Gosar	Carolyn B.	Sherrill
Gottheimer	Maloney, Sean	Shimkus
Granger	Marchant	Simpson
Graves (GA)	Marshall	Sires
Graves (LA)	Mast	Slotkin
Graves (MO)	Matsui	Smith (MO)
Green (TN)	McAdams	Smith (NE)
Green (TX)	McBath	Smith (NJ)
Griffith	McCarthy	Smith (WA)
Grijalva	McCaul	Smucker
Guest	McClintock	Soto
Guthrie	McCollum	Spanberger
Haaland	McGovern	Spano
Hagedorn	McHenry	Speier
Hartgering	McKinley	Stanton
Hartzer	McNerney	Staubert
Hastings	Meadows	Stefanik
Hayes	Meeks	Steil
Heck	Meng	Steube

Stevens	Trone	Watson Coleman
Stewart	Turner	Weber (TX)
Stivers	Underwood	Webster (FL)
Suozi	Upton	Welch
Swalwell (CA)	Van Drew	Wenstrup
Takano	Vargas	Westerman
Taylor	Veasey	Wexton
Thompson (CA)	Vela	Wild
Thompson (MS)	Velázquez	Williams
Thompson (PA)	Visclosky	Wilson (FL)
Thornberry	Wagner	Wilson (SC)
Timmons	Walberg	Wittman
Tipton	Walden	Womack
Titus	Walker	Woodall
Tlaib	Walorski	Wright
Tonko	Waltz	Yarmuth
Torres (CA)	Wasserman	Yoho
Torres Small	Schultz	Young
(NM)	Waters	Zeldin
Trahan	Watkins	

NAYS—7

Flores	Massie	Roy
Grothman	Rice (SC)	
Harris	Rouzer	

NOT VOTING—11

Abraham	Ferguson	Rooney (FL)
Amodei	Gabbard	Rush
Collins (NY)	McEachin	Rutherford
Correa	Reschenthaler	

□ 1625

Messrs. GOSAR, JOHNSON of Louisiana, DAVIDSON of Ohio, TONKO, Mrs. HARTZLER, Messrs. SIMPSON and MULLIN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**THE JOURNAL**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 189, answered "present" 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]  
YEAS—222

Adams	Cárdenas	DelBene
Allred	Cartwright	Delgado
Amodei	Case	Demings
Armstrong	Casten (IL)	DeSaulnier
Arrington	Castor (FL)	Deutch
Bacon	Castro (TX)	Diaz-Balart
Banks	Chu, Judy	Dingell
Barr	Cicilline	Doggett
Barragán	Clark (MA)	Doyle, Michael
Beatty	Clarke (NY)	F.
Bergman	Clay	Engel
Beyer	Cleaver	Escobar
Bilirakis	Clyburn	Eshoo
Bishop (GA)	Cohen	Españalat
Blumenauer	Cooper	Evans
Blunt Rochester	Courtney	Finkenauer
Bonamici	Cox (CA)	Fleischmann
Boyle, Brendan	Cummings	Fortenberry
F.	Curtis	Foster
Brady	Davidson (OH)	Frankel
Brown (MD)	Davis (CA)	Gallego
Brownley (CA)	Davis, Danny K.	Garcia (IL)
Buchanan	Dean	Garcia (TX)
Bustos	DeFazio	Gianforte
Butterfield	DeGette	Gomez
Carbajal	DeLauro	Gonzalez (TX)

Green (TX)	Maloney,	Scanlon
Grijalva	Carolyn B.	Schakowsky
Haaland	Matsui	Schiff
Hastings	McBath	Schneider
Hayes	McCarthy	Schrier
Heck	McCaul	Schweikert
Higgins (LA)	McClintock	Scott (VA)
Higgins (NY)	McCollum	Scott, David
Hill (CA)	McGovern	Serrano
Hollingsworth	McNerney	Shalala
Horn, Kendra S.	Meadows	Sherman
Hoyer	Mitchell	Simpson
Huffman	Moolenaar	Sires
Jackson Lee	Moore	Smith (NJ)
Jayapal	Morelle	Smith (WA)
Jeffries	Mucarsel-Powell	Soto
Johnson (GA)	Murphy	Speier
Johnson (TX)	Nadler	Stanton
Joyce (OH)	Napolitano	Stauber
Kaptur	Neal	Steil
Keating	Neguse	Stevens
Kennedy	Newhouse	Stivers
Khanna	Norcross	Swalwell (CA)
Kildee	O'Halleran	Takano
Kim	Ocasio-Cortez	Taylor
King (IA)	Omar	Thompson (MS)
Kinzinger	Pallone	Thornberry
Kirkpatrick	Pascrell	Titus
Kuster (NH)	Payne	Tlaib
Lamb	Perlmutter	Torres (CA)
Langevin	Perry	Torres Small
Larsen (WA)	Peters	(NM)
Larson (CT)	Peterson	Trahan
Lawrence	Phillips	Trone
Lee (CA)	Pingree	Underwood
Lee (NV)	Pocan	Vargas
Levin (CA)	Posey	Veasey
Levin (MI)	Pressley	Vela
Lewis	Price (NC)	Velázquez
Lieu, Ted	Quigley	Visclosky
Lipinski	Raskin	Wagner
Loebsock	Richmond	Wasserman
Lofgren	Riggleman	Schultz
Long	Rodgers (WA)	Watkins
Lowenthal	Roybal-Allard	Webster (FL)
Lowe	Ruiz	Welch
Lujan	Ruppersberger	Wilson (FL)
Luria	Ryan	Yarmuth
Lynch	Sánchez	Yoho
Malinowski	Sarbanes	

**NAYS—189**

Aderholt	Estes	Kelly (IL)
Aguilar	Ferguson	Kelly (MS)
Allen	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (PA)
Amash	Fletcher	Kilmer
Axne	Flores	Kind
Babin	Foxx (NC)	King (NY)
Baird	Fudge	Krishnamoorthi
Balderson	Fulcher	Kustoff (TN)
Bera	Gaetz	LaHood
Biggs	Gallagher	LaMalfa
Bishop (UT)	Garamendi	Lamborn
Brindisi	Gibbs	Latta
Brooks (AL)	Golden	Lesko
Brooks (IN)	Gonzalez (OH)	Loudermilk
Buck	Gooden	Lucas
Buechson	Gosar	Luetkemeyer
Budd	Gottheimer	Maloney, Sean
Burchett	Granger	Marchant
Burgess	Graves (GA)	Marshall
Byrne	Graves (LA)	Massie
Carson (IN)	Graves (MO)	Mast
Carter (TX)	Green (TN)	McAdams
Chabot	Griffith	McHenry
Cheney	Grothman	McKinley
Cisneros	Guest	Meeks
Cline	Guthrie	Meeng
Cole	Hagedorn	Meuser
Collins (GA)	Harder (CA)	Miller
Comer	Harris	Mooney (WV)
Conaway	Hartzler	Moulton
Cannolly	Hern, Kevin	Mullin
Cook	Herrera Beutler	Norman
Costa	Hice (GA)	Nunes
Craig	Hill (AR)	Olson
Crawford	Himes	Palazzo
Crenshaw	Holding	Palmer
Crist	Horsford	Panetta
Crow	Houlihan	Pappas
Cuellar	Hudson	Pence
Cunningham	Huizenga	Porter
Davids (KS)	Hunter	Ratcliffe
Davis, Rodney	Hurd (TX)	Reed
DesJarlais	Johnson (LA)	Rice (NY)
Duffy	Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)
Duncan	Johnson (SD)	Roby
Dunn	Jordan	Ro, David P.
Emmer	Joyce (PA)	Rogers (AL)

Rogers (KY)	Smucker	Walorski
Rose (NY)	Spanberger	Waters
Rose, John W.	Spano	Watson Coleman
Rouda	Stefanik	Weber (TX)
Rouzer	Steube	Wenstrup
Roy	Stewart	Westerman
Scalise	Suzoi	Wexton
Schrader	Thompson (CA)	Wild
Scott, Austin	Thompson (PA)	Williams
Sensenbrenner	Timmons	Wilson (SC)
Sewell (AL)	Tipton	Wittman
Sherrill	Turner	Womack
Shimkus	Upton	Woodall
Slotkin	Van Drew	Wright
Smith (MO)	Walberg	Young
Smith (NE)	Walden	Zeldin

**PRESENTS—1**

Tonko  
NOT VOTING—19

Abraham	Correa	Rooney (FL)
Bass	Gabbard	Rush
Bost	Gohmert	Rutherford
Calvert	Katko	Walker
Carter (GA)	Lawson (FL)	Waltz
Cloud	McEachin	
Collins (NY)	Reschenthaler	

□ 1634

So the Journal was approved.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

**REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT**

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, if this unanimous consent request cannot be entertained, I urge the Speaker and the majority leader to immediately schedule the Born Alive bill, so we can stand up and protect the—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate.

**HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW**

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

**ALZHEIMER'S IS A PUBLIC HEALTH CRISIS**

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, Alzheimer's is a public health crisis. It is fitting that today, the second day of

National Public Health Week, the Alzheimer's Association held their annual Day on the Hill. That is why I am wearing purple, to help raise awareness about Alzheimer's.

Someone new develops Alzheimer's every 65 seconds in the United States. The cost of caring for those with Alzheimer's and other dementias is around \$290 billion a year in the United States. That cost is only going to get higher.

In New Jersey alone, there are 180,000 people over the age of 65 who suffer from Alzheimer's. Each year, nearly 3,000 of them die from Alzheimer's.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me to raise awareness on Alzheimer's. But raising awareness is not enough. We need to increase research funding, commit to a public health response to Alzheimer's, and support Alzheimer's planning and care services under Medicare.

**RECOGNIZING WORLD AUTISM AWARENESS DAY AND WORLD AUTISM MONTH**

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, on World Autism Day, to recognize and support all children or adults with autism spectrum disorder.

In 2018, an estimated 1 in 59 children in the United States was diagnosed with some form of autism spectrum disorder. Notwithstanding these diagnoses, Americans with autism make exceptional contributions across our Nation and around the world.

Each April Autism Speaks celebrates the start of its signature campaign, Light It Up Blue. Light It Up Blue is a unique global campaign to increase understanding and acceptance for people with autism.

Today we celebrate World Autism Awareness Day, and this month is World Autism Month.

Mr. Speaker, let's renew our commitment to support the entire international autism community, including children and adults with autism, their families, and caregivers.

Together, we can increase access to information, encourage heightened understanding of autism, promote respect and dignity, and support the services that assist people with autism to reach their full potential.

**RELEASE PETER BIAR AJAK AND ALL OTHER POLITICAL PRISONERS IN SOUTH SUDAN**

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

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak, once again, about Peter Biar Ajak, a renowned peace activist unlawfully detained in South Sudan.

In July of 2018, Peter was arrested by South Sudan's security forces. He has

been held without charge or trial ever since, and has been frequently denied access to his family, to counsel, to care, and to adequate food.

Peter was one of Sudan's "Lost Boys," he resettled in Philadelphia, and attended La Salle University, where I taught for 10 years. I knew Peter as a brilliant student and a leader. He later went on to Harvard and to Cambridge.

He is a dedicated peace activist who co-founded South Sudan Young Leaders Forum. In his work, he has criticized South Sudan's leaders for failing to secure a permanent peace for their people.

Incredibly, Peter is now under investigation for crimes including treason and terrorism. If charged and convicted, Peter could be sentenced to death. In reality, he is being persecuted for his speech.

I call on President Kiir to release Peter and all other political prisoners in South Sudan.

#### RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF RICHARD D. WESLEY

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Richard D. Wesley, who retired from being a Savannah River pilot after over 40 years of guiding ships to port through the Savannah River.

This expertise cannot be overstated. An incredible asset to our economy in coastal Georgia, river pilots risk their lives by jumping onto moving container ships, and then guiding them safely into harbor, keeping the ship itself, the cargo on board, and the entire area's economy moving forward.

A graduate of the Maine Maritime Academy in 1976, Mr. Wesley has piloted over 11,000 ships safely in and out of Savannah River. These trips included nearly any situation you could imagine; for example, Coast Guard visits that discovered stowaways, along with previously undiscovered contraband.

He has also seen the ships change dramatically over his tenure, going from 460 feet in length to around 1,200 feet in length. But, all of this accumulated experience over the years enabled him to mentor up-and-coming bar pilots through any situation, and to ensure that they are also going to have safe careers, which keep the economy of our State moving.

Thank you for your work, Mr. Wesley, and enjoy your retirement.

□ 1645

#### IF THIS LAWSUIT SUCCEEDS, CENTRAL VIRGINIANS WILL BE LEFT BEHIND

(Ms. SPANBERGER asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, last week the administration asserted that the Affordable Care Act should be invalidated in Federal court. If this effort succeeds, protections for those with preexisting conditions would vanish.

Approximately 51 percent of central Virginians under the age of 65 have a preexisting condition. If this effort succeeds, we would see the return of caps on lifetime coverage, and those over 65 could be forced to pay higher Medicare premiums.

If this effort succeeds, we would lose the ability to keep our children on our insurance plan until age 26. In Virginia, where we just saw Medicaid expansion become law, this would be upended as well.

If efforts to scrap our healthcare system succeed, Medicaid expansion would be completely gutted, and with it, our efforts and ability to deal with the opioid epidemic across our State.

Right now, we need a bipartisan effort to stabilize and fix our healthcare system, not a hyperpartisan lawsuit focused on settling old scores.

Central Virginians deserve better. We are here to solve problems, and if there is a problem with our healthcare system, we should fix it, not upend our system, not hurt those with preexisting conditions, not get rid of the prohibition on lifetime caps, not eliminate a provision that allows young people to stay on their parents' insurance.

This is why, among the other efforts we are making in this body, I am proud to cosponsor the Protecting Pre-Existing Conditions and Making Healthcare More Affordable Act of 2019.

#### HONORING CORPORAL HERMAN JENKINS TURNING 100 YEARS OLD

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

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Herman Jenkins, a native Floridian, African American, and World War II veteran who, today, turns 100 years old.

Mr. Jenkins enlisted in the United States Army in 1943 when he was 24 years old, was stationed in northern France, and fought to defend Western civilization against the Nazi regime.

He rose to the rank of corporal and received numerous recognitions, including the Conduct Medal, the American Theater Ribbon, and a World War II Victory Ribbon.

After being honorably discharged in 1946, he returned to Lakeland, Florida, where he married his wife, Essie Mae Bryant, and together gave birth to their daughter, Sheila.

Upon returning to Lakeland, Mr. Jenkins entered the retail industry and enjoyed a successful career as a manager of several stores in our community. He also owned his own photog-

raphy business and continues to be a skilled photographer, chef, and musician. However, his greatest passion is being a loving husband to his wife, Essie, daughter, Sheila, four grandchildren, and 11 great-grandchildren.

Mr. Jenkins has made a permanent and positive impact in defending our Nation and building our community, and for that, sir, I thank you. I wish you a very happy birthday and hope that your next 100 years are better than your last.

#### WE COULD LOSE THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, in the 2016 election, as the candidate who now is in the Oval Office said that ObamaCare is a disaster, the question was asked: What do you have to lose?

Well, now we know. It is the Affordable Care Act, which has provided 20 million Americans, for the first time, with security and peace of mind in healthcare.

I rise to support H. Res. 271, and I thank the gentleman from Texas, my colleague, COLIN ALLRED, because we know that the Texas case is the epicenter of destruction of the Affordable Care Act.

The administration's flip on us to now be against the position of survival of the Affordable Care Act tells us we have a lot to lose: 1.8 million Texans have gained coverage; 1.1 million Texans have purchased high-quality marketplace coverage; 913,000 individual Texans have received financial assistance.

More importantly, there are 1.1 million Texans who have insurance. If all the States adopted ACA's Medicaid, we would have that as well. We did not do it.

But, as well, Texans have no lifetime caps. They have the ability to have their children on their health insurance plans.

This is a tragedy. Mr. Speaker, I condemn the action of the administration in filing their opposition to the Affordable Care Act.

#### WE MUST VOTE TO PROTECT THE SANCTITY OF NEWBORNS

(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, I rise today to highlight the discharge petition that was signed by me today on this floor, as well as 189 total Members of this House, and a special thank you to Representative ANN WAGNER and Whip STEVE SCALISE for their great work on this issue.

This discharge petition is to force consideration of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, known

as H.R. 962, which so far has been blocked by the majority in this House.

I am willing to bet most Americans assume that doctors and nurses would do everything they can to help a baby who has somehow miraculously survived an abortion. You would be surprised and saddened to know that that is not always the case.

In 2002, Congress recognized the simple fact that an infant who survives an abortion is, indeed, a person. So why is there still no legal protection for those newborn babies who have been born alive after a failed abortion attempt?

It is past time to hold abortion providers accountable for ensuring the best possible care for any newborn baby regardless of whether that baby happens to survive an abortion. We must vote to protect the sanctity of newborns, and I hope the American people will call their Member of Congress and have them sign on to this discharge petition and support this act.

#### EQUAL PAY DAY

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

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to recognize Katherine Johnson, Dr. Christine Darden, Dorothy Vaughan, Mary Jackson, and the hundreds of women in STEM who made incredible contributions to our country and to the cause of scientific research and exploration.

Katherine and her team of mathematicians and engineers were pivotal to one of our Nation's greatest triumphs: landing the first man on the Moon. Yet, as Black women in America, they faced pervasive discrimination. They were subjected to segregated facilities and their careers were stifled by an explicit and implicit culture of racism and misogyny.

I will also note that today is Equal Pay Day and that the gender pay gap is even more stark for women of color. It takes a Black woman 7 months longer to earn what a man takes home in 1 year, which is why I have been a strong supporter of the Paycheck Fairness Act.

I will further note that we were supposed to send the first all-woman space walk on March 29 up into outer space, but we had to cancel that trip because of lack of proper suits for women. We must do better.

Katherine Johnson, Dr. Christine Darden, Dorothy Vaughan, Mary Jackson, and the hundreds of other women in STEM were never properly recognized for their brilliance and determination, which is why I, as a Member of Congress, am a cosponsor of the Hidden Figures Congressional Gold Medal Act.

#### VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

(Mr. MORELLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, more than 4 million women in the United States experience physical violence by a domestic partner every single day. This staggering statistic underscores the great importance of the Violence Against Women Act reauthorization.

This critical legislation, which I am proud to cosponsor, provides the support and protections that victims of sexual assault and domestic violence need and deserve.

In my community, we have many organizations, like the Willow Domestic Violence Center, that provide life-saving services to women in need and rely on funding authorized by the Violence Against Women Act to operate.

I am especially pleased that this reauthorization includes vital provisions to keep guns out of the hands of those accused of stalking or dating violence.

I look forward to the passage of this important legislation and will continue working with my colleagues in the House to advance policies that support and empower women and ensure a safer community for all people.

#### MEDICARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to the importance of honoring our government handshake agreements.

Medicare and Social Security are cornerstones of America's safety net. Social Security enables millions of Americans to retire with invaluable peace of mind, and Medicare is an effective tool that provides greater healthcare to millions and millions of Americans.

These programs are a golden handshake agreement between the Federal Government and the people of the United States that must be honored, and I will not stand for any attempts to undermine our commitment.

Our seniors rely on Social Security and Medicare, and it is our responsibility to ensure that these programs are always there for them.

Our word is our bond. Keeping the promises made to the people is essential to the success of our Nation and to the success of our government.

#### VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act.

Congress first enacted this bipartisan law 25 years ago to unite our Nation in the fight against domestic violence. It ushered in a new era of protection for all Americans and continues to provide

essential support so that victims have the legal tools and resources to seek justice and receive care.

Domestic violence is a horrific crime experienced by one out of three women and one out of four men. We must do all we can to stop it.

Recently, I visited the WINGS domestic violence shelter on the southwest side of Chicago, and I was joined by Chicago Police Officer Gino Garcia. Gino was only six when his mother, a Chicago police officer, was killed by her boyfriend. Gino was inspired to become an officer and now works with shelters and other domestic violence organizations.

By reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act, we help organizations like WINGS, and we empower victims and save lives. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

#### HEALTHCARE IS A RIGHT, NOT A PRIVILEGE

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

Mr. CISNEROS. Mr. Speaker, healthcare is a right, not a privilege. Unfortunately, I know all too well what it is like to have family members without healthcare coverage.

My mother went 15 years without health insurance, 15 years without seeing a doctor. My father used to drive to Mexico to get his diabetes medication because he had no insurance to cover the high cost.

The Affordable Care Act has provided over 20 million people with insurance and allowed them to have access to healthcare; 9,000 of them are in my district. It has also provided protections for those with preexisting conditions, protections that this administration and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have tried to take away.

I have spoken with so many parents who may have a child with a heart condition, childhood diabetes, or asthma. If these protections are taken away, so many families won't be able to afford the necessary surgeries or medications for these kids.

Let's do what is right for kids. Let's do what is right for families and protect the Affordable Care Act. Let's protect healthcare.

#### CONDEMNING REPUBLICAN HEALTHCARE SABOTAGE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn President Trump and his anti-life Republican enablers in Congress as they seek to repeal the Affordable Care Act, cutting off millions of Americans from their lifeline of affordable healthcare.

Just last week, the Trump administration announced its support of a Federal ruling that would strike down the

entire Affordable Care Act. To do so would threaten the lives of millions upon millions of Americans, including 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions.

If President Trump and Republicans get what they want and the entire ACA becomes invalidated, then the current cost of healthcare for millions of people will skyrocket.

More than 130 million Americans, more than one-third of our people, live with preexisting conditions, and they would no longer receive protection under Federal law.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve a caring President and Congress; they deserve a President who is committed to expanding access to affordable healthcare; they deserve a Congress that is committed to protecting those with preexisting conditions; and they deserve a government willing to stand up to the insurance industry and Big Pharma, whose profits will soar even more if the Affordable Care Act is struck down.

We were elected by the people to work together to strengthen our healthcare system, not destroy it. I thank Representative ALLRED for introducing a resolution condemning the administration's attack on the American healthcare system, and I urge its swift passage through this House and Senate.

□ 1700

#### AFFORDABLE HEALTHCARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MALINOWSKI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, as I often do these Special Order hours here on the floor, I want to start by stating the fundamental reason I am here and my Democratic colleagues are here. I harken back to a very famous American, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. This is actually etched in stone down at his memorial on the other end of the plaza here. He said: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

That "we provide enough for those who have too little," a fundamental value, a fundamental statement of purpose, a fundamental statement of why we seek elective office, not to provide more for those who have much, but, rather, for those who have too little.

In that regard, Mr. Speaker, I do not understand why a man who says he has much would purposely set out to harm those who have too little.

Why, Mr. Speaker, would the President of the United States put in place a policy to take healthcare away from Americans? Obviously, he has much, or at least he says he does. But millions

of Americans rely upon the Affordable Care Act for their insurance, for their health insurance, literally for their ability to stay alive.

Why would the President of the United States ask the court to repeal, to find unconstitutional, the Affordable Care Act that has provided insurance coverage to more than 20 million Americans and healthcare benefits to millions upon millions more?

Why would our colleagues on the Republican side of this aisle fall in lockstep to support the President's effort to take away healthcare from Americans?

I do not understand this. Where is the compassion? Where is the empathy? Where is the concern for Americans, not one or two, but millions upon millions of Americans who have come to rely upon the Affordable Care Act to give them their basic insurance?

More than 20 million Americans found insurance coverage through the expansion of the Medicaid program, not in every State, because there were State Governors who were willing to go along with the President and the Republicans and not institute the Medicaid expansion. But there are still 20 million more Americans who have comprehensive healthcare coverage today.

Why? We must ask the question of the President and any of his sympathizers: Why would you do that?

It is not just those people who have been able to get coverage in the Affordable Care Act, but it is every senior who is on Medicare who will lose coverage. Every senior on Medicare has an annual visit to a doctor to determine if they have any medical problems, a free annual check-up. That, too, would disappear.

For seniors who had hundreds of dollars, if not thousands of dollars, in annual expenses for drugs because of the Medicare drug doughnut hole—yes, the infamous doughnut hole that was created in the expansion of the Medicare program in 2003—that doughnut hole is literally closed as a result of the Affordable Care Act.

Eliminate the Affordable Care Act, Mr. President, and seniors who rely upon expensive drugs are going to, once again, pay billions of dollars of additional costs right out of their pocket.

Here it is: "Whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

Think of seniors who are in nursing homes. Most of the Medicaid dollars are for nursing home care. The expansion will affect them, if it is repealed.

Remember the bad old days when your insurance policy had a cap, a \$50,000 lifetime cap, maybe a \$100,000 lifetime cap? If you had a bad car accident, you would blow right through that. If you had cancer, guaranteed within the first month of treatment, you would blow through that cap, and it would come right out of your pocket.

Remember the bad old days when the great majority of personal bankruptcies were a direct result of medical expenses?

Mr. Speaker, does the President remember those days, that now he wants to eliminate the Affordable Care Act? Is that where we are in this country? How mean-spirited.

Maybe his test of progress is whether we add more to those who have much.

Look at this. The Affordable Care Act actually raised taxes on the superwealthy. Maybe that is what the President wants, to, once again, give a massive tax cut to the superwealthy. If the Affordable Care Act is repealed, the average tax cut for the superwealthy, the top one-tenth of 1 percent of Americans, will be nearly \$200,000 a year. Is that what our President wants?

Apparently, he took the first half of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's statement about values and said: Oh, yes, we want more for the wealthy.

That is precisely what will happen if the Affordable Care Act is repealed, to the tune of more than \$197,000 for the top one-tenth of 1 percent of America's wealthy.

What in the world? What is going on here in America that the President of the United States, in league with many of our Republican colleagues, would rip out of the hands of Americans a healthcare program that is working?

That is not where we are on the Democratic side of this aisle. We have fought this fight for 8, 9, 10 years. The Affordable Care Act passed in 2009 and 2010, and here we are. Our Republican colleagues gained control of this House and the Senate, and we fought the fight over those years to stop the repeal.

Now, the President, once again, is going around Congress, this time to the courts, asking the Supreme Court of the United States to rip out of the hands of Americans the healthcare that they have come to rely upon.

We will continue this fight. Not only will we continue this fight, but we are stepping up to improve the Affordable Care Act, and we intend to do it with a piece of legislation. We call it the Protecting Pre-Existing Conditions and Making Health Care More Affordable Act of 2019, H.R. 1884, protecting pre-existing conditions.

You heard my colleague, just before I stood up here, talking about pre-existing conditions. 130 million Americans have pre-existing conditions: high blood pressure, being a woman who might get pregnant, you name it. We all, at least 130 million of us, have pre-existing conditions.

Here is what we intend to do: improve the Affordable Care Act and reduce premium costs for consumers by expanding the eligibility for the premium tax credit, expanding affordability for working families, protecting comprehensive coverage for small businesses and workers, and eliminating junk insurance policies.

I was the insurance commissioner in California for 8 years, and I can talk for hours and hours about insurance companies that sold junk to people. They worked until they had an illness, and then it failed to work. We would

make those junk insurance policies unavailable in America.

We would ensure that there would be comprehensive benefits, like maternity care. If you talk about family values, you better talk about maternity care.

We would make sure that the programs to make people aware that they can get insurance would be in place.

We would help the States as they carry out their coverages. We would make sure that the exchanges were not eliminated, that they would be strong. Unlike the President who would eliminate the exchanges, we would strengthen them.

We have work to do. We are here to make things better for America, for the people, and we intend to do so.

Joining me tonight are a couple of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), a fellow who has worked on this for years.

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

Mr. Speaker, back in 1966, at a healthcare conference, the late Martin Luther King, Jr., said: "Of all the forms of inequality, injustice in healthcare is the most shocking and inhumane."

I often think of the debate back in 2009 and 2010 when we were trying to pass the Affordable Care Act. I remember one day I was conducting a call-in program on the local radio station. A gentleman called in and said to me: I want you to keep your hands off of my health insurance. I like what I have got, and I don't want you and President Obama messing with it.

□ 1715

I assured the gentleman that we were going to do nothing to interrupt his relationship with his insurance company or his policy.

But then a little while later, a lady called in, and she said, Congressman, I don't have a question, but I would like to say something to the gentleman who just called in. I want to say to him that I had insurance for 30 years, and I thought I liked it, until I tried to use it. When I went for my second treatment for breast cancer, I got a notice, she said, from the insurance company that I had used up my lifetime of benefits.

And then she said, I would like to say to that gentleman, Maybe he likes what he has because he has never tried to use it.

And that is what you have reference to here when you talk about junk policies. What we did with the Affordable Care Act was to make healthcare accessible and affordable for all American citizens.

We created the possibilities of States expanding Medicaid so that low-income people could have access to healthcare.

And if you want to know a little bit about what can be done if we were to, in some way, get rid of the Affordable Care Act, just look at the States that

have refused to expand Medicaid; the number of low-income people today who still do not have access to healthcare.

Think about those middle-income families who had a family member get sick and find out that they are in bankruptcy because they are trying to pay the bills.

The Affordable Care Act is an attempt, like everything else ought to be here.

If we are talking about education, it ought to be accessible and affordable.

If you are talking about housing, it should be accessible and affordable.

Healthcare; accessible and affordable.

And we all know that until we passed the Affordable Care Act, healthcare was not accessible and affordable for all Americans.

We hear the slogan that takes place throughout this country. We don't need to Make America Great Again. America is great. It has always been great. That is not our challenge.

Our challenge, it seems to me, is to make the greatness of America accessible and affordable to all Americans; apply it fairly and equitably.

That, to me, is what this country is all about.

So I want to thank you, my friend from California, Mr. GARAMENDI, I want to thank you for all the work that you are doing on H.R. 1884, because I think before we go home this week, we are going to pass a resolution, a resolution to condemn this administration for attempting to legally take away healthcare from so many citizens.

And I want to close with this: You talk about preexisting conditions. I think that people tend to think about preexisting conditions in a way that deals with people that they know or can relate to. I want all of our listeners, and those looking on, to just think of what you are doing.

If you say to a child born with diabetes, a child who didn't ask to come here, and even if that child could ask to come, they certainly wouldn't ask to come sick. Diabetes; born with it.

And then the insurance company says that it is a preexisting condition and you cannot come on to your family's insurance policies.

If we cannot see the wrongness in that, I am not too sure anything anybody says about anything can be ever wrong in your eyesight.

So I want to thank you so much for the work that you are doing here. I want to thank the American people for keeping our focus on making healthcare accessible and affordable for all Americans.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman (Mr. CLYBURN) so very much. He has been working for those qualities and values all of his life, and I really appreciate his coming to us and bringing us the awareness of what Dr. Martin Luther King said about America and about where the role of healthcare fits into justice in America.

I see Mr. CICILLINE from Rhode Island here, the chairman of the Democratic Policy and Communication Group.

Would you like to communicate with us?

Mr. CICILLINE. I would be honored to. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI), my friend, for organizing this Special Order hour and for giving us an opportunity to speak more about what seems to be a recurring fight here in Congress between Democrats who are committed to preserving access to high quality, affordable healthcare and to our Republican friends who are committed to undoing the progress we have made.

I know the gentleman will remember this. In the last Congress, I think, we were confronted with 50 or 60 votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act in its entirety. And we were able to defeat each of those efforts.

Then President Trump was elected, that effort continued, and the administration began to administratively sabotage the Affordable Care Act, and even proposed TrumpCare, which would have cost 23 million Americans their healthcare in its entirety.

So now having lost that battle, Democrats ran an agenda for the people of this country.

The first item on that agenda was driving down healthcare costs, driving down the cost of prescription drugs, and preserving coverage for preexisting conditions.

We won the election. We were put into the majority, in part because the American people rejected the Republican's relentless effort to destroy healthcare in this country and wanted Democrats to come to Congress in control to build on the success of the Affordable Care Act and make sure that we continue to protect access to quality, affordable healthcare.

Having lost in this body on this issue, now what do the Republicans do? They take the battle to the courts. Let's use the courts to strike down the Affordable Care Act.

And we should be very clear, as I know the gentleman from California knows, President Trump has claimed over and over again that he wants to protect access to healthcare.

In fact, just in the last couple of days, he now claims he has a secret plan. It is so good he is going to share it with the American people after the 2020 election.

But what we know is, unfortunately, what the President says and what he does aren't always the same. Because the truth is, the President has asked his Justice Department to go to court and fight to eliminate every single protection and benefit that the Affordable Care Act has provided.

So that means if President Trump gets his way and our Republican colleagues, there will no longer be caps on out-of-pocket expenses, there will no longer be savings by closing the donut hole, so prescription drug costs are reduced for our seniors. Medicaid expansion will end. The limits that prevent

insurance companies from limiting the total coverage over your lifetime, that ban will no longer exist. You will be able to deny access to healthcare for people with preexisting conditions. And the insurance company will be free to sell junk plans that offer little or no real coverage at all.

And so we are back to the same fight. Democrats have legislation that has already been introduced to build on the success of the Affordable Care Act:

To drive down premiums; to expand access for more working men and women; to drive down the costs of prescription drugs.

But we are back at it where our Republican friends are now joining this Republican President in an effort to use the courts to undo all the progress we have made on the Affordable Care Act.

This is going in exactly the wrong direction. We remain committed to make sure that we do everything we can to protect access to care and drive down costs, because we believe healthcare is a right.

It is not a privilege for a small group of people. It is a right of every single citizen of this country.

And I thank the gentleman for convening this Special Order hour, because amidst the noise, people should know there is one party here in Washington, the Democrats, who are fighting to protect and expand access to healthcare and drive down costs. There is another party that is continuing their effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act in its entirety, to take away coverage for preexisting conditions, to drive up the cost of prescription drugs. And the American people have the right to know who is fighting for them and who is not.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman (Mr. CICILLINE).

It is extremely important that we continue this fight we fought successfully for 8 years, 9 years. And here we are once again.

The general public, keep in mind, Protecting Preexisting Conditions and Making Healthcare More Affordable Act of 2019, H.R. 1884.

I turn to the gentleman from the State of New York (Mr. MORELLE). If you would like to join us and tell us how all of this affects your constituency in New York.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) for his eloquence and his leadership on this critically important issue.

I rise to express my strong opposition to the Trump administration's efforts to repeal the Affordable Care Act and pull the rug out from millions of Americans who rely on the ACA for essential health coverage.

Quality, affordable healthcare should be a right for every American, and we should make it easier, not harder, for individuals and families to get the insurance they deserve.

The House majority made a promise to always offer protections for individ-

uals with preexisting conditions and fight back against those who seek to dismantle their fundamental protections.

That is why I am proud to cosponsor a resolution to reverse the administration's cruel attempts to sabotage care for Americans in need, and I thank Mr. GARAMENDI for his leadership with House Resolution 1884.

We will not allow people with preexisting conditions to go back to the days where they were denied coverage when they needed it the most. And I might also say, parenthetically—and I appreciate very much the gentleman from California's leadership as the superintendent of insurance in the State of the California—I had the privilege of working on legislation in New York back in the early nineties as a new member that introduced community rating in the State of New York and offered protections for preexisting conditions.

Subsequent to that, I had an opportunity to serve as the chair of the Insurance Committee in the New York State Assembly.

In that role, I was responsible for helping to implement the Affordable Care Act in the State of New York.

Many of the protections in the Affordable Care Act were already part of New York law. I am very, very proud of that; and continued to work on that as majority leader of the State Assembly.

But the protections which we, I think, rely on in New York are not available to all Americans, and to those plans which we are not able, as a state, to regulate, self-regulated plans and other plans protected by ERISA, don't have those protections.

So I think it is critically important as we continue to move forward that we work tirelessly. And I will work with my colleagues to protect and expand the Affordable Care Act, to lower costs and ensure hardworking families everywhere in America have healthcare that they can rely on.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman could stand by for a few seconds.

I knew that he had been in the New York legislature as a leader in the assembly there. And I had some recollection of the work he did on insurance matters.

If he could just talk about the experiences he had when he tried to protect people with preexisting conditions, and those issues that he dealt with in the early nineties, some of the work that was done and the experiences that he had there.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend from California.

You know you understand how it is for many of us who are blessed to have either employer-offered health insurance or are in a situation where you don't think as much about the costs or the issues that involve health insurance. But what you find from talking to people, as many people are not as

privileged as I might be, and really faced critical decisions about whether they could have medicine to treat chronic illnesses or had to make the decision between that and rent.

Or for people who had—as I have said on this floor before, I, unfortunately, lost my daughter to cancer, breast cancer, about a year and-a-half ago.

Lauren had good health insurance, but during her illness, I often thought about men and women in her circumstance, what challenges they would face, even if they are able to defeat the illness, whether or not those preexisting conditions would cause their insurance premiums to be so high and so unattainable that the idea of having quality, affordable healthcare would simply not be within their reach.

□ 1730

This affects millions of Americans. Whether it is women who plan on beginning a family, starting a family; whether it is the elderly who have chronic conditions—you mentioned hypertension; or whether you have diabetes, there are a whole host of conditions. Most Americans have some form of preexisting condition.

For us to allow the underwriting to be done with those preexisting conditions in mind would simply put healthcare out of the reach of most Americans, quality, affordable healthcare. That is why I think this is so important.

I might also add that the Department of Justice is charged with defending the laws duly enacted by this Congress and by the President of the United States. That is the job of the Department of Justice. I find it reprehensible that this Department of Justice under this administration would take the view that they will join in a lawsuit against a law fully enacted that is the law of the land of the United States and seek to overturn it. It is virtually without precedent.

What is so troubling about it is that this will leave millions of Americans without coverage and without health insurance at a time when we should be doing everything we can to ensure that more Americans have access to quality, affordable care.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MORELLE so much. Actually, I didn't know that the gentleman had lost his daughter. That tragic illness is an example of why the Affordable Care Act is so important, because people will have coverage. There are no lifetime limits.

Although your daughter was unsuccessful in the treatment, many thousands upon thousands of Americans are able to get treatment and survive cancer or some other debilitating illness.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much for his experience, and I thank him for being here and bringing all those years of knowledge and experience to this House and helping us fight this fight.

Let me now turn to my colleague from New Jersey who often is here with

me on the floor, Mr. PAYNE. He and I talk about a lot of different subjects. Here, we are talking about one that affects every American. I thank the gentleman for joining us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GARAMENDI for once again setting aside time to talk about the issues that affect the lives of people across this country.

I want to start by saying that the contrast between Republicans and Democrats on this issue of healthcare could not be any clearer.

As the gentleman has described in his discussion of the ongoing legal case down south, Republicans and the Trump administration want to make Americans sick again. They want to eliminate protections for people with preexisting conditions.

Let me just stop there. This Nation was built on a morality that we held very deeply in this country. But, to me, it feels like it has been torn apart, is falling apart, that we do not care about people who find themselves in circumstances that they did not create on their own, that they should alone be left, because of a preexisting condition, not to be afforded healthcare.

That is unconscionable. That is profiting at its worst. It deeply upsets me that we find ourselves turning our backs on our brothers and our sisters, our mothers and our fathers, and our aunts and our uncles in this country to say, no, because you have an illness, we cannot protect you and give you insurance. It is unconscionable.

They want to take the United States backward, and they are weaponizing the courts to do what they failed to do in Congress: repeal the Affordable Care Act.

I arrived here in 2012, and the Affordable Care Act was already the law of the land. But what I witnessed in my time here was the over 50 times, close to 60 times, that the Republicans attempted to repeal the Affordable Care Act but could never do it. They could never do it. With the White House, with the Senate, and with the House, they still could not do it, because it was too popular with a lot of Americans in this country. They did not listen to the people. They did not want the Affordable Care Act repealed.

Now they are trying to go the court and the executive route and do what they could not do in this body, which is the body that determines those matters.

Democrats, on the other hand, want to make America healthy. We want to expand healthcare access. We want to strengthen the Affordable Care Act. We want to make sure that people with preexisting conditions are not denied insurance coverage.

Now the Trump administration is fighting to bring healthcare discrimination back. Well, there is no going back. More than 200,000 people in my State of New Jersey who purchased

their insurance through the Affordable Care Act marketplace have preexisting conditions.

President Trump wants to make it easier for insurers to deny coverage. He is playing politics with their lives.

What my constituents want and need is for the Affordable Care Act to be strengthened. The 200,000 New Jerseyans who purchased their insurance through the Affordable Care Act should not have their insurance coverage put to risk because of politics. New Jerseyans and all Americans deserve protection, not discrimination.

Let me be clear: The Trump administration wants to put lives at risk by undermining people's access to healthcare across this country. The Trump administration is sabotaging the Affordable Care Act, and Americans are paying the price.

The Trump administration has made it more difficult to enroll in the Affordable Care Act by increasing website downtime during open enrollment and cutting the budget for healthcare navigators, the people who help Americans determine and figure out what they need in terms of coverage. They cut that.

The Trump administration has stopped finding cost-share reductions, which lower people's out-of-pocket expenses.

The Trump administration has launched a full-scale legal attack on the Affordable Care Act.

In light of those attacks, let me be clear about one thing: Democrats will keep fighting to ensure that all Americans' healthcare is protected. We will fight in the House. We will fight in the Senate. We will fight in the courts.

Once again, I thank the gentleman for his true leadership on the issues that are facing the American people.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PAYNE for his consistent work here on the floor on multiple issues.

Healthcare issues have always been at the front of his agenda for him and his constituents, and he has fought fiercely since 2012 to see to it that the Affordable Care Act remains in place.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to put up one more chart that I think graphically displays what we have been talking about here. This is 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013. The Affordable Care Act really took hold in 2013. It took a couple years to set up the administrative systems and the like.

You can see in 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017, the number of uninsured in America went from 44 million down to 27 million, which is just, in large numbers, a clear description of what the Affordable Care Act was able to do in bringing insurance to Americans.

Here we have a President who was unable to get his wall and decided to go around Congress and the Constitution to try to fund the wall by moving money from one military account to another so that he could build his wall.

Article I, Section 9 of the Constitution clearly states that it is the Con-

gress that appropriates money. It says no money shall be appropriated from the Treasury without law. Congress passed a law that said \$1.2 billion was for border security. That is it. Now the President wants \$8 billion, literally going around Congress and the Constitution.

He is doing it once again with the Affordable Care Act. He was unable to get Congress to repeal the law, so now he is going to the court system to try to get the court to repeal the law.

Hopefully, the court won't do that. But if it does, those 20 million Americans who will lose their insurance and those 130 million Americans who have preexisting conditions and will once again be open to insurance discrimination—not able to get insurance, paying vastly more because they have a preexisting condition, like being a woman, or blood pressure, or diabetes, or any number of things—those people will remember that it was the President who went around Congress to the courts to ask the court to strike down the Affordable Care Act.

There is so much at risk. Every senior on Medicare will see the doughnut hole come back, and their drug expenses will skyrocket billions of dollars. The free annual checkup that seniors are able to get now will no longer be available. It goes on and on, all gone.

I am going to end with this before I turn this over to my colleagues.

I don't know that I could ever put this up enough, when FDR said: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

In this case, probably close to 27 million Americans have too little. They didn't have healthcare, and today, they do. Those are the Americans who had too little.

Where do we stand? What are our values? How do we approach this fundamental question of America as we go into the 2020s? Are we for those who have much, like the President? Or are we for those who have too little, like the Americans who were uninsured prior to the Affordable Care Act?

I will tell you where we Democrats stand. We, without any Republican support, created the Affordable Care Act. We fought over the last decade, not only to implement it, but to fight the defensive battle to see that it would continue.

Now we are going to continue that fight. We are not going to give up because our values, our purpose, are with those Americans who now rely upon the Affordable Care Act, and, indeed, with those seniors and with this country so that we can provide for those in need.

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

### IMPORTANCE OF JOURNALISM IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank those watching and my colleagues who will join me in the next half hour to talk about journalism, the importance of journalism in the United States and the importance of journalism to democracy.

Abraham Lincoln once said: Let the people know the facts, and the country will be safe.

The challenge is, how do we get them those facts?

For professional journalists, there is nothing more important. They don't always make us who hold office happy. Sometimes, we disagree with them. Sometimes, we think they are not being fair. But they are extremely important to the success or failure of American democracy.

□ 1745

Neil Postman, in 1985, in his book, "Amusing Ourselves to Death," wrote about his own belief in 1985 that how people got information in journalism was changing too dramatically, and he was just talking about the media in terms of television news. Think about how much that has changed since 1985.

Mr. Postman talked about the Lincoln-Douglas debates and that thousands of people would go and listen to those debates because Douglas and Lincoln took the time to write out what they would say and how they anticipated answering questions. People would listen without speakers and without any kind of amplification of what they were saying—thousands of people—for as long as 6 or 7 hours, with a break for dinner.

Mr. Postman's whole argument was this was cognitively different, that when you read something that was prepared over and over again by people who were really good writers, people responded differently and they accepted factual information in a different way than we were learning to accept facts.

Now, in 2019, with this administration and with social media and 24/7 news, I think Mr. Postman would be horrified about how Americans get their facts, how they cognitively process them, and how they engage as American citizens.

There is nothing more important than, as Lincoln said and I would opine, that Americans get journalism with factual content, with the professional expertise of people, many of whom have gone to school, to journalism schools for undergraduate degrees, often for graduate degrees, who go out to work for not a whole lot of money but to be able to investigate, get to the facts, and then communicate. Too many of us underestimate those talents. Maybe we have become spoiled.

But what has happened is a consequence of many things. The business model has changed. Being from the bay area, Craigslist changed classified ads, and that is a revenue source to print journalism. But now as it moves to digital, a group of us wants to talk about what we can do appropriately in Congress and maybe work with—not maybe, but work with State and local officials to talk about how we can appropriately support professional journalism so we can get back to that point where Americans are engaged in a very deep way in their discussion with government and, specifically, with local government.

Most Americans—and maybe it is because I came from local government—learn about democracy, oftentimes, at the local level. They know the people who are in the city council and on the school board. An issue comes up. Their kids start to go to school, and they take an interest in the governance and superintendent and the superintendent's bosses. They care about the curriculum. Maybe there is a land use decision at their city council, and so they start to learn about democracy in a meaningful way that way.

Heretofore, except in the last 10 years with the demise of local journalism, for a variety of reasons, they don't get that information. They get a lot of information about Congress. They get a lot of information about the President of the United States, and some information still at the state-house, but not nearly as much, and very little at the local level.

I will say there are heroic people out there who are still doing great local journalism, but because of the business model and because of consolidations, that has become, I am afraid, very ill.

So just in terms of the definition of the problem, in 2017, estimated daily U.S. newspaper circulation—that is print and digital. So when we focus on, "Oh, well, print is gone; forget about it," we realize that the business model has changed.

But there is a digital model here that we can see in The Washington Post, The New York Times, The Boston Globe, Los Angeles Times, San Francisco Chronicle. There is still a model. But their ability to talk about local news is where we have to get more effort, I think, in understanding, as citizens.

Circulation, print and digital, in 2017 was 31 million for weekday and 34 million for Sunday. That is down 11 and 10 percent, respectively, from each previous year. The chart next to me shows the steady decline.

Newspaper consumption—that is digital and print—has been falling every year since 1994. Today most Americans get their news from television and social media, the primary way they get their information.

Fifty-five percent of Americans are regularly tuning into TV to consume that news information. In contrast, only 20 percent of Americans regularly

get their news from a physical newspaper. Only 38 percent of Americans regularly get their news online.

In 2017, advertising revenue for the entire newspaper industry was \$16.5 billion, a 10 percent decrease from 2016.

Then there are consolidations, an issue that I know Mr. CICILLINE will talk about, the consolidation of the print newspaper business in particular.

And I will say this for the bay area where I live and represent, in the bay area, newspapers, at their peak, had about 1,500 journalists. This is for about 7.5, 7.75 million people, in one of the largest metropolitan areas in the country that is very diverse, 1,500 journalists. These aren't support people. These are writers, professional journalists. Now there are less than 300 serving those same 7.5 million people in an area that is growing and has one of the most innovative and fastest growing economies in the world.

It is not just the bay area. Since 2004, 1,800 local papers have been closed or merged. What traditionally happens—and there are two large companies that do this—is they go in and buy the newspaper and then sell the assets. So very rarely now—when you go around to a city or a town where it used to be a prominent building was the headquarters of the local newspaper, those buildings have been sold.

The San Jose Mercury News had a prominent building in downtown San Jose right by city hall. In Los Angeles, the Los Angeles Times still thrives because it has local ownership, fortunately; but that L.A. Times building, a beautiful art deco that was so much a part of the history of Los Angeles, was directly across the street from city hall. There was a reason for that.

The Examiner and the Chronicle in San Francisco were prominent downtown. These were icons. Well, a lot of these consolidations came about, and they sold these iconic buildings where people worked. Then, of course, they sold the print functions because there was less to do and a lot of the distribution. But they also laid off and eliminated a lot of the journalists, and that is where we get our information.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 39,210 people worked as reporters and editors in the newspaper industry in 2017. This is down from 44,000, about 15 percent from 2015, and 71,645 in 2004, about a 45 percent nationwide decrease. About one-third of the large U.S. newspapers have suffered significant layoffs.

Additionally, journalists' wages remained low. In 2017, the median wage for an editor was only \$49,000, while the median wage for a reporter was about \$34,000. If you are in a place like the bay area, Los Angeles, New York, D.C., or Boston, you can imagine what the cost of living does to that kind of income for people whom we rely on to provide us information.

There is hope, however: some newspaper groups like the one in Philadelphia that has coordinated and consolidated with a nonprofit model and is refocusing its mission on producing excellent journalism to inform the public and focusing on local journalism.

There has been a spike in attendance in university journalism programs in spite of the numbers I just told you since this President took office in 2017.

Through programs to reengage citizens, particularly students, in the importance of journalism and reimagining how we fund print and electronic newspapers, we can ensure that journalism remains a bedrock of the country and a check on its power as it always has been.

As someone from the bay area who has had a relationship with our innovation and our tech companies, for Google and Facebook, they make millions of dollars off of journalists, and we think that they should contribute to that amazing asset that they have right now, largely free of charge. So we look to them to partner with us so that these platforms can be platforms not just for profit, but platforms for democracy, where local journalists can put their wares out there and be able to benefit from it just as they benefit from it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), who is my wonderful colleague from San Jose, in the San Francisco Bay Area.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. The gentleman has laid out the case quite eloquently.

I simply wanted to say that, while the government could never own or should never own the news media, we may have a role to create an environment where local news can flourish without our saying in any way how or what they should cover. But we know that local news covers local stories, and without the local news, you will never find out what is going on in city hall, what is going on in the board of supervisors, and what is going on on the planning commission and the like.

So what Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. CICILLINE, and others have outlined here is a very important challenge for the United States of America. If we are going to have control of our governments, we need to have information; and if we are going to have information, then we need to have a free press all the way from city hall up to the White House. We have got some holes in that coverage right now.

So, Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. CICILLINE, and others for the efforts that they are making, and I look forward to supporting them as they move forward.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking Congressman DESAULNIER

not only for organizing this important Special Order hour and saving local news, but for his enthusiastic and really passionate leadership on this issue.

I think the graphs that my friend from California presented tonight are an illustration of how grave the problem is and how essential it is that we develop a solution to help preserve our local newspapers, because I think we all recognize that our democracy is strongest when we have a free and diverse press that informs citizens, holds concentrated power accountable, and roots out corruption.

There are examples all across the country of local newspapers doing heroic investigative work uncovering corruption, holding power to account, and sharing important information with folks at the local level.

As Justice Brandeis wrote in 1927, those who won our independence believed that public discussion is a political duty, that the greatest threat to freedom is an uninformed citizenry, and that the freedom of thought and speech are indispensable to the discovery and spread of political truth.

But today, as you have so eloquently argued, these bedrock constitutional values are facing existential threats by the new gatekeepers of information, the dominant platforms.

Last year, Facebook and Google amassed more than \$60 billion from online advertising, the majority of all online ad revenue. Despite record levels of online readership, news publishers have seen a steep decline in revenue during the rise of these technology giants.

This bottleneck is bleeding publishers dry.

In an editorial published last year, my local newspaper, The Providence Journal explained that: "Google and Facebook now harvest the majority of the advertising that is supposed to sustain that journalism. It's essentially parasitism: newspapers and other journalistic enterprises do all the work, while Silicon Valley sucks out the profits."

In the absence of a competitive marketplace, newsrooms across the country are laying off reporters and editorial staff or folding altogether. This is happening to legacy news companies and digital publishers alike.

There is no question that we have reached a tipping point.

If this trend continues, we risk permanently compromising the news organizations that are essential to uncovering corruption, holding the government and powerful corporations accountable, and sustaining our democracy.

That is why Mr. DESAULNIER and I have introduced the Journalism Competition and Preservation Act, a bill that would strengthen journalism by allowing news publishers to collectively negotiate with dominant platforms to improve the quality, accuracy, attribution, and interoperability of news online.

It is critical that news publishers, both large and small, have a seat at the

table and equal bargaining power when negotiating with dominant platforms. Whether it is an online publisher or your local newspaper, we cannot have a democracy without a free and diverse press. Our country will not survive if we do not have shared facts, if corruption is not exposed and rooted out at all levels of government, and if power is not held to account. It is simply not possible.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his support and cosponsorship of the legislation, his passionate advocacy for moving forward with it and for organizing tonight's Special Order hour to bring attention to this really critical issue which is really at the center of preserving our access to quality, reliable, and trustworthy news information which is essential to the survival of our democracy.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. CICILLINE for the nice comments.

This bill is extremely important, and I am proud to follow the gentleman's leadership in getting it passed and getting it signed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. DESAULNIER for yielding to me. I also want to thank him and my colleague, Mr. CICILLINE, for sponsoring this important piece of legislation.

This really is a very concerning trend that is taking place in our society as more and more local news organizations in our communities are shutting down or becoming nonexistent. Maintaining a truly free and independent press is vital to our democracy.

I guess he is our favorite Founder tonight, Thomas Jefferson, also said: "Were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter."

□ 1800

We, as a society, rely on members of the press to be our watchdogs, to sound the alarms and hold our government leaders accountable when necessary.

According to a study from the University of North Carolina, over the last 15 years, the newspaper industry has seen over 1,800 mergers or closures of print newspapers.

That is a staggering 20 percent of all newspapers in the country that have now closed since 2004.

In my home State of Colorado, we have three counties—Costilla, Baca, and Cheyenne—that have no daily or weekly papers at all.

And, in my hometown of Denver, where we have seen explosive population growth, we now only have one daily newspaper, The Denver Post. Our other newspaper, the Rocky Mountain News, published its last issue in 2009, 2 months shy of what would have been its 150th anniversary.

While it may have outlived the competition and it now serves as our city's only remaining daily paper, The Denver Post, too, has faced its share of hardships in recent years.

In 2013, The Post had over 250 employees, but today the number is less than 100. On April 8, 2018, in response to another round of devastating layoffs at the paper, The Denver Post's own editorial board published an op-ed entitled "As Vultures Circle, The Denver Post Must Be Saved."

In that op-ed, the editorial board wrote: "The smart money is that in a few years The Denver Post will be rotting bones. And a major city in an important political region will find itself without a newspaper."

These are not my words. These are The Denver Post's own employee's words. The massive decline in the number of reporters covering our local communities is not happening just in Denver. It is happening all over the country, and it is threatening to have real, tangible impacts on our communities.

Now, we heard Congresswoman LOFGREN question how we are going to get coverage of local government in our newspapers.

At The Denver Post, one of the layoffs they had was their one employee who covered Congress. So we are not only now not having coverage on local governments, but also of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Nationwide, the number of full-time reporters covering our State legislatures is down 35 percent from 2003.

And, while the reporters who remain continue as an invaluable service to our communities, frankly, they can't do it all, and, as a result, certain stories absolutely go unreported.

A joint study by the University of Notre Dame and the University of Illinois at Chicago found a connection between local newspaper closures and increased interest rates on local bonds. In fact, the study found that the closure of a local newspaper results in local taxpayers paying an extra \$650,000 in interest per loan.

That is \$650,000 in local taxpayer dollars that could otherwise go to schools, police, firefighters, potholes, or any other of a host of local needs, all lost simply because they didn't have local newspapers watching out on local government.

We often talk in Congress about the fox guarding the henhouse, but in too many small and rural communities there is no one guarding at all.

At the end of the day, for the sake of our democracy, we need local newspapers. We need local reporters. We need our watchdogs doing what they do best. We need to find ways to protect local news outlets and help them thrive.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. DESAULNIER for highlighting this pressing issue affecting our communities and for having us here to discuss this tonight.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all my colleagues who have joined me today. We started an informal group, actually, after the instance that the congresswoman talked about in Denver.

The same ownership owns the Bay Area News Group and the Los Angeles News Group, and there were similar layoffs there.

And in the Bay Area, being there, but also being there seeing the demise of local news, seeing the Chronicle in San Francisco, still owned by a local publisher, but then having the rest of the newspapers—almost the entirety of what was the bedrock of local news outside of San Francisco, for the other 7 million residents in the Bay Area—almost 7 million people—they have seen these large layoffs like Denver has.

I will say that, in my native town of Lowell, Massachusetts, the same company owns that newspaper, and a similar event has happened there.

There is nothing wrong with people making money, wanting to make a larger return on their investment; however, this is, I would argue, a very unique institution for democracy.

As Jefferson said, "Our liberty depends on the freedom of the press. . . ."

As Brandeis said: How people get their information, these are not things that you can separate. They are mutually intertwined.

So, we need the ability to have this, and particularly for local government.

When I started almost 30 years ago in the city of Concord, California, with a population of about 130,000 people, there was a gentleman named Larry Spears who had written for years for the Oakland Tribune and then for our local newspaper, The Contra Costa Times, a county of about a million people—not a small county.

He was in the front row. There are still journalists in that front row, but we need people—and more of them—in every front row. Mr. Spears knew the relationships, how people got elected to city council, who was appointed to the planning commission. Having him there made a difference.

It is human nature that, if you don't have someone watching, you are going to have human nature sometimes do things that it wouldn't if somebody who was professionally charged and trained to be able to explain to the general public what is happening and why it is happening was there.

People will talk about the truth and deep truth, "truth" being the simple explanation of what actually happened and "deep truth" being the meaning of why people took those physical actions.

This is what journalism is about. It is both being able to explain why a legislator or a city council member or a county supervisor did what they did and why they voted. But, as important is understanding why they did it. Did they do it for the reasons that they said that were part of the agenda items, or were there other influences

behind their thoughts? And, can we explain ourselves so that the public can understand why we took that choice.

And the ability of somebody to be able to communicate in an objective way what we say is important to democracy.

So, I hope that today is the beginning of a discussion. Mr. CICILLINE talked about his bill that I am proud to be a coauthor of that we introduced today. I think it is probably the most important.

We have many, many newspapers supporting it. We hope that there will be, obviously, a wave of support. Editorial boards, we ask for your help. Any interested citizen can contact my office. I have a simple name to remember as far as Googling it.

Let us know how you can help. If you are at a journalism school, if you are a journalist and you have ideas, give us ideas. These are constitutionally difficult issues.

The Congress shouldn't be, as Congresswoman DEGETTE said, deciding how the First Amendment is orchestrated, I should say, or organized. But we should be supportive because, if we are successful, it is because of independent journalism out there.

I would say that it is important that we have people who write, so that people who read and cognitively accept complicated issues will not become lazy.

We often get told that it is about our messaging, but messaging is a two-way street. It requires the person who is speaking, or writing, to be able to communicate in a succinct, profound, empathy-filled way, but it also requires us, as citizens, to be listening and understand that sometimes issues are complicated.

Well, how do you find that out? I would opine, as Mr. Postman did in 1985, that—and we know more about this now in terms of neuroscience and cognitive development and exercise—the more we read, the more we practice at our writing skills, the more we practice at our communication skills in general, the deeper our knowledge and the greater our capacity, cognitively, to understand and problem-solve.

So I would make the hope that this is the beginning of something that we will do good bipartisan work on and will allow for newspapers, as Jefferson said, to allow for democracy to exist and to prosper.

And lastly, in Lincoln's comment that I started with when he said: If you let the people know the facts, the country will be safe—our Speaker has a favorite quote where she says another Lincoln quote that says: Public opinion means everything. No statute, no public proclamation, Lincoln said, has any meaning if the people do not support it and it has their sentiment.

I would argue this other quote from Lincoln is equally as important: If the American people know the facts, the country will be safe.

We need to provide the professional journalism to make sure they get those facts.

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

## PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE CLIMATE CRISIS FOR THE 116TH CONGRESS

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, April 2, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Speaker of the House,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER, Pursuant to Rule XI, Clause 2(a) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I respectfully submit the rules for the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis in the 116th Congress for publication in the Congressional Record. The Select Committee adopted these rules by voice vote, with a quorum being present, at our organizational meeting on Thursday, March 28, 2019.

Sincerely,

KATHY CASTOR,  
Chair.

### RULE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The provisions of section 104(f) of H. Res. 6 (116th Congress) governing the proceedings of the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis (hereinafter referred to as the "Committee") are hereby incorporated by reference and nothing herein shall be construed as superseding any provision of that section. The Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Committee to the extent that they are not inconsistent with that title.

(b) The rules of the Committee shall be made publicly available in electronic form and published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Committee adopts its rules.

### RULE 2. MEETINGS.

(a) In General.—

(1) The regular meeting date of the Committee shall be the first Tuesday of every month when the House is in session in accordance with clause 2(b) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. If the House is not in session on the first Tuesday of a month, the regular meeting date shall be the third Tuesday of that month. A regular meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with if, in the judgment of the Chair of the Committee, there is no need for the meeting.

(2) Additional meetings may be called by the Chair of the Committee as the Chair considers necessary, in accordance with clause 2(g)(3) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) Meetings of the Committee shall be called to order and presided over by the Chair or, in the Chair's absence, by a member designated by the Chair to carry out such duties.

(c) Notification.—

(1) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(3) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Chair shall make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of a Committee meeting (other than a hearing), which may not commence earlier than the third calendar day (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day) on which members have notice thereof.

(2) The agenda for each Committee meeting, setting out all items of business to be considered, shall be established by the Chair and provided to each member of the Committee at least 36 hours (exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such days) in advance of the commencement of such meeting.

(d) The requirements of paragraph (c) may be waived by a majority vote of those present, a quorum being present, or by the Chair with the concurrence of the Ranking Member. If the requirements of paragraph (c) are waived, the Chair shall notify the members of the Committee at the earliest possible time.

### RULE 3. HEARINGS.

(a) Announcement of Hearings.—

(1) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(3) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Chair shall announce the date, time, place, and subject matter of any hearing of the Committee, which may not commence earlier than one week after such notice.

(2) A hearing may commence sooner than specified in (a)(1) if the Chair, with the concurrence of the Ranking Member, determines there is good cause or the Committee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present. The Chair shall announce the hearing at the earliest possible time.

(b) Written Witness Statement; Oral Testimony.—

(1) Filing of Statement.—To the greatest extent practicable, each witness who is to appear before the Committee shall file with the clerk of the Committee a written statement of his or her proposed testimony at least two business days in advance of his or her appearance. The clerk of the Committee shall distribute this testimony to the Members of the Committee as soon as is practicable and at least one business day before the hearing. The requirements of this subparagraph may be waived or modified by the Chair after consultation with the Ranking Member.

(2) Each witness shall limit his or her oral presentation of testimony to no more than five minutes.

(3) Truth in Testimony.—Each witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity shall include with the written statement of his or her proposed testimony a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of any Federal grants or contracts or foreign government contracts and payments related to the subject matter of the hearing received during the current calendar year or either of the two preceding calendar years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness. The disclosure shall include (A) the amount and source of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) related to the subject matter of the hearing; and (B) the amount and country of origin of any payment or contract related to the subject matter of the hearing originating with a foreign government.

(4) Availability of Information.—Statements filed under this paragraph shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

(c) Notification of Subject Matter.—As soon as practicable but no later than 36 hours before the commencement of a hearing, the Chair shall make available to the public and all Members of the Committee a concise summary of the subject matter under consideration at the hearing, any relevant reports from departments or agencies on such matters, and a list of witnesses, including minority witnesses.

(d) Minority Witnesses.—When any hearing is conducted by the Committee on any measure or matter, the minority party members on the Committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chair by a majority of those members, to call at least one witness, as selected by the minority members, to testify with respect to that measure or matter along with witnesses selected by the Chair.

(e) Opening Statements.—

(1) Chair and Ranking Member.—At any hearing of the Committee, the Chair and

Ranking Member shall each control five minutes for opening statements. The Chair and Ranking Member may recognize other members within their respective five minutes.

(2) Other Members.—The Chair may allow other members of the Committee to deliver oral opening statements, as appropriate, with the concurrence of the Ranking Member. Such statements shall not exceed five minutes in length and are to be equally distributed between majority and minority members to the extent practicable given the party makeup of the members present. Members not recognized by the Chair for oral opening statements may submit written opening statements for the record.

(f) Questioning of Witnesses.—The Chair shall initiate the right to question witnesses before the Committee, followed by the Ranking Member and all other members thereafter.

(1) Order of Member Recognition.—The right to question the witnesses before the Committee shall alternate between majority and minority members. A member of the Committee may question a witness only when recognized by the Chair for that purpose. The Chair shall recognize in order of appearance members who were not present when the meeting was called to order after all members who were present when the meeting was called to order have been recognized in the order of seniority on the Committee.

(2) Procedures for Questioning of Witnesses by Members.—Each member shall be limited to 5 minutes in the questioning of witnesses and shall limit his or her remarks to the subject matter of the hearing. After consultation with the Ranking Member, the Chair may recognize members who have already had an opportunity to question the witness for a second period of 5 minutes once each member of the Committee present has been recognized once for that purpose.

(3) Extended Questioning of Witnesses by Members.—Following the questioning of witnesses described in (f)(2) above, the Chair, with the concurrence of the Ranking Member or the Committee by motion, may permit a specified number of members to question one or more witnesses for a specified period of time not to exceed 60 minutes in the aggregate, equally divided between and controlled by the Chair and the Ranking Member.

(4) Questions for the Record.—Each member may submit to the Chair additional questions for the record to be answered by the witnesses who have appeared. Each member shall provide a copy of the questions in an electronic format to the Committee no later than 10 business days following a hearing. The Chair shall transmit all questions received from members of the Committee to the appropriate witnesses and include the transmittal letter and the responses from the witnesses in the hearing record. After consultation with the Ranking Member, the Chair is authorized to close the hearing record no earlier than 15 business days from the date the questions were transmitted to the appropriate witnesses.

(g) Hearings of the Committee shall be called to order and presided over by the Chair or, in the Chair's absence, by a member designated by the Chair to carry out such duties.

(h) Oaths.—The Chair of the Committee, or a member designated by the Chair, may administer oaths to any witness before the Committee. The Chair or his or her designee may administer the following oath to all witnesses prior to receiving testimony: "Do you solemnly swear or affirm, under penalty of law, that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?"

(i) Claims of Privilege.—Claims of common-law privilege made by witnesses in hearings, or by interviewees in investigations or inquiries, are applicable only at the discretion of the Chair, subject to appeal to the Committee.

#### RULE 4. OPEN PROCEEDINGS.

(a) Meetings for the transaction of business and hearings of the Committee shall be open to the public, including radio, television, and still photography coverage, unless closed in accordance with clause 2(g) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) The audio and video coverage of Committee proceeding permitted under clause 4 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Committee.

#### RULE 5. REPORTS.

(a) Approval of Official Committee Reports.—Any report completed pursuant to section 104(f)(5) of H. Res. 6 (116th Congress) that purports to express the views, findings, conclusions, or recommendations of the Committee must be approved by a majority vote of the Committee at a meeting at which a quorum is present, in accordance with Committee Rule 7(a)(3). The total number of votes cast for and against, and the names of those voting for and against, shall be included in the Committee report on the matter.

(b) Notice of Committee Reports.—Any report described in (a) shall not be considered in the Committee unless the proposed report has been available to the members of the Committee for at least three business days before consideration of such report in the Committee.

(c) Additional Views.—If, at the time of approval of a report, a member of the Committee gives notice of intent to file supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views for inclusion in the report, all members of the Committee shall be entitled to no less than two business days after such notice to file such views following clause 2(1) of rule XI and clause 3(a)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House.

(d) Availability of Publications.—Pursuant to clause 2(e)(4) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form to the maximum extent feasible. Pursuant to sections 104(f)(5) and 104(f)(6) of H. Res. 6 (116th Congress), the Committee shall make its publications available to the general public in widely accessible formats not later than 30 calendar days following the respective dates for completion.

#### RULE 6. COMMITTEE RECORDS.

(a) Availability.—Documents reflecting the proceedings of the Committee shall be made publicly available in electronic form on the Committee's website and in the Committee office for inspection by the public, as provided in clause 2(e) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, within 48 hours of such recorded vote after each meeting has adjourned, including a record showing those present at each meeting; and a record of the vote on any question on which a recorded vote is demanded, including a description of the motion, order, or other proposition, the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those members of the Committee present but not voting.

(b) Archived Records.—The records of the Committee deposited at the National Archives shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House. The Chair shall notify the Ranking Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of such rule, to withhold a record otherwise available. Upon

written request of any member of the Committee, the Chair shall present the matter to the Committee for a determination, which shall be subject to the same requirements for conduct of Committee business under Committee Rule 2.

#### RULE 7. QUORUMS AND RECORDED VOTES; POSTPONEMENT OF VOTES

(a) Establishment of a Quorum.—  
(1) For the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence, no fewer than two members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

(2) A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for those actions for which the Rules of the House of Representatives require a majority quorum.

(3) A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for issuing an official Committee report pursuant to Rule 5 of the Committee rules and section 104(f)(5) of H. Res. 6 (116th Congress).

(4) For the purposes of taking any other action, one-third of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

(b) Recorded Votes.—A recorded vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the members present.

(c) Postponement of Votes.—Pursuant to clause 2(h)(4) of the Rules of the House, the Chair, after consultation with the Ranking Member, may postpone further proceedings when a recorded vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment and may resume proceedings on a postponed vote at any time after reasonable notice to Members by the Clerk or other designee of the Chair. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

#### RULE 8. COMMITTEE STAFF.

(a) Professional and other staff of the Committee are subject to the provisions of clause 9 of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) Majority Staff.—The Chair shall appoint and determine the remuneration of, and may remove, the employees of the Committee not assigned to the minority. The staff of the Committee not assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chair, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate such authority as he or she determines appropriate.

(c) Minority Staff.—The Ranking Member shall appoint and determine the remuneration of, and may remove, the staff assigned to the minority within the budget approved for such purposes.

The staff assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Ranking Member, who may delegate any authority he or she determines appropriate.

(d) The Chair and Ranking Member have the right to secure one or more detailees to assist with the work of the Committee.

#### RULE 9. BUDGET.

(a) The Chair, in consultation with the Ranking Member, shall prepare a budget providing amounts for staff, committee travel, field hearings, investigation, and other expenses of the Committee. Funds authorized for the Committee as provided in clause 6 of Rule X are for expenses incurred in the activities of the Committee.

(b) Consistent with clause 9 of Rule X, the Chair shall designate an amount equal to 1/3 of the amount provided to the Committee in the primary expense resolution adopted by

the House of Representatives to be under the direction of the Ranking Member for the compensation of the minority staff, travel expenses of minority members and staff, and minority office expenses. All expenses of minority members and staff shall be paid for out of the amount so set aside.

#### RULE 10. TRAVEL.

(a) The Chair may authorize travel for any member and any staff member of the Committee in connection with activities or subject matters under the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Travel to be reimbursed from funds set aside for the Committee for any member of staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the Chair. Before such authorization is granted, there shall be submitted to the Chair in writing the following:

- (1) The purpose of the travel.
- (2) The dates during which the travel is to occur.
- (3) The names of the states or countries to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each.
- (4) An agenda of anticipated activities.
- (5) The names of members and staff of the Committee for whom the authorization is sought.

(b) Members and staff of the Committee shall make a written report to the Chair on any travel they have conducted under this subsection, including a description of their itinerary, expenses, and activities, and of pertinent information gained as a result of such travel.

(c) Members and staff of the Committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, and regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration.

#### RULE 11. WEBSITE.

The Chair shall maintain an official Committee website for the purpose of carrying out the official responsibilities of the Committee, including communicating information about the Committee's activities. The Ranking Member may maintain a minority website. To the maximum extent feasible, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form on the official Committee website maintained by the Chair.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 3, 2019, at 9 a.m.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

588. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Scrapie in Sheep and Goats [Docket No.: APHIS-2007-0127] (RIN: 0579-AC92) received March 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

589. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Amendments to the Capital Plan Rule [Regulations Y; Docket No.: R-1653] (RIN 7100-AF41) received March 29, 2019, pursuant

to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

590. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — LPTV, TV Translator, and FM Broadcast Station Reimbursement [MB Docket No.: 18-214]; Expanding the Economic and Innovation Opportunities of Spectrum Through Incentive Auctions [GN Docket No.: 12-268] received March 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

591. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Standards Branch, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oil and Gas and Sulfur Operations on the Outer Continental Shelf-Civil Penalty Inflation Adjustment [Docket ID: BSEE-2019-0001; 190E1700D2 ETISF0000.EAQ000 EEEEE500000] (RIN: 1014-AA42) received March 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DEFAZIO: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 639. A bill to amend section 327 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to clarify that National Urban Search and Rescue Response System task forces may include Federal employees (Rept. 116-29). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEFAZIO: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 16. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition (Rept. 116-30). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DEFAZIO: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 19. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby (Rept. 116-31). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. SCANLON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 281. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1585) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-32). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself and Mr. KINZINGER):

H.R. 2019. A bill to provide for a smart water resource management pilot program; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee (for himself and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 2020. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to require a person that possesses or intends to possess a tableting machine or encapsulating machine to obtain

registration from the Attorney General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 2021. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and to establish a congressional budget for fiscal year 2020; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 2022. A bill to establish certain procurement procedures with respect to businesses wholly-owned through an ESOP, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HECK (for himself, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BARR, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COOK, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HURD of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. OLSON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 2023. A bill to require reports by the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence relating to construction of the Nord Stream 2 pipeline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RESCIENTHALER:

H.R. 2024. A bill to require a five-year staffing plan for the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CASTEN of Illinois:

H.R. 2025. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the alternative fuel refueling property credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 2026. A bill to address the needs of individuals with disabilities within the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 2027. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require the President to place any financial conflicts of interest into a blind trust, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 2028. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to prohibit individuals who threaten to destroy the Government from participating in or attending meetings of the National Security Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Oversight and Reform, for a period

to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GALLEG0 (for himself, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COLE, Mr. COOK, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas):

H.R. 2029. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report on the response of law enforcement agencies to reports of missing or murdered Indians; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. CURTIS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HORSFORD, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MCADAMS, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. STANTON, Mr. STEWART, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 2030. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to execute and carry out agreements concerning Colorado River Drought Contingency Management and Operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. HAALAND (for herself, Mr. COLE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HECK, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. GALLEG0):

H.R. 2031. A bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian Tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 2032. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals to designate overpayments of income tax for disaster relief; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HILL of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. WESTERMAN):

H.R. 2033. A bill to release to the State of Arkansas a reversionary interest in Camp Joseph T. Robinson; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. JAYAPAL (for herself and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 2034. A bill to improve the treatment of Federal prisoners who are primary caretaker parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington):

H.R. 2035. A bill to amend title XXIX of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program under such title relating to lifespan respite care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 2036. A bill to provide protections for amateur and professional athletes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MALINOWSKI:

H.R. 2037. A bill to encourage accountability for the murder of Washington Post columnist Jamal Khashoggi; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to

the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 2038. A bill to allow State-based, market-oriented, prescription drug negotiations to lower pharmaceutical drug prices, to encourage competition, to increase consumer choice and access, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2039. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit discrimination in the payment of wages on account of sex, race, or national origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WENSTRUP, Ms. SPEIER, and Mrs. WALORSKI):

H.R. 2040. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make fuel cells using electromechanical processes eligible for the energy tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 2041. A bill to reauthorize the weatherization assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. ROUDA):

H.R. 2042. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain tax credits related to electric cars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida (for herself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that female athletes be paid the same as their male counterparts and organizers of world-class competitions actively take part in combating the wage gap; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. FRANKEL (for herself, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. BEYER, Mr. NADLER, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. SCHRIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. SCHKOWSKY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. COHEN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. PALONE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COX of California, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. WELCH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. OMAR, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RASKIN, Mr.

NEGUSE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. HECK, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. COOPER, Ms. HAALAND, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. TITUS, Ms. DEAN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. BASS, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. CASE):

H. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution recognizing the significance of equal pay and the disparity between wages paid to men and women; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALDEN (for himself and Mr. BRADY):

H. Res. 280. A resolution protecting the health care of all Americans, especially those with preexisting conditions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DESAULNIER (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H. Res. 282. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the importance of local print and digital journalism to the continued welfare, transparency, and prosperity of government at every level and the continuation and freedom of the United States as it is known today; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H. Res. 283. A resolution condemning racism in sports; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H. Res. 284. A resolution opposing fake news and alternative facts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

15. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, relative to House Resolution No. 109, urging the United States Congress to enact comprehensive legislation to combat call spoofing; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 2019.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee:

H.R. 2020.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Congress shall have power to to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 2021.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18; and Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 2022.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1 Sec. 8 Clause 3

By Mr. HECK:

H.R. 2023.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 3 and 18 of article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RESCHENTHALER:

H.R. 2024.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. CASTEN of Illinois:

H.R. 2025.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 2026.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 2027.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One of the United States Constitution, section 8, clause 18:

“The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof” and

Article One of the United States Constitution, Section 8, Clause 3:

“The Congress shall have Power—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;”

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 2028.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One of the United States Constitution, Section 8, Clause 18:

“The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof” and

Article One of the United States Constitution, Section 8, Clause 3:

“The Congress shall have Power—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;”

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 2029.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2030.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8, cl. 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

U.S. Cont. art. IV, sec. 3, cl. 2, sen. a

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rule and Regulations respecting the Territory of other Property belonging to the United States;

By Ms. HAALAND:

H.R. 2031.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 2032.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. HILL of Arkansas:

H.R. 2033.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 2034.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 2035.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 2036.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MALINOWSKI:

H.R. 2037.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 2038.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 "The Congress shall have Power To . . . regulate Commerce . . . among the several States . . ."

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2039.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 2040.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2041.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the

Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2042.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 9: Mr. PETERS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. OMAR, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. MENG, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. MURPHY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WILD, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CASE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 94: Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 95: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 96: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mrs. CRAIG.

H.R. 141: Mr. BRINDISI.

H.R. 230: Mrs. MCBATH.

H.R. 336: Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 344: Mr. TIPTON, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 372: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 500: Mr. STAUBER, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 530: Mr. BRINDISI.

H.R. 535: Mr. SOTO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. OMAR, and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 541: Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 553: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 594: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 597: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 663: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 677: Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 678: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 692: Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. COLE, Mr. BOST, and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 693: Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 724: Mrs. LESKO and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.

H.R. 748: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BARR, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 803: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 810: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LEVIN of California, and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 838: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BERA, and Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 864: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 884: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. JOHN-SON of South Dakota.

H.R. 929: Mr. JORDAN and Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 935: Mr. BRINDISI and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 938: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 946: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 959: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 960: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 965: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 979: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 986: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 987: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1002: Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 1006: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. GIANFORTE.

H.R. 1007: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1010: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. SHALALA, and Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 1025: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1030: Ms. SCANLON and Ms. FRANKEL.

H.R. 1034: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 1035: Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 1043: Mr. POCAN and Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 1044: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. SHERILL, and Mr. PENCE.

H.R. 1050: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 1052: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Ms. JACK-SON LEE.

H.R. 1096: Mr. KATKO, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. STAUBER, and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 1101: Mr. BACON, Mr. BARR, and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 1109: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1114: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

H.R. 1135: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H.R. 1139: Mr. NEAL, Mr. BRINDISI, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. KIM, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1146: Ms. SCANLON, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 1156: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 1175: Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. NUNES, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 1182: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1183: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1186: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.

H.R. 1222: Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 1223: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 1224: Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MENG, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1225: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. GOODEN.

H.R. 1297: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1309: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. SHALALA, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. CASE, Mr. CISNEROS, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1311: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1346: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1365: Ms. OMAR, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. BACON, and Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 1370: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1373: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 1379: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 1385: Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 1386: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1407: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. RESCHENTHALER.

H.R. 1411: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1425: Mr. CASE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. BRINDISI.

H.R. 1426: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 1450: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. COOPER, Ms. BASS, and Ms. FRANKEL.

H.R. 1458: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1503: Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PAL-LONE, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. MATSUI, and Mrs. CRAIG.

H.R. 1520: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 1530: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. BACON.

H.R. 1545: Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. BRINDISI, Ms. MENG, and Mr. JORDAN.  
 H.R. 1553: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.  
 H.R. 1560: Mr. SABLAN.  
 H.R. 1570: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. COX of California, Mr. MITCHELL, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. BOST, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. STAUBER.  
 H.R. 1595: Mr. BRINDISI and Mr. STEUBE.  
 H.R. 1611: Mr. MEADOWS.  
 H.R. 1618: Mr. UPTON.  
 H.R. 1629: Mr. RIGGLEMAN.  
 H.R. 1643: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.  
 H.R. 1673: Mr. ABRAHAM and Mr. VAN DREW.  
 H.R. 1679: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. RYAN, Mr. HUDSON, and Mrs. WAGNER.  
 H.R. 1682: Mr. POCAN, Ms. SCANLON, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 1690: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mrs. MCBATH.  
 H.R. 1695: Mr. PHILLIPS.  
 H.R. 1713: Ms. OMAR, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. STEUBE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
 H.R. 1722: Mr. COLE.  
 H.R. 1730: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. COHEN.  
 H.R. 1738: Mrs. LESKO and Mr. GROTHMAN.  
 H.R. 1741: Mr. BARR, Mr. LATTA, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BOST, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.  
 H.R. 1748: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. PALLONE.  
 H.R. 1753: Mr. SCALISE.  
 H.R. 1757: Ms. SCANLON.  
 H.R. 1763: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. ROUDA.  
 H.R. 1767: Ms. OMAR and Ms. SCANLON.  
 H.R. 1771: Ms. OMAR.  
 H.R. 1799: Mr. NADLER.  
 H.R. 1807: Mr. GOSAR.  
 H.R. 1832: Mr. LUJÁN and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.  
 H.R. 1854: Mr. MEADOWS.  
 H.R. 1855: Mr. ROUZER.  
 H.R. 1868: Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. HILL of California, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.  
 H.R. 1869: Mr. ESTES, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 1878: Mr. DEFazio and Ms. OMAR.  
 H.R. 1879: Ms. STEFANIK.  
 H.R. 1884: Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr.

SMITH of Washington, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. OMAR, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LEVIN of California, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1895: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. RYAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1904: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BUCK, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 1911: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 1914: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1922: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1934: Mr. QUIGLEY and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1935: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. SPANO.

H.R. 1943: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1944: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. COLE, and Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 1952: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1963: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 2000: Mrs. TRAHAN.

H.R. 2002: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 2010: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. BRADY, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BANKS, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. WRIGHT.

H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. HUIZENGA.

H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H. Res. 54: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. STANTON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, and Mr. HORSFORD.

H. Res. 60: Mr. HORSFORD.

H. Res. 100: Mr. MAST, Mr. BOST, Mr. STANTON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. WOODALL.

H. Res. 179: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H. Res. 189: Mr. WATKINS, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Ms. MENG.

H. Res. 220: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BERA, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. HIMES, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H. Res. 221: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BERA, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. HIMES, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H. Res. 222: Mr. KIND, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BERA, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H. Res. 246: Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. CRIST, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. WILD, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. KIM, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. MEEKS.

H. Res. 250: Mr. COHEN, Ms. OMAR, and Mr. GOMEZ.

H. Res. 254: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. SHALALA, and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H. Res. 255: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 261: Mr. OLSON, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H. Res. 270: Mr. STEUBE.

H. Res. 271: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. COOPER, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. PORTER, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SOTO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. PAPPAS, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. VELA, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. GALLEGOS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. TRONE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. COX of California, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. MENG, Mr. WELCH, Ms. FINKENAUER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KIM, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. SIRES, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. COSTA, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. STANTON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. WILD, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. TITUS, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BASS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. DEAN, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, and Ms. TLAIB.

H. Res. 276: Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. PASCRELL.

#### CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative HAKEEM JEFFRIES, or a designee, to H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.