

them. There are 47 of these guys over here who are not toothless when it comes to district judges.

So this is not a bad day for the Senate; this is a day we end this completely outrageous level of interference and obstruction with this administration. I don't think anybody ought to be seized with guilt over any institutional damage being done to the Senate.

## POINT OF ORDER

Mr. President, I raise a point of order that postcloture time under rule XXII for all executive branch nominations other than a position at level 1 of the Executive Schedule under section 5312 of title 5 of the United States Code is 2 hours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Under rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the point of order is not sustained.

## APPEAL RULING OF THE CHAIR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I appeal the ruling of the Chair and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 59 Ex.]

## YEAS—48

Baldwin	Hassan	Reed
Bennet	Heinrich	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	Jones	Schatz
Brown	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Sinema
Carper	Leahy	Smith
Casey	Lee	Stabenow
Collins	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden

## NAYS—51

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blackburn	Graham	Risch
Blunt	Grassley	Roberts
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeben	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Isakson	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Kennedy	Shelby
Cramer	Lankford	Sullivan
Crapo	McConnell	Thune
Cruz	McSally	Tillis
Daines	Moran	Toomey
Enzi	Murkowski	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Young

## NOT VOTING—1

Harris

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate overrules the decision of the Chair.

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, in the last vote today we established a new precedent. The rules of the Senate are a combination of the rules of the Senate, the standing orders of the Senate, and the precedents of the Senate. Senator LANKFORD and I had hoped to do this with a permanent standing order that basically would have put the Senate exactly where the bipartisan vote was in 2013, which included my vote, to have the same kind of rules that we are encouraging now. This process is designed to speed up not only nominees for Republican Presidents but also nominees for Presidents who are Democrats.

In the last 2 years, we have seen an extraordinary use of every tool available to the minority. The Senate is designed to be a place where the minority is heard. In fact, at one time, any Senator could stop everything forever, and when Senators started doing that to excess, that rule was changed. The protections of the minority often have to be looked at again when the minority abuses those protections. That is what has happened in this case.

Now we have 2 hours of debate on the nominee we are debating right now. If we hadn't just taken the vote we took that overruled the Chair, we would have 30 hours of debate. I guarantee that there will not be 2 hours of debate about this nominee. There may not be 2 minutes of debate about this nominee if we see what we have seen happened in the last 2 years.

The rules of the Senate currently say that if any Senator wants to hold up consideration of a nominee, then, the Senator can insist that we go through the process of invoking cloture. In the first 2 years of the Obama administration, that process was used 12 times, and that was more than had been the case in the past. In fact, the previous 3 Presidents had cloture invoked on their nominees a total of 12 times. That is 24 times in 4 Presidencies. In the first 2 years of President Trump's time in office, the majority leader had to come to the floor 128 times and say we are going to have to invoke cloture to have a chance to vote on this nominee.

It is the first week of April. Eleven times this year already the Senate has had to invoke cloture on a nominee for a government job—for a judgeship or some other government job. While that debate time was seldom used, occasionally, at the end of the week, we would say: Well, OK, we will just go ahead and do the last one. Each time, we had to assume that 30 hours would be used up for those people to be processed and to have a chance to do the jobs that they were going to do.

The history of the Senate is exactly as the majority leader described here earlier. In the first 200-plus years of the Senate, while the Senate often used a delaying tactic to delay legislation and require the Senate to think about it more, the Senate virtually never used

the rules of the Senate to slow down the process of putting people in the Cabinet.

In fact, several Presidents—and Presidents in this century—had their full Cabinet put in place within the first day or two of their administration. That didn't happen with this President, and it is obviously what brought us to where we are today.

Usually, in the first couple of years of a new administration, the President not only gets his Cabinet approved right away, but the President is also able to put people around those Cabinet officers who want to move the government in the same direction that the voters just said they wanted the country to go.

The term of an administration is only 4 years. At the end of 2 years, if you are sending back 124 nominees who just simply didn't get voted on—they got investigated, they got the background checks done, they went through the committee, and the committee voted to send them to the floor—that was always supposed to be part of the work of the committee, and that happened for 124 people who never had a chance to get voted on in the first 2 years of this administration, many of whom had been waiting in line for a year.

Now, if you are appointed and have a short-term job in the Federal Government and are willing to serve, the one thing that does for sure is to put your life in some chaos—coming up with the material that the Congress insists on, going through the background check, and getting your financial records out. For most people, it also means putting the way they make a living on hold.

I had somebody whom I nominated as one of three people for the President to choose from to be the district judge in the Eastern District of Missouri. I made that nomination roughly 24 months ago. Twenty-two months ago, the President told the person he chose that he was going to nominate that person. Last November, after a year and a half of that person telling all his law clients, "You know, I am about to become a Federal judge; you may need to find another lawyer," and after he closed his legal process, he hasn't been voted on yet. That man was one of the people sent back from the White House. He had to be sent back up this year and had to go through the Judiciary Committee again. He had to get back in a line, where every single person took 30 hours of debate, after the 1 day that had to be debatable between the time the leader brings you up and you come to the floor.

This sounds pretty complicated. That is because it is, and it is made more complicated by the fact that people have used it as a delaying tactic.

Now, as for the 128 people whom I mentioned—the 128 people whom the majority leader had to file cloture on—compared to 12, let's be sure we are comparing this the way this used to be,

even in recent years to now—128 compared to 12. When those 128 people finally got votes, the support was substantial. When they finally got votes, one-third of them got 70 votes or more. Thirteen percent got 90 votes or more. So you have 90 people voting for people that someone insisted we needed 30 hours of debate for, and there wasn't a debate at all.

Twenty district judges had cloture filed on them. Twelve of those district judges had nobody vote against them after 30 hours on the floor, where, in all likelihood, nobody had anything to say during those 30 hours.

The average amount of time that we spent talking about nominees during the 30 hours that has been insisted on is less than 1 hour. The person who generated the most discussion, at least this year, was the new Attorney General. That is a pretty important job. There should have been quite a bit of discussion. In fact, it was our intention—the intention of the standing order that Senator LANKFORD and I filed—and it will continue to be the intention, that that person will still have 30 hours of debate if anybody thought that was necessary.

Supreme Court justices, Cabinet members, and circuit judges would all have 30 hours of debate. But even with the Attorney General, less than 4 hours was used to talk about what everybody listening would believe is one of the most important jobs possible.

For the 10 other nominees who have had cloture filed on them prior to this week, almost no debate time was used. In fact, again, even in the case of Attorney General William Barr, four-thirtieths of the time was used. That means that twenty-six-thirtieths of the time wasn't used, but we couldn't use it for anything else. We couldn't use it for another nominee. We couldn't use it for a piece of legislation. We couldn't use it to talk about how the government spends its money basically to debate an appropriations bill that would be on the floor. It just couldn't happen.

Last week, we confirmed Bridget Bade to be a judge of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. We used less than 1 minute of the 30 hours that the minority insisted on—less than 1 minute of the 30 hours—but nothing else could be done during those 30 hours.

Every Member of the Senate knows that the abuse of this process is done to delay and to keep us from confirming not only other people who need to be confirmed but to keep us from getting to the work we need to get to. It prevents us from taking up other legislation. It prevents us from doing our job.

It has to be discouraging when you talk to people in the future about this: Would you be willing to serve as the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for something? Would you be willing to serve as the Assistant Deputy Secretary of Treasury for IRS? And, by the way, you really can't start anything new, and you may never get voted on.

When you do get voted on, you may not actually be able to serve in that job for more than a few months if you serve the rest of the term of this Presidency.

People will begin to say no, and we all know that.

Today we have 140 people who are waiting to be voted on for jobs they have been nominated for. They are now out of committee. They have done all the paperwork. They have cleared all of the days. They have done everything they needed to do.

When President Reagan was President, the average number of days between the time you were voted out of committee and the time you were voted on on the floor was 5 days. By the time you had gotten out of committee, you had already been weeks, if not months, into this process. Five days later, you would get to know whether or not you were going to get the job.

With President Trump, the average number of days between the time you got out of committee and the time you got voted on was 55. That is 55 days when you are waiting to do the job that you have been willing to do, have answered every question you have been asked, have gone through all of the background checks you needed, and you are still waiting.

This system cannot work that way. We would never get everybody confirmed that a President is required to nominate, which means we also would never have time to get the other things done that the Senate needs to do.

I think the step we took today was an important one. We will talk about another category of people to be confirmed later today—district judges. I believe we will be able to make that change as well. Again, the Cabinet, the Supreme Court, and the circuit judges would all still have 30 hours available to them.

Our friends on the other side may continue to insist on that, but if they do, I guarantee that if you run a clock on this, in all likelihood nobody will ever use the 30 hours to talk about the nominee. If we didn't do it to talk about William Barr, we are not hardly going to do it to talk about anybody else.

Debate is an important thing. Having the right people in the right job is an important thing. It is also important to have them in the right job at the right time. Today, I believe the Senate is taking important steps to return back to the traditional role of the Senate in confirming nominees and giving Presidents an opportunity to do the job they were elected to do.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I thank my colleague. He has more institutional knowledge, has been here longer, and understands this process. I haven't been here as long, but I am trying to put a little common sense to it, and I am having a hard time.

I am not naive enough to stand up thinking that if I could have given my speech before we took that vote, it might have made any difference. I wish it would have. I wish I could have. But it didn't happen that way.

Words cannot express how disappointed I am—I truly am—to stand here as the only Member of the Senate who voted against the nuclear option in 2013 when it was a Democratic proposal and in 2017, the Republican proposal, and now what we did today. I have consistently voted against this because it is not who we are, and it is not about what we are about either.

For those who don't know, the nuclear option is strictly a gimmick that allows the majority party to truly steal the power of debate and the power of the filibuster from individual Senators. Why does it matter? Because so much of our influence as Senators comes from our power to filibuster. It is also the most powerful tool we have to force compromise and to stand up for the people we represent.

In spite of the importance of this power, everyone else in the body who has had the chance has voted to use the nuclear option to lower the votes required to end debate from 60 votes to a simple majority of 50 plus 1 on different types of nominees. That is a tragedy for our constituents. For this country, it is even more of a tragedy. For the institution of the Senate, it is a disaster.

This debate is not new, and I would not be honoring the legacy of the late Senator Robert C. Byrd, whose seat I sit in, if I did not take the opportunity to at least recite a little history here on the floor of the Senate.

The Founding Fathers always intended the Senate to be deliberate, and we are known as the most deliberate body in the world.

George Washington himself was said to have told Thomas Jefferson that the Senate should serve as a "cooling saucer" for legislation from the House. As you know, the House works on a simple majority; 218 Democrats or 218 Republicans can do anything they wish. The Senate is supposed to temper that down.

This body was created to protect the rights of individual States—small States in particular. In the Federalist Papers, John Jay notes that "in this spirit it may be remarked, that the equal vote allowed to each State, is at once a constitutional recognition of the portion of sovereignty remaining in the individual States, and an instrument for preserving that residuary sovereignty."

The filibuster is essential to preserving that residual sovereignty, and diminishing that power should matter to anyone who comes from a small or rural State like my State of West Virginia. This power was also meant to empower individual Members, like me, who often find themselves in the minority of their own party.

That doesn't mean we can't make changes for efficiency. But today's rule

change and the two that came before it in 2013 and 2017 were not meant to make this place more efficient; they were meant to take power from each and every Senator. That means you and I have given up our power and our ability to represent our States.

Before 1917, there was no way to end a debate in the Senate whatsoever, from our beginning, so one Member could grind this place to a halt for however long they felt necessary. Then, at the urging of President Woodrow Wilson, the Senate adopted rule XXII that year, 1917, and first used it 2 years later to end a filibuster against the Treaty of Versailles.

For the next 80-plus years, some tweaks were made to the rule and its reach was expanded, but there was no real threat to the existence of the rule. In 2005, that all changed when then-Majority Leader Bill Frist made the first serious effort to change the rules of the Senate and reduce the power of every Member of this body by deploying the nuclear option. None other than John McCain and Robert C. Byrd, our dear departed friends, teamed up to form the Gang of 14 that cut a deal on a package of nominations that took the nuclear option off the table—but only for a little while.

In 2013, when Harry Reid and Democrats—my side of the aisle—voted to end the filibuster for Presidential nominees, I was one of only three Democrats to fight and vote against it. The other two, Mark Pryor and Carl Levin, are no longer serving in the Senate today, but we represented all wings of the Democratic Party—from the liberal end, to the conservative end, to the moderate centrist end. We stood together despite our differences because we knew that it would forever lessen the institution of the Senate and that it would come back to bite us when we weren't in the majority. That was the point we made at that time. That was the argument we made and pleaded with our colleagues.

For the past 5 years, we have seen the consequences of those actions. Today, our Republican friends are using the same excuse our Democrats used—historic obstruction. Democrats are using the same argument today that our Republican friends have used—unprecedented overreach. This is the hypocrisy that makes us understand why people think Washington sucks. It is on both sides. No one is innocent on this.

In 2013, the current majority leader, MITCH MCCONNELL, was furious about what the Democrats were threatening to do. He called it breaking the rules to change the rules. And I agreed with him. He was right. I voted with him.

In 2013, I heard and listened to Leader MCCONNELL when he said:

The American people decided not to give the Democrats the House, or to restore the filibuster proof majority they had in the Senate back in 2009, and our Democratic colleagues don't like that one bit. They just don't like it. The American people are get-

ting in the way of what they'd like to do. So they are trying to change the rules of the game to get their way anyway.

This is precisely what the American people decided about Republicans in the 2018 election, and the Republicans have now gone down the same path Leader MCCONNELL warned us against. You would think that at least we would understand the definition of “insanity”—doing the same thing over and over, thinking we are going to get a different outcome. It doesn't work that way.

Leader MCCONNELL went on to say: “So look, I realize this sort of wishful thinking might appeal to the uninitiated newcomers in the Democratic conference who served exactly zero days in the minority, but the rest of you guys should know better.” And he is absolutely correct. Everyone should know better. Those of you who have been in the minority before should know better because what goes around comes around.

His final warning, which I am disappointed my Republican friends didn't listen to, was this:

If you think this is in the best interest of the United States Senate and the American people, to make advice and consent mean effectively nothing, obviously you can break the rules to change the rules to achieve that.

That is what we have done.

But some of us have been around here long enough to know that the shoe is sometimes on the other foot.

While the majority leader and minority leader have flipped their positions and their perspective today, the lesson is clear: Breaking the Senate for political expedience will, over time, hurt all of us and, most importantly, our constituents and the American people.

I firmly believe the filibuster is a vital protection of minority views and exactly why the Framers of our Constitution made the Senate the cooling saucer. Lately, both parties have lit the saucer on fire and thrown it out the window. The Senate was set up by our Founding Fathers to force us to work together. Think about that. They knew that whatever we receive from the House would be hot as a firecracker. Someone had to put out the flame. Someone had to know to say: That is not who we are as a country, and it is not basically who we want to be as a country.

We are not the House of Representatives, and by golly, we are going there at a rapid pace—a rapid pace. It seems that when people come from the House, they bring that House mentality—scorched and burned earth. That is not what we were set up to be. This is a very different body. It is the most unique body in the world.

As the late great Robert C. Byrd himself said in the months before his death, “While I welcome needed reform, we must always be mindful of our responsibilities to preserve this institution's special purpose.” And we are better than this, he said.

I always tell people back home that I can't vote for something unless I can

go home and explain it. I don't care if it is an idea that my friends on the Republican side have. It makes sense to me. My constituents understand it. I go home and vote and tell them why I voted with my Republican friends. If I vote with my Democratic friends and it makes sense, I tell them the same. If I vote against something of my Republican friends or Democrats, I explain to them. It has nothing to do with politics; it is policy. Does it make sense? Will it help the constituents of the State of West Virginia? Will it make my country stronger and better? That is really what I care about. That is the purpose of my being here.

For the life of me, I can't figure out how anyone who voted for this can explain it when they go back home, because we have given our power away. Every time you do this, you continue to erode the powers you have as a Senate by the Constitution of the United States of America and by the Founding Fathers who created this body. Now, how we can do it in such a willing way makes no sense. How do you look people in the eye and say: I gave up my individual power to represent you. How do I do that? I am not going to do it. I am not going to do it, and I haven't done it, nor will I ever do it.

You can say it was because of obstruction. Well, if there is an obstruction, there is a way around obstructions. You drive around obstructions. You have obstructions in your life every day. You learn to work around obstructions. It is basically by communicating. It is basically by sitting down and looking at the other side, the other point of view.

I have always said that I am not always right. I need help. But I am not always wrong either. I have, hopefully, some input, and I try to make that as a balance as I approach these things. And Republicans are—what they have done today is basically the same. We don't have obstructions we can't overcome if we respect each other. You can't blame everybody for everything. You can't blame somebody else for something you are unwilling to do. You can't blame somebody else if you don't have the patience to sit down and talk through your problems and try to understand better. You can't blame somebody else if you are not willing to give and take. That is what the whole process is about if you are going to be successful in life—anyone who has been successful. It is not “my way or the highway”; it is “our way going down the highway together.”

This move is a betrayal of the people we represent, and everyone in this body is complicit. It is a shame that we are going to go back and try to explain our positions with the votes that were made today. It is just a shame. It should never have come to this. For hundreds of years, we have managed to overcome obstructions and preserve our Founders' vision for the Senate, but for the last 6 years, Members on both sides of this aisle have decided that is no longer possible.

This abdication of our power and responsibility is nothing more than weakness in the face of partisanship. This is truly tribal. What tribe do you belong to? Do you belong to the Democratic tribe, or do you belong to the Republican tribe? I am sorry, I belong to the American tribe, and I am going to stay right in the tribe I belong to, and I am going to be loyal to the American tribe.

This abdication of our power and responsibility is truly, truly a weakness in the face of partisanship, and my colleagues need to stand up to the leaders. We have given too much power to the leadership here.

I remember the day when people used to talk about, oh, the committee chairman had so much power. They could run a bill and make sure it got on the floor and got voted on. Those days are gone. There is always a reason why something doesn't go to the floor, even if it goes through the committee process. Something comes out of the committee unanimously, and it still doesn't come to the floor. Try to explain that one.

To protect the powers of the Senators as representatives for their States and to protect the institution of the Senate, that is not that hard, and I know because I have done it. I have voted against my colleagues on my side of the aisle. I was up front, and I was honest. I said: I am sorry; I can't go home and explain that. It doesn't make sense at all, and I am not voting for it.

If they want to get my vote, they are going to have to sit down and say: What would it take to get your vote?

And I would explain to them: You have to adjust this or adjust this and make sense.

It is fair to the minority, and if we were in the majority, or vice versa, the majority should be fair to us. If you can work through that, you can make it. You can make it on this side. If not, it is going to be a miserable 6 years for every Senator who just got elected, if we don't come back to reality.

I know I keep calling it an individual right, but it really isn't. It is a trust passed down from the Senators who preceded us. They had the will and they had the determination to make this place work, and we have given up on that. This belongs to our constituents, the power we have here, and we have no power to protect them now.

The solution to obstruction isn't ruining the Senate. It is outreach. It is compromise. It is finding solutions that make a bunch of people on the far left and the far right very uncomfortable and mad sometimes. Until we are willing to do that, the hard work of this institution is going to get worse. So it is not that we are fractured, we are almost broken, and it was never intended. I have never seen anything broken that we couldn't fix. I hope we come to our senses. I hope we act as Americans. I hope we understand basically the whole thought process from our Founding Fathers, who had the

great insight of having two bodies in a bicameral, not a unicameral, branch that was supposed to work to help each other and protect us from ourselves. Right now, we have become the worst enemy of ourselves. I hope we change.

Thank you.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Michigan.

#### HEALTHCARE

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I have come to the floor many times, and I come to the floor today to say something straightforward. Healthcare is personal, not political. Despite all the debates, everything that has gone on around healthcare, for every family in Michigan and across the country and for every one of us, healthcare is personal, not political.

If your child gets sick in the middle of the night and needs to be taken to the emergency room, you don't care who the doctor voted for in the last Presidential election.

If you are diagnosed with cancer or a chronic condition, you are more interested in receiving the care you need than the ins and outs of the insurance plan that provides that care.

If your mom or dad needs to move into a nursing home, you want to make sure they are happy and that they are treated well, regardless of the specific Medicaid reimbursement rate.

Healthcare is personal to each and every one of us, not political, and it affects each and every one of us, whether we watch MSNBC, CNN, FOX News, or don't turn on the television.

That is why, when this administration and Republicans in Congress try to take away people's healthcare over and over and over again, I take it personally. You know who else takes it personally? The American people. Certainly, I know the people of Michigan do.

Back in November, they sent a message at the ballot box. Unfortunately, the administration and Republicans in Congress missed the message. They could be working across the aisle right now to expand access to care and improve quality and reduce costs. This is something I work to do all the time. Instead, they are, once again, trying to take away your healthcare.

If you don't believe me, just take a look at President Trump's budget. This administration wants to pay for a huge tax giveaway for the wealthiest among us by taking away people's healthcare.

Let me say that again.

They are asking us to pay for a budget-busting tax giveaway for the wealthy by taking healthcare away from people who depend on Medicare and Medicaid. Many of us, when this

tax bill passed, said that when they were creating almost \$2 trillion in deficit, watch out because the next thing will be a discussion to say: Oh. Oh my gosh. We have a big deficit. We have to cut Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, and the other things that directly affect people, with healthcare at the top of the list.

So what happens? Well, the Trump budget would cut \$800 billion from Medicare over the next 10 years. That is taking away healthcare from our seniors, people with disabilities. The Trump budget would cut \$1.5 trillion from Medicaid over the next 10 years. That is taking healthcare away from half of all the babies born in America who are covered by Medicaid—their parents and their moms. That is taking healthcare away from two in three seniors who get their nursing home care from Medicaid healthcare. That is taking away healthcare from everyone who has benefited from expanding Medicaid, including low-income, minimum-wage working people, working families, including more than 650,000 people in my State of Michigan covered by a very successful program called Healthy Michigan.

Ninety-seven percent of Michigan children can see a doctor when they get sick or hurt now because of what has happened with Michigan, with Healthy Michigan and other coverage, and the number of people treated without insurance has dropped 50 percent, which means instead of folks dropping into the emergency room who can't pay and everybody else's insurance rates go up to pay for it, people now have their own insurance, and those costs have dropped by 50 percent—the number of people walking in without insurance.

What has that meant for the State of Michigan? Taxpayers had more than \$400 million back into the budget in the State of Michigan last year because of the savings because of Healthy Michigan.

We should be building on this progress. Instead, Republicans are, once again, trying to take your healthcare away.

Between 2010 and 2018, the Republican majority in Congress voted to repeal or weaken the Affordable Care Act more than 70 times—70—with no replacement. Now the Trump administration has stepped in to help because they weren't successful in Congress. We were able to stop that because people rose up and said: My healthcare is personal not political. People from across the country engaged and we were able to stop it in Congress. So now the Trump administration has stepped in to do a number of things to sabotage the Affordable Care Act.

Look at what has happened in the last year. Last February, the Trump administration announced it would provide funding to States that want to let insurance plans cover fewer services, encouraging fewer services to be covered.

Last April, they issued a rule that, among other things, allowed insurers