

And so how will they afford insurance? Well, they won't. And in many States where there are Federal exchanges—California not included, because California set up its own State exchange. But in those States that have a Federal exchange, it won't exist. The ability to shop for insurance will be diminished or eliminated and, along with it, the subsidies. So those people, some 9 million who now enjoy those subsidies, will not receive them.

It goes on and on.

Are you a senior? Are you on Medicaid? If so, you are in the last year in which the doughnut hole will no longer exist, beginning 4 years ago. The doughnut hole, the prescription drugs doughnut hole in which prior to the Affordable Care Act there was a subsidy, part D, for prescription drugs, that ended at about \$1,500 of prescription costs.

Then there was a doughnut hole in which the individual on Medicare would have to pay for insurance, and that was somewhere around \$4,000. And then above that, Medicare would once again pick up the cost or most of the cost.

In the Affordable Care Act, we specifically set up a system so that over a 4-year period, the doughnut hole would disappear. It would shrink each and every year. It would rise from \$1,500 to \$2,000, \$3,000, and so forth. And next year, it would be gone.

I am sorry for the seniors. The Affordable Care Act, if found by the court to no longer be constitutional, would reemerge immediately upon an action by either the appellate court or, I suppose, ultimately, the Supreme Court. So, welcome the doughnut hole back.

If someone happens to be a senior, they better start pocketing money—which I am sure they don't have, to begin with—to prepare for the day when the cynical action of these attorneys general—Republicans, every single one of them—and the President would once again reestablish the awesome, terrible prescription drugs doughnut hole.

How small-minded can you be? Apparently, there is no end to it. So here we are. Our effort on this Democratic side of the aisle is for the people, not for some ideological mumbo jumbo, but for the people. We want a healthcare program that provides solid benefits for Americans.

The Affordable Care Act takes us a long, long way toward that goal. It doesn't achieve it totally, and we have more to do. Many of us talk about Medicare for All, and we hope to get there some day. But in the meantime, we have the Affordable Care Act, and our Republican colleagues are doing everything they can since its institution in 2010 to do away with it, and they have never, ever provided a substitute.

Do you remember that repeal and replacement mantra? There has never been a replacement program that made any sense whatsoever.

So, we are for the people. We want to deal with the cost of prescription drugs, not to increase them for seniors, as our Republican colleagues are attempting to do; not to put Americans out of the insurance market, as they are attempting to do, by eliminating the guaranteed coverage regardless of your healthcare status; not to put people out of insurance if they are 18 to 26 years of age, as our Republican colleagues are attempting to do; not to eliminate the clinics that millions upon millions of Americans now depend on for their primary care, as our Republican colleagues are attempting to do.

□ 2000

We want it for the people. We want healthcare coverage for every American. We want it to be affordable, and we want it to be available.

So here we are on a day in which the appellate court in New Orleans is hearing from the President's lawyers in the Department of Justice that 13 million Americans should lose their health coverage and that 130 million Americans should be, once again, facing insurance discrimination because of an existing healthcare issue. We are hearing from the President's lawyers that it is good to eliminate the clinics, that it is good to eliminate the subsidies that some 9 million Americans are able to get to so that they can afford insurance, and that the exchanges that provide a marketplace for people to sort out what kind of an insurance policy they want should be eliminated.

The President's lawyers are out there purposely harming Americans all because the President has said we must repeal the ObamaCare program.

I am sorry. I disagree. I want Americans to have healthcare coverage. I was an insurance commissioner for years, and I fought the insurance companies every single day. Then I came here in 2009 and was able to vote, providing on this floor the vote that allowed the Affordable Care Act to move out of this House to the Senate and eventually become law—the 218th vote. I am proud of that vote because I know from my personal experience that the Affordable Care Act dealt with real problems that Americans had and gave Americans a real opportunity to get healthcare and to get healthcare services.

Here we are with the President of the United States actively this day doing everything he could not achieve in the Congress but rather now in the courts doing everything he can to harm Americans—how cynical, how terrible, and how harmful. But that is where we are.

We will see what the court does. Hopefully, they will be sympathetic to 130 million Americans, to 9 million Americans, to 15 million Americans, to children, and to young adults 18 to 25. Maybe they will be sympathetic. We will see what happens.

But if the Affordable Care Act is somehow through the courts repealed and there is no replacement, then I

want the American people to understand who is responsible for the harm that will immediately be inflicted upon Americans. It is our President and it is his colleagues who have aided and abetted and who today in-State attorneys general are arguing for the harm that will come to Americans.

We haven't given up the fight, and we will never give up the fight so that every American has affordable health insurance, whatever that may be.

We have come a long way with the Affordable Care Act, and we will fight all along the way. Should we lose this battle, we are never, ever going to give up our goal of providing quality, affordable healthcare to every American.

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

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2348

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PERLMUTTER) at 11 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2500, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-143) on the resolution (H. Res. 476) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2500) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2019

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, July 9, 2019.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: To facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I am transmitting