

had about 8 years now, give or take, to prepare something with which to replace it—would have a replacement ready to go, maybe a replacement enacted into law, but at least a replacement that is ready to go on day one that would have all of the details worked out. This would not be just any replacement—not just a replacement that has words like “preexisting conditions” in the title of the bill—but something real and substantial and credible on a complicated subject like healthcare, meaning that the replacement would cover at least 20 million people, would provide all of the protections for all of those Americans, whether it is on protections against a preexisting condition or otherwise, and would be comparable in its positive impact on Americans. You would think this bill would be ready to go and ready to be enacted into law, but that is not the case.

I shouldn't say I was surprised, but I was somewhat concerned when—I guess it was last week, about a week ago—I picked up *POLITICO* and read that a number of Republican Senators were expressing the hope that the lawsuit would be successful, the hope that the Affordable Care Act would be declared unconstitutional. Yet what I didn't see in that article and didn't see in a lot of other places is a replacement that will provide a comparable, if not identical, measure of protection. That is what they told us all along—right?—that they have another way to do it and that all of the American people are going to be better off because of it. That is the basic promise that has been made by the Republicans in the Senate and in the House over many years. So you would think it would be ready, but it apparently is not ready.

I hope that maybe in the month of August, the plan will be developed and be ready to go and not just any old plan that has a nice title on it and a surge of protections that can't be brought to fruition—or brought into effect—because, when you provide the kind of protections the Affordable Care Act provides, you have to make the math work. You have to make sure you can pay for it, and you have to make sure the policy will support what you promise in the details of the legislation.

We will see what happens. If this lawsuit were to be affirmed at the circuit court level, I am assuming there would be an appeal by one side or the other. Yet, if we reach a point at which a court says the ACA is unconstitutional, I hope there is going to be a replacement that will provide all of the protections, all of the coverage, and all of the essential elements that were in the Affordable Care Act but that they will be done in a better way because that is what they have all promised on the other side. I don't think it is likely to happen. Something is going to give. Something will be cut. Something will be taken away or a lot more than that.

By way of an example, I will use only one number for today—642,000. I think

it is 642,700. That is the estimate of the number of children who live in Pennsylvania who have preexisting conditions. So any change in law by way of a court—a Federal court or the Supreme Court or otherwise—or any change in law pursuant to congressional action has to make sure, among many things, that every one of those 642,700 children in Pennsylvania has protections in place by law for preexisting conditions in addition to covering all of the other adults across Pennsylvania.

Basically, it is almost one out of every two Americans who has a preexisting condition. That is the rough estimate. That is a lot of people across the country. Some people believe, as well as there being some credible, reliable estimates, that it is north of 130 million Americans. So those are the only two numbers I will give.

The lawsuit is problematic. If that were all, that would be bad enough, but there are two things that are problematic when it comes to healthcare. One is that of the proposed cuts by the administration. Now, I realize House Republicans and Senate Republicans may not agree with the President's proposal, but he is in the same party, and his Budget Director is in the same party, and the Congress of the United States has to react to that budget proposal.

The administration proposed a 10-year Medicaid cut of \$1.5 trillion, and that is with a “t”—trillion—not billion. The administration proposed a \$1.5 trillion cut to Medicaid. It proposed a similar cut—or, I should say, a comparable cut but actually a lower number—to Medicare over 10 years of \$845 billion. You have to be able to say: OK, if it is the case that there is a credible replacement that provides the identical protections and coverage that the Affordable Care Act provided, what would happen to healthcare if you were to cut Medicaid by \$1.5 trillion and Medicare by \$845 billion?

You have to answer those questions if you are serious about healthcare. Now, if you are just kind of moving things around and having a talking point for a campaign, maybe that is different, but if you are serious about healthcare and if you are serious about coverage and if you are serious about there being an adverse impact on kids, on people with disabilities, and on seniors, you can't cut Medicaid by \$1.5 trillion.

One way to describe Medicaid is in the nursing home program for the middle class, in many instances. Medicaid is not a program for someone distant out there who is not worthy of our support and our help. Medicaid is about us. Medicaid is who we are because we decided more than 50 years ago that we are the United States of America, and we are the strongest country in the world for lots of reasons. Thank goodness we have the strongest military, and thank goodness we have the strongest economy. Yet we are also the

greatest country in the world because folks around the world have seen they can follow our example once in a while. They saw more than 50 years ago that we said, if you are a child in a low-income family or if you have a disability or if you are a senior who is trying to get into a nursing home, Medicaid is going to help you do that. We also passed Medicare at the same time.

So if you are serious about healthcare, you have to be really concerned about these budget cut proposals by the administration.

The third and last topic on this is the efforts undertaken by the administration, when in the midst of failing to repeal the Affordable Care Act and, thereafter, the efforts to sabotage the Affordable Care Act—and not in any way an overstatement—when you have an advertising budget to let people know that they can go to the exchanges—not the Medicaid expansion but the exchanges—to get healthcare coverage and to get a subsidy to help them purchase healthcare—maybe for the first time, millions of people got that opportunity, and millions still have it—in order for folks to know about that, to know about their eligibility, to know about the benefits of that, you have to advertise. We know that. The administration cut the advertising budget by only 90 percent—not quite 100 but a 90-percent cut in the advertising budget.

There are also other ways they have undermined and sabotaged the system. If you are concerned about healthcare, you have to be concerned about that sabotage, you have to be concerned about Medicaid and Medicare cuts, and you have to be concerned about this lawsuit.

We have a lot of work to do just to protect the gains—the coverage gains and the protection gains—that have been hard won over many years that benefit tens and tens of millions of Americans. I am not sure I can put a total number on them. So I hope those who are rooting for this lawsuit to be successful will have factored in all of that when that day comes, if it were to come, to change healthcare radically and dramatically for the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO DR. JOHN LOGAN

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on this recent Father's Day, Dr. John