

From your graduation in 1965 to leading the way in raising over \$1 billion, the time you have spent at Tech has left a lasting impression on the university. You strengthened ties between Texas Tech and the City of Lubbock, and your efforts to increase enrollment have led to new students and families now calling Lubbock home.

You are a true servant of the state, having served as a Texas State Senator, U.S. Congressman, and Chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission. Thank you for the years of service you dedicated to making Lubbock and West Texas a better place to live and work.

Sincerest congratulations,
 GLEN C. ROBERTSON,
Mayor.

— TXTA,
 TEXAS TRUCKING ASSOCIATION,
Austin, TX, April 9, 2014.

HON. MEMBERS OF THE U.S. CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION: Let it be said that Chancellor Kent Hance has a deep and abiding love for the institution he has devoted the last eight years of his life to. In reality, Chancellor Hance has given so much more than just those eight years. Those who know him, know that his love affair with Texas Tech University began shortly after his parents dropped him off there in 1961. Since that time he has served his family and his constituents with honor, going all the way back to the late 1970's when he served in this hallowed body.

As he is well known for saying to freshman during their orientation, and to seniors at their graduation, "I love Texas Tech." It also goes without saying that Texas Tech loves Kent Hance. And while his time in service as its Chancellor will soon end, the love shared will be without end. I am proud to have been a part of the Hance Administration.

On behalf of The Rivers and my wife, Leah, we wish him all the success in retirement that he has realized in service Texas Tech. All very well deserved, all with loyalty and honor.

JOHN D. ESPARZA,
*Texas Tech Board of Regents,
 Texas Tech Class of 1997.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to direct their remarks to former Members on the House floor.

PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be here on behalf of the Progressive Caucus Special Order hour. We are going to be talking about the budget. Everyone is talking about the budget, the Paul Ryan Republican budget, the Democratic budget, the Progressive Caucus budget, and other budgets that we have had before us.

We have our own version of a budget. The Progressive Caucus has the Better Off Budget. It is a budget that invests in the economy, creates 8.8 million jobs, and does a tremendous job of dealing with issues that are at the forefront of what America needs to deal with.

But we have a huge contrast in the budget that we have in this body before us that the Republicans have introduced that we will be voting on this week, tomorrow, in this very body. Tonight we would like to have a little talk about that.

As you look at the Better Off Budget in blue versus the GOP budget, the Better Off Budget creates 8.8 million jobs by investing in infrastructure, investing in our schools, and investing in energy, and a number of programs across the country.

On the contrast, the Republican budget actually costs the economy 3.1 million jobs. That is as many people as the entire workforce of the State of Wisconsin getting fired in a simple budget.

One of the biggest issues about the budget is what we are doing about jobs and the economy. We have been told by the Congressional Budget Office that the number one issue this year, the number one thing that causes our deficit, three-quarters of the deficit in 2014, is caused by economic weakness, in other words, unemployment and underemployment. Our budget directly addresses that, and the GOP budget does just the opposite. It is an austerity budget.

I would like to yield some time to one of my colleagues, a strong member of the Progressive Caucus, an outstanding Member of our California delegation. I would like to yield some time to Mr. ALAN LOWENTHAL.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his work on the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget, the CPC budget, and for just being an all-around good guy.

□ 1900

The nondefense discretionary side of the budget has taken a beating in recent years with extreme cuts to its programs. The Ryan budget continues this damage with even deeper cuts to discretionary programs.

Now, what do I mean by discretionary programs? We are talking about education, public safety, clean drinking water, food safety, roads, bridges—our transportation system—air traffic controllers, medical research to find cures for diseases, among others.

The question I ask is: What is discretionary about any of these basic needs? What is discretionary about making sure that children can read or about making sure that drinking water is safe or that bridges don't collapse? There is nothing discretionary about these programs.

I think part of the problem is simply the word "discretionary." We need to stop calling this discretionary, and we need to start calling this beleaguered side of the budget what it is, essential. These are the essential non-defense programs.

My dear friend, the main difference between the Ryan budget proposal and the CPC budget proposal is that Mr.

RYAN believes that the government funding of these essential programs is a drain on the economy and a drain on taxpayers.

The CPC, however, recognizes that the investment in these essential programs is fundamental to the vitality of our country. It moves us forward, and as you pointed out, it creates millions of jobs—over 4.6 million jobs in the year 2014, almost 3 million in the year 2015 and close to 1.3 million in the year 2016.

It moves us forward, this investment in essential programs. It drives innovation. It creates jobs. It stimulates the economy. It puts our government and our country on a sustainable path to prosperity.

My friend Mr. RYAN's economic model of austerity contrasts sharply with our model of investment and progress in a fiscally responsible way. We believe that educating our workforce, building our infrastructure, ensuring access to a safe and healthy environment, which includes water and food safeguards, is the ticket to a secure future for our country. That is the difference between the Ryan budget and the CPC budget.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Mr. LOWENTHAL, for those wise comments about the word "discretionary." I think, all too often, people don't understand what we mean when we talk about discretionary. Those are hardly discretionary programs.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. That is exactly right. They think that you can cut these because these are nonessential. These are not nonessential. If you tell a child that his education is nonessential or if you tell a family that public health or health research to those families is discretionary or if you tell those scientists who are trying to find cures for some of the worst diseases that they are just discretionary, we will lose the momentum that this country has, and we will no longer be the world leader in democracy and also no longer in innovation and job creation.

No, these are not discretionary programs. These are essential programs that are different than defense programs. To call them discretionary does a great disservice to the great importance and to the centerpiece of our budget that they really occupy and should occupy and that all Americans should understand.

Mr. POCAN. Again, thank you, Mr. LOWENTHAL, for your service, for your hard work on this budget, and for all you do for the people of California.

When we talk about those discretionary funds, it is interesting because, when we had the sequester that made a huge cut to these programs and that affected people in all of our States, the Paul Ryan Republican budget doubles down on these sequester cuts, and it makes even deeper cuts in a number of areas.

I just want to go through a little bit of a chart. Unfortunately, I found out

that I can't use a marker on the House floor because that is against the rules, so we are going to use this in a little bit of a different way, to try to have you take a look at this and decide where the difference is and who winds up winning on the side of the GOP Paul Ryan budget and the Congressional Progressive Caucus Better Off Budget. I just want to go through a few examples of programs that would matter.

Let's start with unemployed workers. Let's take a look at the two budgets. When you look at the Better Off Budget, as I showed before, 8.8 million jobs are created by the Better Off Budget. In the Republican budget, according to the Economic Policy Institute, it would cut 3 million jobs by the year 2016.

If you are someone who is unemployed, the Better Off Budget would make sure we extend emergency unemployment benefits. The GOP budget is silent—crickets. There is absolutely nothing to help people who—in a tough economy and who have worked hard all of their lives and who have played by the rules—have lost their benefits.

SNAP, for people who are getting help on the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or food stamps, by and large, two-thirds of those people are children, seniors, and people with severe disabilities.

If you add the working poor, you are at 92 percent of the people who receive these benefits. The Democrats restore the cuts that happened this year in the farm bill and previous cuts to the program. \$31.50 a week is what someone was making on the SNAP program to help him in getting by with food. We know this program is one of the best programs to help lift people out of poverty, and we restore that funding.

What does the Paul Ryan budget do? You may remember the debate that we had on the farm bill. Originally, the Republicans wanted to cut the SNAP program by about \$20 billion, and they couldn't get enough votes because Republicans wanted to cut it even more, so they finally cut it by \$39 billion.

Now, when we got to the conference committee with the Senate, we were able to get that down to \$8 billion of cuts, but these are cuts to, as I mentioned, children, seniors, people with severe disabilities, and the working poor—two-thirds of whom are seniors, children, and people with severe disabilities.

What does the Paul Ryan budget do? Does it cut the \$20 billion that they couldn't pass originally? No. Does it cut the \$39 billion like the Republicans ultimately passed? Oh, no, as it was not nearly enough.

There is a \$125 billion cut to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program in the Paul Ryan Republican budget.

Let's take a look at that for jobs. It costs 3 million jobs. It does nothing for the long-term unemployment extension, and it cuts assistance to the needy by \$125 billion. I would say that

the Progressive Caucus Democratic budget, by far, would win out in that category.

Let's next look at education. We have got pre-K, K-12, and college students. Let's look at each of these areas. The Better Off Budget invests \$100 million into a stimulus for teachers and schools, so that we can help do what we need to in order to be competitive globally.

We need to be investing in our students through our teachers and our schools. We provide funding to rehire teachers who have lost their jobs through the bad economy in the last several years. We invest in early childhood development, which is crucial for someone to get a fair start in life, and we invest in job training. That is what the Congressional Progressive Caucus Better Off Budget includes.

What does the Republican budget include? Let's start with pre-K. In pre-K, there is an \$18 billion cut to early education programs. Right off the bat, are they investing more? There is an \$18 billion cut. Once again, the Progressive Caucus budget leads us.

Next, on K-12, in which we invest in the hiring of teachers and invest in our schools, what does the Republican budget do? In the Republican budget, if you have a child in K-12 public education in this country, there is an \$89 billion cut.

Again, \$89 billion in cuts or investing in our teachers and schools? Once again, the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget outdoes the Republican budget.

How about college students? This is where you are going to see some really big differences. We invest in the very financial aid programs that people need. We invest in higher education because, in order to be competitive in a global economy, we have to have the most talented, the smartest, the most innovative people we can possibly have in the economy to create the jobs we need to for the future.

What does the Republican budget do? It cuts \$205 billion in higher education services—\$205 billion—and I am not even counting Pell grants. Pell grants, which help some of our neediest students get access to higher education, get a \$145 billion cut. We are talking, overall, just in higher education, almost \$350 billion.

We invest more in those educational opportunities, and the Republican budget cuts over \$350 billion. Overall, in those three areas in education alone, the Republicans cut \$871 billion to education. That is what we do for middle class families and those aspiring to be in the middle class in the budget that this House will very likely pass tomorrow.

Let's look at the next category, seniors. Seniors, you have put your entire lives into this country, and you have worked all of your lives. You expect to have a retirement that you have invested in, and you have put your hours in.

What is the difference in the budgets? The Congressional Progressive Caucus budget does a number of things. One, we protect Social Security and Medicare. We make future investments in those programs. We protect funding in the Medicaid program.

We allow Medicare to negotiate for better prescription drug prices, so that seniors can pay less on drugs that they have to pay a larger percent of their income on, so that they can get by in those years, and we help, overall, in putting America on a path towards offering a single-payer option.

What does the Republican budget do when it comes to seniors? First of all, they end Medicare as we know it. Under the Republican budget, you now have a voucher program. You don't get Medicare. You get a voucher, something you can trade in, hopefully, for something in the future, which will very likely be a cut in the very health care that you have now and that you receive.

They increase the costs for seniors on prescription drugs by reopening the doughnut hole, which is going to cost seniors \$4.1 billion extra on prescription drugs. Seniors are going to pay more for the prescription drugs they need.

They raise the Medicare eligibility age to 67, and they put seniors who rely on Medicaid at risk because they are making big cuts to the Medicaid program, \$732 billion in cuts to the Medicaid program.

Once again, for seniors, it is cuts, it is paying more for prescription drugs, and it is putting you at risk through the Medicaid and Medicare program. The Democrats and the Progressive Caucus protect all of those programs that the seniors rely on so very much.

Our next group, the vets; they have served our country with distinction. If it weren't for the veterans we have, we wouldn't be able to protect the very liberties and freedoms that we have as a citizenry.

What does the Progressive Caucus budget do? We adopt a cost-of-living adjustment that takes into account realistic retiree expenses, and we fully fund veterans programs in advance.

We are protecting the programs, so that they have the guarantee to the veterans, the guarantee that they have promised to them, as they have put their time in for this country. We protect those very programs to ensure that they will have those programs in the future.

With the Republicans, we hear a lot of lip service about veterans and about protecting veterans, especially around Memorial Day and Veterans' Day, but the proof is in the budget.

What do the Republicans do? By 2016, the Republicans actually cut funding for veterans by \$1.7 billion. Now, we saw what they did back in the budget in December when they cut the pensions for families who are in the military, but now, in their budget in 2016, there is an additional \$1.7 billion cut to veterans.

This is the sort of lip service that you get when a holiday comes up and when we show up. The reality is when we vote on it on this floor.

Once again, for veterans, they lose money under the Republican budget, and in our budget, we protect programs that veterans deserve.

The middle class, what does our budget have for the middle class, and what does the Republican budget have for the middle class?

There are a couple of things around taxes. One of the things that we have been very careful to do is to get rid of some of the tax loopholes that benefit special interests.

There are tax breaks for Big Oil and Big Gas and tax breaks that go to companies that send jobs overseas, which doesn't even make any sense, yet we incentivize those very companies that send those jobs overseas rather than create jobs in America.

□ 1915

We protect middle class taxpayers by going back to the Clinton-era tax rates for households who make more than \$250,000, and we add new brackets at \$1 million. That allows us to bring in revenues from those who can most afford to, but protecting the very middle class that are the backbone of this economy.

By doing that—and protecting health care, seniors, education, investing in infrastructure for the very roads and services that people count on—we are doing everything we can to protect the middle class. This is one area where the distinction could not be more clear.

The Republicans have given a lot of lip service about trying to protect the middle class. Once again, the proof is in their budget. The budget shows their real values.

What does it do? It lowers the top tax rate down to 25 percent. Do you know what percent of taxpayers are in that top bracket? Less than one-half of 1 percent.

So when Chairman RYAN described the budget in the Budget Committee, which I serve on—we spent 10½ hours last Wednesday debating the budget—he said the budget was a win-win.

Well, if he meant it was a win for the top 1 percent and a win for the second percentile, I will agree. The other 98 percent of us pay for those two wins that are out there.

By lowering that rate to 25 percent, that gives the average millionaire a \$200,000 tax break. Millionaires get big, big tax breaks.

How do you pay for that? Well, there is only one way: you are going to have to put the taxes onto the backs of the middle class. It is estimated it would be about \$2,000 per middle class family to pay for those wealthiest few in the Nation.

So when it comes to the middle class, there is no question our budget does more for the middle class, and the Republican budget is a direct attack on the middle class by what we are able to do by making them pay for the very

tax breaks that the wealthiest have put out there.

When you look at all this, there is one group that wins at the very bottom. I mentioned millionaires and billionaires. I have to give that edge to the Republican budget. You are going to get a great tax break—a great big check from Uncle Sam—at the courtesy of the middle class taxpayers in this country.

That is the only winner under the Republican budget. Clearly, in every other category, the Progressive Caucus and the Democratic budgets are superior to that budget introduced by the Republicans.

You are going to hear how it balances the budget in 10 years. That is the only talking point the Republicans have. They don't want to talk about the specifics because they lose in every single category, but the one thing that they claim they have is that they balance the budget in 10 years.

They don't mention it is on the backs of the middle class, but they say they are going to balance the budget in 10 years. Well, I wish their math were only as accurate as their rhetoric because the math simply doesn't add up. Let me tell you why. Let me give you one big glaring example of why the budget doesn't add up.

The Republican budget repeals the benefits of the Affordable Care Act, so it repeals all the positive things like the fact that, when you go to get insurance, if you have a preexisting condition, you now can get access.

You have got preventive care provided, so we can save long-term health costs. You don't have a lifetime cap on your insurance. Your children can stay on your policy until they are 26.

All these benefits were incorporated in the Affordable Care Act, and we just saw the success from the enrollment numbers. Millions of more people have access to health care.

It repeals those benefits, but get this: it keeps the revenues and the savings of the Affordable Care Act in order to make the numbers balance out for that allegedly 10-year balancing of the budget.

It doesn't take much more than a fourth-grader to understand that doesn't work out. You can't repeal a program, but still keep the revenue and the savings from that program, but the Republicans are trying to pass that off. They are trying to sell you a bill of goods.

Do you know how much that bill of goods is, that fuzzy math? Two trillion dollars is the amount that they are using in fuzzy math to try to claim their budget balances in 10 years. It doesn't take a lot to poke the holes in the fact that their budget doesn't balance out.

If their budget doesn't balance out, it doesn't benefit the middle class, and it only benefits the wealthiest, we have a really bad budget that this House will be voting on tomorrow. We are going to do everything we can to make sure that that budget doesn't pass.

I think one really important note that people have to realize from all that we describe that is in that budget is, even if it doesn't become the law of the land—thankfully, we have the Senate and the President still—it is the roadmap that the Republicans have if they were to take control.

If they were to keep the House of Representatives, if they were to take the U.S. Senate, if they were to take the Presidency, this is the fourth year in a row they have laid out this essential roadmap—this roadmap that benefits the top 1 or 2 percent and that every other person—every other American has to pay to subsidize those people.

We lose those important programs in health care and education, for veterans and for the unemployed and those struggling to get by in our society.

There is a very clear distinction between what the Democrats and the Progressive Caucus have put out as our budget that we have put forth to the American people and what the Republicans are actually offering.

They have warmed over austerity. Again, cuts, cuts, cuts will somehow make the economy work, and that is simply impossible to happen.

What I would like to do, at this time, is introduce another Member of the Progressive Caucus who has been a very hard worker on behalf of the middle class, not just in his district in the State of Pennsylvania, but across the country.

I yield to Representative MATT CARTWRIGHT from the great State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Thank you, Mr. POCAN.

Madam Speaker, I rise not only in support of the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget, but in opposition to the abomination that is this Ryan budget.

I am from Scranton, Pennsylvania. I represent the great northeast part of Pennsylvania in the 17th Congressional District.

I wanted to talk this evening a little bit about a couple of guys that came from Scranton. The first one is the Vice President of the United States, JOSEPH BIDEN.

I mention Vice President BIDEN tonight because it was Vice President BIDEN who intoned the phrase—and continues to do so—that there are a lot of people out there that love to talk about their values.

They will tell you all day about their values—their values on this, their values on that. They will wear you out. They will give you a good ear beating about their values; but Vice President BIDEN says: look, don't tell me about your values. Show me your budget, and let me read it, and I will tell you about what your values are.

Because that is what a budget is, it is a statement of your values. It is a statement of your principles and priorities.

When we see something like this Ryan budget that cuts everything, like

pre-K education, what does it say? That says you don't care that much about educating young kids, even though you know that, if you start kids off behind all the other kids, they are going to be struggling the rest of their academic careers.

It is going to affect their self-confidence in their academic lives, and they are not going to go far in school. It has ripple effects. A higher percentage of them will get in trouble with the law. How much do we end up paying for all of those things?

If you don't devote money to pre-K, it says you don't care about those things. Those things are not included in your set of values.

I also want to talk about another fellow because, when you go and slash pre-K and K-12 and Pell grants for colleges and you turn your back on seniors and veterans and you favor the haves against the have-nots—and even the middle class—when you do those things, you do that all in the name of austerity and cutting because you are worried about the deficit and you are worried about \$16 trillion—\$17 trillion is higher than anybody has ever counted in the history of mankind; and so therefore, we have to cut, cut, cut.

A lot of that is well-intentioned—it really is—because people are afraid, but you have to look at the current debt of this Nation in the context of what the gross domestic product is.

The truth is our national debt is not the highest it has ever been in connection with and comparison to the gross domestic product. It is not anywhere near the highest it has ever been. That is something pointed out by another fellow from Scranton, former Secretary of Labor Robert Reich.

Robert Reich is all of about 5 feet tall on his tiptoes, but he is a giant when it comes to labor policy and economics. He points out forcefully, time and time again, that if you compare the national debt to the gross domestic product, the highest it ever was in that ratio was after World War II.

It was after we defeated the Nazis, after we defeated the Axis powers, and after we had engineered the New Deal and brought this Nation out of the Great Depression, where upwards of 25 percent of people were unemployed, and we had done all of that.

Robert Reich remembers vividly his father saying to him in the late forties, into the early fifties:

It's this Roosevelt debt we have been left with. You are going to be paying this off the rest of your life, and your children will be paying that Roosevelt debt off the rest of your life and your grandchildren, too.

That is not what happened, though. Robert Reich happily tells the way it played out. The way it played out, what did we do? We believed in ourselves. We believed in the strength and the vision of Americans and we did things like the Marshall Plan, and we rebuilt Europe and Japan and built the interstate highway system in this country.

We sent the GIs to college under the GI Bill. For crying out loud, we sent a man to the Moon. We did all those things because we were bullish on America. We need to continue that approach, which is something that Robert Reich likes to point out.

He says that, by the late sixties, nobody could mention the Roosevelt debt with a straight face. So I am here to say, Madam Speaker and Mr. POCAN, that we need to do that again. We need to grow our way out of the debt.

It is nowhere near as bad as it was after World War II, but we still have to grow our way out of it by believing in ourselves by being bullish on America.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, again, Mr. CARTWRIGHT. The work you have done on behalf of the people not just of Scranton—I have heard you mention Scranton many times on the floor—but for all of Pennsylvania and the entire country, thank you for all your efforts. I really appreciate that.

In closing, for this part of the Progressive Caucus Special Order hour, I just want to hit the main point again when it comes to the budget.

We all know that the top three issues facing this country are jobs, jobs, jobs. There is such a difference between what the Democrats and the Progressives have proposed and what the Republicans have proposed.

Again, the Better Off Budget for the Progressive Caucus shows an 8.8 million increase in the number of jobs in this country. We invest in our infrastructure. We invest in our schools. We invest in job training. We create 8.8 million jobs.

The Republican budget, according to the Economic Policy Institute, would cost this country 3.1 million jobs. Those 3.1 million jobs are as many people as we have working in the entire State of Wisconsin. Think about firing every single person in the State of Wisconsin. That is the job loss that would come out of the Republican budget.

So it is an honor tonight to talk on behalf of the Progressive Caucus and our budget and to highlight the many problems that we are going to have tomorrow when this body votes on the Republican budget.

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

□ 1930

THE IMPACT OF THE RYAN BUDGET ON AMERICA'S WOMEN

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana) Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) for 27 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Madam Speaker, I want to rise this evening to discuss our annual budget. Congress has a number of responsibilities, but a big one is that Congress is

tasked annually with developing a budget that lays out our Nation's priorities in spending and lays out a budget that reflects our values.

Democrats have been working to provide a fair shot for everyone to succeed by creating good-paying jobs and an opportunity for working families. Our country is, in fact, strongest when our economy grows from the middle out, and not from the top down.

Unfortunately the fiscal year 2015 Republican budget introduced by PAUL RYAN takes the opposite approach. It benefits the few at the top by showing tax breaks on millionaires and corporate special interests, while shifting the burden of the Federal budget to middle class families.

Once again, Mr. RYAN and Republicans have been convinced that the best way to help working families is to stop helping working families. Unfortunately, the Ryan budget resolution would actually harm families, most especially, women and children.

According to the Economic Policy Institute, the Ryan budget would cost jobs and slow our recovery, costing 1.1 million jobs in fiscal year 2015, and rising to about 3 million in the following year.

Republicans are raising taxes on middle class families with children by an average of at least \$2,000 a year in order to cut taxes for millionaires.

Now, let's just take a look at that, Madam Speaker. A recent analysis by Citizens for Tax Justice finds that, under the Ryan plan, taxpayers with income exceeding \$1 million in 2015 would receive an average net tax decrease of over \$200,000 in that fiscal year.

Now, let's balance this. Families with children would have to pay an additional \$2,000, and millionaires would get the benefit of a decrease in their taxes of \$200,000. \$2,000 for working families, and \$200,000 for millionaires.

Now, of course, the Ryan budget doesn't touch tax breaks for big oil and gas companies that ship jobs overseas. After all, you have to have priorities, priorities and budgets that are a statement of values.

So it is very clear that the Ryan priorities and the Ryan budget priorities benefit millionaires. It is very clear, unsurprisingly, that the Ryan budget also repeals, yet again, the Affordable Care Act, despite the fact that 9.3 million people now have health care as a result of the Affordable Care Act, that according to a Rand Corporation study.

Now, repealing the Affordable Care Act would allow insurance companies, once again, to treat a woman and being a woman as a preexisting condition, would once again enable insurance companies to charge women more than men.

Insurance companies would also be able to deny women coverage because of preexisting conditions, including a history of domestic violence, breast and cervical cancer, and C-sections.

Under this budget, millions of women and their families would be stripped of