

□ 1114

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 114 through 117, 120, 121, 123, and 126, I was unable to cast my vote in person due to an unexpected illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea."

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes on Thursday, March 2, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted "Nay" on rollcall No. 122, "Yea" on rollcall No. 123, "nay" on rollcall No. 124, "nay" on rollcall No. 125 and "Yea" on rollcall 126.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader and my friend.

(Mr. MCCARTHY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will consider several reform bills straight from our Better Way agenda:

First, the Fairness in Class Action Litigation and Further Asbestos Claim Transparency Act, sponsored by Chairman BOB GOODLATTE, which ensures that only similarly injured parties can be in the same class for purposes of a class action suit, as well as requires public disclosure of reports on the receipt and disposition of claims for injuries based on exposure to asbestos.

Next, H.R. 725, the Innocent Party Protection Act, sponsored by Representative KEN BUCK, which establishes a uniform standard for determining whether a defendant has been fraudulently joined to a lawsuit.

And third, H.R. 720, the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act, sponsored by Chairman LAMAR SMITH, which restores accountability to our legal system by penalizing lawyers for filing baseless lawsuits.

Our Federal litigation system is plagued with broken rules that unnecessarily harm American businesses and consumers. With these measures, we will follow through on our pledge to take on trial lawyers and crack down on lawsuit abuse through meaningful litigation reform.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider the Fiscal Year 2017 Department of Defense Appropriations bill, sponsored by Chairman RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

The gentleman mentions the Defense Appropriations bill is going to be brought forward. It is my understanding that the text was just introduced this morning. Is that accurate?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. HOYER. Do you know when it will be marked up?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We passed this bill last year, working together with others. You will see the bill reposted, and we will vote on it next week.

Mr. HOYER. Is the majority leader not aware of whether there will be a markup on the bill or will it come directly to the floor through the Rules Committee?

Mr. MCCARTHY. It will come straight to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman just indicated that this will be the bill that we passed last year.

Mr. MCCARTHY. This bill reflects the 2017 NDAA, which passed with 375 votes in the House and 92 votes in the Senate.

Mr. HOYER. So I am correct, then, that the bill will be the same bill that we passed last year? Is that accurate?

Mr. MCCARTHY. It is not the exact same, but it reflects the work of the NDAA. It is a bipartisan agreement. It is also—you will find as soon as it is posted to read all the way through it—a reflection of the 2017 NDAA bill.

Mr. HOYER. The majority leader may not know, and I certainly understand that. We will see what differences might exist. If there are any substantive changes in the bill, we would hope that it would be subjected to a hearing or at least a markup.

But the gentleman believes there is no substantive change. Is that accurate?

Mr. MCCARTHY. That is very accurate. This is a bipartisan, bicameral agreement based upon the 2017 NDAA bill, which, if you watched, had 375 votes in the House, 92 in the Senate.

As you know as well as I do, and we have talked many times together about this, we cannot continue to have our military continue further with just the CR. If you have a continuing resolution, you now are saying that you have to fund what was last year. You can't go through with what the future needs without putting together the appro-

priations process. And this is what we are going through right now.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the majority leader for that observation.

I agree with the majority leader that subjecting the Defense Appropriations or any other appropriation is not a tenable or appropriate policy to pursue.

The gentleman knows we were for an omnibus being passed in 2016, as an omnibus was passed in 2015, which, therefore, gives the administrators of any agency or Secretaries of any agency the opportunity to have the ability to plan over a period of time longer than months.

So I certainly agree. But very frankly, I want to tell the majority leader, on our side of the aisle we are very, very concerned that privilege will be accorded to the defense bill.

Can the majority leader tell me whether or not we intend to adopt and pass, in the regular order, individual bills—the Labor-Health bill, the Interior bill, the Agriculture bill, et cetera, et cetera—in a similar manner? That means considering them on their merits discretely, separately, individually.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman knows we are working, in part, under the continuing resolution short-term; but it is my intention, once we pass the FY 2017 defense bill, I will keep Members updated on the further floor schedule of appropriations bills. It would be my goal to continue to pass the rest of the appropriations bills.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate that, Mr. Leader, if that is your goal; and I hope that, in fact, we can pursue that goal. Very frankly, we believe that the scenario is being set up to take care of the defense bill.

I voted for the defense bill. I was one of those people. I intend to vote for the defense bill next week when it comes to the floor, if, in fact, as the gentleman represents, it is substantively the same as the bill that we have already adopted.

What I am concerned about and what Members on my side of the aisle are very concerned about is that the remaining nondefense discretionary spending bills will be substantially altered from that which we would have passed in December of last year in the 2017.

Of course, we were 4 months late doing that—or 3 months late, at least: October, November, and December. But I am hopeful, Mr. Leader, that those bills will, in fact, be considered discretely so that the American public can see us vote on those bills and on the priorities that are incorporated in those bills.

Mr. Leader, it appears that the majority has stalled somewhat in their efforts in a path forward on repeal of the ACA. President Trump's address on Tuesday, it seems to me, didn't offer many details. He does say, however, that everybody is going to be covered—everybody—with better health care,

cheaper. If that bill comes to the floor, I am going to vote for it, Mr. Leader. I want you to know that. Health care for everybody—quality, accessible, affordable, and cheaper.

Now, as the majority leader knows, the budget resolution that was passed this year set a deadline of January 27 for committees to report legislation repealing the law. It is now March 2, and there are reports, Mr. Leader, that Republicans have a draft bill that perhaps is located in H-157, that it is not being posted, and that Republicans have been told they can view it in H-157.

I don't know that I have the room number correct, and I am not sure that the information that I have is correct, but I will tell you that MICHAEL BURGESS, or Dr. BURGESS, on your side of the aisle said this. He said it yesterday: People need to have access to this document—apparently his presumption was he did not have access to the document or he believed others should; not only Members of our side of the aisle, but also the public—and if there are problems, let's talk through them. It's been a long time in the works. Most of the pieces that are in there, people have seen in the past, but it does need to be an open process.

Mr. Leader, let me repeat that. It does need to be an open process, according to Dr. BURGESS.

GUS BILIRAKIS says: We're not having a hearing or anything. We're not having a hearing or anything. But there'll be a place for us to view it, the draft.

PAUL RYAN, the Speaker, said, 3 days ago: We're going through the committee process. We're doing this step by step. We're having public hearings. We're having committee work on legislation. This is how the legislative process is supposed to be designed. We are not hatching some bill in a back room—perhaps H-157; he didn't say that, I said it—and plopping it on the American people's front door.

Mr. Leader, you and I both were here when the Affordable Care Act was passed. There was a lot of talk about the Affordable Care Act and how it was passed in the dark of night. That was baloney, of course. We had 79 bipartisan hearings and markups over the 2 years that we considered the Affordable Care Act. House Members spent nearly 100 hours in hearings, heard from 181 witnesses from both sides of the aisle, considered 239 amendments—both Democratic and Republican—and accepted 121 amendments.

The original House bill was posted online 30 days before the first committee began their markup and more than 100 days before the committee introduced their merged bill in the House. House Democrats posted the House bill—that was the final process—online 72 hours before the bill was brought to the floor, consistent with our rules.

Now, to my understanding, the Ways and Means Committee has been told this bill is going to be marked up on Wednesday. There will not have been a

single hearing, there will not have been a single witness, and Members cannot, on our side of the aisle—as I understand it—see the bill today.

I don't know where all my Tea Party friends are who demanded full consideration and that everybody read the bill. I don't see them out on the lawn. I don't see them out on the plaza. I don't see them out on the sidewalk as they were when we were considering the bill and we had those 181 witnesses, the 100 hours of hearings that they thought weren't sufficient.

□ 1130

I don't know whether they will think that having a markup next Wednesday when the bill has not even been made available to Democratic Members of the House. Apparently, Republican Members have to go to a room to see it, and the public clearly has no idea of what that bill is.

Mr. Leader, I hope you will tell me that I am wrong, that there will be hearings consistent with what Speaker RYAN said 3 days ago. I hope you will tell me, yes, we are going to honor what Speaker RYAN said, that we are going to have those hearings, we are going to have witnesses, and we are going to consider amendments.

All of us understand that this is one of the biggest issues confronting the American people. We have had hundreds of thousands of people showing up at town meetings saying how concerned they are, yet, if my information is correct, Mr. Leader, they will have no opportunity to talk to the Committee on Ways and Means.

I am further informed, and I hope the majority leader says this is wrong, that the markup will occur before the Congressional Budget Office has the opportunity to say how much it is going to cost. All this weeping and gnashing of teeth about balanced budgets and fiscal responsibility, a bill that affects 18 percent of the gross domestic product, and the critical need for people to have access to affordable, quality health care, not one of them will have an opportunity to know how much this repeal will cost.

Again, Mr. Leader, I hope you are going to be able to tell me, no, Mr. Whip, we are going to have hearings, we understand how important this issue is, how much interest there is in this country, and we are going to give time for serious consideration, and we are going to have witnesses come before those hearings; and then after the witnesses, we are going to have a markup after substantial debate and consideration is allowed on both sides of the aisle.

I now yield to the majority leader with the hopes that he will be able to give me some degree of confidence that PAUL RYAN, our Speaker, was correct, that we are going to follow regular order and make a transparent consideration of this piece of legislation.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I always look forward to your quotes.

Mr. HOYER. I have some more.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Now you have gone beyond. You now bring in rumors. I give you credit there. You have been here quite some time, much longer than I. I agree with you, this is a very big issue. That is why, for the last 6 years, we have had hearings because all those hearings you reported, I would have wished you would have listened during those hearings. I would have wished you would have been able to do a healthcare bill that actually works. The essence of what the ACA did, it was about exchanges and the expansion of Medicaid.

So my dear friend here tells me that was a big success. What do you tell all those people across this country? In fact, one-third of every county in this country now only has one health insurer. Humana just announced they are pulling out. Because you love quotes so much, let me read what the CEO of Aetna says: ObamaCare is failing. It has entered a "death spiral."

With Humana pulling out, that gives 16 counties in Tennessee that have no one to care for them. The expansion of Medicaid—I know you are concerned about the budget, as am I—says within this 10-year window, in the tenth year, it will cost us \$1 trillion. You know as well as I do that that is about the exact amount of money we spend for all discretionary spending in government today. We watched the ACA create 23 CO-OPs. They were provided more than \$2 billion. Eighteen of those 23 have collapsed.

So, yes, for the last 6 years, we have been holding hearings, we have been listening to the public, and we have been working on this bill. Yes, we will go regular order. We will have a markup in committee. When the bill comes out of committee, we will take that markup, we will go to the Committee on the Budget because it is reconciliation, and we will bring that bill to the floor, just as the rules state we will do that. We have waited 6 years to do this, just as we moved one last year to the President as well, and he vetoed it.

We cannot sit and wait for this failure to continue any longer. The health of this country deserves something much better. That is why we have been spending our time, that is why we have been working on it, and that is why we have been listening. We have had the wisdom to listen, but now I promise you we will have the courage to lead.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comment. It is, therefore, extraordinarily sad that we have spent 6 years with only one option that the majority would pursue: repeal. Not fix, not make it work better, not ensure that people can afford their care, not make sure that insurance companies had the competence to stay in the market because the market was destabilized for all of its lifetime to date by the Republicans saying all we are going to do is repeal.

The gentleman talks about the cost. The gentleman cannot tell me some 4

days before he suggests passing a piece of legislation that will affect 18 percent of our gross domestic product what it will cost. Why? Because he has no score from the CBO. He can tell me all he wants about 6 years of waiting and listening. He has no score on this bill. My judgment is he will have no score when he marks it up. By the way, he will give no access, contrary to Speaker RYAN saying that we are going to go regular order. I reject, with all due respect, Mr. Majority Leader, the fact that we had a hearing a year ago or 2 years ago or 3 years ago, that the opinion that was given at those times by various witnesses who differed on their conclusions, that we can apply that to the bill that you have introduced now.

I don't know what the bill you have introduced is. I don't know whether you have introduced it or somebody else has introduced it. I don't even know whether it exists. I told the gentleman what I am told. He has not disabused me of any of the assertions I made. He has not disabused me that it is not available publicly. He has not disabused me of the fact that we can't see it. He has not disabused me of Dr. BURGESS saying it ought to be seen by everybody and considered, it should not be in a secret room someplace that people have to go to, like it is a secret document. We have to go down to the Capitol Visitor Center in the secure facilities of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to see secret documents. Surely that is not the standard that we are giving to a bill that will have such, in my view, catastrophic effect on individuals, on jobs, and on businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the majority leader that I do not accept the proposition that a hearing over 6 years about repeal only—and I am not sure how many hearings there were. Maybe the majority leader knows. But I know for a fact that proponents of the bill were very difficult to get on the list of witnesses that we wanted to testify at some of those hearings. The American people, the Tea Party, all those people for and against who came to these town meetings should really lament. And, frankly, I think that the Speaker's representation is not being followed. The assertion that it was done last year, the year before, we have a lot of new Members in this Congress who weren't here. Frankly, when we have bills introduced in Congress, we usually have hearings on them. That is the regular order.

Now, we haven't been following regular order on all these congressional review acts, Mr. Leader, so maybe the precedent nowadays is forget about hearings because most of the bills that we have considered during this Congress have not had hearings. The ramifications of the repeal of these rules no one knows. There were no hearings on those. Frankly, we didn't have hearings on those year after year after year in the past. So, Mr. Leader, it appears that the representation you are mak-

ing is we know all about this, we don't need hearings, we have been talking about this stuff forever, we are just going to act. The courage, I would suggest to my friend, the courage would be to expose these to full and fair and open debate. That would be the courage.

Now, Mr. Leader, unless you want to respond to that, I will move on to a different subject.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Well, I would only like to end with this: I was here at the same time. I know you have your history, and I have the history that I remember. I remember seeing the Speaker at that time, now your leader, say we need to pass the bill to find out what is in it. I remember being here late that night. I remember a lot of people, citizens around this building complaining. You know what? The saddest part of all that, their fears became true. They didn't get to keep the doctor or the health plan that they were promised. The premiums they were told would go down \$2,500, that didn't happen. They now find that they don't have the care that they were promised. We have spent our time.

You did make a statement that there are a lot of new people in this building. I would argue that is a reason why there are a lot of new people in this building, the ACA and the way you carried it out. That is why we did not do that. You stipulated a little earlier, trying to state about a 3-day rule. That wasn't your rule. That is a rule we instituted and changed when we became the majority, Mr. Speaker.

So we will have regular order. We will have regular order. We will take it through committee, we will have it open for debate, and we will bring it to the floor because we promised the American people, and we will keep our promise, just as the President, as you heard just this week, talked about the reform. We will protect preexisting conditions. We will make sure those who are 26 or younger can stay on their parents' plan. The bans or lifetime limits, we will protect those like we have always said we would. We will create a healthcare bill that actually empowers the individual, not more government. We will actually lower the premiums. That is the difference between us. We can have those debates, and I welcome them, because I think history will show your hearings and our hearings. But, at the end of the day, I want the history to show who actually did a better job of providing health care to the American people at a lower cost.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Leader, you can be assured that history will show that. Can I see the bill today?

Mr. MCCARTHY. You are not on that committee, so you can look at it when we mark it up.

Mr. HOYER. In other words, they will mark it up before anybody in the public, including a Member of the House of Representatives—

Mr. MCCARTHY. No.

Mr. HOYER. Before then, we cannot see it.

Mr. MCCARTHY. If the gentleman yields, I will answer his question.

Mr. HOYER. Is that what the gentleman is telling me?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. It is similar to every other bill we move. They will post it before they mark it up so everybody can see it and debate it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Leader, reclaiming my time, that is not regular order. I have been here a long time. You have been here a long time. That is not regular order. Regular order is you introduce a bill, you go up to this desk, and you put a bill in. We don't follow that very much, but that is regular order. It is then printed. It is referred to a committee. The public can see it as soon as it is printed. It goes to the committee. They establish a hearing. The witnesses then come before the committee and testify as to its positive and negative aspects. The committee then schedules a markup. It may even be the same day after the hearing, I get that. And then they mark it up. But the bill has been given to the public and to Members, invariably under regular order, substantially before that happens.

You are telling me, as I understand it, Mr. Leader, I cannot see the bill today, 5 days before it is scheduled to be marked up. Is that accurate?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Have you seen a scheduled markup? I didn't have it in my list. I don't announce markups, but apparently this is another rumor you may have heard.

Mr. HOYER. Is the leader telling me that he does not know personally whether a markup is scheduled on the Affordable Care Act repeal next week?

I yield to my friend.

□ 1145

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for asking. That is a question to the chairman. I simply provide you the schedule for next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman, but that was not my question, whether the chairman of the committee knows. Maybe the gentleman does not know, in which case he can say no.

My question is: Does the gentleman know whether a markup is scheduled for next week in the Ways and Means Committee on the repeal of the Affordable Care Act?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

That is an action of the committees, and they will list as soon as they are prepared to do their markups.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether that is a "yes" or a "no" or "I don't intend to tell you," but it certainly does not tell me whether the majority leader knows that.

I would suggest to the chairman of the committee, though, Mr. Speaker, that the majority leader ought to be informed of what the committee is doing on such an important issue.

I am just informed that while the majority leader may not know, The Hill newspaper knows and says: ObamaCare reconciliation markup on track for next week.

They, perhaps, heard the same rumor I have heard, Mr. Leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Will the gentleman yield for one moment?

The gentleman understands that this is coming through reconciliation, and reconciliation is created through committee, not by submitting a bill. So this is regular order.

I thank the gentleman for his concern, and I thank the gentleman for the last 6 years that we have had concerns about this. I will provide the gentleman with a number of hearings. In Energy and Commerce this year alone, they have had hearings and they have had votes on markups on improvements and changes to our healthcare system. If the gentleman would like, I will provide those to him at a later date.

But when it comes to reconciliation, committees will move that. When it goes through the committees, it will then go to the Budget Committee, and then it will come to the floor. That is regular order, and that is what we are following.

Mr. HOYER. I ask you: Do you expect the Budget Committee to have a hearing on it?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I expect to follow regular order. When a bill goes through Energy and Commerce and a bill comes through Ways and Means, it will then go for markup inside the Budget Committee, and then come to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I will close on this subject, unless the majority leader would like to make a comment. He does know I like quotes.

Mr. Leader, you said the following:

This bill is being pushed through because the majority in the Congress refuse to listen to the people.

You said that on March 2, 2010. You were referring, of course, to us Democrats who refused to listen to the American people, because your presumption was the American people was not for the proposition we were promoting.

There were two candidates for President who got major votes in this election. One was Hillary Clinton, who said: I want to keep the Affordable Care Act. And one was Donald Trump, who said: I want to get rid of the Affordable Care Act. Although, he has said then and now that he wants to have everybody covered at a cheaper price with assured benefits. As I said, we would support a bill like that.

Of those two candidates that were running, one got 65 million votes and one got 62 million votes. Now, the one who got 62 million votes won the election. Why? Because of the electoral college. He is the legitimate elected President of the United States. I do not question that at all. But it ought to give some degree of humility that he

got 3 million less votes than the person that espoused policies other than those espoused by President Trump. It ought to give some pause to let the American people into the process and testify.

I will tell the gentleman that what the Republican Party is recommending in repeal of the ACA will have very substantial consequences. You may think they are positive, I may think they are negative, but I hope neither one of us think that that won't have very substantial consequences for our country. In that context, we ought to have allowed, and we ought to allow, the people of this country to testify on those consequences.

Again, I will move on, unless the gentleman wants to make an additional comment.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just didn't know that 4 months later we were still going to litigate who won the election. It has always been the electoral college.

I know the gentleman likes to make a lot of quotes, but I think if you take my quote and you look at the date and you want to go back in time and you look at the polling, I think my quote is right. I think the American people were at that exact same position.

You talk about consequences. The ACA has a tremendous amount of consequences on the American public, and, unfortunately, they haven't been positive. Some have, but the majority have not. That is why a number of people today, one-third of this Nation of the counties, 1,022, only have one healthcare provider.

I listened to our President just this week right down this well. I know you haven't commented about that or quoted anything he said there, but I listened to other people who commented about that, people who are on different sides of the aisle who I know did not vote for him.

Mr. Speaker, Van Jones, I know the man well. He and I philosophically disagree. But he said that night, listening to President Trump, that he became America's President.

So I just say to my friend across the aisle, Mr. Speaker, that I think 4 months is long enough to decide who won the race, and we don't have to come back to this. If we really want this country to come together, I don't think that type of questioning on this floor is productive. I think it is time to come together as one Nation and start solving these problems, but not try to bring back up and litigate who really won the election.

Mr. HOYER. There are so many comments I could make in response to that.

No one today on this floor is questioning the legitimacy of President Trump's Presidency—period. What I said was that more people voted for the candidate who wanted to keep the ACA than voted for the candidate who wanted to repeal the ACA.

Secondly, if the gentleman refers to the polls of his quote in 2010, then I can refer to the polls today, which show that the majority of respondents believe that the ACA should be retained until and unless an acceptable replacement is provided.

The gentleman talks about 6 years. Not once in those 6 years, not once, has the majority party offered a comprehensive replacement for the Affordable Care Act. They have talked about it.

By the way, on the 26-year-olds and on the preexisting conditions, the repeal bills didn't say we were going to keep the preexisting conditions or the 26 age or the lifetime limits or the annual limits or the drug discounts for senior citizens. It didn't say any of that. It said repeal the ACA.

So the polling data today, Mr. Speaker, is that more people want to keep the ACA prior to the consideration and adoption of a replacement than want to repeal it. I agree with you, that is a change from 2010. And the reason it is a change is because they are now looking at it very carefully. They are figuring out what, in fact, it has done for them and their families and for their children who had preexisting conditions and for their access to affordable health care, and they are saying: We are taking a second look.

They do not now reflect that poll to which the gentleman referred that is now 7 years old and, very frankly, last year's poll. Now they look at it differently.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, if I could just tell my friend, when I refer to a poll, I mean the main poll of election day. If I look at what happened on 2010 and I look at what took place in this last election, you are correct, one side campaigned on repealing and replacing ObamaCare. This is only the third time since World War II that the American public entrusted that to a Republican Party who have a majority in the House, a majority in the Senate, and the Presidency.

So, yes, that is the poll I was looking at; the same as what transpired in 2010. That was the cornerstone and the foundation of what people said in that last election.

We are moving forward on that our promise. We have been working on this for more than 6 years with hearings, townhalls, and listening. We are going through reconciliation, the regular order. So the committees will mark up, send it in to the Committee on Budget, where they will do a markup, and then it will come to the floor.

I thank the gentleman for his concern.

Mr. HOYER. Well, I think that is some degree of clarity in terms of the markup, and no hearing, no witnesses, and I presume no CBO score to tell us how much that legislation is going to cost.

Now, Mr. Leader, two things. One is certainly less global and impactful,

but, nevertheless, important. I am sure the gentleman met with the Governors when they were in town, as I did. They met on a bipartisan basis. I met with a lot of the Republican Governors and Democratic Governors together.

They are very concerned, as you know, not only about the ACA—which we talked about, which they have great concerns of the impact on their States, Republicans and Democrats, of the repeal of the Medicaid expansion, in particular, the impact it will have on them and their people—but they also are very concerned about the Marketplace Fairness Act.

That is simply, frankly, trying to protect small businesses so that they can compete, the local mom and pop store can compete with the online vendors so that everybody would have to pay the sales tax, whatever the State sales tax is. That bill, I believe, enjoys the majority support in this House. I think it has enjoyed the majority support since it passed the Senate pretty handily.

Does the gentleman know whether or not that bill is going to be considered at any point in time in the near term?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we did meet with a bipartisan group of Governors, and that was one of the discussions as well. It is not scheduled at this time, but we will continue to work on that in committee. Our hope is to be able to find a solution in committee and be able to move that forward.

Mr. HOYER. Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my friend, the majority leader, that I look forward to working with him. I see that he recently observed that the attorney general ought to recuse himself in dealing with issues of the relationship between the administration during the course of the campaign and Russia, which the intelligence community has said interfered in America's election.

All of us ought to be concerned about that—a foreign government interfering in our democracy; particularly, a government that is hostile to our interests; particularly, a government led by Mr. Putin, who has committed international crimes, who, contrary to international law, invaded Crimea, still holds Crimea inconsistent with international law, and has been sanctioned. Hopefully, those sanctions will stay in place.

I agree with the gentleman that, at the very least, the attorney general ought to recuse himself. I have asked him to step down.

But we need to have, Mr. Speaker, an independent bipartisan commission with subpoena power, similar to the 9/11 Commission, for the security of our country and, yes, for the confidence building for our President to see what, in fact, were the relationships between his campaign and Russia and to what extent Russia involved itself in trying to impact on the elections of the United States.

I don't have anything further to say. Unless the gentleman wants to say something, I will yield back.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is a matter for investigation by the House Intelligence Committee. For years, we have investigated Putin's hostile international actions.

Just so the gentleman does know, Mr. Speaker, this week, Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF approved the scope of their committee's inquiry into Russia's measures of targeting in the 2016 election. I support this bipartisan investigation. I have great faith that the committee will fully investigate all of the evidence and follow the facts wherever they lead.

I know the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, made comments in regards to the attorney general. Attorney General Sessions stated this morning that whenever it is appropriate, he will recuse himself. I agree with those remarks.

As far as the ongoing investigation into Russia, I would, again, direct my friend to the bipartisan effort that is underway in the House Intelligence Committee.

□ 1200

Mr. HOYER. I thank the majority leader for his comments.

Let me say that I was very disappointed to learn that Mr. NUNES, at the request of the administration, talked to members of the press before the investigations have occurred, before they have heard a single witness, to say that he really thought this was not a matter that really needed careful consideration. That is not a quote. I characterized what I read his comment to mean to the press.

In addition, I understand the Department of Homeland Security was also requested, and the FBI, to talk to the press to tamp down interest in those. The American people need to be very concerned about these issues. Every Member of this Congress, a separate and coequal branch of the Government of the United States, ought to be very concerned about that.

The Bible says that the truth will set us free. And the truth will give us confidence. And the truth should be known by the American people.

The problem I have with the Intelligence Committee is that the Intelligence Committee—most of the information they gather is not available to the public. I don't know what they will do moving forward.

But we found in the 9/11 Commission a perfect example of a commission equally divided with two extraordinarily respected co-chairs that got to the bottom and made significant recommendations, most of which—almost all of which—were adopted in a bipartisan fashion by this Congress.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we would pursue that not in lieu of the Intelligence Committee—not in lieu of

the Intelligence Committee—but in addition to.

Benghazi, we had seven committees, and you thought on your side of the aisle that wasn't enough, so you spent some \$4 million on an additional special committee to find exactly the same conclusion.

So, in this case I do not oppose the work of the Intelligence Committee, but I certainly believe the American people would expect and would want a similar bipartisan commission as they saw work on the 9/11 tragedy to give them the confidence that Russia is not in any way undermining the independence of our government or undermining the democracy that we hold so dear.

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

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, MARCH 2, 2017, TO MONDAY, MARCH 6, 2017

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 4 p.m. on Monday, March 6, 2017.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BACON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CELEBRATING THE 105TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GRAND CANYON STATE

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on February 14, my home State of Arizona celebrated its 105th year as a member of the United States. The Grand Canyon State is an incredible State to raise a family in, to live in, and to play in.

There is so much to love about Arizona. We have over 300 days of sunshine. We enjoy the cool pines of Flagstaff; the rustic and historic towns of Prescott, Show Low, and Tombstone, which give perspective into Arizona's first days as a State; and we greatly benefit from the agricultural city and county of Yuma.

Arizona's lakes, mountains, forests, and skies provide countless activities throughout the year for natives and visitors alike. Arizona also enthusiastically hosts spring training, Super Bowls, college football playoff games, and the Waste Management Open, which many call "The Greatest Show on Grass."

Most of all, I love the people of Arizona. Arizonans are diverse, patriotic, and fiercely independent people. They bring so much talent and potential to our communities. I am deeply honored to serve my constituents in Chandler, Gilbert, Mesa, Sun Lakes, and Queen Creek.

After a long week in Washington, I cannot wait to step off the plane into