

sing the songs of his people 8,000 miles away.

Though a Delegate in this House, Eni Faleomavaega never presented himself as anything less than a Member of Congress. In doing so, he never diminished the standing of his constituents and their right, like all Americans, to have their voice heard here in the people's House.

The second lesson I learned from our departed friend was that the responsibilities of a Member of Congress go beyond the parochial concerns of our district. Of course, we are here to be sure that the people and place we represent are treated fairly and that our special circumstances are taken well into account in the formulation of Federal law and policy; but beyond that local responsibility, we all have a larger responsibility to act and speak on behalf of our Nation as a whole.

Eni certainly demonstrated that larger role we must all accept by his advocacy for Native Americans and by taking leadership in the foreign affairs of our Nation, especially in Asia and the island nations of the South Pacific. A good Member of Congress takes care of their own people, just as Eni did. A great Member of Congress understands that their people can only thrive when the Nation as a whole is a place of justice and peace.

Those are the lessons I learned from knowing Eni Faleomavaega, and for what he taught me, I will forever be grateful.

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join us in passing this important piece of legislation. When those veterans in American Samoa see Eni's name, it will strike them about what he has done and the work that he did here in Congress.

I would also like to give a heartfelt thanks again to the gentlewoman for bringing this bill forward and for honoring her friend the way she has.

I encourage Members to support this bill.

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

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers at this time. Once again, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

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

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1362 a bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Pago Pago, American Samoa the Faleomavaega Eni Fa'aua'a Hunkin VA Clinic. This is a fitting way to honor the life and service of my good friend and colleague former Congressman Eni Faleomavaega of American Samoa. During his 26 years of service in the House of Representatives, Congressman Faleomavaega displayed unwavering commitment to addressing a wide range of issues affecting veterans

in the Pacific. His focus on access to health care and veteran services in remote areas of the Pacific ensured that veterans had access to the critical resources and services they needed and deserved after serving their country. His efforts directly contributed to increasing the quality of life of veterans throughout the Pacific region. Naming the VA facility in Pago Pago in his honor is a tribute to his service and commitment to the veterans in the Pacific region.

Congressman Faleomavaega's compassion for veterans can be attributed to his own service as an Army officer during the Vietnam conflict. Serving in this capacity gave him firsthand knowledge of the sacrifices servicemen make to protect our way of life.

I deeply miss Eni's advice, friendship and compassion for veterans. His passing has created a void for all that have known him. On behalf of the people of Guam, I extend my condolences to his family and the people of American Samoa. Our lives are richer for knowing Eni. I also extend my appreciation to Congresswoman RADEWAGEN in putting forward this legislation. It is a very appropriate way to memorialize an important part of Eni's work on behalf of the people of American Samoa.

Un dangkulo na si Yu'os ma'ase (with deepest gratitude), Eni. You are deeply missed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from American Samoa (Mrs. RADEWAGEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1362.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### FRED D. THOMPSON FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 375) to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 719 Church Street in Nashville, Tennessee, as the "Fred D. Thompson Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 375

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building and United States courthouse located at 719 Church Street in Nashville, Tennessee, shall be known and designated as the "Fred D. Thompson Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

#### SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the

United States to the Federal building and United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Fred D. Thompson Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

□ 1715

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 375.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 375 would designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located in Nashville, Tennessee, as the Fred D. Thompson Federal Building and United States Courthouse.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for her leadership on this legislation.

Senator Thompson was respected for his work as a lawyer, an actor, and as a United States Senator. This legislation is a fitting tribute that I am honored to bring to the floor today.

Fred Thompson first made a name for himself as an assistant U.S. attorney from 1969 to 1972. That experience brought him to the national stage in his subsequent position as special counsel on a number of Senate committees, most notably as minority counsel with the Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities, better known as the Watergate Committee.

It was then-Counsel Thompson who helped frame Senator Howard Baker's now famous question, "What did the President know, and when did he know it?" in regards to the Watergate controversy. Thompson himself asked an even more important question related to the existence of taped conversations in the Oval Office—tapes that led to President Nixon's eventual resignation.

After returning to the private practice of law in Nashville, Thompson represented the chairperson of the State Parole Board who unearthed a cash-for-clemency scheme involving the then-Governor of Tennessee. This case was eventually made into a book and into the film "Marie." Fred Thompson was cast to play himself, which launched his acting career. Throughout the 1990s, Fred Thompson appeared in supporting roles in some of the decade's biggest movies, including "Days of Thunder," "The Hunt for Red October," and "Die Hard 2."

In 1994, Fred Thompson ran for political office for the first time and was elected to fill the remaining 2 years of Vice President Al Gore's Senate term. He was re-elected in 1996 to a full 6-year term and served as chairman of the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs until his retirement in 2002.

That didn't slow Senator Thompson down. He returned to acting and won the role of New York District Attorney Arthur Branch on the hit NBC show "Law & Order" between 2002 and 2007. It was in 2007 that Senator Thompson returned to politics by announcing his candidacy for the United States Presidency. Although his return to the political realm was unsuccessful, Senator Thompson's popularity did not wane. He returned to acting on screen and on TV, wrote a memoir, and appeared often to comment on politics. Tragically, in 2015, Senator Thompson died from a recurrence of lymphoma.

Senator Thompson was a man of many talents. Through it all, he never lost his roots as a Tennessean. Given Senator Thompson's dedication to the law and public service, I believe it is more than fitting to name this courthouse and Federal building in Nashville after him.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of this legislation, H.R. 375, which names the Federal building and U.S. courthouse in Nashville, Tennessee, after the late Senator Fred Thompson.

Senator Thompson had a long and extraordinary career in many roles that included actor, lobbyist, private attorney, and radio show host. But he is best known and respected not for his hawking of reverse mortgages but for being an assistant U.S. attorney, a congressional staffer, and, lastly, a U.S. Senator representing the State of Tennessee. Senator Thompson was a graduate of Memphis State University and Vanderbilt Law School. Senator Thompson got his start in public life in 1967, when he served as an assistant U.S. attorney in Nashville, Tennessee.

During his time in that office, he met U.S. Senator Howard Baker from Tennessee who became a lifelong mentor to Senator Thompson. After managing Senator Baker's successful U.S. Senate campaign in 1972, Senator Thompson moved to Washington, D.C., where he was appointed counsel to the U.S. Senate Committee investigating the Watergate break-in and famously helped shape the direction and tone of those hearings.

I think that he will be known as one who helped Senator Baker in formulating that age-old, timeless question: "What did President Nixon know, and when did he know it?" It is ironic that today, Mr. Speaker, people are asking about our current President, President Trump: What did he know, and when did he know it?

I will tell you, President Trump stood right there at the rostrum of the House last week and said that the Republican health insurance plan would have insurance for everybody, the insurance would be far less expensive and far better than what we have today. But we see now that that was incorrect, as the Republicans have, on a Monday, I guess at some point before the day ended, introduced their repeal bill of the Affordable Care Act.

We are here talking about Senator Thompson today, but I just can't help asking: When did President Trump know that the Republican plan was going to throw 20 million people off of the Affordable Care Act depriving them of insurance? When did he know that? What did he know about this plan? Because not a whole lot of people around here knew of the plan until it was released because it was shrouded in secrecy, and it was released and a hearing scheduled to mark it up, to mark up the legislation with no hearings taking place on the underlying legislation.

So no CBO score, no congressional hearings about it, introducing it in a cloud shrouded in secrecy, and, boom, it is dropped on the American people at a time when you are trying to distract attention from other questions about what President Trump knew about Russia, Russian hacking, and those kinds of questions. What did he know about the GSA hotel that the taxpayers own that he is leasing and now he is the lessor and the lessee of that hotel that belongs to the American people? What did he know and when did he know it? Those are questions that the American people have. We intend to get down to the bottom of it on this side. I hope that we will have some help on the other side.

I do want to say that I support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I think the American people would be horrified to learn that of the 30 million people who were able to attain health insurance coverage and access to the healthcare system as a result of passage of the Affordable Care Act, many of those, a substantial number of those, will be thrown off of the rolls and deprived of the ability to have access to the healthcare system because of this new replacement bill that has been filed, which, as I said before, has not been scored.

We don't know how much the Medicare solvency issue is going to cost. We don't know how much it is going to cost. We don't know how much it is going to cost the taxpayers. We don't know how many people will lose their jobs because, after all, it stands to reason if you are serving 30 million more people, that means you have brought a whole lot of people into the healthcare delivery business, people who are working, people who have jobs, people who have husbands, wives, parents, and children who are depending on them for support, and you are going to tell them that their jobs are at risk.

Yes, they are, with this new law that has been half-baked introduced and fast-tracked to become law without people really knowing about it. This is something that people need to know about, people need to get out and explain their opposition to because it is going to hurt a lot of people.

The way that this bill changes the Affordable Care Act is it makes it unaffordable for most Americans to be able to afford the insurance that they have gained as a result of passage of the Affordable Care Act. The premium subsidies are recalculated. Instead of based on a sliding scale which is an indication of need, this Republican plan is going to replace that and calculate the amount of the premium subsidy based on age.

Now, what does that do, especially when you consider that some elderly people are more well-heeled than others? They can afford insurance, and they can afford to front the policy cost in return for the tax subsidy that they get. But what does that do to the younger people? So it is good news for some older people who are well-heeled. They will be helped by this Republican plan. But the average wage earner is going to be hurt—the younger people—because it is going to be more expensive for them.

But then I have some bad news for the elderly people, also. Insurance companies under this new plan will be able to charge the elderly five times more than they will charge a younger person. That differential had been abolished in the Affordable Care Act, but the Republicans are bringing it back. Who is going to pay? It is going to be those same elderly people. You put it in one hand, and you take it out of the other. All of the elderly people in America, regardless of how much money you earn, should be concerned about that.

Prioritizing health savings accounts over these premium subsidies is going to provide a great big tax cut to the wealthy. You can't get away from that. It is going to hurt the working people of this country. It is going to be a tax giveaway to the wealthy. I am sad to hear and to see this plan, and all of you should be, also.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT).

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I stand today in strong opposition to the Republican proposal to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

This is a rushed bill, Mr. Speaker, that was written behind closed doors in total secrecy with no daylight and with no access to the important content of this bill that all of us should have ample time to be able to digest the details of it and be able to make a good decision that is consistent with the will of our constituents. This is a

rushed bill that was written behind closed doors, again, in total secrecy.

Mr. Speaker, procedurally, we have not seen a CBO score of this bill. There have been no hearings on this bill. There has been no expert testimony on the impact of this bill, and the effect to healthcare costs for families or the quality of coverage all of those families will receive is completely unknown.

Substantively, this bill is an absolute nightmare. It guts Federal requirements for essential health benefits like maternity care. It shatters working Americans' access to insurance covering abortions. It creates age-based subsidies, repeals all the ACA taxes, and completely destroys the Medicaid expansion program which so much helped many of our States.

□ 1730

In our country, at least 11 million people will lose their healthcare insurance coverage as a result of this reckless dismantlement of Medicaid. In my district alone, over 156,000 individuals are going to lose their coverage with the repeal of the Medicaid expansion. Over 156,000 people, Mr. Speaker, will lose their coverage.

This bill kicks the elderly, the poor, and the sick to the curb and benefits only the young, healthy, and incredibly wealthy.

I urge my colleagues to stand with me in opposition. This bill is a serious heart attack to the American people. It is a blatantly partisan action to dismantle President Obama's successful signature project: ObamaCare. Again, the 1 percent get their way.

Mr. Speaker, as we move forward, decades to come, we will be able to go back and think of health care within the context of three major programs: Medicaid, Medicare, and ObamaCare.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE), my friend.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, with exactly zero hearings on the topic, our Republican friends have now revealed their TrumpCare plan.

Just to remind everyone what President Trump said during the campaign and promised, he said that his Republican plan would "have insurance for everybody," and that it would be "far less expensive and far better" than what we have today.

Well, now we actually have the plan out. What does it do?

It kicks 20 million Americans off their health insurance. It sharply increases out-of-pocket costs for millions of American families. It rations care for millions of Americans on Medicaid. It includes massive cuts to Medicaid. It would make maternity care much more expensive.

But don't worry, there is good news. If you are a CEO of a healthcare company and you make, on average, as they do, somewhere between \$13 million and \$14 million, the tax increases that were leveled on you 6 years ago will now be repealed. So, congratulations. Those folks benefit, but 20 million Americans lose their health insurance.

Please join me in saying "no" to TrumpCare.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just can't get out of my mind, Mr. Speaker, those words of President Trump that everybody would have insurance and that it would be far less expensive and far better than what we have today.

The Republicans have campaigned incessantly for the last 7 years on repeal and replace of the Affordable Care Act, which they derisively referred to as ObamaCare. We are going to repeal it and we are going to replace it on day one is what they all said.

And here we are at day 45, something like that, and we have had nothing but one scandal after another; but we have finally now gotten to the House Republicans revealing what they have shrouded in secrecy for so long over the last 7 years. It sputters out without much ado, trying to sneak it in, trying to keep it undercover so that the American people won't realize what is being done to them.

I can tell you that what is being done under those covers is not worthy of my comment descriptively at this time, but I will say that it is an illicit, illegitimate situation that is taking place because you are taking from a group of people who are in need and you are giving more to individuals who have and who don't need.

In this country we are all in the same boat together. That is what the Affordable Care Act did. It was an aspiration for health care for everyone. It wasn't perfect. It is not a perfect bill. It needs some repairs done, if you will, some enhancements. We have never had the co-operation from the other side of the aisle to do anything to enhance that foundation that was already laid.

Nobody can argue with the fact that 30 million people who did not have health care access and now having it is a bad thing. Nobody can argue that. They could argue that: Well, the way that it was done was bad. They say that we rushed it through without any input from them, but there were literally dozens of public hearings and markups. The bill, all 1,000 pages, was available for everyone to be able to read.

They talk about reading the bill. Well, there are so many bills coming through right now that they don't want people to take the time to read them. That is why they introduce them late in the day and then they schedule

markups for them without even putting them in front of the committee for a hearing. No airing out of the bill and what it does.

Why are they holding this and hiding it from the American people?

It is because they are trying to get away with something that is going to be bad for the people. That is why.

They knew that their changes, their repeal and replacement bill, if properly vetted, if the American people had an opportunity to learn what is in it, they knew it would not be popular. That is why they hid it from the public. That is why they are not having any hearings on it. They just want to proceed straight to a markup; pass it out of the committee; put it on the floor of the House; pass it out of the House with little debate; send it over to the Senate for a rubber stamp, they hope; and then on to President Trump, who, as I said, when did he know that this bill that he was going to be presented with perhaps did not provide coverage for everybody and was not far better in coverage than the Affordable Care Act? When was it that he learned that?

The American people want to know a whole lot. There is a whole lot to investigate about President Trump and his campaign. There is a whole lot to investigate about this repeal and replacement of the Affordable Care Act with an inferior product, one that is slanted to the rich and hurts the working people of this country.

Then it guts the Medicaid program, which millions and millions of people depend on to keep grandma and granddaddy and momma and daddy at the nursing home. Medicaid helps to make nursing home care affordable.

But under this healthcare repeal legislation that the Republicans have filed, they are going to cut Medicaid. They are going to use the expansion of the Medicaid program which enabled 10 million people to gain coverage that they could not afford, and they are going to cut that. At the same time, they are going to cut the other part of the Medicaid program which provides for people to be able to have their loved ones properly cared for at the nursing home, instead of down in the basement or upstairs in the spare bedroom.

So, get ready, ladies and gentlemen, for that inevitability if this legislation passes. Get ready for your loved ones to have no place to go, no nursing home facility to take care of them, because they will not be able to afford it and you will not be able to afford it.

Who will suffer most?

Momma and daddy and granddaddy and grandma. They are the ones that get the care that is so needed for the elderly.

So in this bill, where they are going to cut 20 million people off the healthcare rolls, they are going to cut momma and daddy from the nursing home by cutting the Medicaid program and turning it into a block grant program and turning it over to the States.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 375.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### FAIRNESS FOR BREASTFEEDING MOTHERS ACT OF 2017

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1174) to provide a lactation room in public buildings, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1174

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Fairness For Breastfeeding Mothers Act of 2017”.

#### SEC. 2. LACTATION ROOM IN PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

(a) LACTATION ROOM IN PUBLIC BUILDINGS.—Chapter 33 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

##### “§ 3318. Lactation room in public buildings

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY.—The term ‘appropriate authority’ means the head of a Federal agency, the Architect of the Capitol, or other official authority responsible for the operation of a public building.

“(2) COVERED PUBLIC BUILDING.—The term ‘covered public building’ means a public building (as defined in section 3301) that is open to the public and contains a public restroom, and includes a building listed in section 6301 or 5101.

“(3) LACTATION ROOM.—The term ‘lactation room’ means a hygienic place, other than a bathroom, that—

“(A) is shielded from view;

“(B) is free from intrusion; and

“(C) contains a chair, a working surface, and, if the public building is otherwise supplied with electricity, an electrical outlet.

“(b) LACTATION ROOM REQUIRED.—Except as provided in subsection (c), the appropriate authority of a covered public building shall ensure that the building contains a lactation room that is made available for use by members of the public to express breast milk.

“(c) EXCEPTIONS.—A covered public building may be excluded from the requirement in subsection (b) at the discretion of the appropriate authority if—

“(1) the public building—

“(A) does not contain a lactation room for employees who work in the building; and

“(B) does not have a room that could be repurposed as a lactation room or a space that could be made private using portable materials, at a reasonable cost; or

“(2) new construction would be required to create a lactation room in the public building and the cost of such construction is unfeasible.

“(d) NO UNAUTHORIZED ENTRY.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize an individual to enter a public building or portion thereof that the individual is not otherwise authorized to enter.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 33 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item related to section 3316 the following new item:

“3318. Lactation room in public buildings.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1174, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleagues for their work on bringing this bill to the floor today.

H.R. 1174 is a straightforward bill that would make nursing rooms available to new mothers in public buildings. The bill would apply to buildings already open to the public and which already have nursing rooms for employees. The requirements would not apply if existing space cannot feasibly be repurposed.

This is a good bill that will make the lives of nursing mothers easier and will improve the accessibility of public buildings.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1174, the Fairness for Breastfeeding Mothers Act of 2017, introduced by my good friend, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Georgia for yielding. I certainly thank him for being a cosponsor of my bill.

I should start, however, by thanking Chairman SHUSTER, and Ranking Member DEFAZIO, who have moved this bill so quickly.

The bill is called the Fairness for Breastfeeding Mothers Act of 2017. This is a real motherhood bill. Mr. DEFAZIO,

Mr. JOHNSON, and BARBARA COMSTOCK have all joined me as cosponsors.

H.R. 1174 requires locations that are either federally owned or leased to provide designated private and hygienic lactation space for nursing mothers. As I will indicate, no new space in buildings or expenditures is contemplated.

Last Congress, I offered this bill as an amendment to the Public Buildings Reform and Savings Act of 2016, and I was pleased to have it pass the House.

Space for lactating women is already required for Federal employees. We are really not talking about a new kind of benefit. Certainly, there is no new money. The reason that this is not new is because Federal employees already have lactating space under the Affordable Care Act.

So I have to ask my good friends on the other side: As you try to repeal the Affordable Care Act, do you propose to erase this motherhood provision as well? Will you preserve it?

□ 1745

My bill extends the lactating space requirement to include not just employees, but visitors and guests of Federal facilities across the Nation. H.R. 1174 also does not require additional Federal funds or space to be mandated at all. Since Federal employees already have this space, I look forward to visitors to Federal buildings also making use of this space. In our country, new mothers often come to visit Federal buildings, not only those who work in Federal buildings.

The reason this is such an important bill is that the benefits of breast milk are so well documented: antibodies and hormones that boost babies' immune systems, lower risks of asthma, diabetes, respiratory infections, and other diseases among breastfed babies.

There are benefits also for nursing mothers. Research has shown that there are lower risks of diabetes and even cancer as a result of breastfeeding. Speaking of motherhood, the Republican healthcare plan would even make maternity care significantly more expensive.

Now, this, of course, is a bill that is very easy to support, but when we think of its links to other important legislation, I ask that there be sincere consideration given to whether or not at this moment in time my good friends across the aisle want their legacy to be: We actually repealed your health care.

I don't think they are going to be able to do it.

My Republican friends have no experience with structural reform. If you look at all the structural reform in our country, beginning with the New Deal, none of it was done by Republicans. Whether you are talking about the administrative agencies that are so important to all that we do in this country, Medicare, Medicaid, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, whatever you have in mind, these are structural reforms that Republicans