The President has already taken action to tell the IRS not to enforce the mandate. So the young healthy invincibles shirk the law knowing that they don't ever have to pay a penalty because the IRS is not looking.

Okay, if that is what you want to do. However, if you want to improve the healthcare of America, if you want to hold premiums stable and perhaps even declining, expand that risk pool.

How about a few other things?

When the Affordable Care Act passed the House of Representatives in 2009, there was a public option in it. Unfortunately, the Senate wouldn't stand for a public option. But bring the public option back so that there would be a national public option insurance company available to everybody. Bring that back. That is another idea that ought to be the improvement of it.

Another thing: States can and have successfully modified the Medicaid programs in their State. Expand the ability of States to experiment with different ways of providing services under the Medicaid program. Not by eliminating it, as the Republicans would do—that is, eliminating the expansion, as the Republicans would do in their repeal and in TrumpCare—but, rather, allow the States to experiment with different ways of providing the medical services in the Medicaid program. And there are some great ideas out there.

We know that many of the people in Medicaid have long illnesses, high blood pressure; perhaps they have other illnesses that require constant care. We know that there are examples of programs that provide ongoing services so that these illnesses are constantly being able to be monitored and dealt with.

You want to deal with blood pressure, take a couple of cheap pills and you keep the blood pressure down and you avoid stroke and diabetes and the like. Those programs should be existing in most States, in most Medicaid programs. So we ought to provide the opportunity for the States to experiment with different ways of keeping down the cost of medical services.

There are many other things that we can do with regard to the delivery systems. California has been a leader in creating various delivery systems that do keep down the cost of care—comprehensive delivery system, preexisting conditions being taken care of. So we can do this with a variety of ways.

All of these should be on the floor of the House of Representatives and the Senate and presented to the President as we have the Affordable Care Act in place and we have ideas on how it can be improved.

Programs such as mandatory care, all of those can be taken into consideration. But, no, we are not going to do that. We are just going to let the Affordable Care Act die, so says our President.

It is unbelievable that you sign on, presumably to provide more opportunity for Americans, to provide better medical care for Americans. But, no, that is not what is going to happen here. The President of the United States said he is going to let it die, let it collapse. How cruel, how harsh, and how unlike previous Presidents. I pray future Presidents who say: My job as President of the United States is to carry out, yeah, the preamble to the Constitution, to form a better union.

But apparently that is not the case with this President.

So the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land, and it is the responsibility of the President to carry out the laws of the land, and that includes things that he thinks may be discretionary, such as the IRS mandate, such as the advertising, the cross-subsidization for those insurance companies that have higher risk pools than other insurance companies.

We live in a very important moment where at risk are 22, 23, 24 million American lives. Thankfully, four senators stood strong and courageous and said, no, they were not going to support the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

It is not over. This fight is going to go on for some time, and as it goes on, I would hope the American people understand what is at risk. It is the well-being of their neighbors, it is the health of their communities, and, indeed, in some cases, it may be their own life. We will see.

But today, a good thing happened—actually it was yesterday a good thing happened. The Senate was unable to pass a repeal of the Affordable Care Act and a replacement that was in every way a terrible blow to Americans. So we are thankful, and we look to the future and we look to the fight ahead.

I can tell you this: My colleagues on the Democratic side are absolutely determined that the Affordable Care Act be improved and that it continue to be the law of the land. And the millions upon millions of Americans that have had the opportunity to purchase health insurance, to be covered in health exchanges, to be covered under the expansion of the Medicaid program, we are there for them and we are going to fight this. And we will succeed because Americans know what is at risk in the legislation that passed the House of Representatives with the repeal of the Affordable Care Act and the legislation that almost passed the Senate. This isn't over. Our determination to stay the line remains.

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

POLICIES THAT ARE HARMFUL TO AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BERGMAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) for 30 minutes.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, every day, millions of Americans from every corner of our Nation get up early in the morning, leave their families, go off to work. They work hard to support themselves and their families. Many of them work two or more jobs at a time. Some come home very late, miss seeing their kids go to bed. These are folks, again, in every part of the Nation who don't ask much from their government. The only thing that they ask is that we live in a country where there is opportunity to pursue their American Dreams.

That means different things for different people. Some kids dream of growing up and being a teacher, an engineer, a lawyer, a firefighter, many things. As parents, we want to see our kids succeed, to live in a nation that remains the preeminent Nation of opportunity around the world.

Unfortunately, over the last 6 months, the policies pursued by this administration are endangering the United States' infrastructure of opportunity, endangering our position in the world. Today we are going to have an opportunity to talk about some of those policies that are harmful to America now and America in the future.

President Trump's proposals on the budget, for example, would hurt the creation of jobs, the ability of people to get healthcare, would be bad for the environment, would do so much harm in so many ways. So I am honored tonight to be with three of my colleagues, all of us from different parts of the country: Myself from Texas, the congresswoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), the congresswoman from Washington State (Ms. JAYAPAL), and the congresswoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

First I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin, Congresswoman GWEN MOORE, because I know that she has some very strong opinions and perspectives on healthcare.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just want to tell you how grateful I am that my colleagues want to have this dialogue, this colloquy with me.

I have been so disturbed by the false information that is being given to Americans about the Affordable Care Act, the whole notion that it is somehow in this death spiral, that somehow the Affordable Care Act is dead. And I think that the President and our illustrious Speaker, and the majority are promoting this point of view because they want the public to believe that the things that they are doing to destroy the Affordable Care Act and, ultimately, Medicaid are the causes for them not having health insurance, the causes for their premiums rising, the causes for insurers fleeing the market in rural areas. And I just want to spend some time this evening sharing the truth with you all this evening.

The majority, they now have both houses of Congress: the Senate and the House of Representatives. They have the White House. And their message that ObamaCare or the Affordable Care

Act is dead sort of covers up the fact that they owe the insurance industry $8 billion that we, in the Affordable Care Act, promised to give to the insurance companies while they sort of figured out how much premiums would cost in this new market.

They have sued the Federal Government because they say that the subsidies that we are paying for poor people are unconstitutional. And, of course, insurers, not knowing whether or not we are actually going to appropriate the money for the Affordable Care Act because they don't know whether we are going to do it or not, that causes destabilization in the market.

They are threatening in their bill to eliminate the individual mandate, which, of course, the individual mandate is a great source of revenue.

□ 1830

They are gutting the taxes on the wealthiest people in the Affordable Care Act to pay for some of the cost-sharing expenses. And, of course, insurance companies have no idea. In order to set appropriate rates and in order to stay in the market, insurance companies need some certainty. So if, in fact, ObamaCare is dead, it is because they have killed it.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. This week, I thought it was astounding, in the course of less than 24 hours, the Senate was unable to pass a healthcare bill. The President had promised for months that there would be a new healthcare bill to replace so-called ObamaCare. That failed in the Senate. And then the strategy after that became: Well, we are just going to repeal this, and we are going to give ourselves 2 years to come up with a replacement.

That failed today, and I think it failed for good reasons, because that would be disastrous for the American people; 32 million people would be dropped from the healthcare rolls if all you did was repeal.

So what were you hearing in this whole debate in Wisconsin from your constituents and your voters up there?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Well, I am glad you asked that question, because there are a couple of things that have happened. They ran into so much trouble in the Senate from those Senators who were concerned about them block-granting the Medicaid program, killing basically Medicaid. This was aside from the Affordable Care Act. To reduce Medicaid funding by one-third was one of the most egregious portions of the bills that have come out of the House and the proposals in the Senate.

What people need to understand is that, especially in States like Alaska, West Virginia, we have got 70 percent of people in nursing homes depending on Medicaid. We are not talking about able-bodied working people who have been able to benefit from the expansion of Medicaid.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Sixty-four percent of long-term nursing home stays are paid for by Medicaid.

Ms. MOORE. Exactly.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I represent the State of Florida. I want to thank my colleagues for bringing up this extremely important conversation about the, at least, 23 million people who would have lost healthcare coverage if the ''Not Very Affordable Care Act'' that the Republicans envisioned would have passed.

If I were the President of the United States, I might want to revise my definition of winning, because I think that we have a leader in the White House who repeatedly said that America would get so tired of winning, once he became President, that we wouldn't know what to do with ourselves.

Well, if killing their horrific healthcare bill and making sure that we can maintain healthcare as a right and not return it to the privilege that it once was for only people who could afford it, then I will take that kind of winning, because we did win on behalf of the American people, but we know that this is not the last trick up their sleeve.

The gentlewoman from Wisconsin mentioned the huge cuts to Medicaid in this terrible piece of legislation, and the gentleman from Texas mentioned the 64 percent of seniors in nursing homes who are there because they are on Medicaid.

I represent the State of Florida, Mr. Speaker, and in the State of Florida, we have the highest percentage of senior citizens as a proportion of our population in the country. This is just one example of a very vulnerable population, and this is an example of a population that our friends on the other side of the aisle were willing to just write off and leave twisting in the wind.

What would happen if this bill became law is we would go back to the days before Medicare and before Medicaid, in which you had families go bankrupt trying to take care of the ever-increasing healthcare needs of their most elderly family members, and it is just absolutely unacceptable.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. And, Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, in the 1990s, my grandmother was in her eighties. In 1993, she went into a nursing home and stayed there for about 3 years until she passed away. My grandmother suffered most of her life from type 2 diabetes, and before the end of her life, she had to have one of her legs amputated, and finally succumbed to congenital heart failure, but there is no way that my family, my mom, would have been able to afford to pay for 3 years of a nursing home stay but for the effect of this program.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I, too, had a very similar experience. My mother-in-law suddenly had a stroke when she was 58 years old, and she was cut down in her prime, also suffered from diabetes, and spent 3 years really in a very debilitated condition. She had to spend down essentially all of her assets to be able to qualify for Medicaid, because the only way that she could get care in a nursing home and be able to afford to get quality care in a nursing home was through Medicaid. She did also eventually die after 3 years in a nursing home, but I can't even imagine having to try to find a way to pay for her care if it were not for Medicaid.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. I just wanted to go back to this question of Medicaid, because I think you have raised such an important program that is really a mainstay for the American people. A lot of people don't understand exactly how much it covers. You have mentioned 62 percent of seniors in nursing homes.

One in four births in this country is covered through Medicaid. I was just talking to our good colleague, Mr. YARMUTH of Kentucky. Over half of the births in Kentucky are covered through Medicaid.

Then if you look at kids with disabilities, Medicaid covers 60 percent of kids with disabilities.

So when you talk about cutting $1.5 trillion from Medicaid, as was the case between TrumpCare and what was proposed in the budget, which I know our good friend from Florida is going to talk about, you actually had $1.5 trillion in cuts to a program that serves 72 million Americans. So it really is a travesty when you think about how much this program supports.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, that is right, because the narrative is that Medicaid only covers these ne'er-do-well, able-bodied people who the Medicaid expansion dealt with. But the reason why the Senate, to answer your question, couldn't live with the bill that was there is because not only did it repeal the Affordable Care Act, so-called ObamaCare, but it also undermined Medicaid, which is so vital.

And just think about this: cutting Medicaid by one-third would lead to people in nursing homes competing with disabled children, disabled children competing with other disabled adults, and with hospitals and nursing homes fighting for the crumbs that fall from the master's table.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. And, by the way, Congresswoman MOORE, that is why a lot of people were referring to these cuts as cruel. I mean, it really is cruel.

Ms. MOORE. It is mean.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. ''Mean'' was the exact word that the President used.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. That is right. You bring up a great point, and then I want to talk real quick about the budget.

There is this underlying tone from the President and from other politicians that some of the folks who are on Medicaid are somehow undeserving, that they are somehow freeloading, and that is just not the case. It is a complete misunderstanding of who these Americans are.

We talk about how healthcare failed. It seems like the President promised healthcare, but it didn't happen.

One of the things that they wanted to do before healthcare, which hasn't happened either, was tax reform. That is going to be very difficult, especially when one of the foundations of your new tax plan is giving a tax cut to the wealthiest folks, literally who need it the least, but it raises a question of the budget and what the budget does for the American people.

Ms. MOORE. Will the gentlewoman from Florida explain kind of the budget reconciliation, where they are going to get these tax cuts?

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I would be happy to. I am a member of the Budget Committee, and we are actually going to mark up the Republicans' budget tomorrow in that committee. Really, with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, to the ''Commander in Tweet,'' President Trump's budget that he proposed in May certainly did not put either families or taxpayers first—far from it.

In fact, the budget that both he proposed and that we will mark up tomorrow put Americans and taxpayers dead last, right behind polluters, industry lobbyists, and climate change deniers. And like too many of our Republican colleagues' spending priorities, this budget, this Republican budget, is actually a brutal attack on America's families.

We all know that it fails to deliver on investments in jobs, in infrastructure, and in education, but, my friends, nowhere is the damage to American families as stark as when it comes to our environment.

The Trump budget, the Republican budget that we will mark up tomorrow, will irreparably damage our air, our water, and our climate. The President has already managed to undermine America's position as a global leader in clean energy frontiers by withdrawing America from the Paris climate accord, for example. And like many of his tweets, President Trump's climate science policies are a rejection of reality, and a cynical embrace of falsehood and fantasy.

Ms. JAYAPAL represents a State that is on a coast, I represent a State that is on a coast, Ms. MOORE represents a State that is on the Great Lakes. Sea levels are rising. Our water levels are rising, Mr. Speaker. Property appraisers and insurance companies in south Florida are already factoring this reality into their home value assessments. King tides are bringing fish into the streets of south Florida.

President Trump's climate change solution is not the Paris climate accord, it is not making sure that we make investments in alternative energy. Let me show you what President Trump's solution to sea level rise and climate change is. His solution is to throw people a life vest, and they can sink or swim. Folks like the people in my district, who have invested most of their savings, like so many people, into their home, a life vest and being told that they can just deal with it is unacceptable.

We have to come together and come up with solutions to make sure that we can fight sea level rise and climate change, to make sure we can keep our drinking water clean, to make sure we make the kinds of investments so that we can protect the air we breathe. We have cities like Flint, Michigan, that have dealt with lead in their water and children being poisoned for years.

To my colleagues, this is something that is an existential threat, that if we don't make the kinds of investments that we must, then we are going to be in a world of hurt, and it is not at some distant point in the future. There was an article in the Miami Herald yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that referenced that my children's generation may not be able to live in my own district. That is absolutely unbelievable.

I am actually thinking of sponsoring an appropriation. Rather than making sure that we can invest in moving away from fossil fuels, maybe we will just invest in more life vests, President Trump's solution to global warming and climate change and sea level rise, and just issue everybody one of these, and we are good to go.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Congresswoman, you bring up a great point, and you focused on the environment there and how the President's budget proposal and the majority's budget proposal is damaging to the environment.

I think about a series that I saw yesterday in Texas. The Texas Tribune is an online publication, but it is kind of like the State newspaper, and they did a series called ''A Pass to Poison.'' And in the series, they noted that in 2016, I believe, there were about 3,700 incidents of air pollution in Texas, and the regulating agency in Texas, which is TCEQ, only gave out fines for 20 of those incidents.

So you talk about breathing harmful air. I can't help but think what will happen if these cuts that are being proposed under this budgetary situation go through, are we going to have 5,000 incidents now, and you are still only going to fine 20 people?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I just came from the Appropriations Committee markup on the Interior legislation, and a large part of that committee's work relates to the environment.

In my district, which is ground zero for sea level rise, Broward County recently ordered the drawing of new flood maps because of anticipated higher water levels. The city of Fort Lauderdale has already increased the height requirement for seawalls and raised the elevation of home sites. Miami Beach's climate plan involves building elevated roads and installing pumps to keep out saltwater.

□ 1845

So the President's and the Republican's—our colleagues on the other side of the aisle—solution for sea level rise is basically sink or swim. Here is the President's coastal flood mitigation plan. We have got the sea level rise plan and the coastal flood mitigation plan. Take your pick. At some point, we are probably going to have to give people both because we literally have to slosh around in galoshes when you are walking down the street in south Florida because of how bad the king tides are and how bad the streets flood in a normal rain.

But, God forbid, we should invest in infrastructure. And I know the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), when she was in the State senate, was a significant leader on investing in infrastructure, which is absolutely critical to making sure that we can keep people safe and that we can make sure that we can create jobs. That is something that this President and the Republicans have talked a whole lot about.

We are 178 days into this President's term, and we haven't passed a single piece of legislation related to infrastructure investment. And I think he actually promised to think big, because supposedly Democrats weren't thinking big enough; and that he was going to propose a $1 trillion infrastructure plan. I am hearing crickets. I am still waiting for that plan.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when Americans think about their main concerns—I have a bread and butter district where people are thinking foremost about their work. They want to make sure that they can support themselves and their family members, but there hasn't been much in the way of anything from the White House to create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There really hasn't. And I want to say that, if you look at the budget, you really get a sense of where the priorities are. They are not investing in climate. They are cutting healthcare dramatically. They are not investing in jobs and infrastructure.

Now, as the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) said, when I was in the State senate—it was

actually a Republican-controlled senate—together, we worked on a package and we invested $16 billion into infrastructure because we knew that that was good for Republicans and for Democrats.

If you look at what this President has to say, this was a tweet that he just put out:

''Really great numbers on jobs and the economy. Things are starting to kick in now. . . . ''

But the thing is that, this week, the White House is calling this ''Made in America Week.'' Well, maybe somebody should let the President know that everything should be made in America, because I happen to take a look at some of the products of the Trump Organization—and I am talking about Ivanka Trump's products and all of the President's organizations' products—and here is what I found:

Here is one of the products of Donald J. Trump's signature collection, made in Mexico.

Here is another one from Ivanka Trump, made in China.

So if the President is so incredibly committed to making things in America, I have a proposal—and perhaps we should have an amendment to this effect—that he should start with the Trump Organization. In fact, much of the steel that was put into buildings that were built by the Trump Organization was not steel that was made here in America.

I actually have one of the largest steel manufacturing plants in my district in Washington State. Nobody ever thinks about it that way, but we do have steel being manufactured in Seattle. And we are in a situation now where this President and this Republican-controlled Congress has yet to introduce a single bill that would actually invest in jobs or infrastructure.

In fact, the budget takes money away from job training. It takes more money out of infrastructure investment than it puts into infrastructure investment. And when you think about the Federal Government's role in infrastructure—of course, we all want public-private partnerships, where possible—the Federal Government has a very strong role in making sure that we are investing in all of our infrastructure, not only our roads and our bridges, but also all of our water sources, and making sure that we are investing in transit. These are all ways to put Americans back to work.

Yet, for a President who ran a campaign based on jobs and infrastructure and a Republican-controlled House, we have yet to see a single job emerge. And even the jobs that he says he has created, recently reports that he had created 45,000 coal mining jobs, but, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, what we have seen is the numbers show only 800 jobs created in the coal mines.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Would the gentlewoman be surprised that last night in the Appropriations Committee, we marked up the T-HUD bill—the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development bill? And for all the talk about making it in America and investing in infrastructure and transportation and making sure that we can create jobs through those vehicles, will the gentlewoman be surprised that the Republican majority actually zeroed out TIGER grants?

Those are the transportation grants that go directly to projects in communities across this country, to help move people around through people movers and investments in roads and bridges.

In my district, a TIGER grant was granted last year for complete streets because we have the highest number of pedestrians and bicyclists killed in the country, unfortunately, in Broward County.

So would the gentlewoman be surprised to learn the so-called big commitment to creating jobs and investing in infrastructure actually resulted in massive cuts in the very legislation where we would be investing those resources and infrastructure?

Ms. JAYAPAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. I thank the gentlewoman for raising that because this elimination of TIGER grants affects cities across the country—red States, blue States, Republican, and urban. We have a lot of those TIGER grants that have paid for our roads, rails, transit, ports, and new transportation projects.

Perhaps I will turn it back to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin. Would you be surprised to know that the budget actually slashes job training programs for distressed workers by 65 percent?

Ms. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. I would be stunned to think that any party or any President would do that.

Infrastructure has been the bread and butter, and it has been one of the most bipartisan things that we have.

When you talk about the need to expand our economy, expand the gross domestic product, one of the sure-fire ways to do that is through infrastructure projects. Not just building roads, but we need water treatment plants, our new energy economy, we have bio technology, and a number of other ways.

But I hail from Milwaukee, Wisconsin, which is still very reliant on the manufacturing industry. But I am wondering if my colleagues would be surprised to know that healthcare is one-sixth of our economy, and that if we were to repeal the Affordable Care Act and then slash the growth of Medicaid by one-third over the next decade, that there will literally be millions of jobs that are lost?

I mean, everybody depends on the healthcare system, whether you are the brain surgeon or you are the guy that is mopping up the ICU; whether you are the person who is dispensing pharmaceuticals at CVS or whether you are the receptionist at the community health center.

And by destroying the Affordable Care Act, we are going to cost shift a lot to our States. Just over the next decade, it is $68 billion of unfunded mandates shifted to the States so that they won't be able to fund things.

And I just want to point something out before I finish. There are a lot of people who think that this just doesn't matter to me. Those 24 million, 22 million, whatever number people agree upon that the CBO says that will lose health insurance if the Affordable Care Act ends—those people who are in nursing homes—that doesn't matter to me. Forty-nine percent of the folks in this country receive their healthcare through their employer and your premiums will go sky high, unlike what President Trump says, because you will have to pay for all of the uncompensated care that this country will see after we destroy Medicaid in the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I hear you. I wanted to give Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I just wanted to, again, place these items on the table and demonstrate the grave impact that will take its toll on the American people if the cuts that have been proposed by the Trump administration and the Republican majority go through. And we will stand together fighting every step of the way to make sure that—instead of galoshes, a life vest, and a surgical mask that we see so many citizens of other countries have to walk around their streets using because their air quality is so poor, we will stand together to continue to fight to make the kind of investments that will help improve, not detract, from people's quality of life.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CUMMINGS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for July 11 through July 20.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 19, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.