

good for them—though it is—but because it is good for us as a society. This is why I support real reform that will make our prisons safer for inmates and correction officers alike and take real steps to help inmates leave their lives of crime behind once and for all.

The second lesson is this: We need to know far more than we do now about how many people we release early from prison go back to a life of crime. What types of crimes do they commit? How many murders? How many robberies? How many drug arrests? Those numbers can be small or they can be large, but we need to know them to understand the full scope of our problem. And having that information will help the President decide each case as he considers when and how to use his pardon power.

But, today, the Federal Government doesn't even compile these data.

That is why I, along with Senators HATCH, Sessions, and PERDUE, introduced a bill last year to require that the government collect and report on these numbers. Unfortunately, the bill did not pass into law. So I want to announce today that I intend to reintroduce the bill with a renewed sense of urgency. This is just one story, after all. We don't know how many people granted clemency are returning to crime. But that is all the more reason to start collecting more data. We need to thoroughly evaluate cold, hard evidence before we make any sweeping changes to our criminal laws.

Carol Richardson's story should warn us of the perils of letting ideology get the better of common sense. We owe it to our neighbors to keep their families safe, and we owe it to the Carol Richardsons of the world to give them a real and honest chance at life once they complete their sentence.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, on May 4 of this year, there was a party at the White House, a celebration—a celebration that the House had passed TrumpCare. Indeed, the President wanted to invite people over and say what a great job they had done and what a great bill they had passed. He called it a “great plan.” He said the House plan was “very, very incredibly well-crafted.”

That was on May 4—a party at the White House, a celebration—but what a difference a month can make. A week ago, on Tuesday, June 13, the President had another gathering, and at this gathering he said that the bill from the House was “mean,” and he went on to use a very derogatory phrase to describe it.

So what happened between May 4 and June 13? Did the bill change in some way? Absolutely not. It had already been passed out of the House. Apparently what happened is that someone explained to the President what was in it, and he said: That is terrible. We

can't do that. It is a mean bill. And he used other vivid language to say just how bad it was.

What feature of the TrumpCare bill did the President get briefed on that made him say that it was mean? It certainly is a mean-spirited bill. It certainly is a hard-hearted bill. It certainly is destructive to the quality of life of millions and millions of Americans. So which aspect of the bill was he referring to?

I asked that question of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Tom Price, when he came to the Senate for a hearing last week. I asked the Secretary if he shared the President's opinion that the TrumpCare bill was a mean bill. He didn't have an answer for that. He wouldn't say whether, as a leader in the administration on healthcare, he shared the President's opinion.

I asked whether he thought the President thought it was a mean-spirited bill because it ripped healthcare from 23 million Americans. The Secretary of healthcare didn't answer.

I asked whether it was mean because it eliminated essential health benefits like emergency care and rehabilitation services and mental health and addiction treatment and maternity coverage for women having a child. The Secretary again refused to answer.

And he proceeded to say things like “Well, I wasn't in the meeting,” and that he hadn't talked to the President about why the President didn't like the bill. One would think that the Secretary of Health and Human Services, upon hearing that the President thought that the bill he had advocated for was terrible, would actually go to him and say: What is it you thought was so terrible? That might inform the conversations here in the Senate. But he said that he hadn't talked to the President about it. The Secretary of Health and Human Services didn't want to know why the President disliked this bill.

I asked if the President thought that this was a mean bill because it has vast premium increases for older Americans. An individual in their mid-sixties, prior to the age for Medicare, a 64-year-old earning \$26,500—how much would they pay under current law and how much would they pay under TrumpCare? Under current law, the answer is about \$140 a month. And under TrumpCare from the House, the answer is \$1,200 per month—an eightfold increase. How can anyone earning a little over \$2,000 a month spend \$1,200 on health insurance? It is an impossible situation.

So, of course, those Americans in that situation would not be able to buy health insurance, would not be able to access healthcare. Is that why the President thought it was mean? Did the President get briefed on the damage it would do to our older Americans? Or was the President concerned about the impact on our older Americans who need to have care in a nurs-

ing home? Is the President finally aware that Medicaid pays for more than 6 out of 10 individuals who are in a nursing home because they need a level of care that can't be provided in the home?

I went and visited a nursing home over the weekend in urban Oregon and then visited one in rural Oregon, in Klamath County. In Klamath County they told me that almost 100 percent of their citizens in long-term care are paid for by Medicaid. Nationally, it is a little more than 6 out of 10, but in this rural community, almost 100 percent. I thought about the residents there and what happens to them. Under this bill, when Medicaid is slashed massively and 23 million folks lose access to it, what happens to them? One woman, Deborah, said: Senator, Medicaid pays for my bill and if it doesn't exist for me—if it is taken away—I am on the street, and that is a problem because I can't walk.

So picture an older American, a senior American who needs an intensive level of care that can't be provided in the home being thrown into the street in a wheelchair, unable to walk, and, by the way, no support structure because in order to qualify for Medicaid to pay your bill, you have to have spent down all your own resources, so it isn't like somebody has a backup plan. Maybe there are family members who will take them in and provide an intensive level of care. Maybe a few will have friends who will take them in and provide an intensive level of care. But for the vast majority, that support structure isn't there, and that means they are going to be on the street. Is that why the President said it was mean?

Was it because the bill said States can charge more, allow insurance companies to charge more for individuals with preexisting conditions? That is certainly a huge problem. Community pricing has given access to insurance at the same price to everyone in America, regardless of preexisting conditions, but, unfortunately, TrumpCare changes that.

I think we need to recognize that now, here in the Senate, 13 Senators are working to craft a Senate version of TrumpCare, and they are terrified—terrified of the public seeing their bill. It is a vampire bill. It is afraid of the sunlight—the sunlight of public commentary, input, even a public discussion from experts. They are afraid of their citizens. They are afraid of the expert commentary. And they want to hide it until the last second so they can bring it to the floor—next Thursday, a week from this Thursday—and try to pass it in a moment's time, less than a day.

I was fascinated that our Secretary of Health and Human Services—after there were more than 100 hearings and roundtables and walk-throughs of the healthcare bill in 2009, after consideration of more than 300 amendments in the Senate, after more than 100 Republican amendments that were adopted,

minority amendments adopted, after more than 25 days of debate on the Senate floor—complained that the bill and the process were not transparent. If that wasn't transparent, how do you score the transparency of a bill where there have been zero committee meetings, zero chance for legislators to weigh in, zero chance for public input by experts, zero chance for the citizens of the United States to see this bill and share their feelings, zero chance for us to go back to our own States and have townhalls and ask for input? Well, you give it an F. It is a process completely out of sync with the responsibilities that every Senator took when they took the oath of office to be a Member of a legislative body—not a secret body, a legislative body, which implies deliberation in committee and deliberation on the floor and deliberation with constituents back home.

There is a phrase for the Senate—probably not merited; in fact, I am sure it is no longer merited—that the Senate was the world's greatest deliberative body. But crafting legislation in secret that affects the quality of life of millions and millions of Americans, with no deliberation, that is not a legislative process. That is not what was envisioned under our Constitution, our “we the people” Constitution. It wasn't a “we the secret group of powerful folks accommodating powerful special interests, government by and for the powerful.” That wasn't the introduction to our Constitution. Perhaps Members might read the first three words of the Constitution. Perhaps folks might go back and look at our history of why we have this floor to debate the issues, because that is what a system of government of, by, and for the people is all about.

In my home State, the elimination of Medicaid expansion—that is, the Oregon Health Plan expansion—would throw 400,000 people off of healthcare. Stretching that timeline from a couple years to 7 years doesn't change the fact that 400,000 people lose healthcare. That is mean-spirited. That is hard-hearted. That is terrible healthcare policy.

It is not just those individuals who are affected. The uncompensated care rate has dropped enormously in Oregon, from 15 percent to 5 percent. The result is that there is much more income to our clinics and to our hospitals, and the result is better healthcare for everyone—everyone in our rural communities, everyone in our urban communities. Nonetheless, the majority persists in wanting to destroy this improvement.

I am hearing from people like Elizabeth from Portland, who wrote to say that the Oregon Health Plan saved her life. The Oregon Health Plan, or Medicaid, saved her life. She was in school, and she had some health problems that were getting worse because of stress. But she didn't have a job and didn't have insurance, and things were getting bad. Then the Affordable Care Act

came around, and it extended coverage. Since then, she has gotten her health problems under control, finished school, and was able to get a job. In Elizabeth's own words:

I am once again contributing to society. I just need a little bit of time and help and I'm back on my feet.

Isn't it the right thing to provide a foundation for every single American to have access to quality healthcare, so that when they get sick, it helps them get back on their feet?

Ask yourself: What is your value? Is it your value that every American should have access to affordable healthcare? That is my value. That is what I am fighting for. What are you fighting for? Are you fighting to destroy healthcare for millions of Americans? Is that your value—to make life difficult and hard and mean-spirited and hard-hearted and terrible and painful for millions of Americans? Is that your value? If so, then keep up with this secret plan to destroy healthcare for millions of Americans. But if you value your constituents' quality of life, if you value their peace of mind, then put a stop to this abomination, this anti-democratic process. Insist that there is at least a month of consideration of the bill so that citizens can weigh in, so experts can weigh in, so committees can deliberate, so committees can propose amendments and improvements. Insist on that.

We just need three Members of the majority party to believe in the responsibility of this Chamber to hold a public debate and insist that they will not vote to proceed to the bill unless we have at least a month of opportunity. That is only one-ninth of what we had in 2009. It is only a fraction of the committee meetings, roundtables, and walk-throughs we had in 2009. It would be only a fraction of the amendments offered in 2009. It would only be a fraction of the time here on the Senate floor we had in 2009. Don't you believe we should have at least a fraction of the public deliberation we had just 8 years ago before jamming this through and destroying healthcare for millions of Americans? What does peace of mind mean to you?

I will tell you what it means to my constituents. It means that when their loved one gets sick, their loved one will get the care they need. It means that when their loved one gets sick, they won't go bankrupt. That is the peace of mind we are talking about, and that is the peace of mind that is so profoundly disturbed when you have a secret group meeting with powerful special interests, devising a bill they are afraid to show to the public of the United States of America. I would never want to have to vote on such a major bill without being able to hear what my citizens in Oregon think. I don't think any Member of this Senate should agree to vote on a bill with no deliberation and no public hearing.

So we need three champions. Just three out of 52. It should be 52 out of 52

who insist on a quality public process. We have heard the comments in the hallways, many Members of the majority dislike the fact that there is a secret process that their majority leader is insisting on. We have heard that they don't like it. It is not right. But do you know what? Every Member here has a chance to say no to the secret operation, the secret committee of 13, and the last-second presentation of such a bill on the floor.

The issue of the changes in healthcare without public deliberation terrifies folks like Deborah from Hillsboro, OR. She was diagnosed with Crohn's disease 8 years ago and has to take regular injections and medications to keep it under control. She does a lot of things right. She doesn't smoke, she exercises, and she follows her doctor's recommended diet. Other than her regular medications, she lives a normal, healthy life, and she is looking forward to retiring in the near future with her husband. They have been working hard their whole lives. They have been saving up for it. It is so close that they can almost taste it. But it is a dream that could be shattered by the Republican healthcare plan—the TrumpCare plan—being concocted secretly by 13 Members of this body. As she says:

Without affordable coverage for pre-existing conditions I cannot even switch jobs easily. If Medicare is reduced or eliminated, as the GOP is trying to do, I may never be able to retire . . . we should not now, or ever, eliminate coverage for pre-existing conditions (or price that coverage such that most of us will never be able to afford it).

She is worried that changes that refer to Medicaid and the Oregon Health Plan will ruin her ability to retire and her ability to access healthcare.

I don't know exactly what the President was briefed on that made him call TrumpCare “mean” and then speak in a very derogatory fashion about the bill from the House. I don't know exactly what he learned. I don't know if it was because he learned that folks on long-term care could lose that long-term care and Medicaid pays for more than 6 out of 10 Americans who are in long-term care. I don't know if it was because he learned about preexisting conditions. I don't know if it was because he learned it would throw 23 million people out of the healthcare system. I don't know if it was because he learned this would have devastating consequences to rural healthcare because of the impact on the finances of clinics and hospitals.

Whatever he meant, he was right. He was right to make that transition from a month earlier when he held a celebration at the White House because this terrific, wonderful bill had been passed by the House, and when he sobered up and discovered that it was a mean-spirited, hard-hearted bill. But for all these reasons, no healthcare should be crafted and jammed through without deliberation. No significant bill affecting

the lives of Americans should be pushed through in this manner. Americans deserve better. They expect more from this Chamber than such a secret, callous, poorly informed process. They don't like that powerful special interests are meeting with the Senators in private—those private 13—to develop a plan, because here is what they have heard:

They know this bill gives huge tax breaks to powerful parts of the healthcare industry, that it gives huge amounts of money away to those who make medical equipment and huge amounts of money away to health insurance companies, meanwhile stripping healthcare from millions of Americans. They know it also gives a massive tax break to the richest Americans.

So here we are with a bill that Trump has called “mean,” giving away the Treasury to powerful special interests, meeting in private with my colleagues, giving away the Treasury to the richest Americans, while on the other hand lowering the boom on our seniors in long-term care, lowering the boom on struggling and working families, lowering the boom on 20 million or so Americans who would lose healthcare, and lowering the boom on the clinics and hospitals that provide care for everyone.

That is what they see: special favors for the powerful and thrown into the street the working and struggling families. That is morally wrong. That is wrong from a policy point of trying to improve the quality of life of Americans, and it is why every Senator here should absolutely say no to moving to this bill on the floor without a full month, at least, for committee deliberations and for the citizens of the United States to weigh in.

That is the difference between what happens in a dictatorship with no deliberation and a democratic republic with a legislative process that values deliberation and openness. That is the difference. Which model do my colleagues support?

Let's fight for the “we the people” vision of our Constitution, and let's fight for quality healthcare for every American, and let's say no to moving to any bill that hasn't had public deliberation and at least a full month of deliberation in this Chamber.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 6 minutes.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I want to thank all of my colleagues for their

comments today on the damage TrumpCare would do. Democrats, patients, and families have been fighting back against TrumpCare and Republican efforts to jam it through Congress for months.

I want to take a moment and recall some of the promises President Trump and Republicans made at the very beginning of this process because there truly is a Grand Canyon between President Trump's promises and the TrumpCare bill he has now admitted himself is “mean.”

At the start, President Trump promised to provide insurance for everybody that was both cheaper and higher quality. When TrumpCare was introduced in the House, Secretary Price said that “no one would be worse off financially” under the law. And when Speaker RYAN was asked whether millions of people would lose their insurance coverage under TrumpCare, he said “no.”

Families were told again and again that TrumpCare would lower costs and keep people covered. As we know, TrumpCare would do the exact opposite. It will raise healthcare costs for people across the country, astronomically for those with preexisting conditions and for seniors, who could pay as much as 850 percent more in premiums. Medicaid would be gutted. Women and men would be unable to get care from the providers they trust and choose at Planned Parenthood. New mothers would pay as much as \$1,000 more a month just to get maternity care. Tens of millions of people would see their healthcare coverage taken away.

I could continue. And I want to be clear that those facts came from the nonpartisan, independent Congressional Budget Office.

Unfortunately and unsurprisingly, when TrumpCare passed the House, President Trump ignored those facts and doubled down on his broken promises. He championed TrumpCare, calling it “very, very well-crafted.” He promised to get TrumpCare through the Senate, predicting that it would be an unbelievable victory. His Secretary of Health and Human Services called this bill—which would take healthcare coverage away from 23 million people—a victory for the American people. Which people? Maybe President Trump. Maybe special interests who are going to get these massive tax breaks. But not the hundreds of thousands of people in Washington State who are rightly scared of TrumpCare or millions more across the country.

Democrats have come to the Senate floor with story after story about how our constituents would suffer under this legislation, workers who would not be able to make ends meet between jobs without losing health insurance, seniors who know they will go bankrupt if TrumpCare becomes law, moms who stay up at night worrying about whether their child who has a pre-existing condition will be priced out of coverage, patients fighting for their lives who are afraid that TrumpCare

will kill them and who are literally begging Congress not to do this.

To these patients and families, President Trump's decision to finally admit the incredibly obvious—that TrumpCare is “mean”—doesn't begin to cover it. To them, that bill is a gut punch. It is the bottom dropping out. It could be a death sentence. And this is especially true because, as hard as Senate Republicans have tried to keep their version of TrumpCare secret, behind closed doors, and in back rooms, as often as some have made promises just like those President Trump and House Republicans were making to try to reassure their constituents somehow that the Senate version of TrumpCare would be somehow less mean, the truth is, we know the Senate version of TrumpCare will be just as damaging.

Senate Republican leaders have already admitted that they expect their TrumpCare bill to mirror 80 percent of the House's. We have House conservatives writing letters to Senate Republicans making demands even meaner than many Senate Republicans want. And we all have a good idea how this is going to end up. “Mean” doesn't even begin to cover what TrumpCare would do to my constituents in Washington and to people across the country, but it is a start.

I haven't said this often, but I hope Senate Republicans listen to President Trump. This is a man who knows about mean—from making fun of a reporter with disabilities, to belittling our friend the junior Senator from Florida, to even impugning the senior Senator from Arizona, a war hero. When President Trump says something is mean, that certainly means something.

Mr. President, I hope they think about why he had to make that comment. They realize just how hard it will be to defend this truly appalling legislation, especially after it has been jammed through Congress, hidden from patients, and hidden from families without seeing the light of day. I hope they do what we tell preschoolers to do when they do something mean—apologize and make sure to do better next time. In Senate Republicans' case, that means dropping this effort to undermine families' healthcare once and for all and then joining with us to continue fixing healthcare for the people we serve by making healthcare more affordable, getting more families covered, and maintaining quality of care.

Democrats have ideas. We are at the table. We are ready to get to work as soon as Republicans are. It is not too late to make the right choice. The wrong choice is far more than mean. If my Republican colleagues do continue down this deeply harmful path, they should know they will own every bit of the hurt they cause, and they will be held fully accountable.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

## RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:37 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, Senator LEAHY be recognized next.

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

## NATIONAL GREAT OUTDOORS MONTH

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, Montanans can tell you that nothing beats getting outdoors for hunting, skiing, fishing, backpacking—you name it; it is our way of life. In fact, after I graduated from Montana State University, I had to leave Montana to start my business career, but I came back to Montana while my knees were still good so I could spend my time enjoying all that Montana's outdoors have to offer. That is why I am excited that June is National Great Outdoors Month.

Montana's outdoors have a special meaning for me. In fact, I even proposed to my sweet wife Cindy some 31 years ago next month on the summit of Hyalite Peak, just south of Bozeman.

The value of Montana's outdoors is simply incredible. In fact, according to the Outdoor Industry Association, there are 64,000 Montanans whose jobs are directly tied to our outdoor recreation industry. In 2012, outdoor recreation generated almost \$6 billion in consumer spending in Montana alone. Nationally—taking this to the big picture of our great country—outdoor recreation generates \$887 billion in consumer spending each year and provides 7.6 million jobs.

Folks travel across our Nation, even from around the world, to come visit America's great outdoors. It is all right here in our backyard—in fact, for me literally. I grew up just about 90 miles from Yellowstone National Park. I went to kindergarten through college just 90 miles away from Yellowstone National Park, and I can tell you, I go back there every year with my family.

Whether it is hiking in Glacier National Park up in Northwest Montana, fly fishing the Gallatin River that Brad Pitt and Robert Redford made famous with that great movie "A River Runs Through It"—which runs right by my hometown—or skiing at Whitefish, Big Sky, or floating down the Madison on a hot summer day, we can take these things for granted. That is why it is so important to recognize the value of the outdoors during National Great Outdoors Month. If you visit one of our national parks or if you go on a white water rafting tour, you are not only

getting a great experience yourself, you know you are giving back to our local economy, and you are helping create jobs.

I want to encourage everyone to recognize National Great Outdoors Month by joining me and getting out there. Don't just talk about it. Get outdoors and experience all that the outdoors has to offer.

I yield my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Montana. I have hiked in his State before, and it is a wonderful place. Their mountains are a tad higher than ours, but both my wife and I love hiking in the mountains, and I have enjoyed his State.

## HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, for the last 7 years, we have heard Republicans in Congress campaign on the pledge to repeal the Affordable Care Act. For 7 years they have said: We are going to repeal it and replace it. State to State, district to district, like President Trump, they pledged to repeal and replace the health reform bill that made access to affordable healthcare a reality for millions of Americans.

One would think—and what I get asked in Vermont is—when they campaigned for 7 years that they were going to repeal and replace it as soon as they were in power, you would think they would have a plan to do that. But it seems there is no plan. Instead, there are a dozen or so Republican lawmakers meeting behind closed doors. And they are shielded from public view. I don't think any other Members of Congress are allowed in their presence—lobbyists, but no Members of Congress. They say they have negotiated, finally, a grand plan to repeal the Affordable Care Act—and oh, by the way, a plan that makes devastating cuts to the Medicaid Program. And they have done this with no hearings, no debate, no process, no showing what the cost would be, and no bill. They are keeping a tight lid on the decisions they are making for the rest of America. What I get asked back home in Vermont is: What are they so afraid of? We are about to find out.

We hear they still intend to bring this yet-to-be-finalized bill to the Senate floor very soon under the expedited reconciliation process, without even the most basic vetting and transparency. Not only is this latest TrumpCare plan that is about to be foisted on the American people and on the Senate not ready for prime time; it is not fit for prime time. It is really nothing short of shameful.

Certainly, in my decades here in the Senate, I have never seen anything by either Republican or Democratic majorities done like this. In fact, I will give you an idea of how it can be done differently.

When the Democrats were in control, before we passed the Affordable Care Act, the Senate held over 100 hearings

on the issue. Republicans haven't held one. We had over 100 hearings. We had roundtables on health reform. Hundreds of amendments were considered by the Senate Finance and HELP Committees during an exhaustive markup process, with 160 amendments by Republican Senators adopted. The process itself stretched for so long—more than a year—in the vain hope that Republicans would come to the table and stay at the table. In fact, the final Senate bill included more than 145 Republican-authored amendments, and it was posted for every single person in America to see for nearly a week before the Finance Committee marked it up. The same can be said for the HELP Committee. Then, more than 160 hours were spent on this Senate floor in considering the Affordable Care Act. Everybody had an opportunity to speak on it. That is when the Democrats controlled the Senate.

What is happening with the Republicans? Will they have 100 hearings? No, they have not had one single hearing, and they are not having any debate and not having any process. We don't even know what this is going to cost. And as of right now, there is no bill.

In the House and now in the Senate, this charade boils down to bumper sticker politics. It is not a solid, seriously vetted, workable, fair and equitable plan or policy. Let's see what happens when you do it this way.

After this bill passed in the House—a bill that no one had read—even the Secretary admitted he hadn't read it. After it passed and people had a chance to see what was in it, what did we find out? That 23 million Americans were going to lose coverage. And then the President proposed a budget that assumes savings from the repeal of the Affordable Care Act through big, big cuts to the Medicaid Program.

Under the House-passed TrumpCare bill, the State of Vermont will spend hundreds of millions more on Medicaid to compensate for the loss of Federal funds targeted by President Trump and the House Republicans. Under the House-passed TrumpCare bill, premiums are expected to rise by 20 percent. Seniors—many of whom live on fixed incomes—will be charged five times more than younger enrollees under the House-passed TrumpCare bill. Well, that translates north of \$4,400 in increased healthcare costs for Vermonters between the ages of 55 and 64.

Notwithstanding the millions of people being thrown off the list, notwithstanding the cuts to Medicaid, President Trump joined Republicans at the White House, and he celebrated the House-passed bill. He celebrated. He said: Look what we can do with me as President. They all applauded, and they were all so happy.

Then somebody must have finally read the bill. Somebody at the White House must have read the bill and actually told the President what was in the bill that he was praising. And then,