

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. AXNE. Mr. Speaker, this past winter, Iowa and the Midwest experienced record snowfall with freezing temperatures. The ground has remained frozen, which kept the snow from melting into our soil. And then the rapid warming over March 12 to March 14, along with heavy rains, resulted in mass flooding and devastation across Iowa, particularly in my district of southwest Iowa.

The flooding has resulted in hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars in agricultural losses; destroyed homes, schools, small businesses, medical centers; and has caused significant damage to public infrastructure that is vital to these communities.

Entire small towns, such as Hamburg in Fremont County and Pacific Junction, shown here, in Mills County, are under water and are facing irreparable damage.

Communities are without sanitary water. The lasting effects on the health and well-being of Iowa families is beyond calculation, and the flooding is still ongoing. We have yet to have seen, probably, the worst of it.

I am grateful that the President declared a disaster emergency declaration to support efforts to guarantee public safety and rapid recovery, but, given the impact of this flooding—and it was mainly in smaller rural communities—the assistance needed to ensure these communities can recover is dramatic, and I have requested the House Appropriations Committee to fund additional disaster supplemental support.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I have got a couple of things I want to do today, and I would like to start with a very special celebration that occurs every spring, and this is the Sikh community's annual historic, cultural, and religious celebration of Vaisakhi.

It is a celebration in the Punjab region of south Asia. It has been going on for centuries, and today it is also celebrated in communities throughout India, the United States, and, really, around the world.

Vaisakhi is an annual festival celebrating the spring season, and it is of great significance to the Sikh religion. It commemorates the creation of Khalsa, a fellowship of devoted Sikhs, and was founded in 1699 by Guru Singh and celebrates the community, prosperity, and continued progress in the year ahead.

It is springtime, and so we celebrate this very important event in the Sikh community.

I also want to talk about another event of the spring, one that you just

heard mentioned a moment ago from our colleague, Mrs. AXNE of Iowa, when she talked about the flooding that is occurring.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Readiness of the Armed Services Committee, the question for the U.S. military is very, very clear: Is the U.S. military ready for climate change?

Recent events indicate that there is considerable doubt. Just this last year, Hurricanes Florence and Michael caused billions of dollars of damage to Camp Lejeune and leveled much of Tyndall Air Force Base.

Perhaps a photo might be better than my words in describing the destruction at Tyndall Air Force Base. Essentially, this key Air Force base located on the Panhandle of Florida, on the Gulf Coast, was wiped out.

We don't yet know how much it is going to cost to rebuild it. We do know that the Air Force is trying to sustain operations there, and I am told that by May they will be out of money to be able to sustain operations.

We know that there is probably \$3 to \$4 billion of damage at this Air Force base alone. Keep in mind that this base is located, literally, on a sand spit adjacent to the Gulf, and, when hurricanes come through, destruction is sure to occur.

Every marine knows this place, Camp Lejeune. It, too, was hit by a hurricane, not the winds but the deluge that came with the hurricane.

Flooding wiped out a large portion of the base. As you can see, a tree did something that no marine would ever want to have happen, and that is to take out their barracks. This base, too, sustained substantial damage as a result of the hurricane and the flood that was precipitated by the hurricane.

This is also a \$3 to \$4 billion event. The rebuilding of Camp Lejeune and Tyndall raises a serious question for those of us who must decide on the appropriations: Should we even return to these locations which we know are going to be hit once again and perhaps multiple times in the future?

And if we decide to return and spend the \$3 to \$4 billion to repair each of the bases, how will it be done? Will it be done in the recognition that there is climate change, that the hurricanes will be stronger, the deluge even more?

We must always build for resiliency.

Now, this isn't the only place that the military has sustained significant risk this year. I am from California, and I know wildfires. Camp Pendleton, on the far side of this continent, another marine base, faced evacuation of the family housing units when fires occurred in the hills above Camp Pendleton.

Naval Air Station Point Mugu and the Marine Corps Mountain Warfare Training Center in the Sierra Nevada mountains also had to be evacuated as wildfires came down into those areas.

In addition, beyond Camp Lejeune, beyond Tyndall Air Force Base, we

know that our coastal installations and their surrounding communities are already experiencing significant flooding as sea levels rise.

The Army's Ronald Reagan Ballistic Missile Defense Test Site at the Kwajalein Atoll in the Pacific is threatened by sea level rise and is not expected to exist in 20 years.

The Navy's principal Atlantic base, Norfolk/Hampton Roads, and the Naval Academy are already experiencing flooding.

We know that melting polar ice in Arctic regions has already opened up new sea lanes and new routes and competition for resources in the Arctic Ocean.

Yet, today, it appears that the Department of Defense has not developed a systematic strategy for ensuring that our U.S. national interests in the Arctic and, indeed, the protection of our bases, key military bases, here in the United States and around the world are prepared for climate change.

I want to give you one more example. It was actually opened in a discussion a moment ago by my friend from Iowa.

Now, this is not Iowa. This is Offutt Air Force Base, just across the river from the photo you saw just a few moments ago of the flooding in Iowa. It is on the Missouri River. This happens to be the Strategic Air Command's Basic Center. This is our nuclear weapons system.

□ 1500

More than half of the base was underwater, and more than half of the base today is not operable. Six years ago, the U.S. Air Force knew that this Strategic Air Command base was subject to flooding. Indeed, the flooding 6 years ago had come up to the edge of the runway. Last week, it inundated the runway and half the base.

Back to my question: Is the U.S. military ready for climate change? It would indicate, from these few examples, that the answer is no. So what are we to do about it?

The United States military is one of the largest employers in the world. It is also one of the largest consumers of energy. The Department of Defense owns millions of acres of global real property, including over 550,000 facilities valued at well over \$1 trillion. The Department is uniquely situated to enhance its readiness and resiliency through effective energy policies, programs, and structures that are resilient in the face of climate change.

Installations, bases, are where we generate the force, where we train and sustain them and, in many cases, house critical operational missions, such as the Strategic Air Command.

One way to enhance readiness is to consume less. In fiscal year 2017, the Department of Defense consumed over 85 million barrels of fuel to power ships, aircraft, combat vehicles, and contingency bases, at a cost of nearly \$8.2 billion. In many cases, through contract vehicles such as energy-saving

performance contracts, these energy-saving and resiliency enhancements can be made at no upfront cost to the Department of Defense.

In contested environments, such as Afghanistan, Syria, and Iraq, better fuel consumption extends the range of, and mitigates the risk to, our military. The resupply of energy is one of the most dangerous things that occurs in military operations, and resupply convoys are targeted. Naval vessels are vulnerable during at-sea replenishment. For austere land-based sites in remote locations supporting contingency operations around the world, lower fuel and water consumption rates are an essential readiness enabler, helping that facility to maintain a lower profile at far less risk.

It is essential that our bases and our facilities recover quickly from extreme weather events and from energy disruptions that impact mission capability.

Section 335 of the fiscal year 2018 National Defense Authorization Act required the Department of Defense to report on the effects of climate change on the Department and propose mitigation plans. We have that report in hand. Only days after we received it, Camp Lejeune was flooded; Tyndall was wiped out; and now Offutt is flooded.

We are not happy with the report that the military sent to the House Armed Services Committee and the Subcommittee on Readiness because that report did not meet the congressional reporting requirement that we sent to the Department to describe future focused mitigations necessary to ensure mission resiliency.

We are not going to stop. The military is going to come back to the committee, and we are going to hammer home the necessity of resiliency and the necessity, as every Boy Scout knows, to be prepared.

What do they need to be prepared for? Certainly, for the missions, whatever those might be, whether it is the Strategic Air Command or the Marines or the Air Force, but also to be prepared for the inevitable effects of climate change.

To ensure that the military can perform its national defense mandate, the Department of Defense must—must—plan for the vagaries and exigencies that exist as a result of climate change.

The “2014 Climate Change Adaptation Road Map” that the Department put out noted that rising global temperatures, changing precipitation patterns, climbing sea levels, and extreme weather events will intensify the challenges of global instability. Hunger, poverty, and conflict are the inevitable results of climate change and its effects on communities all around the world.

In the Department’s words, climate change “will likely lead to food and water shortages, pandemic disease, disputes over refugees and resources, and destruction by natural disasters . . . across the globe.”

Not only are these climate-related events impacting installations and base readiness, but they are also creating more frequent requests for military support for disaster relief and humanitarian assistance. Active Duty servicemembers, National Guard personnel, and Reserve personnel are increasingly responding to assist communities in impacted events here in the United States and around the world.

Climate change presents a myriad of readiness challenges, both here at home and abroad. It is not only a future threat. By the events of this year and last week, it is an event here and now. It is a threat today; it is impacting the resiliency of our installations and our operations; and it is seriously impacting the readiness of the Department of Defense to meet its challenges all around the world.

We have our hands full, making sure that our military is ready in the era of climate change.

HEALTHCARE IN AMERICA

Mr. GARAMENDI. Now, if I might, Mr. Speaker, change subjects and pick up another issue that is before us today. Joining me in this discussion will be Mr. PAYNE from the beautiful State of New Jersey.

Just a moment, Mr. PAYNE. Let me lay out what we are going to talk about here.

Today, the House Democrats unveiled new legislation to protect people with preexisting conditions and also to lower healthcare costs. We know that, over the last 2 years, President Trump has declared war on healthcare, and the Democrats here in this House and in the Senate intend to address that by lowering healthcare costs.

Last night, in a Federal court, President Trump radically expanded his monstrous war on America’s healthcare, asking the court not only to strike down protections for people with preexisting conditions—not only asking the court to strike down protections for people with preexisting conditions—but also to eliminate the very last protections and benefits provided in the Affordable Care Act.

If President Trump gets his way in the Texas v. U.S. lawsuit, he would destroy the ban on lifetime and annual limits of care. He would destroy the Medicare expansion and the tax subsidies that make health insurance affordable for millions of America.

On the very first day of the 116th Congress, the House Democrats voted to throw the full legal weight of the House of Representatives against what President Trump is attempting to do in the Texas v. U.S. lawsuit. Thanks to that vote, the House counsel has been able to intervene as a party in the lawsuit to argue on behalf of the healthcare of the American people. But more than 190 of my Republican colleagues stood behind the President in his brutal assault on American healthcare.

Unlike my colleagues on the Republican side, today, the Democrats of

Congress are introducing legislation to protect preexisting conditions and make healthcare more affordable. We are taking another step forward to deliver on our promises to reverse the last 10 years of our Republican colleagues’ effort to sabotage the Affordable Care Act, and to lower the healthcare costs that American families need.

There are three parts to the legislation: lowering healthcare insurance premiums with strengthened and expanded affordable assistance; expanding the tax credits that make healthcare insurance more affordable to more middle-income families; and making them more sustainable to all those who are eligible.

Point 2 strengthens protections for people with preexisting conditions, curtailing the Trump administration’s effort to give States waivers to undermine protections for people with preexisting conditions and weaken the standards for essential health benefits.

Third, stop the insurance companies from selling junk health insurance policies.

Finally, reverse the GOP’s health sabotage that has needlessly driven up premiums and uninsured rates.

We know we are going to have our hands full to get this past the Senate and to the desk of the President, but we would hope, as this debate develops, as time goes by and Americans realize what they are losing as a result of the efforts of the Trump administration and many of my Republican colleagues to deny them the healthcare that they deserve as Americans, that we will ultimately be successful in this legislation and that we will get the President to see clearly what he is doing to the American people as he promotes, defends, and attacks Americans through the Texas v. U.S. lawsuit that is currently underway.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague, Mr. PAYNE, if he could join us with his comments. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman GARAMENDI for his leadership and for bringing us together today on two very, very important topics. I have come to know him as a leader on issues that are impacting the American people, from California to New Jersey. The gentleman has demonstrated a concern for all people of this country and his constituents. For that, I am grateful.

Today, the second topic on the Democratic agenda for the people, protecting preexisting conditions, is both timely and important. Yesterday, the Trump administration unleashed another assault on the Affordable Care Act. In Federal court, the Trump administration said that it agrees with the lower court’s decision to overturn the Affordable Care Act.

After campaigning on the premise that he would work to improve healthcare, President Trump wants to

eliminate protections for people with preexisting conditions.

President Trump wants to end the provision that allows young people to stay on their parents' health insurance plans.

President Trump wants to bring back junk insurance plans that take people's money but refuse to cover their medical expenses. That is what will happen if President Trump wins in Federal court.

It was not that long ago when Federal law allowed insurance companies to discriminate against people with preexisting conditions. Insurance companies could charge people with preexisting conditions extremely high rates and refuse to cover them at all. The Affordable Care Act eliminated legalized discrimination against people with preexisting conditions.

□ 1515

But now the Trump administration is fighting to bring healthcare discrimination back.

Well, there is no going back.

More than 200,000 people in New Jersey, alone, who purchase their insurance through the Affordable Care Act marketplace have preexisting conditions. Nearly 5 million New Jerseyans who get insurance through their employment could be harmed by Trump's attack on the Affordable Care Act's protections for people with preexisting conditions.

New Jerseyans and all Americans deserve protection, not discrimination.

In my district, 16,000 people, alone, with preexisting conditions would be at risk of coverage loss or premium increases if the Trump administration successfully rolls back the Affordable Care Act.

Now, let me touch on the effects of this on women for a second.

The Affordable Care Act's protection for people with preexisting conditions prevents insurance companies from charging women a higher premium on the basis of their being a woman. It keeps insurance companies from charging women a higher premium on the basis of them being a woman. Now, that is not something that they had very much of a choice in at birth, so it is immoral to hold that against them.

What the Trump administration is trying to do would result in women facing significantly higher health insurance premiums simply because they are not men. That wasn't right before the Affordable Care Act, and it sure isn't right now.

Let me be clear: The Trump administration wants to put lives at risk by undermining people's access to healthcare in this Nation.

And let me be clear about this: I will keep fighting, along with the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI), to ensure that all Americans' healthcare is protected. That is the least we can do in the position that our constituents have given us in this task to be their voice in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to once again commend Mr. GARAMENDI for always being timely in bringing these issues to light for the American people and for all the country to see, that we here in the House of Representatives do speak for them.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so very much; he is far too generous in his comments with regard to me. He is constantly here joining in these discussions and putting forth the interests of the constituents in his district in New Jersey and across wider America. I thank the gentleman for raising those issues, and particularly for pointing out the issue of preexisting conditions as it affects women.

Before the Affordable Care Act, every woman was considered to have a preexisting condition, and, indeed, they were charged higher premiums. That is not the case with the Affordable Care Act in law, but if the Texas case is successful, if the President is successful in his arguments before the court and it is carried on, then those protections for women, more than 50 percent of the American population, will be gone.

Beyond that, the expansion of the Medicaid programs, those, too, will be gone. For people with preexisting conditions, people who have diabetes or high blood pressure, their protections will be gone.

So the effect on preexisting conditions, and particularly this case that the President has put his full support behind, is an egregious attack on the healthcare and the well-being of Americans, as Mr. PAYNE so well pointed out. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much for doing that.

ARMED FORCES READINESS

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of other things that I do want to speak to today.

Today, the House Armed Services Committee had before it the Acting Secretary of Defense as well as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Issues were raised during that committee hearing about readiness, specifically about the efforts of the President to circumvent the Constitution of the United States and to take unto himself the appropriation power, which is clearly laid out in the Constitution as the power of Congress.

Article I, Section 9 of the Constitution clearly says that there shall be no money taken from the Treasury except by appropriation law. That is the power of the purse that is given to Congress.

The Founders were very clear that, if the President would have not only the power of carrying out the law, but also the power of appropriation—that is, money to carry out the law—we would have a completely different system. In fact, we would have an imperial presidency. They didn't want that, and they wrote very clearly into the Constitution that no money shall be taken from the Treasury without an appropriation.

Now, the Congress acted on this issue, acted on the issue with an appro-

priation bill, and Congress did not agree with the President. Instead of the \$5 billion, \$6 billion that the President wanted for his border wall, Congress said no and provided \$1.3 billion for border security, including some fences in some locations. Very clearly, Congress said no to the President, and Congress appropriated money for a specific purpose.

No sooner was that legislation signed by the President than the President attempted to usurp the power of Congress and to appropriate for himself some \$8 billion by manipulating the existing emergency laws that allow the declaration of emergency and money to be spent for that emergency.

Okay. That is what he wanted to do. Be clear in understanding that this is the attempt by the President to appropriate money in an unconstitutional and, I believe, an illegal way.

Now, it is not just a constitutional issue; it is also an issue of readiness for the military. We are talking about tens of millions of dollars to rebuild Offutt Air Force Base, the home of the Strategic Air Command.

We are talking about \$3 billion to \$4 billion to rebuild Camp Lejeune, one of the two major domestic bases for the U.S. Marine Corps.

We are talking about \$3 billion to \$4 billion to rebuild Tyndall Air Force Base in Florida, the home of the F-22 fighter jets and the new and presumed home of the new F-35 multitask fighter.

So we should ask: If the President is able to divert \$6 billion to \$8 billion from the military construction account, which we call MILCON, and use it for his border wall, where are we to find the money, the \$3 billion to \$4 billion to rebuild Tyndall, the \$3 billion to \$4 billion to rebuild Camp Lejeune, and all of the other bases across the United States and around the world that face climate change? Where are we going to get the money?

Well, if you happen to be a deficit hawk, you are going to get excited about the prospect it is going to be borrowed money.

The way in which the budget and the appropriation process works here, critical programs that the military has deemed essential for the readiness of our military and Congress has agreed to, authorized and appropriated money for that purpose, those programs will be delayed, and we will simply increase the deficit to do it so that the President can fulfill his campaign promise of a big, beautiful border wall.

Last week, I was in Jordan on a military mission to look at our troops there, to look at the situation in Syria and Iraq. Also, I was in Iraq and specifically went to look at a program that the U.S. Government had funded to build a modern 21st century border security program for Jordan's military and Jordan's Government.

Over 300 miles between Jordan and Syria, in the most violent part of the world, with ISIS, with refugees, with

military weapons, with drugs, all of that, we spent \$345 million of taxpayer money building a 21st century border security system, a system that involves observation techniques of many kinds, a system that involves observation towers at appropriate locations along that 300-plus-mile border, and quick response teams to go where there was an incursion across the border. And by all accounts from our own military, from Jordan's military, it is effective.

Now, the President wants \$8 billion for 150 miles of fence and walls. There is a better way, and as Democrats, we have been calling for this better way for months and months. In fact, in the legislation that the President signed, it is the better way.

It is not a big, beautiful wall with "Trump" written on it. It is, in fact, a virtual system similar to what we built in Jordan, in the most dangerous place in the world, and it works.

So we need to be very careful here, because that is \$8 billion that will not be available to make our American military installations all around the world ready for the tasks that they have before them.

So as we ponder this issue, as we go through the appropriation process this spring, and as we fight this constitutional battle with the President over the founding mothers' and fathers' understanding of what an imperial presidency could become if they have both the appropriation power as well as the power to execute the law, they said, no, the President cannot have that power.

As we fight this fundamental constitutional issue, we should also keep in mind that there is a better way to protect our southern border, or any border for that matter, and it is essential that we spend the money that we have appropriated for the military to protect their readiness and, in so doing, protect the security and safety of America.

So we will have this debate, and this debate will hopefully result in the American public understanding what they should have learned in grammar school about civics and about the separation of powers. Unfortunately, our President seems to have missed that class.

But we are not going to let it go. This is not a Democratic or Republican issue. This is an American constitutional issue.

So let us proceed. Let us proceed in full understanding of what is at stake here: the rebuilding of the bases, yes, but, more importantly, the very fundamental notion of the separation of powers that is inherent in the Constitution. And, by the way, every Member of the House of Representatives, every Senator, and every general, including acting Secretaries of State, have taken an oath to defend and uphold the Constitution. We would all do well to read Article I, Section 9.

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

□ 1530

RECOGNIZING HARVEST HOME FARMS

(Ms. WILD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the DiFebo family, constituents of mine from Upper Mount Bethel Township, Pennsylvania, who run Harvest Home Farms. They were recently honored with Pennsylvania's first-ever Leopold Conservation Award, named after the conservationist Aldo Leopold, for demonstrating excellence in environmentally sustainable farming practices.

Richard DiFebo; his wife, Lynn; and their sons, Dohl and Dane, work hard 7 days a week. Their days are long and, as Richard says, it is a "family effort" that only works because everyone pitches in.

In Richard's words: "It all starts with the health of the soil. Less runoff means cleaner creeks and rivers, which leads to cleaner air. It benefits the whole community. You need to protect those resources or there is not going to be anything left for the next generation."

Congratulations to the DiFebo family not just for this award, but for their dedication to being responsible stewards of the Earth and for the powerful example they are setting.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT MALICIOUS CYBER-ENABLED ACTIVITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-23)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, as amended by Executive Order 13757 of December 28, 2016, is to continue in effect beyond April 1, 2019.

Significant malicious cyber-enabled activities originating from or directed by persons located, in whole or in substantial part, outside the United States continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have de-

termined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13694, as amended by Executive Order 13757, with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 26, 2019.

COMMEMORATING WORLD DOWN SYNDROME AWARENESS DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Speaker, on March 21, our country and the world celebrated World Down Syndrome Awareness Day.

This afternoon, I am happy to lead my colleagues in recognizing this important day and all of the contributions individuals with Down syndrome make each day to families, businesses, schools, and communities. From brothers and sisters to employees and businessowners, to artists and models, people with Down syndrome have an incredible impact on every part of society. They deserve our support, understanding, and full acceptance.

Thankfully, there are many groups and programs that have made it their mission to support individuals with Down syndrome and their families.

As Kansas State treasurer, I advocated for passage of the Federal ABLE Act and led the effort to implement it in Kansas.

It is kind of one of those things that, several years ago, I didn't necessarily expect that I was going to be standing here today; so I was going through the process of how do we lobby, how do we make sure that a good program gets passed through the Federal legislative process that benefits so many people, and then having to take that initiative in my home State of Kansas and work through the legislature and making sure that we implemented it to help people's quality of life and enable them to live the lives that they wanted to live and make it more beneficial for them.

This important law created tax-free savings accounts for individuals with disabilities to cover expenses like healthcare, education, housing, and transportation. It is important for parents raising a child to be able to help provide their care.

Obviously, the concern on the part of parents is that, over years, particularly as the parents age, they want to make sure that their children, in some cases when they are in their adult life, are able to enjoy the life that they want and the life that they deserve. A program like ABLE is able to help make that dream come true.

These programs are similar to the 529 college savings programs, health savings accounts, and individual retirement accounts. The ABLE accounts