

□ 1343

Messrs. RESCHENTHALER and SCA-LISE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. BASS changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TITUS). The question is on adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 188, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

YEAS—230

Adams	Eshoo	Luria	Sires	Titus	Velázquez	REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT
Aguilar	Espauillat	Lynch	Slotkin	Tlaib	Visclosky	
Allred	Evans	Malinowski	Smith (WA)	Tonko	Wasserman	
Axne	Finkenauer	Maloney	Soto	Torres (CA)	Schultz	
Barragán	Fletcher	Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean	Spanberger	Torres Small	Waterson	
Bass	Foster	Maloney, Sean	Stanton	Trahan	Watson Coleman	
Beatty	Frankel	Matsui	Stevens	Trone	Welch	
Bera	Fudge	McAdams	Swalwell (CA)	Underwood	Wexton	
Beyer	Gallego	McBath	Takano	Van Drew	Wild	
Bishop (GA)	Garamendi	McCullum	Thompson (CA)	Vargas	Wilson (FL)	
Blumenauer	García (IL)	McGovern	Thompson (MS)	Veasey	Yarmuth	
Blunt Rochester	García (TX)	McNerney		Vela		
Bonamici	Golden	Meeks				
Boyle, Brendan F.	Gomez	Meng				
Brindisi	Gonzalez (TX)	Moore				
Brown (MD)	Gottheimer	Morelle				
Brownley (CA)	Green (TX)	Moulton				
Bustos	Grijalva	Mucarsel-Powell				
Butterfield	Harder (CA)	Murphy				
Carbajal	Hastings	Napolitano				
Cárdenas	Hayes	Neal				
Carson (IN)	Heck	Neguse				
Cartwright	Higgins (NY)	Norcross				
Case	Hill (CA)	O'Halleran				
Casten (IL)	Himes	Cheney				
Castor (FL)	Horn, Kendra S.	Omar				
Castro (TX)	Horsford	Diaz-Balart				
Chu, Judy	Houlihan	Pallone				
Cicilline	Hoyer	Panetta				
Cisneros	Huffman	Pappas				
Clark (MA)	Jackson Lee	Pascrill				
Clarke (NY)	Jayapal	Payne				
Clay	Jeffries	Perlmutter				
Cleaver	Johnson (GA)	Peters				
Clyburn	Johnson (TX)	Peterson				
Cohen	Kaptur	Phillips				
Connolly	Keating	Pingree				
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Pocan				
Costa	Kennedy	Porter				
Courtney	Khanna	Pressley				
Cox (CA)	Price (NC)	Rashida Tlaib				
Craig	Kildee	Rubin				
Crist	Kilmer	Rosa				
Crow	Kim	Rosa (NY)				
Cuellar	Kind	Richmond				
Cummings	Kirkpatrick	Rose (NY)				
Cunningham	Krishnamoorthi	Rouda				
Davids (KS)	Kuster (NH)	Royer-Allard				
Davis (CA)	Lamb	Ruiz				
Davis, Danny K.	Langevin	Ruppersberger				
Dean	Larsen (WA)	Ryan				
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Sánchez				
DeGette	Lawrence	Scanlon				
DeLauro	Lawson (FL)	Schakowsky				
DelBene	Lee (CA)	Schiff				
Delgado	Lee (NV)	Schneider				
Demings	Levin (CA)	Schrader				
DeSaulnier	Levin (MI)	Scott (VA)				
Deutch	Lewis	Schrader				
Dingell	Lieu, Ted	Scott, David				
Doggett	Lipinski	Serrano				
Doyle, Michael F.	Lofgren	Sewell (AL)				
Engel	Lowenthal	Shalala				
Escobar	Lowey	Sherman				
	Luján	Sherrill				

NAYS—188

Aderholt	Gonzalez (OH)	Norman	
Allen	Gooden	Nunes	
Amash	Gosar	Olson	
Amodei	Granger	Palazzo	
Armstrong	Graves (GA)	Palmer	
Arrington	Graves (LA)	Pence	
Babin	Graves (MO)	Posey	
Bacon	Green (TN)	Ratcliffe	
Baird	Griffith	Reed	
Balderson	Grothman	Reschenthaler	
Banks	Guest	Rice (SC)	
Barr	Guthrie	Ruby	
Biggs	Hagedorn	Rodgers (WA)	
Bilirakis	Harris	Roe, David P.	
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Rogers (AL)	
Bost	Hern, Kevin	Rogers (KY)	
Brady	Herrera Beutler	Rouzer	
Brooks (AL)	Hice (GA)	Roy	
Brooks (IN)	Higgins (LA)	Scalise	
Buchanan	Hill (AR)	Shweikert	
Buck	Holding	Scott, Austin	
Bucshon	Hollingsworth	Sensenbrenner	
Budd	Hudson	Shimkus	
Burgess	Huizenga	Simpson	
Burgess	Hunter	Smith (MO)	
Calvert	Hurd (TX)	Smith (NE)	
Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Smith (NJ)	
Carter (TX)	Johnson (SD)	Smith (NE)	
Carter (TX)	Johnson (IA)	Smith (NJ)	
Chabot	Jordan	Smucker	
Cheney	Joyce (OH)	Spano	
Meeks	Joyce (PA)	Stauber	
Cline	Katko	Stefanik	
Cloud	Kelly (MS)	Steil	
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Steube	
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Stewart	
Collins (NY)	King (NY)	Stivers	
Comer	Kinzinger	Taylor	
Conaway	Kustoff (TN)	Thompson (PA)	
Cook	Crawford	Thornberry	
Diamond	Drenshaw	Timmons	
Dunn	Duncan	Tipton	
Emmer	Davidson (OH)	Turner	
Estes	Davis, Rodney	Upton	
DesJarlais	Conaway	Lesko	
Diaz-Balart	Cook	Long	
Duffy	Kinzinger	Wagner	
Duncan	Kustoff (TN)	Walberg	
Flores	LaHood	Walberg	
Gallagher	LaMalfa	Walden	
Gianforte	Lamborn	Tipton	
Gibbs	Latta	Turner	
Gillibrand	McHenry	Upton	
Gillibrand	McKinley	Lesko	
Gillibrand	Meadows	Long	
Gillibrand	McCormick	Wagner	
Gillibrand	McClintock	Walberg	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walden	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Tipton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Turner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Upton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Lesko	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Long	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Wagner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walberg	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walden	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Tipton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Turner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Upton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Lesko	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Long	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Wagner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walberg	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walden	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Tipton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Turner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Upton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Lesko	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Long	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Wagner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walberg	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walden	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Tipton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Turner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Upton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Lesko	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Long	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Wagner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walberg	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walden	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Tipton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Turner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Upton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Lesko	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Long	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Wagner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walberg	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walden	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Tipton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Turner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Upton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Lesko	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Long	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Wagner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walberg	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walden	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Tipton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Turner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Upton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Lesko	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Long	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Wagner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walberg	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walden	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Tipton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Turner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Upton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Lesko	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Long	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Wagner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walberg	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walden	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Tipton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Turner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Upton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Lesko	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Long	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Wagner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walberg	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walden	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Tipton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Turner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Upton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Lesko	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Long	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Wagner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walberg	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walden	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Tipton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Turner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Upton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Lesko	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Long	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Wagner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walberg	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walden	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Tipton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Turner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Upton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Lesko	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Long	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Wagner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walberg	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walden	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Tipton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Turner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Upton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Lesko	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Long	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Wagner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walberg	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walden	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Tipton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Turner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Upton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Lesko	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Long	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Wagner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walberg	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walden	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Tipton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Turner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Upton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Lesko	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Long	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Wagner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walberg	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walden	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Tipton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Turner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Upton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Lesko	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Long	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Wagner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walberg	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walden	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Tipton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Turner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Upton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Lesko	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Long	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Wagner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walberg	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walden	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Tipton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Turner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Upton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Lesko	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Long	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Wagner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walberg	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walden	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Tipton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Turner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Upton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Lesko	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Long	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Wagner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walberg	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walden	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Tipton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Turner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Upton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Lesko	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Long	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Wagner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walberg	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walden	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Tipton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Turner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Upton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Lesko	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Long	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Wagner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walberg	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walden	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Tipton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Turner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Upton	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Lesko	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Long	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Wagner	
Gillibrand	McEnany	Walberg	
Gillibrand	Mc		

(1) would not defend the constitutionality of the minimum essential coverage provision; and

(2) would argue that provisions protecting individuals with pre-existing conditions (specifically the provisions commonly known as “community rating” and “guaranteed issue”) are inseverable from the minimum essential coverage provision and should be invalidated;

Whereas in the June 7, 2018, letter to Congress, Attorney General Sessions also advised Congress that “the Department will continue to argue that Section 5000A(a) is severable from the remaining provisions of the ACA”, indicating a difference from the plaintiffs’ position in *Texas v. United States*;

Whereas on December 14, 2018, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas issued an order that declared the requirement to maintain minimum essential coverage unconstitutional and struck down the ACA in its entirety, including protections for individuals with pre-existing conditions;

Whereas the decision of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas was stayed and is pending appeal before the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit;

Whereas on March 25, 2019, the Department of Justice, in a letter to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, changed its position and announced that the entire ruling of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas should be upheld and the entire ACA should be declared unconstitutional;

Whereas prior to 2014, individuals with pre-existing conditions were routinely denied health insurance coverage, subject to coverage exclusions, charged unaffordable premium rates, exposed to unaffordable out-of-pocket costs, and subject to lifetime and annual limits on health insurance coverage;

Whereas as many as 133,000,000 nonelderly people in the United States—

(1) have a pre-existing condition and could have been denied coverage, only offered coverage at an exorbitant price had they needed individual market health insurance prior to 2014, or had coverage for their pre-existing condition excluded prior to 2014; and

(2) will lose protections for pre-existing conditions if the ruling of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas is upheld in *Texas v. United States*;

Whereas contrary to President Trump’s public claims that he supports protections for people with pre-existing conditions, he has ordered his Department of Justice to actively pursue the destruction of these protections in Federal court;

Whereas employer-provided health plans cannot place lifetime or annual limits on health coverage, and if the Trump Administration succeeds in its argument before the court, more than 100,000,000 people in the United States who receive health insurance through their employer could once again face lifetime or annual coverage limits;

Whereas if the Trump Administration succeeds in its argument before the court, insurers would be allowed to impose an unlimited “age tax” on the health insurance premiums of older Americans;

Whereas prior to 2010, Medicare enrollees faced massive out-of-pocket prescription drug costs once they reached a certain threshold known as the Medicare “donut hole”, and since the donut hole began closing in 2010, millions of Medicare beneficiaries have saved billions of dollars on prescription drugs;

Whereas at a time when 3 in 10 adults report not taking prescribed medicines because of the cost, if the Trump Administration succeeds in its argument before the court, sen-

iors enrolled in Medicare would face billions of dollars in new prescription drug costs;

Whereas as of March 2019, 37 States, including the District of Columbia, have expanded or are in the process of expanding Medicaid to individuals with incomes up to 138 percent of the Federal poverty level, providing health coverage to more than 12,000,000 newly eligible people;

Whereas if the Trump Administration succeeds in its argument before the court, the millions of individuals and families who receive coverage from Medicaid could lose eligibility and no longer have access to health care;

Whereas as of March 2019, many people who buy individual health insurance are provided tax credits to reduce the cost of premiums and assistance to reduce out-of-pocket costs such as copays and deductibles, which has made individual health insurance coverage affordable for millions of people in the United States for the first time;

Whereas if the Trump Administration succeeds in its argument before the court, the health insurance individual exchanges would be eliminated and millions of people in the United States who buy health insurance on the individual marketplaces could lose coverage and would see premium expenses for individual health insurance increase exorbitantly;

Whereas if the Trump Administration succeeds in its argument before the court, people in the United States would lose numerous consumer protections in their coverage, including the requirements that—

(1) plans offer preventive care without cost-sharing;

(2) young adults have the option to remain on a parent’s insurance plan until age 26; and

(3) many health insurance plans offer a comprehensive set of essential health benefits such as maternity care, addiction treatment, and prescription drug coverage;

Whereas pursuant to section 516 of title 28, United States Code, the conduct of litigation in which the United States is a party is reserved to the Department of Justice;

Whereas public reports suggest that the President and his political advisors directed this course of action in direct contravention of the Department of Justice’s longstanding policy to defend Acts of Congress and duty to advance reasonable analysis of legal questions, for example—

(1) when the Department of Justice changed its litigating position on June 7, 2018, in the *Texas v. United States* case to ask the court to strike down the ACA’s guaranteed issue and community rating requirements, thereby eliminating protections for people with pre-existing conditions and reinstating legal discrimination based on health status, that position was found to be so legally indefensible that three of the four career attorneys representing the Government refused to sign the relevant briefs and removed themselves from the case; and

(2) when the Department of Justice again changed its litigating position on March 25, 2019, in the appeal of *Texas v. United States* to seek the invalidation of every provision of the ACA, it was reported that decision was made over the objections of both the Department of Justice as well as the Department of Health and Human Services; and

Whereas the Trump Administration has proceeded in the *Texas v. United States* lawsuit with total disregard for the consequences of its actions for the lives of millions of Americans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the actions taken by the Trump Administration seeking the invalidation of the ACA’s protections for people with pre-existing conditions, and later the invalidation of

the entire ACA, are an unacceptable assault on the health care of the American people; and

(2) the Department of Justice should—

(A) protect individuals with pre-existing conditions, seniors struggling with high prescription drug costs, and the millions of people in the United States who newly gained health insurance coverage since 2014;

(B) cease any and all efforts to destroy Americans’ access to affordable health care; and

(C) reverse its position in *Texas v. United States*, No. 19-10011 (5th Cir.).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ALLRED), who is the sponsor of this resolution.

□ 1400

Mr. ALLRED. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman PALLONE for his leadership, and I am proud to lead the charge on this resolution condemning the administration’s attacks on American’s healthcare in Federal court.

With the support of so many of my colleagues, this resolution puts the United States Congress on the record as being on the side of the people. As this administration seeks to tear down our healthcare system, this Congress will not stand by while cynical and partisan interests attack our healthcare system and that of hard-working Americans.

Whether it is allowing young people to stay on their parent’s insurance until they are 26, or protecting people from lifetime caps, or ensuring that folks with preexisting conditions get the care that they need, this should not be a partisan issue.

The fight to protect preexisting conditions is personal for me. My mother is a breast cancer survivor and my wife Aly and I just celebrated the birth of our son. Both of those are preexisting conditions. And concern about healthcare is, by far, the number one issue that my constituents talk to me about back home.

That brings me to Natalie, a lawyer with young children, Hugo and Mia, who is married to Nathan, a law professor at Southern Methodist University. Nathan recently attended the State of the Union here with me in Washington.

I met Natalie on the same day that the House voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act. I learned that she had stage IV cancer and that she had come to my event from her chemotherapy treatment. She explained to me that her goal was to fight her cancer for as long as she could so that her two children would know her.

Natalie came to my event that day because she was worried about future moms who would lose their care if the Affordable Care Act was repealed. She was concerned about a return to the bad old days with lifetime caps and discrimination against people with pre-existing conditions.

Sadly, Natalie passed away last year, but her fight goes on, a fight that I am honored to carry forward on behalf of north Texans here in Washington. My home State of Texas has the highest uninsured rate in the country. One in five people in Dallas County, where I live, do not have health insurance. We can and must do better.

I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in the House and the Senate to join us in condemning these attacks on our healthcare system. We must make sure that we don't go back to the bad old days where people can get thrown off their healthcare just because they got sick.

This resolution is a good first step, but we must come together to help our constituents by working together to pass legislation that will stabilize our system and lower costs for everyone.

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

Madam Speaker, the American people expect us to come to this floor with solutions, not political "gotcha" statements. The resolution before us in this week's Democratic dosage of attack on the President is just that. It doesn't do a darn thing to protect people with pre-existing conditions; not one thing.

In the opening day of the 116th Congress, House Republicans brought a powerful, but simple, measure to the floor that called on this body to legislate on what we all agree needs to be done: locking in protections for patients with preexisting conditions.

Let me repeat. Republicans acted on day one of this Congress to protect Americans with preexisting conditions. Democrats blocked that.

In fact, I introduced legislation which has 45 cosponsors that protects people with preexisting conditions. Period. This is something I have fought for my entire time in public service. It would lock in existing protections for patients. It is before the Energy and Commerce Committee, and I have worked since the first day of this Congress to get this measure passed so that if the court decision that found ObamaCare to be unconstitutional, if that judge's decision is upheld, we want to make sure that our citizens who have preexisting conditions still have coverage.

The legislation I have sponsored would do that. Republicans and Democrats could get this done, and the question is: Why are we not voting on that today?

Instead, Democrats have rushed a resolution to the floor that has never had a hearing before the Energy and Commerce Committee. So much for the talk about due process and regular

order, Madam Speaker. No hearing, and it was rushed to the floor.

We only got to see it for the first time last Friday. So it is little more, in my opinion, than a political screed, not a public policy proposal. It will never go to the Senate. It is only here. Americans ought to know this, too: that the legal case working its way through the courts did not immediately end ObamaCare and will not affect insurance coverage on premiums for 2019.

Moreover, Democrat attorneys general and a couple of Republicans from intervening States are already defending the law in this case, and the judge's ruling has been appealed. This body has voted not once, but twice, to allow Speaker PELOSI to intervene in the case, and she has moved to do.

Just as my Democratic colleagues have repeatedly refused to let this House approve protections for people with preexisting conditions, they also know they could moot the lawsuit that they so decry today. All they would have to do is bring a bill to the floor and vote to repeal the individual mandate. That would turn off this lawsuit.

I am sure many on our side might be happy to join them in that effort. And if the Democrats didn't want to do that, they could vote to reinstate the individual mandate penalty. That, too, would moot the lawsuit. But we are not doing that either.

So they had policy options that could have been brought to the floor, three of them. Two would have ended the lawsuit that they decry today, and one would have given rock-solid security to those with preexisting conditions if the law is thrown out. There is no difference between us or among us about protecting people with preexisting conditions.

But, unfortunately, they chose not to actually legislate. Democrats control everything in this House. They decide what gets heard in committee or, in this case, not, and what is brought to the floor, or not. So it is clear they would rather play politics with healthcare and attack the President for political purposes rather than work with us on what could and should be bipartisan solutions.

A fact that my friends on the other side of the aisle must acknowledge is, for many Americans seeking coverage, healthcare costs keep getting more and more expensive. Last week, the Bend Bulletin, a newspaper in my district, reported on a recent analysis by the Kaiser Family Foundation about how insurance premiums are out of reach for many older, middle-class residents of our area, particularly in rural areas, including my home State.

They report: "In central Oregon, for example, a 60-year-old individual with an annual income of \$50,000 must pay at least \$703 a month, representing 17 percent of his or her income, and that would only buy a bronze plan with a deductible of \$6,500."

We should be focused on helping people like that be able to afford insurance.

When the Affordable Care Act passed, Democrats promised people their insurance premiums would actually go down by \$2,500. For many in America, that promise was false. For many Americans, healthcare costs, health insurance premiums, and, certainly, deductibles and copays have done nothing but gone up and up.

I was in Oregon over the weekend and held seven townhalls. Do you know what I hear about when it comes to healthcare? That insurance premiums are out of reach for too many of my constituents. And for those who cannot afford the premiums, many make difficult choices, from choosing which family members to cover, to changing jobs, or limiting income in order to continue to qualify for subsidies. This is a real problem. I think we can find a bipartisan solution if Democrats are willing to work with us on it.

But, plainly, the current healthcare system for too many Americans is not working. So we know we have more work to do, and I hope that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would agree with us that we need to improve State markets that, in some part, were damaged by ObamaCare; that we should work together to lower healthcare costs and increase access to private health insurance.

In the Energy and Commerce Committee, actually, there are some things we are working on, on drug costs. No President, in my memory, has ever leaned farther forward to get drug costs down for American consumers than President Trump. He has been an incredible leader in this effort, and we are going to see bipartisan work get marked up tomorrow in the Energy and Commerce Committee.

So on that topic of healthcare that is so crucial to survivability of American consumers, we can move forward. We have proven that.

But, meanwhile, the American people need to fully understand that the Democrats' one-size-fits-all, government-run plan itself would end the Affordable Care Act. You have to admit that. That is what your Medicare-for-all plan does.

They need to understand the \$32 trillion price tag for the Democrats' alternative and the tax increases that would be necessary to go with it; the doubling of the individual income tax; doubling of corporate tax; and providers would have to take a 40 percent reduction in their payments.

Think of what the wait lines will be if that were to become law. Americans need to know that when the Democrats Medicare-for-all plan ends, employer-sponsored healthcare and your union plans you negotiated for, 158 million Americans who have health insurance today, will lose it tomorrow. They need to understand how they would have to wait longer for access to care than they do today.

And for my older friends, they need to understand the worst-case scenario. Seniors in America need to fully understand how this plan does away with

popular Medicare Advantage plans and Medigap plans and impacts this proposal would have on access to their doctors and an earlier bankruptcy of Medicare altogether.

So we would be better served today, and so would the American people, if we stood down, parked our partisan swords and shields, and worked together to solve the real problems Americans face when they go to pay their family bills.

I had lunch today with a couple from the southern part of my district, professionals. They said the cost of health insurance for them is so high they have had to make the choice not to have it.

This is going on every day in the marketplace, and I wish we could come together and spend our time on this House floor with a solution we could agree upon, because I think we could. But that is not what we are doing today.

It is like every week there has to be a resolution on the floor to condemn the President, something he said or did; not a policy proposal that will actually solve the Nation's problems. That is all you are dealing with today, another screed.

So let's work together. Let's come together as this Congress can, and as the Energy and Commerce Committee has had a wonderful record of doing over the years, and can go forward, to address healthcare and other issues. We can do that.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this partisan, political resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would hope that we could do what the gentleman from Oregon wants to do and work together in a bipartisan fashion.

I will say to him, however, that his party was in control from 2011 to last year, and there was almost no effort to accomplish that objective. There were, however, over 65 votes to repeal, and there was no replace. When his party won the Presidency as well, there was no replace. We passed something through this House that couldn't get through the Senate. The Senate was controlled by the gentleman's party.

This is something that is not optional for any of our citizens. Healthcare is essential, and they expect us to sit down and work together.

Unfortunately, today, we saw in a tweet—the President who campaigned on the basis of everybody was going to be covered at less cost and higher quality. We are now, I suppose, in about the 29th month in the President's term. He has sent us no bill—and this morning, he has the gall, in my opinion, to tell the American people: I have got a plan. It is secret, and I will show it to you in 2021.

What is interesting about 2021? It is after the election.

Elections ought to be about policy. The election of 2018 was about policy, healthcare, and, very frankly, our argument prevailed. Our argument was that we wanted to protect the Affordable Care Act; that we wanted to make sure that the protections included in the Affordable Care Act were available to all Americans.

□ 1415

Madam Speaker, I want to thank Representative ALLRED for introducing this resolution, and I rise in support of it.

Since taking office, President Trump and his administration have been focused on doing everything it can to take affordable healthcare coverage options away from American families.

Madam Speaker, you can make healthcare a lot cheaper. Offer them no coverage—it is very simple—not hospitalization, not doctors' reimbursement, not this, not that, and not the other. We call them junk policies. They pretend to be health coverage when they are not.

The President did make two failed efforts along with his party to repeal the Affordable Care Act in Congress. They came after Republicans tried to repeal or undermine the bill in more than 65 votes during their years in the majority. The American people do not want to get rid of the Affordable Care Act, because if they did, then they wouldn't have us in the majority because they know we want to keep it. They want Congress, however, to work to improve and make our healthcare system work better for all Americans, and, yes, have it affordable and accessible.

Instead, President Trump and Republicans have doubled down and tripled down on their agenda of sabotaging the law through executive actions on an almost weekly and monthly basis and through lawsuits like the one now pending in Texas.

I am not sure who convinced the President to change his mind, but I have a suspicion Mick Mulvaney did. Mick Mulvaney, of course, voted 65 times—well, I don't know that he was here every one of those votes, but every time he had an opportunity, he voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act. If the Americans wanted to repeal the Affordable Care Act, then they would have voted against us.

Madam Speaker, I would tell my friend from Oregon that if it is partisan, it is partisan because none of you will support it, and so many of you campaigned on the basis of wanting to protect preexisting conditions. Obviously, the President changed his mind about doing that.

All this resolution does is express the sense of this House that such efforts are wrong and would harm tens of millions of Americans who benefit from the ACA. This includes the 133 million or more Americans living with preexisting conditions like asthma, diabe-

tes, cancer, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, who are protected in their ability to get healthcare insurance.

The actions taken by President Trump, however, and the Republicans would make these individuals uninsurable, forcing them and their families into financial hardship in order to pay for medical bills. It also includes older Americans for whom Republicans have proposed an age tax.

It would do harm to the 20 million Americans who are now covered because of the Affordable Care Act who would lose their coverage as a result of what President Trump and Republicans in Congress are seeking to do. That is what the lawsuit does. This says that we don't agree with the lawsuit—a pretty simple proposition.

By joining the Texas lawsuit, the Trump administration is seeking to allow women to be charged higher premiums than men as they used to be. It seeks to allow lifetime and annual limits on coverage, which the Affordable Care Act banned. In addition, it is trying to force Americans under age 26 to get coverage on their own, even if they don't have a job yet and are still in college.

Preventive health visits and screenings would, once more, require out-of-pocket co-pays. Plans would no longer be required to cover essential health benefits. Now, if you don't have to cover required health benefits, then you are going to get a cheaper policy, not a lot of coverage, but a cheaper policy. The objective is not just a cheaper policy, it is a policy that covers your risks. If we can make it cheaper, then we ought to do that. Plans would no longer be required to cover, as I said, essential benefits such as maternity care and prescription drugs.

This resolution is an opportunity to state on the RECORD whether Members support doing away with these reforms or not. Now, that doesn't mean you think that an alternative is perfect, it simply means that we either want to improve or replace it with something that is viable, passable, and good for the American people, whether to turn back the clock or look ahead, and whether to stand with the Trump administration as it seeks to dismantle every single piece of the Affordable Care Act, which it has done.

The gentleman mentions maybe a daily resolution, well, unfortunately, we have daily action by the President that does things that we don't think are appropriate. We voted on one of those the other day where we appropriated money to a certain object, and the President wants to change it on his own. We think that was unconstitutional. We didn't get a lot of help on the Republican side, the gentleman did, I agree with that, the gentleman who has spoken before me.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me and others in supporting Representative ALLRED's resolution in expressing bipartisan opposition to the

Trump administration's efforts—not to Trump, but to the policies. We ought to be talking about policies, not personalities. It is not about personalities. It is about policies and do we believe that we ought to repeal the Affordable Care Act without a replacement?

I think the answer to that ought to be an emphatic “no” for all of us. The gentleman is correct. We ought to work on a bipartisan basis to accomplish good objectives for our people. This vote will show every single American where his or her Representative stands on the question which is so consequential to the everyday lives of millions and millions of Americans.

The President clearly has no intention—he said in his tweet today—of sending a bill down here until 2021, 2 years and more from now. How sad to be the leader of our country and say: I am not going to tell you what I am going to do, just trust me.

Well, Mr. President, we don't have any reason based upon your performance to trust you to make sure that Americans have what you said you were going to give them, that everybody was going to be covered at lower cost or higher quality.

Vote for this resolution and tell the American people that when you said on the campaign trail: I am for pre-existing conditions, you meant it; and when you said that there were other protections that you wanted to keep in the bill, you meant it.

If you do, then you will vote for this resolution and send a message—democracy is a lot about messages—by talking to one another. This is the way the Congress can talk to the administration—one way. We can talk a lot of ways.

Have that communication be clear: Mr. President, leave the Affordable Care Act alone and work with us to make it better and work for all Americans, which is what you said you would do during the course of the campaign.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 20½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 26½ minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to make a couple of comments.

First of all, the President is very good to work with, and we worked in a bipartisan manner last Congress to address the Nation's opioid epidemic. That is a healthcare issue and a life-and-death issue. We passed 60 bipartisan bills that became law, and President Trump signed them.

We extended health insurance for children in America—the CHIP program, the Children's Health Insurance Program—for 10 years. That is twice as long as ever had been done before. We did that on the Energy and Commerce

Committee, and the President signed that. In my State, that is 122,700 Oregon kids and pregnant moms who are covered for certainty for 10 years under that insurance program. We reauthorized and fully funded community health centers. Now 240,000 Oregonians in 63 sites in my district get their healthcare from community health centers, Madam Speaker, and we did that at a fully funded record level.

Now, I just want to address something my friend, the majority leader who schedules bills on the floor, said about how we voted to repeal ObamaCare 65 times. What he kind of failed to mention is Democrats voted for not quite half of those, I would wager, because 25 of those votes became law, signed in large part, if not totally, by one Barack Obama, because there were problems in the Affordable Care Act or ObamaCare, however you want to describe it, that this Congress interceded on and in a bipartisan way voted to repeal “ObamaCare.” That is what the leader said, the 65 were all to repeal.

I would argue he probably voted for a bunch of those, because some of them passed unanimously in the House and Senate. Even President Obama agreed there were mistakes in ObamaCare. Our argument is we can fix America's healthcare laws going forward, and we should.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE), who is a terrific new Member of Congress and of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Madam Speaker, I hear from hard-working Montanans in my office and throughout the State that they are worried about the rising cost of healthcare. Rising premiums and increasing deductibles force Montana families to spend more and more on healthcare and less and less on clothes, books, and food for the table.

Since my first day in office, I have made lowering healthcare costs, promoting rural access to care, and protecting those with preexisting conditions my primary priorities.

Unfortunately, the Affordable Care Act has been anything but affordable. In the first 3 years of ObamaCare, premiums in Montana rose by 66 percent, and they are still rising today. ObamaCare robbed consumers of choice and gave hardworking Montanans plans they can't afford.

As we work toward solutions that make healthcare more accessible and affordable, I will keep fighting to protect those with preexisting conditions. I cosponsored the Pre-Existing Conditions Protection Act that ensures patients with preexisting conditions have access to health insurance. I also voted to ensure those same protections. We need to ensure that those with preexisting conditions have coverage.

House Democrats have said they are for protecting those with preexisting

conditions. Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, it seems they are only interested in defending them if the solution includes preserving ObamaCare or pursuing a government-run, single-payer healthcare plan.

One of the earliest votes we took in this Congress was to lock in protections for Americans with preexisting conditions. It was a simple and straightforward measure that I enthusiastically voted for. It would protect Americans with preexisting conditions period—so simple and straightforward. We should revisit that approach.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, my friends across the aisle voted down that measure, because it appears the majority values trying to score political points more than providing certainty and peace of mind to Americans with preexisting conditions.

I hope they will come to the table in good faith and choose to work with us to find a bipartisan solution to bring down healthcare costs and protect people with preexisting conditions.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I continue to yield myself such time as I may consume to say that I appreciate the gentleman's comments and share them.

This is H.R. 692, legislation that would guarantee Americans with pre-existing conditions are not discriminated against. We have a lot of cosponsors on this, but we don't have a single Democrat willing to cosponsor a bill that would provide protection to Americans should this judge's decision be upheld. That is my argument today.

Why wouldn't we go ahead and schedule this, pass this, and move this to the floor so that if by some means this judge's decision is upheld, Americans with a preexisting condition would have coverage?

Meanwhile, why don't we start hearings on the Medicare for All proposal that Democrats have championed?

I have asked for those hearings from my friend. We have not seen that happen, and I know there is a certain dust-up in the press even today about alleging the Speaker's own staff person here may have been saying things or not about whether this is a good idea or not.

We ought to have a hearing on that because close to 200 million Americans might lose their insurance under this plan. So there is lots we should be doing here.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who is the Speaker of the House and who was so much the force behind making the Affordable Care Act reality.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for the leadership role he played in making America healthier in the original passage of the Affordable Care Act and protecting it from the constant sabotage that the Republicans in the Congress and in the White

House have exacted on the Affordable Care Act.

I want to pay special tribute to the outside groups, the patient advocacy groups, the Little Lobbyists, the children, so many people who spoke and told their stories at 10,000 events across the country to oppose the Republicans' constant assault on the Affordable Care Act for the first 2 years of the Trump administration, a time when the President had the White House, the House, and the Senate and could very well have passed legislation to replace the Affordable Care Act, as they said they would do.

□ 1430

They didn't replace it because they don't believe in a government role. Much about the Affordable Care Act has to do with Medicare and how we prolonged the life of Medicare and adjusted funding so that we could reduce the cost of prescription drugs for our seniors.

The Republican approach to Medicare is that it should wither on the vine, that there is no place in a free society, in a free economy, for Medicare.

Let's understand this. This is not just about the issue or the legislation of the Affordable Care Act. This is about a value system in our country, about understanding that healthcare is a right for all Americans, not just a privilege.

Yes, they could get preexisting conditions coverage—with rates that go right through the ceiling and are a gift to the insurance industry, but not to make care affordable and accessible to all.

So, here we are, in an unusual situation where the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land, and it is the responsibility of the Justice Department and the administration to defend the law of the land in court, and what are they doing? Just the opposite. Why? Because they don't believe in governance.

That is why they are happy to shut down government for any reason. They don't believe in governance. They don't believe in a public role in the well-being of the American people. They don't believe in the Affordable Care Act.

What they are trying to do is strike down every last provision of the ACA: protection for preexisting conditions, which I will come back to; bans of lifetime and annual limits; the Medicaid expansion; Medicare solvency going out for many more years; savings for seniors on prescription drug costs; and the vital premium assistance that makes healthcare coverage affordable for millions of families. It all would be ended if the President and the Republicans in Congress get their way. I hope it is not all Republicans in Congress, because I hope that some of them will care enough about their constituents and meeting their needs.

On the subject of preexisting conditions, how many times during cam-

paigns did they say, "Oh, we are for preexisting conditions," having voted it down over and over and over again?

The misrepresentations were almost embarrassing. Let's look the other way, so we don't embarrass them any further. It is almost a joke, but it is not funny if you have a preexisting condition.

What was interesting about the Affordable Care Act is it wasn't just about expanding coverage to 20 million more people. That, in itself, would be a justification. It was about the more than 150 million families who had better coverage, on a trajectory of lower cost, better benefits, no preexisting condition barrier, no lifetime limits, no annual limits, and the rest. And if your child is up to 26 years old, your child could be on your policy.

Actually, the issue of subsidizing those so that everyone could participate and it would be affordable, can we do more there? We certainly can, and we certainly will.

I want to tell this story. As I said, the outside groups were so instrumental in saving us from the Republican sabotage of the Affordable Care Act and of the good health of the American people. The outside groups held, as I said, 10,000 events around the country, telling stories. Nothing conveys more information and more understanding than people telling their own stories.

The statistics are interesting. They are staggering. But the stories are powerful, and they make a difference.

I am going to tell the story that I have told before. It is about America's families paying the price and America's children paying the price for this Republican sabotage of the Affordable Care Act.

The story I would like to tell is about Zoe Madison Lihn. Zoe was born with a congenital heart defect in May 2010. She faced the first of her three heart surgeries at just 15 hours old.

By 6 months old, Zoe was halfway through the lifetime limit that her insurer had placed on her case. She faced a grim future, not just using up her lifetime limit by preschool—her lifetime limit was used up, but her preexisting condition had not gone away—but carrying the preexisting condition that would require attention and care for the rest of her life.

Under the ACA, Zoe is protected. She will celebrate her 9th birthday next month.

But the Republicans want to take all that away, not only from Zoe but from their own constituents.

Our Democratic House majority will not let that stand. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., said: "Of all the forms of inequality, injustice in healthcare is the most shocking and inhumane because it often results in physical death."

Our colleagues are used to our colleague, Whip CLYBURN, telling that story, which I think he heard Dr. King say.

On day one of this Congress, freshman Member from Texas Congressman

COLIN ALLRED led the way. House Democrats voted to throw the full legal weight of the House against the Texas lawsuit to destroy the ACA.

We salute Congressman ALLRED for his outstanding leadership to protect America's families' health and to reach out to the Republicans to join him in doing so. But more than 190 Republicans voted to be fully complicit in that attempt to overthrow the ACA and tear away those health protections.

Now, with this resolution led again by Congressman ALLRED, we call on our Republican colleagues to go on the record once more. Either they will vote for protecting their constituents' healthcare, or they will vote for taking it away. With this vote, we will see their values and their intentions.

House Democrats will always fight to protect families' affordable and quality healthcare. We don't see it as an issue or legislation. We see it as a value—a value. It is not just about healthcare. It is about the good health of America, a source of our strength.

After we pass this resolution, we will continue to advance our transformative legislation to reverse the GOP healthcare sabotage. We will lower healthcare costs and strengthen protections for people with preexisting medical conditions.

By the way, under the Affordable Care Act, being a woman is no longer a preexisting medical condition. As a mother of five, I can attest to that being a preexisting condition.

Democrats are for the people: lowering healthcare costs by reducing the costs of prescription drugs, preserving the preexisting condition benefit, increasing wages by building the infrastructure in a green way, and cleaning up government. Lower healthcare costs, bigger paychecks, cleaner government.

Once we can reduce the role of dark, special-interest money in Washington, D.C., people will have confidence that it is possible that their voices will be heard more strongly than the voices of those who stand in the way of progress.

Three months ago from tomorrow, the Members of this institution, Democrats and Republicans, took a solemn oath to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution of the United States, after the beautiful preamble of our Nation's purpose, is Article I, the legislative branch. The legislative branch's responsibilities are spelled out in the text of the Constitution.

This body, the first branch of government, voted to protect the health and well-being of the American people. It is the law of the land. It is the responsibility of the executive branch to protect the law of the land.

They have departed from that and, therefore, departed from our oath to the Constitution to protect and defend.

If they have a better idea, we haven't seen it. On top of that, the President has said we won't see it until 2021, after the 2020 elections.

That is just not good enough, Mr. President. The needs of the American people will not stop right now because you have stopped believing in them. The needs of the American people go on, and we will continue this fight. We will fight in the Congress; we will fight in the courts; and we will fight in the court of public opinion.

I hope that we can have some Republican support from the other side of the aisle to vote to protect America's families and their healthcare and, therefore, strengthen America.

Madam Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote.

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

Madam Speaker, I hope, before the Speaker of the House leaves, she will listen to this.

I was moved by her story about a young child with a congenital heart defect, but nobody is going to lecture me about the need to protect people with preexisting conditions or the need to repeal the lifetime caps.

Let me tell you a story about a young man with a heart defect. February 7, 1994, he was born in Portland, Oregon, at Oregon Health Sciences University, with hypoplastic left heart syndrome. It would require immediate surgery and multiple surgeries to try to save his life, or a complete heart transplant.

Tragically, that little boy did not live long enough to be flown to Loma Linda Hospital in California for that heart transplant.

His name: Garrison Daniel Walden. He died the next day.

Madam Speaker, nobody is going to tell me about the need to protect people with preexisting conditions. Nobody is going to lecture me about the need to get rid of caps on lifetime. My wife and I dealt with those issues directly, and I will always stand up for people who face similar challenges.

That is not what this is about today, and you can laugh if you want.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCARTHY).

Mr. McCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman WALDEN for his sobering words, for his actions. He has a bill that will protect preexisting conditions. The difference about that to today: It is actually a bill; this is a resolution.

I always thought, when you ran for Congress, you would want to do more than a press release. Apparently, it is different with the new election, Madam Speaker.

"Show me your budget, show me your values." It has been said so many times on this floor. Those were the words that have been recited by Speaker PELOSI quite frequently. You could have a whole ring of videos of her just saying those exact words.

But, of course, that was before the newly minted Democratic majority quickly decided they won't be introducing a budget.

Madam Speaker, I wonder if America will question the values. It appears they won't be sharing their values with the American people. But if we had questions as to what those values were, this week removes all doubt.

Madam Speaker, we are celebrating 40 years of C-SPAN, but I wonder if those who are watching today understand what is happening. You see, on this floor, they learned early on, even from a childhood of "Schoolhouse Rock," I'm just a bill on Capitol Hill.

This is not a bill we are talking about. This isn't even a resolution that goes to the Senate. This will never end up with the President. This will do nothing for your healthcare. What will it do? It will make a great press release.

The difference, Madam Speaker, in one election is what happens on this floor. The difference is: Do you really want to protect people with preexisting conditions? Because, Madam Speaker, there is an individual who has a bill that is filed, that has cosponsorship, that is sitting in committee, that the Democrats control. They didn't mark it up. They didn't talk about it. They wrote a resolution.

To those who are watching on C-SPAN, I know what they have watched on this floor before. I know what they watched in the last Congress, that we sat and talked about not a resolution for children's health, for the CHIP program, but we wrote a bill. We extended it longer than anyone has ever dreamed possible, a full decade.

Yes, Madam Speaker, we had to do it with one side of the aisle, because the majority on the other side of the aisle didn't even write a press release supporting it. They voted "no."

To those who are watching on C-SPAN and questioning what has gone on in this House, yes, they watched it the last Congress. When we had an opioid epidemic, we wrote a bill. We didn't write a press release, and we didn't write a resolution.

□ 1445

Or when the National Institutes of Health, where you could really care about an individual with healthcare and solve a problem, we didn't write a resolution about giving them more money. We actually voted for it. We actually moved it through committee, and we had a bill and we funded \$3 billion more.

To those who are watching on C-SPAN, don't change the channel. Don't wonder about the words that were used before, "show me your budget," "show me your values"; there is no budget, and you are probably going to question their values.

Show me the bill and show me your values. I guess that is the new line we should ask, because what does a resolution do?

Maybe we can all get together and go to the Rayburn Room today and have a press release. What? Let's go further. Let's have a press conference. Let's get

really serious about a problem, and let's write a resolution for the floor, because that problem will still exist.

A lot of people put a lot of effort into running for office. A lot of people make a lot of promises, and Americans expect legislation to solve them, not a resolution.

You know what is most ironic today? If they wanted to solve the problem, there are options there.

If we are worried about a lawsuit, if we are worried about preexisting conditions, go to Congressman WALDEN's bill. Let's bring that to the floor. It is not a resolution. We will have to vote for something different. We will have to actually vote for a bill.

It is interesting that, on the other side of the aisle, Madam Speaker, I heard people were concerned the Republicans were concerned about what ObamaCare has done, that premiums have risen, that the promise we were given that, if you liked your healthcare, you could keep it. For millions of Americans, that proved to be a lie and false.

We are not the only ones who believe that has been a failure. If that were not true, why do half the Members on the other side of the aisle cosponsor a bill that says Medicare for All? They must believe it is not working either.

Or maybe they want to take more healthcare from individuals. I am not quite sure. The way I look at Medicare for All, it has got a great name. Anybody who is 65, they should get Medicare, and I will stand with them. But they shouldn't take away 158 million Americans' private health insurance, because that is exactly what they do.

Why don't they make another promise to the American public and deny them their healthcare?

Or why don't they even go further? For everyone who is on Medicare Advantage, that goes away as well. Or for everyone who is on Medicare itself, you are going to bankrupt it.

You have got that in legislation. That is not a press release. Why don't we bring that to the floor or committee? Why don't we debate that?

And, Madam Speaker, when I sat on this floor and I heard the words used from the other side of the aisle, from the leader of that side of the aisle to say Republicans don't care about Medicare, that was a lie. Medicare part D; you know, when you talk to seniors, you know what they are most concerned about? The price of prescription drugs.

Or for those C-SPAN viewers who have more than 40 years to watch it, Republicans were in the majority. Do you know what they did? They didn't bring a press release down with a resolution. They brought a bill. They created Medicare part D to lower prescription drug prices. It has been one of the most effective programs around.

And do you know what we had to do? We had to do it alone because we passed legislation. We didn't pass a press release.

Madam Speaker, shame, shame on an individual who would lie to the American public about their own healthcare, lie about another side, but, more importantly, say they care about Americans' health and bring a resolution.

I want to see everybody go home this weekend, go back to their constituents and tell them what they did about preexisting conditions. They passed a resolution when they could have passed a bill.

I happen to be the leader of the Republicans, and I stand here in this well, in this body, and tell you we support preexisting conditions. I tell you to bring his bill up, Congressman WALDEN's, and we will support this bill on this floor.

We won't support shams. We won't support press releases, because we care about Americans' health. And we will not support kicking 158 million off their healthcare.

I know half the body on the other side has cosponsored that. That is even further than I have seen before. They want to end Medicare Advantage.

When are they going to say that to the seniors? And that is not a press release. That is something they are really going after.

If they are serious about their words, if they believe they care and are concerned about a court case because maybe they wrote a bill that isn't constitutional, they could have solved it today.

You know what we could be talking about today? They own the majority. They control the floor.

What is most interesting, the majority of bills that they brought to the floor in this new majority—they have brought more bills and resolutions to the floor than even passed the committee, but they sat here and told us it is for the people.

They are about to have 100 days, but it is 100 days of disappointment. I have never thought a majority would want to claim how many press conferences or how many resolutions they could pass on the floor, but they are setting a record. They are setting a record while they are failing the American public.

Do you know what they could be doing right now? If they really cared about fixing our healthcare system and protecting Americans with preexisting conditions, they could do one of the three things in the face of this lawsuit. And let's not lie to the American public. They could repeal the individual mandate. Boom, the lawsuit is gone.

They could reimpose the penalty. They voted for it before, so why don't they vote for it again?

Or they could put a bill on the floor that explicitly protects preexisting conditions. The difference is that is a bill, not a resolution.

Maybe if they had a lot of power, maybe if they really felt strongly about this, make a resolution that even goes to the Senate so the Senate can talk about it, too.

Or if they really care, make a bill. Write a bill. Don't write a press release. Don't lie to the American public. They are smarter than this.

You know, the words I have heard today, the line that will sit up to speak, not one of them will use the term of a bill; not one of them can look the American public in the eye and say they are protecting preexisting conditions. But what they can say, Madam Speaker, is they are denying a bill that would protect preexisting conditions to come to the floor because the Republicans offered it.

This is an honorable floor. This is a floor that makes history. This is a floor that has changed and shown the values of America to lead the world, but it has not done that by doing resolutions. It is a shame that we are trying to put a resolution on the floor.

Is this why you ran? Is this why you craved to become the majority?

I didn't hear any of my constituents say, "I want you to go there"—because I heard this language. I heard this language on the other side, Madam Speaker, just from the last speaker: We will fight in court. We will fight on the floor. We will fight in the public's opinion.

Do you know what fighting means if you want to succeed? Put a bill. I didn't know fighting was writing a press release. Don't take America's time and don't waste it, because that is exactly what they are doing.

Do you want to tell stories? Go tell the stories to the individuals who are concerned about this. Go tell those individuals you did nothing to solve it. Go tell those individuals you denied a bill to come to the floor that could solve the problem.

Be honest, but stop wasting our time. And if you don't want to lead, get out of the way, because we will definitely solve it.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD), who is the vice chair of our Health Subcommittee.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, I rise to support H. Res. 271. This resolution, I would say to the minority leader, is a statement. It is a statement by Democrats of our position on the Affordable Care Act.

It is not surprising to me that they would not want the facts to be before the American people. That is what this resolution is about.

On day one of his administration, President Obama announced he would address the critical need for affordable healthcare for millions of uninsured Americans.

He reminded us that nearly 50 million Americans were uninsured. Low-income, childless adults could not benefit from Medicaid.

Millions of seniors were not fully benefiting from prescription drug benefits under Medicare part D because of the doughnut hole.

He told us that parents needed insurance on their children to age 26.

And finally, Madam Speaker, President Obama stressed that insurance companies were increasing premiums and not providing quality coverage, and they were discriminating based on preexisting conditions, high copays, and higher deductibles.

After much debate, we passed ObamaCare. It has made a difference in health accessibility and health outcomes. It is not a perfect solution, but it has impacted millions of lives.

We want to make ObamaCare better; we want to make it more affordable. I would say to my friend from Oregon, with bipartisan cooperation, we can do that, and we can do it effectively.

But Republicans have repeatedly tried to legislate ObamaCare out of existence with no replacement. This Congress has repeatedly said "no" to any repeal.

On February 26 of last year, Republican plaintiffs filed a lawsuit in the Northern District of Texas contending that the minimum essential coverage provision is unconstitutional, and, since Republicans removed the mandate penalty, the entire law is unconstitutional. That was their claim.

Three months later, Attorney General Sessions announced that the Trump administration wouldn't defend the minimum essential coverage claim and that the Trump administration would argue that preexisting conditions protections should be invalidated. However, the Trump administration said that the remaining parts of the law could be severed or separated and the law could remain intact.

The Court heard the case and, as we all know, the Affordable Care Act was declared to be unconstitutional. It is now on appeal.

On March 28 of this year, President Trump changed his position. On appeal, he is now aligning with the Republican plaintiffs and thumbing his nose, Madam Speaker, thumbing his nose again at this Congress.

The Affordable Care Act, as the Speaker said a few moments ago, is the law of the land, and Republicans are refusing to defend it.

Protection of preexisting conditions is the law of the land, Mr. President.

The final insult came this morning when President Trump confirmed that he will ask the higher courts to throw out the entire law and that he will have a replacement ready the day after the election. I am outraged, and so should the American people be.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE) from the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, we stand here today with another in a series of weekly messaging bills. I wonder what, next week, we will deal with. I am sure it will be another whipsaw response to the headlines of the day.

If you truly want to protect people with preexisting conditions, as Republicans do, bring forth Mr. WALDEN's

bill. It has teeth. In the event that this lawsuit is upheld and the Affordable Care Act is unconstitutional, it will protect people with preexisting conditions.

The Speaker, Ms. PELOSI, a minute ago said that the Republicans' position on healthcare was a joke. Well, I will tell you what is a joke, and that is to call the Affordable Care Act successful.

The promises on which the Affordable Care Act were based were that we would cover all Americans; that the premiums would go down; that if you like your doctor, you could keep your doctor; and that if you like your insurance policy, you could keep it.

Clearly, almost every existing insurance policy was declared invalid. You could only keep your doctor if he is in your plan and your hospital. Premiums have gone from an average of \$225 in 2013, just before the Affordable Care Act was enacted, to \$475, average cost for an individual policy today, almost a 250 percent increase.

What did we get for that?

Before the Affordable Care Act, 85 percent of Americans were covered. Before the Affordable Care Act, 85 percent of Americans were covered. At the peak, after the Affordable Care Act, last year, 91 percent of the Americans were covered. We covered 6 percent more people, mostly because we gave them insurance policies with the Medicare expansion. We covered 6 percent more people.

But what was the cost of that? The 85 percent that were already covered had to pay 250 percent more for their health insurance. That is completely absurd.

And don't lecture me about people with preexisting conditions. I have a son who had a congenital heart defect. I had a son who, as a 7-month-old child, was in a car wreck and had a brain injury, both preexisting conditions.

□ 1500

Throughout their life, they were covered. For a brief period of time, South Carolina, like almost every other State in the country, had protections for preexisting conditions before the Affordable Care Act. Under the health insurance pool in South Carolina, they had to pay 30 percent more.

It irritated me as a father that my children had to pay 30 percent more for their health insurance, but guess what? Under the Affordable Care Act, instead of having to pay 30 percent more, they have to pay 250 percent more and their deductibles have tripled.

You call that a success? In what world is that a success?

Republicans want to protect people with preexisting conditions. We have voted repeatedly to do it. We have bills out there that will do it.

Stop with the messaging, stop with the lies, and let's move forward and do something that actually works. Let's move forward and protect people with preexisting conditions in the event that this law is declared unconstitutional.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I would just point out Gallup just announced in a survey, 65 million Americans, 20 percent, put off treatment this last year and borrowed \$88 billion to cover their healthcare costs. So we know there are problems out there we need to address.

Mr. Speaker, could I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARBAJAL). The gentleman from Oregon has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 22½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the chair of our Consumer Protection & Commerce Subcommittee.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, clearly, we have hit a nerve with the Republicans on the Affordable Care Act, which they opposed before it began, have been opposing it for 9 years, promising to come up with some sort of a repeal and replace, never being able to do it, and now standing up here and saying life was better before the Affordable Care Act. Amazing.

People with preexisting conditions love the Affordable Care Act.

Why are we here in the majority today? Because the American people came to understand that before the Affordable Care Act, children born with preexisting conditions from the day of birth were not able to be covered by healthcare, that there were limits in how much insurance companies would pay per year or per lifetime caps, and making families live in fear of disaster and financial chaos.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the Trump administration and their decision to support the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, not in the Congress, but now in the courts.

They couldn't defeat it here. They tried when they had the majority in both Houses and could not repeal it.

When I came here, being a woman was essentially a preexisting condition. Women paid more for healthcare, sometimes 40 percent more, just because we are women. Pregnancy was very rarely covered by insurance, and now women are covered for those things like preventive services, mammograms, pregnancy.

The Affordable Care Act has let people 26 years old stay on their parents' policies.

No wonder the American people have completely turned around and understood the sham that the Republicans were offering and support the Affordable Care Act.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Oregon for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to this debate as it has gone on, and the bottom line is, if you listen to the Democrats, you would think that they had stuck it to the insurance industry with all of the rules and all of the laws that they passed.

As we talk about values, I thought I would give you a few values.

Aetna in 2010 was trading at \$27.39 a share. In 2018, it was \$187 a share.

You know who you stuck it to? You stuck it to the American citizens. You took the money out of our pockets and you put it into the hands of the insurance industry.

If you don't want to talk about Aetna, let's talk about United Healthcare: \$29 a share in 2010; in 2018, \$246.54 a share. How did that happen?

If the American citizens were getting a square deal before the legislation that you passed, that you could only pass if the insurance industry didn't object, how did United's stock go from \$29 a share to \$246 a share?

If that's not enough, how about Humana: \$29 a share in 2010 to \$246 a share in 2018. How did this happen?

This happened because you left the insurance industry exempt from the antitrust laws of the country.

Now, how did that work out for the American citizen? We got a mandate by the Democratic Party to purchase a product from an industry that is exempt from the antitrust laws of the country.

Now, there are flaws in the legislation that you passed. I am amazed at your refusal to accept that.

You can't even buy an Affordable Care Act contract today. Do you realize the next time you can buy it is January 1 of next year?

If you are uninsured right now—you all have been telling the American public, if you are uninsured and you go to the doctor and the doctor says you have got cancer, you can get a contract the next day. It is just not true. You can't get it until January 1 of 2020.

It is a poorly worded piece of legislation. Regardless of the intent, it is a poorly worded piece of legislation that moved money from the individual citizens of this country to the pockets of the insurance industry, and it needs to be rewritten.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the leadership of Congressman COLIN ALLRED, who has been an incredible advocate for his community in Dallas and for millions of Americans whose healthcare President Trump and our Republican colleagues are trying to take away.

President Trump has claimed over and over again that he wants to protect

access to healthcare, and he has even announced recently that he has a secret plan that he will make available to the American people after the 2020 election.

But as is true with any con man and charlatan, when you dig a little past the surface of the President's words, the facts tell a much different story.

Last week, the President's Justice Department asked a court to eliminate every single protection and benefit that the Affordable Care Act has provided.

Democrats won the majority because the American people understand that we are fighting to protect their healthcare. And now Republicans have moved away from the Congress to try to take away healthcare from millions and millions of Americans in the courts.

Let's be clear about what this means. President Trump wants to repeal the caps on out-of-pocket costs, he wants to eliminate the prescription drug savings for seniors and end the Medicaid expansion.

If he succeeds in this litigation, it will be legal for insurance companies to limit the amount of coverage someone can get in their lifetime, it will deny access to people with preexisting conditions, and it will allow insurance companies to sell junk plans that offer no real coverage for the American people.

Democrats have a better plan, and the minority leader will be happy to know there are actually bills to do it. We are going to strengthen the protections for people with preexisting conditions, we are going to expand access to insurance for more working men and women, and we are going to bring down the costs of prescription drugs with bills like my legislation, the CREATES Act, to allow more generic drugs into the marketplace.

Look, we take a lot of complicated votes in this Chamber. This is not one of them.

This vote is very simple. A vote in favor of this resolution is a vote for access to quality, affordable healthcare. A vote against it is a vote for the interests of insurance companies at the expense of working people.

I know where members of the Democratic Caucus stand. We ran on this, we are committed to it. We are fighting every day to protect the Affordable Care Act and to build on its success and to improve it.

The Republicans' last vote was TrumpCare, which took away health coverage from 23 million Americans, and that is why they were rejected in the midterms.

People want Members of Congress to stand up and fight to protect their access to quality, affordable healthcare, to protect their access to coverage for preexisting conditions, to drive down the costs of prescription drugs, and to end these junk plans that, in fact, don't provide coverage to the American people.

This resolution is a strong statement of our position on this.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues, don't be afraid of the resolution, don't be afraid that it is going to expose that you actually don't support efforts to protect access to healthcare, because you have an easy solution to that problem: vote for it. Show the American people you care about the quality of their healthcare, you want to expand access, strengthen the Affordable Care Act, and support this excellent resolution.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, President Trump's Department of Justice letter seeking the invalidation of the entire Affordable Care Act by the Fifth Circuit is nothing short of self-sabotage.

The Trump position in *Texas v. United States* would deny coverage for those with preexisting conditions, dismantle protections on out-of-pocket costs and the ban on annual and lifetime caps, and the return of the notorious donut hole for seniors on expensive medications would come forward again.

I support this resolution. It is important that we band together to protect the Affordable Care Act and its protections against junk insurance policies.

The American people deserve to know whether their Representative is going to fight for them and vote to condemn the DOJ's actions or if they will simply fall in line behind this President on his thoughtless and heartless mission to destroy access to the healthcare system for millions of Americans.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. WEXTON).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 271, a resolution condemning the Trump administration's legal campaign to take away America's healthcare.

Here is what healthcare means: it is the freedom and security to live your life the way you choose. It can be the difference between financial security and bankruptcy, or life and death.

Donald Trump and congressional Republicans want to use the courts to take health insurance away from 21 million Americans. They want to eliminate protections for the more than 133 million Americans with preexisting conditions.

Now, the Affordable Care Act is not perfect, but never in American history has the uninsured rate been lower than it is today.

But rather than be honest about what is working, rather than coming to the table to work across the aisle and

fix what is wrong, Republicans are fighting tooth and nail to overturn the ACA, with no plan except one that was so bad, they couldn't pass it when they controlled both houses of Congress.

Meanwhile, the Democratic majority is proposing real solutions and smart healthcare policies that will lower costs and expand coverage.

The contrast couldn't be more clear.

Democrats want quality, affordable health coverage for every American, and Republicans don't.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on this resolution.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), our resident racist on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act is not working for too many Americans.

I welcome all efforts to lower costs, to increase choice, and to protect those with preexisting conditions.

Remember, the very first thing, the very first floor vote we pushed as Republicans this Congress was to solidify protections for those with preexisting conditions. It was the first thing we did. We did it right out of the gate.

While Republicans have stood ready to work on lowering costs and increasing choices, so far the Democrats, the Democratic majority, have only tried to double down on the ACA.

On the Energy and Commerce Committee, the only solution we have seen from Democrats are partisan bills that throw billions of unpaid-for dollars at a broken system, at a failed experiment.

If my Democratic colleagues were serious about helping patients, they would work with us on reforms to lower costs and increase choices.

□ 1515

The fact is we could vote on independent legislation that protects patients with preexisting conditions. The fact is, if my Democratic colleagues were serious about their concerns over this lawsuit, they could, legislatively, end this lawsuit once and for all. We could vote to repeal the individual mandate. That would immediately invalidate the lawsuit. They could vote to reinstate the individual mandate penalty. That would also stop the lawsuit in its tracks.

But, instead, we are here to vote on a resolution about politics, not solutions. It is clear that Democrats would much rather score political points than to protect the ACA.

They would have surprised me 2 years ago, but now the Democratic Party seems to have already moved on from the Affordable Care Act. Instead of truly working on improvements to the ACA, Democrats are focused on their \$32 trillion plan to kick 152 million people off their insurance for their one-size-fits-all government-run healthcare plan.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my Democratic friends to stop the politics and to work with us to protect those with preexisting conditions, to lower healthcare costs, and to increase choices for patients.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire about the amount of time that remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 14½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oregon has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON).

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn this administration's latest attempt to do away with the healthcare provided by the Affordable Care Act.

The Department of Justice's decision to go after the healthcare of millions of Americans by seeking a ruling that the Affordable Care Act is unconstitutional underscores their belief that healthcare should be a luxury reserved for the privileged few, only now we have moved from repeal and replace to just flat-out repeal. I could not disagree more strongly.

In my home State of Pennsylvania, the ability to get health insurance regardless of chronic illness has saved countless lives. Tens of thousands of my constituents have gotten healthcare for the first time under the Affordable Care Act. Those with preexisting conditions have received peace of mind, and many, myself included, have been able to keep their children on their health plans even as they become adults themselves.

The administration's callous decision to continue undermining the Affordable Care Act endangers my constituents, just as it endangers the lives of Americans in every district of our country.

We were chosen to serve in this House to protect Americans who need us most, and that means protecting their healthcare. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "yes" on this important resolution.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor and privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the Republican whip of the House, and an incredibly important member of our committee.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on healthcare.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution, which has nothing to do with actually helping improve healthcare, the costs, especially, that so many millions of people are enduring, because the Affordable Care Act is anything but affordable.

Mr. Speaker, let's keep in mind what this resolution is about. It is not about changing any healthcare policy. It doesn't do that. It has been made clear. It is attempting just to try to take cheap shots at the President while di-

verting attention away from what this lawsuit that you see moving through the courts is really all about.

Mr. Speaker, if the healthcare law that my friends on the other side of the aisle rushed through Congress and passed is held unconstitutional, they have nobody to blame but themselves. Let's keep in mind—and they want you to forget this, Mr. Speaker—and let's go back to those days when they rammed this bill through and the infamous statement: You have to pass the bill to find out what is in it.

Nobody read that bill who voted for it. We said back then that it was unconstitutional.

And, oh, by the way, not only was it that, but it has actually led to dramatic increases in cost for families. So someone with a preexisting condition—whom we want to protect, by the way, Mr. Speaker. But we don't just want to protect the fact that they shouldn't be able to have costs go up. We want to help them lower the costs for health insurance and lower their premiums.

So many millions of Americans are not only facing double-digit increases, but people with preexisting conditions, in many cases, are facing a \$10,000 deductible, so they have no access to healthcare, Mr. Speaker.

Why don't we focus on the underlying problem?

We on the Republican side support protecting people with preexisting conditions, but we also want to lower their premiums and lower their deductibles. The other side wants to see their costs continue to go up. That is the biggest difference between the two sides.

We ought to focus on lowering premiums. Let families make those decisions, not unelected bureaucrats in Washington. That is what we ought to be focused on. This resolution falls short.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, too often, we forget what our healthcare system was like before we passed the Affordable Care Act.

Before the ACA, healthcare costs were skyrocketing; insurers could deny people coverage if they had a preexisting condition; policies did not have to provide essential benefits; and people were losing their insurance at alarming rates. Before the Affordable Care Act, insurers could place annual and lifetime caps on insurance coverage.

Today, the Affordable Care Act ensures that 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions can have access to the healthcare peace of mind and financial security that comes with quality, affordable health coverage.

Now, we have heard a lot about what we can do to make things better. We have heard about a bill that just protects those with preexisting conditions. The problem with that, Mr. Speaker, is, if you allow people to wait until

they get sick before they buy insurance, they will wait until they get sick before they buy insurance. Those buying insurance are, on average, sicker, and the costs tend to go up. Fewer people can afford it. The healthy people drop out, and the costs go up.

There is a name for this cycle. It is called the death spiral. Every time they try to protect those with preexisting conditions without the supports of the Affordable Care Act, there is a death spiral out of control.

In Washington State, for 3 years, they tried that. In the 3 years, nobody could buy insurance.

New York was in the death spiral when we passed the Affordable Care Act. When we passed the Affordable Care Act, the costs for individual insurance dropped more than 50 percent.

So we know we just can't protect those with preexisting conditions without the supports and tax credits available under the Affordable Care Act. But we do know what a replacement plan looks like.

The Republicans voted on such a thing. It was actually evaluated by the Congressional Budget Office, finding that, if the bill passed, about 20-some million fewer people would have insurance.

They talk about costs. Under their plan, the costs would go up 20 percent the first year. Insurance policies would not have to cover essential benefits, as they do now, and those with preexisting conditions would lose many of their protections.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and support people with preexisting conditions so that they can have access to the care they need to live healthy and fulfilling lives.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I think we have had a very important debate today. I just wish that that debate had occurred on H.R. 692. This is the legislation that we should put in place in case the decision that the judge made in the Texas case that said ObamaCare was unconstitutional is upheld. If that is upheld, then there is going to be this problem, this gap that everybody is talking about.

This is an honest attempt to make sure there is a safety net for people with preexisting conditions, H.R. 692. You are welcome to cosponsor it. I wish we would move it. I always think maybe it is the old Eagle Scout in me that you are always supposed to be prepared and ready and that you help people.

I will tell you, Republicans also believed we should take care of people with preexisting conditions. Republicans also supported getting rid of lifetime caps on insurance policies and many of the other things you have heard about today, and we will continue to.

But we also led the effort to deal with the Nation's opioid crisis, made it

bipartisan, brought it to the floor, and it became law.

When seniors couldn't afford their medicines, it was Republicans, under George W. Bush, who put Medicare part D into law, and we had to fight Democrats to do that. Then seniors didn't have to go to Mexico or Canada or somewhere to get their drugs anymore. It has been highly successful. The costs are 40 percent or more less than what the Congressional Budget Office said it would be, and premiums have remained low. Now we need to do some modernization there.

Republicans also passed the longest extension of children's health insurance in the history of the country: 10 years, fully funded. Democrats voted against it over and over again on this House floor less than a year ago.

Community health centers, an incredibly important part of our network, I led the effort to get them funded at the highest levels ever. That funding is going to run out, but we don't have a plan from the Democrats yet. We are told we are not even going to have a budget on how to go forward. I think we can find bipartisan consensus there.

We are working together right now and will have a markup tomorrow in the Energy and Commerce Committee to address the drug issue and the cost of drugs. As I said earlier, I can't remember a President of the United States more engaged in getting better prices for consumers than this one. Donald Trump has led the country in an initiative to drive down the cost of drugs, and Congress is responding in a bipartisan way, and that is a good thing. We should do that here, Mr. Speaker.

The resolution before us today, if you are just watching or listening to my colleagues, is just that. It is a resolution. It will never leave the House because it is only for the House. It is the taxpayer-funded equivalent of a press release; that is all it is.

And we know that there are Members who never have accepted the outcome of the 2016 election, and no matter what the President says or does, they want to do a resolution or attack him. Yet the American people want us to come here and get our work done and stand up for them.

So rather than that resolution, I genuinely wish that H.R. 692, a bill that would protect people with pre-existing conditions, was what we were voting on today. We stand ready to work with Democrats to get that done and provide that safety net that these Americans need.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, before I talk about H. Res. 271 which is before the House today, I want to respond to my ranking member's statements about H.R. 692. This is the bill that he repeatedly has mentioned on the Republican side.

I want to point out that the Republican bill, H.R. 692, under that legislation, you could theoretically buy insurance if you have a preexisting condition; but it is very deceptive because the bill will still allow insurers to set premiums based on health status, resulting in individuals with preexisting conditions being charged substantially more or priced out of the market.

The Republican bill does not include critical ACA consumer protections, including community rating, essential health benefits requirements, and annual or lifetime prohibitions. Basically, the GOP bill would allow insurance companies to once again discriminate against 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions. They would be priced out of coverage because they wouldn't be healthy enough. Individuals with preexisting conditions like cancer or diabetes could face extremely unaffordable premiums and, again, be priced out of the care that they desperately need.

The GOP bill would also put a significant financial burden on older Americans, while doing very little to lower costs for young adults. This Republican bill leaves Americans worse off and does nothing, really, to protect people with preexisting conditions, in reality.

Now, if I could speak again in support of H. Res. 271, which is before us today, that condemns the Trump administration's legal campaign to take away Americans' healthcare.

As you know, last Monday night, the Justice Department filed a brief saying that they wanted the court to repeal the Affordable Care Act in its entirety.

□ 1530

The Trump administration's announcement last week that it would actively support this frivolous lawsuit striking down the entire Affordable Care Act shows the President's shameless disregard for the health and well-being of the American people, in my opinion.

If the Trump administration got its way in court and the ACA is struck down, tens of millions of Americans would lose their health coverage overnight. Hundreds of millions would immediately lose protections for pre-existing conditions, and we would be sent barreling back to the days of lifetime limits and price discrimination against women based on their gender.

Republicans had their chance to repeal and replace the ACA, and the American people overwhelmingly rejected their plan. And now by refusing to defend the ACA in court, the Trump administration is asking the courts to do what President Trump and the Republican Congress could not do, and that is repeal the ACA and all the protections that it includes for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle repeatedly claim that they stand for protections for people with preexisting conditions and for other protections in-

cluded in the Affordable Care Act. Well, now is your chance to show it.

We have an opportunity today to send a clear message that we will not support this reckless attack that imperils the well-being of millions of hardworking Americans.

The time for empty promises has expired. It is time to act. The Trump Administration is determined to destroy protections for preexisting conditions and to tear down every last benefit guaranteed by the Affordable Care Act, and today's vote is an opportunity to stand up in solidarity against this heartless attack.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 271, to send a clear message: We will not stand idly by while the Trump administration wages an all-out assault on Americans' healthcare.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments on my bill, H.R. 692, known as the Pre-Existing Conditions Protection Act of 2019.

As we've made clear today, Republicans have long believed that pre-existing condition protections are an essential part of our nation's health care markets.

These assurances give patients and families who have suffered from or are battling pre-existing conditions peace of mind. As a nation, we will not go back to the days when patients could be denied care or charged more than their peers because of their pre-existing condition.

The Pre-Existing Conditions Protection Act has 45 cosponsors and would lock in existing protections for patients.

It aims to achieve three important goals for patients: guaranteed access to coverage; a prohibition on pre-existing condition benefit exclusions; and, a ban on premium rating based on health status.

This bill reaffirms the commitment by House Republicans to uphold these three safeguards, commonly defined as the principle pre-existing condition protections in Obamacare.

And we can build on this foundation if necessary to adapt to potential changes in law or decisions from the courts in order to ensure our citizens who have pre-existing conditions are protected.

In the first few months of the new Congress, Democrats have already voted down multiple attempts to lock in a commitment to legislate on pre-existing condition protections. Instead, they'd rather score political points on an issue that we actually have agreement on.

This bill represents the desire of House Republicans to maintain these crucial protections for patients.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the first registered nurse elected to Congress, I can attest to the importance of the Affordable Care Act in improving our country's health care, especially for the 133 million Americans living with pre-existing conditions—of which 11.5 million live in my home state of Texas.

Today, we bring a resolution to the floor that reaffirms our support of the Affordable Care Act and defends its protections. It is clear as day that this president and his administration will stop at nothing to tear down the very law that has expanded critical health care coverage to millions of Americans.

I urge my Republican colleagues to join us to protect the health care of all our constituents. We cannot stand silent when our health care system is thrown into chaos.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 271, Condemning the Trump Administration's Legal Campaign to Take Away Americans' Health Care.

Last week, the Trump Administration launched a monstrous attack on our nation's health care system and on the people of our country when it was announced that they would be joining the 18 Republican state attorneys general in support of the Texas vs. United States lawsuit to strike down the entirety of the Affordable Care Act. By joining this lawsuit, the Trump Administration demonstrated they do not believe Americans should have access to comprehensive, affordable health insurance or that the 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions should be protected.

I've already heard from many constituents who are frightened about losing protections for their preexisting conditions, panicking about being able to afford their medical bills, and worried about where they can go to get their health insurance if this lawsuit succeeds.

For those enrolled in the Affordable Care Act, if this lawsuit is successful, 13 million Americans who gained health insurance through the Medicaid expansion will lose their health insurance; the 9 million Americans who rely on tax credits to help them afford their insurance plan will no longer be able to afford their insurance; and the 130 million patients with preexisting conditions could be denied coverage or charged more.

Since the Affordable Care Act was signed into law over 20 million Americans have gained health insurance that requires coverage for preexisting conditions; disallows charging sick consumers more; allows children to stay on their parent's health insurance until the age of 26; and provides coverage for preventive health services with no cost sharing.

The insurance reforms of the ACA protect every American, including those who get their health insurance through their employer. Every insurance plan today is required to cover ten basic Essential Health Benefits; there are no longer lifetime limits; and women can no longer be charged more because they are females. All of this is at risk if this lawsuit succeeds, and the Trump Administration demonstrated their total disregard for the consequences of its actions on the people of our country last week.

On the first day of the 116th Congress the House voted to intervene in this lawsuit on behalf of the tens of millions of Americans who rely on and have benefited from the ACA. Today, we renew our promise to the American people that we will fight this Administration's sabotage and do everything to protect, defend and improve the ACA.

The resolution we're considering today condemns the Texas vs. United States lawsuit and the Trump Administration's recent actions to intervene to seek the invalidation of every provision of the ACA. It calls on the Department of Justice to protect Americans with preexisting conditions, cease their efforts to destroy access to affordable health care, and reverse its position in the court case. I urge my colleagues to support this timely and critically important resolution we are considering today

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong and unequivocal support for H. Res. 271 as well as the underlying resolution and ask all Members to join me in supporting this resolution which condemns the Trump Administration's ongoing legal campaign to take away health care from more than 100 million Americans and to make health care dramatically less affordable for those fortunate enough to be insured.

I thank Congressman ALLRED, my Texas congressional delegation colleague, for introducing this important resolution.

As a new member of Congress who unseated an opponent who voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act dozens of times, the gentlemen from Texas knows first-hand how important and critical access to affordable, high quality, accessible health care available to everyone, including those with pre-existing conditions, to the well-being of American families.

Because of the passage of the Affordable Care Act, the national uninsured rate has been slashed from 14.8 in 2012 to 8.8 percent in 2018.

Texas has long led the nation in rate of uninsured so the comparable rates are 24.6 and 15 percent, respectively.

Mr. Speaker, I distinctly recall a candidate for the highest public office in the land saying "Obamacare is a disaster" and appealing for voters to support him with this question:

"What have you got to lose?"

The question deserves a response so I hope that person, who occupies the Oval Office, is listening to my answer.

The Affordable Care Act, or "Obamacare," has been an unmitigated success to the more than 20 million Americans who for the first time now have the security and peace of mind that comes with affordable, accessible, high quality health care.

Mr. Speaker, Tip O'Neill used to say that "all politics is local" so let me share with you how Obamacare has dramatically changed lives for the better for the people in my home state of Texas.

1.874 million Texans who have gained coverage since the ACA was implemented could lose their coverage if the ACA is entirely or partially repealed or invalidated.

1.1 million Texans who purchased high quality Marketplace coverage now stand to lose their coverage if *Texas v. United States*, No. 4:18-cv-00167-O (N.D. Tex.), the lawsuit brought by Republican Governors, and now whole-heartedly supported and aided by the Trump Administration were to succeed.

913,177 individuals Texans who received financial assistance to purchase Marketplace coverage in 2016, averaging \$271 per individual, are at risk of having coverage become unaffordable if the Republican Congress eliminates the premium tax credits.

1.1 million Texans could have insurance if all states adopted the ACA's Medicaid expansion; these individuals will not be able to gain coverage if the Republican Congress eliminates the Medicaid expansion.

508,000 kids in Texas who have gained coverage since the ACA was implemented are also at risk of having their coverage rolled back.

205,000 young adult Texans who were able to stay on a parent's health insurance plan thanks to the ACA now stand to lose coverage if the Republican Congress eliminates the requirement that insurers allow children to stay on their parents' plans until age 26.

646,415 Texans who received cost-sharing reductions to lower out-of-pocket costs such as deductibles, co-pays, and coinsurance are now at risk of having healthcare become unaffordable if the Republican Congress eliminates cost-sharing reductions.

10.28 million Texans who now have private health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductibles stand to lose this access if the Republican Congress eliminates ACA provisions requiring health insurers to cover important preventive services without cost-sharing.

Women in Texas who can now purchase insurance for the same price as men are at risk of being charged more for insurance if the ACA's ban on gender rating in the individual and small group markets is invalidated.

Before the ACA, women paid up to 56 percent more than men for their health insurance.

Roughly 4.5 million Texans who have preexisting health conditions are at risk of having their coverage rescinded, being denied coverage, or being charged significantly more for coverage if the ACA's ban on pre-existing conditions is struck down.

346,750 Texas seniors who have saved an average of \$1,057 each as a result of closing the Medicare prescription drug "donut hole" gap in coverage stand to lose this critical help going forward.

1.75 million Texas seniors who have received free preventive care services thanks to ACA provisions requiring coverage of annual wellness visits and eliminating cost-sharing for many recommended preventive services covered by Medicare Part B, such as cancer screenings, are at risk of losing access to these services if congressional Republicans go forward with their plan to repeal the ACA.

The Affordable Care Act works and has made a life-affirming difference in the lives of millions of Americans, in Texas and across the country.

This is what happens when a visionary president cares enough to work with a committed and empathetic Congress to address the real issues facing the American people.

You want to know why the American people have Obamacare?

It is because Obama cared.

The same cannot be said about this Republican president and congressional Republicans who have made careers of attacking and undermining the Affordable Care Act's protections and benefits for the American people.

I urge all Members to vote for H. Res. 271 and send a powerful message to the President and the American people that this House will not stand idly by as this Administration tries to take away health care from more than 130 million persons.

Instead, this House will resist by all constitutional and appropriate means, including opposing this Administration in the courts and by passing the "Protecting Pre-Existing Conditions and Making Health Care More Affordable Act of 2019," which will lower health insurance premiums with strengthened and expanded affordability assistance by:

- strengthening tax credits in the Marketplace to lower Americans' health insurance premiums and allows more middle-class individuals and families to qualify for subsidies;

- ensuring that families who don't have an offer of affordable coverage from an employer can still qualify for subsidies in the Marketplace; and,

3. providing funding for reinsurance, to help with high-cost claims, improve Marketplace stability, and prevent the Administration's sabotage from raising premiums.

The "Protecting Pre-Existing Conditions and Making Health Care More Affordable Act of 2019," will also strengthen protections for people with pre-existing conditions by curtailing the Administration's efforts to give states waivers to undermine protections for people with pre-existing conditions and weaken standards for essential health benefits.

These improper waivers leave consumers with less comprehensive plans that do not cover needed services, such as prescription drugs, maternity care and substance use disorder treatment.

Another way the "Protecting Pre-Existing Conditions and Making Health Care More Affordable Act of 2019," protects consumers is by prohibiting insurance companies from selling junk health insurance plans that do not provide coverage for essential medical treatments and drugs, or cover people with pre-existing medical conditions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and the preamble.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1585, VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2019

Ms. SCANLON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-32) on the resolution (H. Res. 281) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1585) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

LOUISE AND BOB SLAUGHTER POST OFFICE

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 540) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 770 Ayrault Road in Fairport, New York, as the "Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 540

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

SECTION 1. LOUISE AND BOB SLAUGHTER POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 770 Ayrault Road in Fairport, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 540, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 770 Ayrault Road in Fairport, New York, as the "Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office".

Representative Louise Slaughter was a groundbreaking Member of this House. She served here for 32 years. She was the first female chairwoman of the Rules Committee, and she coauthored the landmark Violence Against Women Act. She was also a dear friend.

Born in Harlan County, Kentucky, in 1929, Louise Slaughter was the daughter of a blacksmith. After graduating from high school, she went on to earn a bachelor's degree in microbiology and a master's degree in public health, both from the University of Kentucky.

After moving to upstate New York and marrying her beloved husband, Bob, Louise became active in local community groups and, eventually, in politics. She served a number of years in local elected offices and in the New York State Assembly.

Louise was first elected to Congress in 1986, where she eventually rose to become the top Democrat on the powerful Rules Committee. Tragically and very sadly, Louise died in March of last year, and she is sorely missed by all of us.

Naming a post office in her honor in her hometown of Fairport, New York, is maybe the least we could and should do to honor the distinguished career in public service of this remarkable woman.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 540, which names a post office located in Fairport, New York, in honor of Louise and Bob Slaughter.

Louise Slaughter was a Member of the House body for over 30 years. From 1987 until she passed away last year, Representative Slaughter was a tireless advocate for the people of her upstate New York district.

In addition to her numerous legislative accomplishments, Representative Slaughter made a mark on this body as the first woman to chair the House Committee on Rules.

Representative Slaughter was an intellectual and a beloved Member of the House. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I took my colleague by surprise here. We just came down from a Rules Committee meeting, and I appreciate her yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, if you didn't have the pleasure of serving with Louise on the Rules Committee, it looks kind of strange to have the Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office.

I have been here only 8 years, but I can't recall us doing that after a couple out here. Perhaps it is done regularly, but to serve with Louise—you know, the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, goes into the wee hours of the morning; 2 a.m., 3 a.m., 4 a.m., the Rules Committee is working, and it is truly Louise and Bob Slaughter.

Since my first day on the Rules Committee back in 2011, Louise took me under her wing. Yes, I was a young conservative Republican. Yes, she was an older—we can say, I think, honestly—liberal Democrat. She began building those partnerships with the young members of the Rules Committee with each and every committee meeting that took place.

I don't know if she was the first one who said it to me, but she was certainly one of them. She said: You know, ROB, of your colleagues on the other side of the aisle, folks sometimes think that we are upset with each other and we are bad people.

She said: I always tell folks, it is not that the people on the other side of the aisle are bad people. They are really good people. They just have some bad ideas.

She would share that with me from time to time, that my ideas were amongst those bad ideas. Her picture hangs right across from my seat there today.